

# BRAHMA SUTRA

By Swami Paramarthananda

Transcribed by Sri Balakrishnan

& Sri Vancheeswaran

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



Published by :

Arsha Avinash Foundation

104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012

Phone: 9487373635

E mail: [arshaavinash@gmail.com](mailto:arshaavinash@gmail.com)

[www.arshaavinash.in](http://www.arshaavinash.in)

BRAHMA SUTRA		
Classes: 001 to 011 - Introduction		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Topic
1	2	Preparatory
2	2	Introduction
3	5	Santhi Mantras
4		Dhyana Slokas
5	7	Outline of Brahma sutra
6	9	Two types of inference
7	13	Adhyasa Bhasyam
8	17	Adhyasa Bhasyam
9	21	Adhyasa Bhasyam
10	25	Adhyasa Bhasyam
11	29	Adhyasa Bhasyam
	29	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1		
Classes: 011 to 035 - Sutras: 1-1-1 to 1-1-4		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Sutra
11	32	1 . 1 . 1
12	34	1 . 1 . 1
13	37	1 . 1 . 1
14	40	1 . 1 . 1
15	43	1 . 1 . 1
16	46	1 . 1 . 1
17	49	1 . 1 . 2
18	53	1 . 1 . 2
19	57	1 . 1 . 2
20	60	1 . 1 . 2
21	63	1 . 1 . 2
22	66	1 . 1 . 2 and 1 . 1 . 3
23	70	1 . 1 . 3
24	73	1 . 1 . 4
25	76	1 . 1 . 4
26	79	1 . 1 . 4
27	82	1 . 1 . 4
28	85	1 . 1 . 4
29	88	1 . 1 . 4
30	92	1 . 1 . 4
31	95	1 . 1 . 4
32	98	1 . 1 . 4
33	102	1 . 1 . 4
34	106	1 . 1 . 4
35	109	1 . 1 . 4
	112	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1		
Classes: 036 to 063 - Sutras: 1-1-5 to 1-1-31		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Sutra
36	114	1 . 1 . 5
37	117	1 . 1 . 5
38	120	1 . 1 . 5
39	123	1 . 1 . 5
40	127	1 . 1 . 5 to 1 . 1 . 7
41	130	1 . 1 . 7 and 1 . 1 . 8
42	133	1 . 1 . 9 to 1 . 1 . 11
43	137	1 . 1 . 11 and 1 . 1 . 12
44	140	1 . 1 . 12
45	143	1 . 1 . 12 to 1 . 1 . 14
46	146	1 . 1 . 14 and 1 . 1 . 15
47	149	1 . 1 . 16 to 1 . 1 . 18
48	152	1 . 1 . 18 and 1 . 1 . 19
49	156	1 . 1 . 19 and 1 . 1 . 20
50	159	1 . 1 . 20
51	162	1 . 1 . 20 and 1 . 1 . 21
52	165	1 . 1 . 21 and 1 . 1 . 22
53	169	1 . 1 . 22
54	172	1 . 1 . 22 and 1 . 1 . 23
55	175	1 . 1 . 23
56	178	1 . 1 . 24
57	181	1 . 1 . 24
58	184	1 . 1 . 24 and 1 . 1 . 25
59	189	1 . 1 . 25 to 1 . 1 . 27
60	193	1 . 1 . 27 and 1 . 1 . 28
61	196	1 . 1 . 28 and 1 . 1 . 29
62	199	1 . 1 . 29 and 1 . 1 . 30
63	202	1 . 1 . 30 and 1 . 1 . 31
	204	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 2		
Classes: 064 to 087 - Sutras: 1-2-1 to 1-2-32		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Sutra
64	206	1 . 2 . 1
65	209	1 . 2 . 1 and 1 . 2 . 2
66	213	1 . 2 . 2 to 1 . 2 . 5
67	218	1 . 2 . 5 to 1 . 2 . 7
68	222	1 . 2 . 7 and 1 . 2 . 8
69	226	1 . 2 . 8 and 1 . 2 . 9
70	230	1 . 2 . 9
71	234	1 . 2 . 9 and 1 . 2 . 10
72	238	1 . 2 . 11
73	241	1 . 2 . 11 and 1 . 2 . 12
74	245	1 . 2 . 12 and 1 . 2 . 13
75	249	1 . 2 . 13 and 1 . 2 . 14
76	253	1 . 2 . 15 to 1 . 2 . 17
77	257	1 . 2 . 17 and 1 . 2 . 18
78	261	1 . 2 . 18 and 1 . 2 . 19
79	264	1 . 2 . 19 and 1 . 2 . 20
80	267	1 . 2 . 20 and 1 . 2 . 21
81	271	1 . 2 . 21
82	274	1 . 2 . 21 to 1 . 2 . 23
83	278	1 . 2 . 24
84	281	1 . 2 . 24 to 1 . 2 . 26
85	285	1 . 2 . 26 to 1 . 2 . 28
86	290	1 . 2 . 28 and 1 . 2 . 29
87	293	1 . 2 . 29 to 1 . 2 . 32
	296	

# BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 3

Classes: 088 to 124 - Sutras: 1-3-1 to 1-3-43

## Page Detail & Content

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Sutra</i>
88	298	1.3.1
89	301	1.3.1 to 1.3.4
90	305	1.3.5 to 1.3.7
91	310	1.3.8
92	313	1.3.8 and 1.3.9
93	317	1.3.9 and 1.3.10
94	321	1.3.10 to 1.3.12
95	325	1.3.12 and 1.3.13
96	329	1.3.13
97	332	1.3.13 and 1.3.14
98	336	1.3.14 and 1.3.15
99	341	1.3.15 to 1.3.17
100	345	1.3.17 to 1.3.19
101	349	1.3.30 to 1.3.32
102	353	1.3.32 and 1.3.33
103	357	1.3.33
104	360	1.3.34
105	363	1.3.34 and 1.3.35
106	366	1.3.35 and 1.3.36
107	370	1.3.36 to 1.3.38
108	373	1.3.38
109	377	1.3.39
110	380	1.3.40 and 1.3.41
111	383	1.3.41 and 1.3.42
112	386	1.3.42 and 1.3.43
113	389	1.3.30 to 1.3.32
114	393	1.3.32 and 1.3.33
115	397	1.3.33
116	401	1.3.34
117	405	1.3.34 and 1.3.35
118	408	1.3.35 and 1.3.36
119	411	1.3.36 to 1.3.38
120	415	1.3.38
121	418	1.3.39
122	423	1.3.40 and 1.3.41
123	427	1.3.41 and 1.3.42
124	432	1.3.42 and 1.3.43
	435	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 4		
Classes: 124 to 143 - Sutras: 1-4-1 to 1-4-28		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Sutra
125	437	1 . 4 . 1
126	441	1 . 4 . 1 to 1 . 4 . 3
127	445	1 . 4 . 3 and 1 . 4 . 4
128	448	1 . 4 . 4 to 1 . 4 . 6
129	453	1 . 4 . 6 to 1 . 4 . 8
130	457	1 . 4 . 8 and 1 . 4 . 9
131	461	1 . 4 . 9 and 1 . 4 . 10
132	465	1 . 4 . 11
133	468	1 . 4 . 11 to 1 . 4 . 13
134	472	1 . 4 . 14 and 1 . 4 . 15
135	475	1 . 4 . 15
136	478	1 . 4 . 16 and 1 . 4 . 17
137	482	1 . 4 . 17 and 1 . 4 . 18
138	486	1 . 4 . 18 and 1 . 4 . 19
139	490	1 . 4 . 19 to 1 . 4 . 22
140	495	1 . 4 . 22 and 1 . 4 . 23
141	500	1 . 4 . 23 to 1 . 4 . 25
142	506	1 . 4 . 26 to 1 . 4 . 28
143	511	1st CHapter Summary
	512	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 1		
Classes: 143 to 169 = 2-1-1 to 2-1-37		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Topic</i>
143	2	CHp-2: Introduction
144	4	2 . 1 . 1 and 2 . 1 . 2
145	7	2 . 1 . 2 and 2 . 1 . 3
146	12	2 . 1 . 3 and 2 . 1 . 4
147	15	2 . 1 . 4 to 2 . 1 . 6
148	19	2 . 1 . 6
149	21	2 . 1 . 6 and 2 . 1 . 7
150	26	2 . 1 . 7 and 2 . 1 . 8
151	30	2 . 1 . 8 to 2 . 1 . 10
152	34	2 . 1 . 10 and 2 . 1 . 11
153	37	2 . 1 . 11 and 2 . 1 . 12
154	40	2 . 1 . 12 to 2 . 1 . 14
155	43	2 . 1 . 14
156	47	2 . 1 . 14
157	52	2 . 1 . 14
158	56	2 . 1 . 14 to 2 . 1 . 16
159	60	2 . 1 . 16 and 2 . 1 . 17
160	64	2 . 1 . 17 and 2 . 1 . 18
161	68	2 . 1 . 18 to 2 . 1 . 20
162	72	2 . 1 . 20 to 2 . 1 . 22
163	76	2 . 1 . 22 to 2 . 1 . 25
164	82	2 . 1 . 25 and 2 . 1 . 26
165	85	2 . 1 . 26 and 2 . 1 . 27
166	88	2 . 1 . 27 to 2 . 1 . 30
167	93	2 . 1 . 30 to 2 . 1 . 32
168	97	2 . 1 . 32 to 2 . 1 . 34
169	101	2 . 1 . 34 to 2 . 1 . 37
	104	



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2

Classes: 170 to 194 = Sutras: 2-2-1 to 2-2-45

### Page Detail & Content

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Sutra</i>
170	106	2 . 2 . 1
171	110	2 . 2 . 1 to 2 . 2 . 3
172	114	2 . 2 . 3 and 2 . 2 . 4
173	118	2 . 2 . 4 to 2 . 2 . 7
174	122	2 . 2 . 7 to 2 . 2 . 10
175	126	2 . 2 . 11
176	129	2 . 2 . 11 and 2 . 2 . 12
177	132	2 . 2 . 13 and 2 . 2 . 14
178	136	2 . 2 . 15 to 2 . 2 . 17
179	141	2 . 2 . 17
180	143	2 . 2 . 18
181	146	2 . 2 . 18 and 2 . 2 . 19
182	149	2 . 2 . 20 and 2 . 2 . 21
183	153	2 . 2 . 21 to 2 . 2 . 23
184	157	2 . 2 . 23 to 2 . 2 . 25
185	161	2 . 2 . 25 to 2 . 2 . 27
186	165	2 . 2 . 28
187	169	2 . 2 . 28 and 2 . 2 . 29
188	173	2 . 2 . 29 to 2 . 2 . 32
189	176	2 . 2 . 33
190	179	2 . 2 . 33 to 2 . 2 . 35
191	183	2 . 2 . 35 to 2 . 2 . 37
192	187	2 . 2 . 37 and 2 . 3 . 38
193	191	2 . 3 . 39 to 2 . 3 . 41
194	195	2 . 2 . 42 to 2 . 2 . 45
	200	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 3		
Classes: 195 to 226 = Sutras: 2-3-1 to 2-3-53		
Page Detail & Content		
Class No	Page No	Content of Sutra
195	202	2 . 3 . 1
196	204	2 . 3 . 1 to 2 . 3 . 4
197	209	2 . 3 . 5 and 2 . 3 . 6
198	213	2 . 3 . 6 and 2 . 3 . 7
199	217	2 . 3 . 7 to 2 . 3 . 9
200	221	2 . 3 . 9
201	225	2 . 3 . 10 to 2 . 3 . 12
202	229	2 . 3 . 12 and 2 . 3 . 13
203	232	2 . 3 . 13 and 2 . 3 . 14
204	236	2 . 3 . 14 to 2 . 3 . 16
205	240	2 . 3 . 16 and 2 . 3 . 17
206	243	2 . 3 . 17 and 2 . 3 . 18
207	247	2 . 3 . 18
208	251	2 . 3 . 18 to 2 . 3 . 20
209	255	2 . 3 . 21 to 23 . 3 . 23
210	259	2 . 3 . 24 to 2 . 3 . 26
211	263	2 . 3 . 26 to 2 . 3 . 29
212	267	2 . 3 . 29
213	270	2 . 3 . 29 to 2 . 3 . 31
214	274	2 . 3 . 31 and 2 . 3 . 32
215	278	2 . 3 . 33 to 2 . 3 . 36
216	283	2 . 3 . 36 to 2 . 3 . 39
217	287	2 . 3 . 39 and 2 . 3 . 40
218	291	2 . 3 . 40 and 2 . 3 . 41
219	296	2 . 3 . 41 and 2 . 3 . 42
220	298	2 . 3 . 42 and 2 . 3 . 43
221	302	2 . 3 . 43 to 2 . 3 . 46
222	305	2 . 3 . 46 to 2 . 3 . 48
223	310	2 . 3 . 48 and 2 . 3 . 49
224	316	2 . 3 . 49 to 2 . 3 . 51
225	321	2 . 3 . 51 to 2 . 3 . 53
226	326	2 . 3 . 53
	327	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 4		
Classes: 226 to 236 = Sutras: 2-4-1 to 2-4-22		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Sutra</i>
226	202	2 . 4 . 1
227	204	2 . 4 . 1 to 2 . 4 . 4
228	208	2 . 4 . 4 to 2 . 4 . 7
229	212	2 . 4 . 7 and 2 . 4 . 8
230	216	2 . 4 . 9 and 2 . 4 . 10
231	220	2 . 1 . 10
232	223	2 . 4 . 11 to 2 . 4 . 13
233	227	2 . 4 . 13 and 2 . 4 . 14
234	231	2 . 4 . 15 to 2 . 4 . 17
235	235	2 . 4 . 17 to 2 . 4 . 19
236	239	2 . 4 . 20 to 2 . 4 . 22
	242	

**BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 1****Classes: 237 to 248 = 3-1-1 to 3-1-27****Page Detail & Content**

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
237	2	Introduction
238	4	3 . 1 . 1 and 3 . 1 . 2
239	7	3 . 1 . 2 to 3 . 1 . 5
240	11	3 . 1 . 5 and 3 . 1 . 6
241	14	3 . 1 . 7 and 3 . 1 . 8
242	17	3 . 1 . 8
243	20	3 . 1 . 9 to 3 . 1 . 11
244	24	3 . 1 . 12 to 3 . 1 . 15
245	28	3 . 1 . 16 to 3 . 1 . 19
246	32	3 . 1 . 20 to 3 . 1 . 23
247	36	3 . 1 . 24 and 3 . 1 . 25
248	40	3 . 1 . 25 to 3 . 1 . 27
	43	

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 2

Classes: 249 to 268 = Sutras: 3-2-1 to 3-2-41

### Page Detail & Content

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
249	45	3 . 2 . 1
250	49	3 . 2 . 2 and 3 . 2 . 3
251	53	3 . 2 . 3 and 3 . 2 . 4
252	57	3 . 2 . 4 to 3 . 2 . 6
253	61	3 . 2 . 7 and 3 . 2 . 8
254	65	3 . 2 . 9 and 3 . 2 . 10
255	69	3 . 2 . 10 and 3 . 2 . 11
256	73	3 . 2 . 11 to 3 . 2 . 13
257	77	3 . 2 . 14 to 3 . 2 . 16
258	81	3 . 2 . 17 to 3 . 2 . 20
259	86	3 . 2 . 20 and 3 . 2 . 21
260	90	3 . 2 . 22 and 3 . 2 . 23
261	94	3 . 2 . 24 and 3 . 2 . 25
262	98	3 . 2 . 26 to 3 . 2 . 28
263	102	3 . 2 . 29
264	106	3 . 2 . 30 to 3 . 2 . 33
265	110	3 . 2 . 33 to 3 . 2 . 35
266	114	3 . 2 . 35 to 3 . 2 . 37
267	118	3 . 2 . 38 to 3 . 2 . 41
268	122	3 . 2 . 41
	124	

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 3

Classes: 268 to 306 = Sutras: 3-3-1 to 3-3-66

### Page Detail & Content

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
268	126	3 . 3 . 1
269	127	3 . 3 . 1 and 3 . 3 . 2
270	131	3 . 3 . 2 and 3 . 3 . 3
271	135	3 . 3 . 3 to 3 . 3 . 6
272	140	3 . 3 . 6 and 3 . 3 . 7
273	144	3 . 3 . 8 and 3 . 3 . 9
274	148	3 . 3 . 9 to 3 . 3 . 11
275	152	3 . 3 . 12 to 3 . 3 . 14
276	157	3 . 3 . 14 and 3 . 3 . 15
277	161	3 . 3 . 16 and 3 . 3 . 17
278	165	2nd interpretation
279	168	3 . 3 . 17 and 3 . 3 . 18
280	172	3 . 3 . 18 and 3 . 3 . 19
281	176	3 . 3 . 19 to 3 . 3 . 22
282	180	3 . 3 . 22 and 3 . 3 . 23
283	183	3 . 3 . 24 and 3 . 3 . 25
284	186	3 . 3 . 25 and 3 . 3 . 26
285	189	3 . 3 . 26 and 3 . 3 . 27
286	192	3 . 3 . 28 and 3 . 3 . 29
287	196	3 . 3 . 29 to 3 . 3 . 31
288	200	3 . 3 . 31 and 3 . 3 . 32
289	203	3 . 3 . 32 and 3 . 3 . 33
290	206	3 . 3 . 33 and 3 . 3 . 34
291	209	3 . 3 . 34 to 3 . 3 . 36
292	213	3 . 3 . 37 and 3 . 3 . 38
293	218	3 . 3 . 38 and 3 . 3 . 39
294	222	3 . 3 . 39 to 3 . 3 . 42
295	227	3 . 3 . 43 and 3 . 3 . 44
296	231	3 . 3 . 44 to 3 . 3 . 47
297	235	3 . 3 . 47 to 3 . 3 . 49
298	239	3 . 3 . 50 and 3 . 3 . 51
299	243	3 . 3 . 52 to 3 . 3 . 54
300	247	3 . 3 . 54
301	251	3 . 3 . 54 to 3 . 3 . 56
302	255	3 . 3 . 57 and 3 . 3 . 58
303	258	3 . 3 . 58 and 3 . 3 . 59
304	261	3 . 3 . 60 and 3 . 3 . 61
305	264	3 . 3 . 61 to 3 . 3 . 66
306	269	3 . 3 . 66
	270	

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 4

Classes: 306 to 339 = Sutras: 3-4-1 to 3-4-52

### Page Detail & Content

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
306	272	3 . 4 . 1 and 3 . 4 . 2
307	274	3 . 4 . 2
308	277	3 . 4 . 2 to 3 . 4 . 6
309	282	3 . 4 . 7 and 3 . 4 . 8
310	285	3 . 4 . 9 to 3 . 4 . 12
311	290	3 . 4 . 13 to 3 . 4 . 15
312	294	3 . 4 . 16 to 3 . 4 . 18
313	298	3 . 4 . 18
314	301	3 . 4 . 19 and 3 . 4 . 20
315	305	3 . 4 . 20
316	309	3 . 4 . 20
317	313	3 . 4 . 20 to 3 . 4 . 22
318	317	3 . 4 . 22 to 3 . 4 . 24
319	321	3 . 4 . 24 to 3 . 4 . 26
320	325	3 . 4 . 26 and 3 . 4 . 27
321	329	3 . 4 . 27 and 3 . 4 . 28
322	333	3 . 4 . 28 and 3 . 4 . 29
323	337	3 . 4 . 29 to 3 . 4 . 31
324	340	3 . 4 . 31 and 3 . 4 . 32
325	344	3 . 4 . 32 to 3 . 4 . 35
326	347	3 . 4 . 35 and 3 . 4 . 36
327	350	3 . 4 . 36 to 3 . 4 . 39
328	353	3 . 4 . 39 and 3 . 4 . 40
329	356	3 . 4 . 41
330	359	3 . 4 . 41 and 3 . 4 . 42
331	362	3 . 4 . 42 and 3 . 4 . 43
332	365	3 . 4 . 43 to 3 . 4 . 46
333	370	3 . 4 . 47
334	373	3 . 4 . 47
335	376	3 . 4 . 47 and 3 . 4 . 48
336	379	3 . 3 . 48 to 3 . 4 . 50
337	383	3 . 4 . 50 and 3 . 4 . 51
338	386	3 . 4 . 51 and 3 . 4 . 52
339	390	3 . 4 . 52
	392	

**BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4 Pada: 1****Classes: 340 to 355 = 4-1-1 to 4-1-19****Page Detail & Content**

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
340	2	4 . 1 . 1
341	5	4 . 1 . 1 and 4 . 1 . 2
342	9	4 . 1 . 2 and 4 . 1 . 3
343	13	4 . 1 . 3 and 4 . 1 . 4
344	17	4 . 1 . 4 and 4 . 1 . 5
345	21	4 . 1 . 5 and 4 . 1 . 6
346	25	4 . 1 . 6
347	29	4 . 1 . 6 and 4 . 1 . 7
348	33	4 . 1 . 7 to 4 . 1 . 11
349	38	4 . 1 . 11 and 4 . 1 . 12
350	41	4 . 1 . 12 and 4 . 1 . 13
351	45	4 . 1 . 13 to 4 . 1 . 15
352	49	4 . 1 . 15
353	52	4 . 1 . 16 and 4 . 1 . 17
354	55	4 . 1 . 17 and 4 . 1 . 18
355	59	4 . 1 . 19
	61	

**BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4 Pada: 2****Classes: 355 to 367 = Sutras: 4-2-1 to 4-2-21****Page Detail & Content**

<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
355	63	4 . 2 . 1
356	65	4 . 2 . 1 and 4 . 2 . 2
357	69	4 . 2 . 3 and 4 . 2 . 4
358	73	4 . 2 . 4 to 4 . 2 . 26
359	77	4 . 2 . 7 and 4 . 2 . 8
360	80	4 . 2 . 8 to 4 . 2 . 10
361	84	4 . 2 . 11 and 4 . 2 . 12
362	87	4 . 2 . 12 and 4 . 2 . 13
363	91	4 . 2 . 13 to 4 . 2 . 15
364	94	4 . 2 . 15 to 4 . 2 . 17
365	98	4 . 2 . 17
366	101	4 . 2 . 17 to 4 . 2 . 20
367	105	4 . 2 . 20 and 4 . 2 . 21
	108	



BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4 Pada: 3		
Classes: 368 to 375 = Sutras: 4-3-1 to 4-3-16		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
368	110	4 . 3 . 1 and 4 . 3 . 2
369	114	4 . 3 . 2 and 4 . 3 . 3
370	118	4 . 3 . 4 to 4 . 3 . 6
371	122	4 . 3 . 6 to 4 . 3 . 9
372	125	4 . 3 . 9 to 4 . 3 . 11
373	129	4 . 3 . 12 to 4 . 3 . 14
374	132	4 . 3 . 14 and 4 . 3 . 15
375	136	4 . 3 . 15 and 4 . 3 . 16
376	139	Conclusion
	140	

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4 Pada: 4		
Classes: 376 to 390 = Sutras: 4-4-1 to 4-4-22		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>
376	142	4 . 4 . 1
377	144	4 . 4 . 1
378	148	4 . 4 . 1 to 4 . 4 . 3
379	153	4 . 4 . 3 to 4 . 4 . 5
380	158	4 . 4 . 5 to 4 . 4 . 7
381	162	4 . 4 . 7 and 4 . 4 . 8
382	166	4 . 4 . 8 to 4 . 4 . 11
383	170	4 . 4 . 11 and 4 . 4 . 12
384	173	4 . 4 . 12 to 4 . 4 . 15
385	176	4 . 4 . 15 to 4 . 4 . 17
386	180	4 . 4 . 17 to 4 . 4 . 19
387	184	4 . 4 . 19 to 4 . 4 . 22
388	188	Summary
389		Conclusion
390		Questions & Answers
	191	

BRAHMA SUTRA		
Classes: 001 to 011 - Introduction		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Topic</i>
1	2	Preparatory
2	2	Introduction
3	5	Santhi Mantras
4		Dhyana Slokas
5	7	Outline of Brahma sutra
6	9	Two types of inference
7	13	Adhyasa Bhasyam
8	17	Adhyasa Bhasyam
9	21	Adhyasa Bhasyam
10	25	Adhyasa Bhasyam
11	29	Adhyasa Bhasyam
	30	

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 1

#### Introduction

Brahma sutra classes will be based on Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam. We will pray for the successful completion of the course, which will take more than three years.

### Class 2

#### Human goal

Many things are common between animal and human being and human being basically an animal only. Hunger, growth, procreation, sleep etc. are common to both. The evolved intellect or the power of reasoning is the extra faculty because of human being is different from all the other animals. If you take thinking faculty from human being there will be no different from human being and animal. He is able to reason out about himself and he has clear-cut goal in his life. Animals have no planned life or any goal to achieve,.

Human beings are able to achieve for the set goal. He is a thinker with clear set of ideas whatever be the level of thinking. Some dedicate their life and study to achieve their goal. An ordinary human being is a casual thinker and serious thinker studies analyses and form set of conclusions.

Six topics are important which are connected with human thinking. He should know about himself; next he should know about the universe; third is he should know about Isvara; fourth topic is bandha why human beings suffer and they are in bondage. Bondage and samsara and sufferings fall into this category. Fifth is moksa or mukti or freedom from bondage. Sixth and final topic is the means by which a person goes from bondage to the liberation/moksa. Jivat, Isvara, banda, moksa and sadhanani are the six topics a serious thinker studies.

Such a thinker who forms such a philosophy is darsanika and the philosophy is called darsanam. Others to follow such persons. Darsanika is propagator of his philosophy. The founders of the darsanams are called acharyas. We have twelve famous philosophies. Six of them are called nastika darsanani and six are called astika darsanani. Nastika darsanams are those, which do not accept vada pramanam. Their philosophies are based on perception, inference and reasoning. Astika darsanams are those which accept Veda as valid source of knowledge.

#### Caravaka darsanam

First is called carvaka darsanam or materialism. The source of this philosophy is brahaspati himself the deva guru. The purpose of this philosophy is to mislead asuras. So that asuras will follow and they will get punished. His sishya is carvakah who popularised this philosophy. It does not accept Atma, Vedas dharma etc. Modern science is close to this philosophy. Consciousness is temporary product of matter. Enjoy life is his motto. Enjoy even by borrowing money from other. He does not believe in the return of the body. None has seen sookshma sariram, karana sariram, no belief in scriptures etc. He believes in perception only,

which is nice to hear. It is not discussed in Brahma sutra. Other 10 darsanas are discussed in Brahma sutra.

### **Jaina darsanas.**

This is given by 24 acharyas called tirthankara. Starting from rishab acharya ending with varthamana mahavira. Varthamana is also called jinah and janah means one who has conquered himself. He has conquered his sense organs, mind etc. His teachings we will discuss as and when the topic comes in Brahma sutra. There are two groups space is sacred dhikambara and svetamabars. Difference is in the form of external practices.

### **Bouddha darsanam**

The founder of this is buddhah. He did not teach any systematic philosophy but he gave some stray statement that approached him. It was not well-developed system initially. Thereafter many followed including the kings of those days. Three books have been brought out and they are three pitakams. The three pitakams sutra pitakam, adhi dharma pitakam and vinaya pitakam. Also are called adhi damma pitakam, sutra pitakam and vinaya pitakam.

They contain the teachings in sutra form. First deals with statement of master, the second one the philosophy and the third one the conduct of the followers of the system. Later scholars analysed and brought their own books. Then came four branches of Buddhism. One is soutrantika based on the sutra books called suddha pitakam. sutra based philosophy is called soutrantika. Second one is based on adhi dhamma pitakam. Vibasa commentary and hence it got the name of ibashika. Third one is called yogachara and this gives emphasis on yoga and achara. Both are called madhyamika Buddhism. They claim to follow the medium path and avoidance of all extreme. I will deal with the teachings later.

### **Six asthika darsanam.**

Samkya, vaiseshika, nyaya, purva mimamsa and uttara mimamsa are the six falling under this category. All believe in Vedas of the six darsanam the first four accept Veda pramana but gives importance to tarka pramanam. Between tarka and Veda they will take tarka as important. Otherwise they are called tarikika darsanam.

Purva mimamsaka and uttara mimamsaka gives importance to Veda and tarka is secondary. Purva mimaska is based on Veda purva bagha or karma kanda based one. The upanisadic portion is less important for the purva mimamsaka. Uttara mimamsaka gives important to the Veda anta portion. Veda purva is not thrown away but it plays a supporting role.

All of the darsanams are formed in sutra form by the presenters. Sutra means a brief statement containing the packed ideas. Uttara mimamsaka sutra is known as Brahma sutra or Vedanta sutrani. Also it is called sariraka sutrani popular among Sanskrit commentators.

Another name is badarayana sutrani of these we will discuss the Brahma sutra. Even sentence will be incomplete. We have to complete the sentence and thereafter understand the meaning. Many have written the commentary on the Brahma sutram. There is ambiguity or doubt regarding the meaning of the sutrams, which is too brief. Veda talks about dvaidam,

advaidam etc. There are different types of teachings. Brahma sutra has given birth more than ten types of interpretations.

Of these several interpretations, three of them are very popular. Nirvishesha advaidam revealed by Adhi Sankaracharya; visistadvaidam is based on ramanujacharya [sri bashyam] and the third one is based on the commentary by madhyvacharya [anu bashyam]. Our discussion will be based on Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam. Before learning the bashyam we have set method for study of this bashyam. We will chant mantras and thereafter we will take up the study.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 3

Now I will give the meaning of the shanti padas of the ten upanisads we have changed to day. I will give you the essence of the shanti padas.

#### **Brief analysis of ten principal shanti padas**

First shanti pada is om shano mitra, which occurs in Taittiriya upanisad. The essence of this is that student asks for auspicious. He offers prostrations to hiranyagarbha who is the embodiment of all the devatas. Then he glorifies the hiranyagarbha as the very vayu tattvam. Hiranyagarbha is also seen as embodiment of all the virtues. Then there is a prayer of guru sishya raksanam that protect guru sishya.

Second shanti pata occurs in Taittiriya upanisad Brahmananda valli. First teacher prays for guru sishya raksanam for communication. A prayer is to put forward sufficient effort for communication. Teacher and sishya are to put forward sufficient efforts to study. Homework has to be done both by teacher and sishya. Good homework on both guru and sishya to make the study effective. Also there is a prayer for mutual relationship between guru and sishya. Compassion on the part of teacher and trust on the part of sishya will make the study effective. Such relations are valid for family relationship also.

Third prayer is taken from taittiriya upanisad siksa valli to develop medha saksi. First he asks for grahanam saksi to grasp the teaching. Secondly he asks for jnanam jivatma paramatma jnanam and thirdly he wants his sthoola sariram and sookshma sariram fit enough to pursue the study and fourthly he asks for continuous sravanam without any obstacles. Finally student asks for retaining what he has learnt from the guru.

Fourth mantra is also taken from Taittiriya upanisad siksa valli meant for Atma jnana siddhi. Here we quote the statement of great Brahma jnani known as trisanku rishi. This statement comes after gaining the knowledge. He says i am as great as Isvara and i have Isvara saksi. I enliven and invigorate the whole creation. He says that he has the glories of Isvara. Thirdly he says i have got greatest wealth in the world, which is Brahma jnanam.

Fourth mantra states that I am as great as lord i am as glorious as lord and i am wealthiest in the world. Student will own up with the statement after gaining Atma jnanam. Jivatma and paramatma have got karana karya sambandha. First we talk of aikyam and then we talk of sambandha. Aikyam is from the standpoint of Atma and sambandha is from the standpoint of jivatma. Atma dristya aikyam and anatma dristya sambandha. Atma is sathyam if you remove Atma anatma cannot exist independently.

Sixth shanti mantra occurs in keno upanisad. First he asks for sarira yogyatha. Both sthoola sariram and sookshma sariram seventeen organs must be healthy. Then he asks for shraddha and faith in Brahman until he understands Brahman. Brahman cannot be known through sense organs, mind and not available for transactions and initially he may think Brahman is nonexistent. Student must believe in nirgunam Brahman even if he does not understand in the beginning. Next he wants Isvara anugraha. Let me not negate Isvara and let not Isvara negate me. The he wants all virtue required for assimilation for jnanam.

Seventh mantra belongs to rg Veda occurring in Aitreryea upanisad. He asks for following blessings. He asks for harmony of thought and word. Let there not be split between thought and need. Secondly he asks for grahanam capacity to grasp the teachings. Even if don't go in for Veda, let Veda come to me. Student ask for daranam which means retention of whatever he heard and fourthly let the life be in keeping with the learning and understudying and guru sishya raksanam so that the yagna continue.

Eighth one is prayer to lord to gently lead or gently take the mind to auspicious Brahman or Atman or truth. Second is addressed to the mind praying it to lead to Brahman. Either way the essence is that we should gain Brahma jnanam.

Ninth mantra relates to atharvana Veda. He asks for auspiciousness. Second prayer is for sarira yogyatha.

Tenth shanti pada occurs in svetasvara upasana. Here student says that he surrenders to the lord and it lord's job to save him from samsara and give liberation. All responsibility is passed on to Isvara. Jnana yoga is preceded by saranagathi. The lord is glorified. The lord is the one who creates Brahmaji or hiranyagarbha before creation. Hiranyagarbha is samasti sookshma sariram. Isvara is Hiranyagarbha's father.

That Isvara alone sends Vedas to hiranyagarbha. Hiranyagarbha is the disciple of Isvara. He gets Vedas from Isvara alone. Brahmanji does not require systematic teachings. He grasps the whole thing through tapas or intuition as it were. It is mouna vakyanam. That Isvara's name Atma buddhi prakasam. He is the one who reveals Atma jnanam. Students ask Isvara to reveal Brahma jnanam to him as he had done to Brahmaji.

Next prayer is the one directed to all the rishi parampara. There is vamsa Brahmanam given in Brihadaranyaka upanisad giving the details of gurus who have perpetuated the teaching from the beginning to date. You cannot compare one from the other. There is prostration for all the gurus. I am identical with Brahman with the blessings of all the rishis. Then prayers are offered to Dakshinamurthi. More in the next class

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 5

#### Adhi Sankaracharya's views on bashyams

Brahman or Isvara are most auspicious thing i the world. Everyone is auspicious due to Brahma sambanda only. Merely hearing or remembering Isvara gains constant flow of auspiciousness. Brahman is adhi kalyana rupam, the most auspicious one. It bestows all the wishes of the devotee. Hence Brahman is known as mangala swarupam.

Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam says that the credit goes to Isvara for writing the whole commentary of the upanisad. He admits that it is not his original commentary but repeated only what have been stated by his previous commentators.

Vedic interpretations should be based on grammar [pada sastra], vakya sastra or mimamsa sastra, which is exclusively designed for interpretation of Vedas; this deals with sentences. The meaning of sentences change depends upon various factors. So many factors are taken in to account what is stated in the Vedas more so when the author is not there to cross check the intention of Vedic authors.

The third is the pramana sastra the science of logical thinking or tarka sastra. Adhi Sankaracharya says that he would only re-present the commentary in his own ways. Finally the glory of two words is mention that is 'om' and 'atha'. They are glorious because Brahmaji uttered the words before creation. These two words did not come from the mouth but came from throat directly breaking open. The idea is that Brahmaji uttered these words. Having uttered these words before creation, Brahmaji created the world successfully. With this prayer verses are also over.

#### Overview of Brahma sutra

Now I will give three outlines of the Brahma sutra. Four chapters or four adhyayas are there. Each chapter is subdivided onto four sections known as padas. There are sixteen sections in Brahma sutra. Each section is subdivided into adhi karanam. 192 adhikaranams are there in Brahma sutra. Each section consists number of adhikaranam, which are no uniform. All these topics are taken from Vedanta or upanisads. They are in the form of statements in the upanisads. Each topic is elaborately discussed in the Brahma sutra. Some topic has got one sutra while some have more than one sutra. Totally we have 592 sutras in Brahma sutra.

In the four chapters four topics are discussed. The first chapter deals with samanvayah. So it is called samanvayadhyayah. It is a technical word occurring in mimamsaka sastra, which means consistency. Samanvaya as prove that Brahman is central theme of the upanisad is established here. This we will see later. Vyasacharya has to prove this because other darsanas do not accept this particularly samkya and purva mimamsakas. Samkya have got their own intention and hence he refuted samkya philosophy and purva mimamsaka philosophy. Hence he uses samanvaya prove this.

Second chapter deals with avirodhah. Here he establishes that Brahma vidya does not have any contradictions. Contradiction is a defect in the teaching and he shows that teaching is



defect free. Three types of contradiction he refutes the internal contradiction within Vedas itself; Vedic statement do not contradict one another; that is sruti virodhah; the second contradiction is with regard to smriti gita, maha bhārata etc. Finally, sruti yukti virodhah nasti means it is not logically contradictory or illogical. He takes all nastika darsanams also like nyaya vaiseshika etc. He establishes that Brahma vidya is free of logical contradictions. The second chapter is heavily logic based.

The third chapter deals with sadhana preparatory disciple required to gain Brahma vidya. Those directly connected and indirectly connected are pointed out here. Rituals indirectly help to purify the mind. In fact everything connected with religion is useful it is said.

The fourth chapter discusses the benefit or fruit of Brahma vidya which is moksha or liberation. Karma mukti and sadhyo mukti are discussed. These four topics are subdivided into 592 sutras. Based on these only names of the adhyayas are based.

We use three common words while discussing Brahma sutra. One is sutram, second is bashyam and third is adhikaranam. Sutram or any aphorism should be concise and should not be long; it should be clear and it should not be unambiguous; it should deal with the essentials alone. It should be pregnant with meaning; it should have many facets if possible;

Sutra should not have unnecessary glorification; no extra decoration should be there. Saving one letter from the sutra gives so much pleasure to the sutrakaras as if he has got a putra. It should be defect free. There should not be any grammatical error in its construction; it should not have any logical mistake. 'man are' going or fire is cold etc., and such usages should be avoided. It should be free from sabda and artha dosah. Then only it is called sutram.

The word sutram has got literal meaning also and it is a thread. The second meaning is applicable in the case of Brahma sutra. It strings the upanishadic ideas into a mala. The beads in the form of sutra give a good garland of flowers in the forms of sutras. Vyasacharya has made the garland, a Vedanta sastra garland.

### **Definition of bashyam**

What is the definition of bashyam? The commentary should be in the same order in which sutras are there. The commentator may introduce technical word but he should explain the word. Such commentary is called bashyam.

Now, we will see adhikaranam or the topic. Every thing consists of five factors. First is the subject matter visayah; upanishad is the subject matter; second factor is samsayah what is the doubt in that statement. If there is no doubt there is no need for enquiry; what is evident need not be enquired into. What are the doubts expressed compared to other philosophies?

Third factor is purva paksha. The views of the non-vedantism mean all other people. They give their own logic. Fourth are siddhantah or the Vedantic conclusions, which has to be established by refuting all the views. Also our conclusion free from doubt should be established. The fifth factor is sangathih the link between previous and present topic. Next I will like to go through the Adhi Sankaracharya's introduction to Brahma sutra, which is adhyasa bashyam. This I will take up in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 6

#### **All about anumanam – general principle**

Brahma sutra uses the method of anumana to bring out the teachings of the upasana. Anumanam is inference based on pratyaksa or perception. Without perception data, inference will be an imagination and it will not be valid. Scientist cannot know the age of moon and he therefore collects the data from the moon before he infers the age of moon etc. Collect data based on data for any inference to be valid.

For any inference to be valid, it should be based on four factors. Four factors are required for inference are one is paksa, the second is sadhyam, the third is hetu and the fourth dristandah. The example generally taken in sastra is inference of fire on the mountain by seeing the smoke. It is taken in technical form is *parvadhah agniman doomavatvad yata maha nate*. This we should remember because throughout Brahma sutra we will use this. In this *parvatah* mountain is said to be paksah. The second *agniman* the mountain has fire is sadhyam; *doomavatvad* it is smoky it is called hetu; *yata maha nate* as seen in the olden day kitchen. This is the example.

The mountain is said to be paksa because it is the locus of discussion. In this example we know the unperceived fire in the hill through the perception of smoke and fire. There is first the knowledge or apprehension of smoke in it and the knowledge of an invariable relation between smoke and fire.

There is, first the knowledge or apprehension of smoke as a mark in the hill. Secondly there is a recollection of the relation of invariable concomitance between smoke and fire as we have observed in the past.

Thirdly we have the resulting knowledge of the existence of the apperceived fire in the hill. Now, the inference the hill is the paksa [minor term] since is subject under consideration in the course of the inference reasoning. Fire is the sadhya [major term] as that is something, which we want to prove or establish in relation to the hill by means of this inference.

Smoke is the linga [middle term] as it is mark or sign, which indicates the presence of fire. It is called the hetu or sadhana i.e., the reason or ground of inference. Thus corresponding to the minor, major and middle terms of the syllogism, inference in Indian logic contains three terms namely paksa, sadhya and hetu.

The paksa is the subject with which we are concerned in any reference. Sadhya is the object, which we want to know in relation to the subject with which we are concerned in any inference. The sadhya is the object, which we want to know in relation to the paksa or the inferable character of the paksa. The hetu is the reason for our relating the sadhya to the paksa. It is the ground of our knowledge of the sadhya as related to the paksa.

In the order of the events which take place when a certain thinker is inferring, the first step inference is the apprehension of the hetu [smoke] in the paksa [hill] the second, recollection of the universal relation between hetu and sadhya [smoke and fire] and the last is the

cognition of the sadhya [fire] as related to the paksa [hill] but as a matter of formal statement or verbal expression, the step in inference is the predication of the sadhya with regards to the paksa e.g, the hill is fiery.

The second is the affirmation of the hetu as related to the paksa. e.g., wherever there is smoke there is fire as in the kitchen, thus in inference we must have at least three propositions, all of which are categorical and one must be affirmative and the others may be affirmative or negative.

The first proposition corresponds to the conclusion of the syllogism, the second to the minor premise and the third to the major premise. Thus inference in Indian logic may be said to be a syllogism consisting of three categorical propositions. But the order of the propositions is reversed in Indian logic in so far as it puts the conclusion of the syllogism first and its usual major premise last in the formal statement of inference.

Wherever there is fire there is smoke. You should not say it otherwise. In the body agni is there. We do not develop smoke. We don't see the smoke coming from the head. Remember it is figurative expression. Yatra yatra doomah tatra tatra agni. This knowledge is called vyapti knowledge. The knowledge of invariable coexistence of the fire along with fire is vyapti knowledge. This will have two factors.

Yatra yatra doomah is one factor and tatra tatra agni is the second factor. The yatra yatra doomah [smoke] is called vyaptam and tatra tatra agni is called vyapagam. Their coexistence is called vyapti. If you study vyapti vakyam *yatra yatra doomah and tatra tatra agniman* the anumana vakyam, dooma is vapyam and agni is vyapakam. Vyapyam of the vyapti vakyam, vyapyam becomes hetu in the anumana vakyam. Vyapakam of vyapti vakyam becomes sadhyam of anumana vakyam.

We can put vyapti vakyam in two ways. Now we represent as yatra yatra hetu tatra tatra sadhyam. Only if this is proved anumana vakyam is valid. Only if this valid the anumana vakyam is valid. Only if the vyapti vakyam is valid the anumana vakyam will be valid. How do validate the vyapti vakyam. Only means of validating the vyapti vakyam is perception. Study the kitchen or yaga sala etc. Thus I show few standard cases to validate vyapti vakyam. Yatra yatra doomaha tatra tatra agniman. Whenever vyapti vakyam is disproved anumanam is disproved. Even the scientists use this method.

In fact, when the scientist studies the rocks of the moon he collects observed data. The observed data helps him arriving at the conclusion. The inference is based on observed data. Now we collect data through observation and arrive at conclusion. The conclusion will be about that object from where data has been collected. Suppose I collect data from the moon, the conclusion will be about the moon only and not about other planet. We call it data and conclusion will deal with the same object alone. Hetu and sadhyam will belong to the same paksa. If I collect some data from my blood, the findings will be about me alone. Once this is understood we will derive an important inference.

Scientist collects data from observed world. All data we collect is from anatma alone. All observed deal with anatma. If scientific reasoning is used the entire scientific conclusion will be about anatma because science collects data from anatma and they can have conclusion with regard to anatma. Sadhyam should deal with that paksa about which we have data.

All scientific reasoning process is called loukika anumanam. Therefore all loukika anumanam will deal with anatma jnanam apra vidya alone. Therefore loukika anumanam has no access to Atma vidya. This is proved by loukika anumanam. It cannot touch Atma vidya. Don't hope to arrive Atma jnanam through scientific process of reasoning because it has no access. It is like hearing through the eyes. If i try to know Atma it is abuse of pramanam and it is born of delusion. This is established in Brahma sutra.

We will see later. Tarka cannot prove anything about Atma. If tarka is used for Atma vidya we can never come to any conclusion. What is nyaya used in sastram? This must be different from loukika anumanam. Here we deal with different field. Loukika anumanam is based on data collected. The difference is with regard to the source of data. In loukika anumanam the data is collected through observation or pratyaksam.

The crucial thing to be noted is that data is based on pratyaksam. In sastra we cannot collect data through observation and the data is collected from sastram. It is sastra based data collection. We base the data collected through sastram while discussing Brahma sutra. We accept as asthikas sastram as valid means of collecting data just as scientist accept observation valid means for collecting data. No scientist negates observation but scientist may question conclusion. The whole science is based on that observation is valid pramanam and scientist's aim is to arrive at conclusions based on the observation.

Similarly, once we come to sastram, our basic assumption is that all sastram is valid source for the collection of data. The conclusion based on the sastric data may be questioned but the sastric data cannot be questioned. Dvaidam is the conclusion based on sastra. Advaidam is based on sastric data. Vishistadvaidam is based on the sastric data. We cannot question the sastric statement itself because sastram is as valid as pratyaksa or observation is valid for the scientists. So much validity is given to sastra vakyams.

### **Anumanam in sastric studies – an overview**

In Brahma sutra we collect the data from sastram and based on the sastric data alone, we arrive at the conclusions and establish the truth. Here hetu will be based on sastram. The reason is based on sastram. The student must be an asthika for sastric anumanam. For nasthika or scientist Brahma sutra is not applicable. Vedanta will be useful only for asthika and not a nasthika.

The next question is does it mean that loukika anumanam is not there in Brahma sutra. Do we have a role for loukika anumanam perception based anumanam in Brahma sutra. It is there. But it has got a different application. Loukika anumanam used in Brahma sutra is not for establishing Vedanta, the reason being loukika anumanam deals with anatma while Vedanta deals with Atma.

The regular reasoning is not used to establish in Brahma sutra. I said that scientific reasoning has no access to Atma because data is collected on anatma. Vedantic teaching is based on sastric anumanam. Since loukika anumanam has no access to Atma it cannot prove Vedantic teaching and it is equally important loukika anumanam, cannot disprove Vedantic anumanam.

For proving a colour or disproving eyes alone is used and you cannot use ear to prove or disprove the colour. Proving as also disproving required access. Loukika anumanam cannot

prove Vedantic teaching and logic cannot disprove Vedanta. Some nastika philosophers use loukika anumana to disprove Vedanta. If nastika uses loukika anumana to disprove Vedanta, he used the anumana wrongly. I know that there is some fallacy in his inference. We use logic not to prove Vedanta is logical, but to prove Vedanta is not illogical. It is one use of loukika anumana for our purpose. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 7

#### **Anumanam in sastric studies contd.**

The difference between loukika anumanam and sastriya anumanam there are common and uncommon features. Both are data based and data collected from other pramanam. Both are dependent on some data. Both of them do not question the validity of the data. For example scientist inference is based on perceptual data and he takes the sensory perception is valid and he does not question the data. A scientist can question the conclusion based on the data. In scriptural inference we don't question sastric data. Here also the conclusions based on the data are questioned.

Loukika anumanam is based on perception data and it deals with anatma. Whereas aloukika or sastric anumanam is based on scriptures and it deals with Atma. Scriptures especially Vedanta deals with Atma alone. It has functions in the fields of Atma. One has anatma as its field and the other Atma as its field. It is like eyes and ears. Both are pramanams all right but in different fields.

We arrive at some important conclusions. Loukika anumanam can never prove or disprove Atma gained through sastriya anumanam. It has no judging capacity either to disprove or prove Atma vidya. Eyes cannot question the information regarding the sound nor eyes can disprove the information gained through the ears. Extending this we say loukika anumanam cannot prove or disprove Vedantic knowledge. Here in Brahma sutra we deal with Atma jnanam and loukika anumanam has no role to play. This is called sruti sammada tarkah. That is what Adhi Sankaracharya says in sadhana panchakam in Vedana if you use loukika anumanam it is dry logic or wrong or misplaced logic.

Is there any utility for loukika anumanam in Brahma sutra discussion? Do we use loukika anumanam if you ask; loukika anumanam is used in Brahma sutra rarely. In this context loukika anumanam cannot be used for proving and disproving Vedanta. Some philosophers use loukika anumanam to disprove Vedanta and to say it illogical. To prove loukika anumanam is falsely proved we use loukika anumanam to prove the fallacy of loukika anumanam.

In this context, we say that your anumanam is wrong. Loukika anumanam is not used to disprove Vedanta anumanam is logical. Vedanta is beyond the field of logic and loukika anumanam. You cannot say that Vedanta is logical or illogical for it is supra logical. Don't use loukika logic to prove or disprove the Vedanta. This is done very efficiently in the second chapter. The entire discussion in the first chapter of Brahma sutra is based on sastric anumanam. In the second chapter we use loukika anumanam to disprove the loukika anumanam put forward by nasthika philosophers.

Certain nasthika philosophers they do not have sastriya anumanam because they don't accept sastram. They know only loukika anumanam. Based on that they try to arrive at the truth of Atma swarupam or the truth of the world. We want to establish that using loukika anumanam can never arrive at the truth. So we use loukika to disprove their conclusions. This we do to dismiss Buddhist and Jaina anumanams. I disprove their philosophies. Loukika anumanam

has no role to play in the field of Vedanta. Another logician who is more intelligent than the former can disprove one logician. He may say that I am the greatest.

Tarka can give functional information with which we can conduct vyavahara. Scientists have no courage to say this is the fact but they say this is my observation. Don't use logic or science to find the truth and truth is not accessible to the loukika anumana. In the creation there are many things, which are above logic and science. Every scientist should be humble to accept that there are many things which above science. He should not apply logic in the Vedantic field.

By using logic one has crossed the ocean of samsaya. By using perpetual data one confused becomes confounded. Vyasa dismisses all four types of Buddhism, Jaina theory etc. Our conclusions are based on sastra. Now we will go to the introduction given by Adhi Sankaracharya to Brahma sutra, which is called adhyasa bashyam.

### **Adhyasa Bashyam of Adhi Sankaracharya**

Adhyasa means an error or mistake. In this bashyam Adhi Sankaracharya establishes that the whole samsara is because of error or mistake. This is very important because once Adhi Sankaracharya proves that samsara is because of error he can say samsara nivritti is adhyasa nivritti. Once error vanishes, the error caused problems is gone. Now the question is at all we have the error or adhyasa. Any error is because of ignorance ajnanam. Ajnanam causes adhyasa and adhyasa causes samsara. This is the essence of adhyasa bashyam.

If samsara is to go adhyasa should go and if adhyasa should go jnanam should come. Therefore, it is jnanena eva moksah. Karmana na moksah, baktiya na moksah, upasana na moksah. You may do anything you cannot gain moksha. They prepare you to gain jnanam only and it will not take you to moksha. Ignorance based samsara will go only through knowledge alone. Therefore the Brahma sutra starts with 'atha tho Brahma jijnasa [now therefore desire to know Brahman].

For conveying this topic of adhyasa, we take the well known example of the rope and snake aniscita yatha rajjurandhakare vikalpita sarpa dharadibhir bhavais tadvad Atma vikalpita that says as the rope whose real nature when not known is imagined in the dark to be a snake, a water-line, etc., so also the Atman is imagined in various ways.

When there is a rope is in front of you there is a mistake of snake. Snake perception of rope is called an error. The panca bhutas are mistakes on Brahman so also snake on the rope. How the error takes place we will see now.

The error takes place only when the rope is not in complete darkness with partial light. So ignorance is bliss. In total knowledge there is no error. In total ignorance there is no error. When total ignorance or when total darkness prevail, we don't see anything; but where is total light and we are wise with knowledge we see things properly. Ignorance is bliss to a sleeper. Knowledge is bliss to the wise man.

Now the problem comes when there is partial light and partial darkness. You have seen the picture before. Snake picture is in the mind. Now in the twilight time when there is partial knowledge, we don't see things clearly. The error occurs.

What is that thing you dont know. It is samanya knowledge. Partial knowledge is that part of the snake that there is snake; that part of the rope is called samanya amsa. That 'thingness' is rope. This general feature is not covered. There is something real and that some thing is called sathya amsa.

Samanya amsa is general existence; anavruta amsa is uncovered part; and sathya amsa is the real part. Because of the partial light the sathya amsa is covered and samanya amsa is evident and hence the mistake takes place. Covered amsa is the specific feature. Ropeness, which is visesa amsa, is covered due to partial light. It is covered because of partial, light and it is avruta amsa.

Rope is a fact; of the total fact one part is covered and another part is uncovered. There is a part that is not covered. Rope is covered. There is part, which is samanya amsa. Rope is avruta amsa or visesa amsa. When visesa amsa is covered, I imagine things. Where visesa amsa is covered, I replace it with another visesa amsa. Ropeness visesa amsa is covered and I put in its place the snake visesa amsa and snakesness is replaces visesa amsa. We are not replacing samanya amsa. There is as it is.

Then we add another visesa amsa, the snake that is mithya or avrutam. It is unreal. When you say there is a snake, there are two parts samanya amsa expressed by 'there is' and one visesa amsa the snake, which is mithya visesa amsa. In every error, there are sathya samanya amsa and mithya visesa amsa.

In the whole discussion, we should take samanya means general and visesa means particular amsa. I say the unreal particular feature, because the real particular feature is covered due to bad light or ignorance. That is why, when I gain the knowledge, I see the error and when the error is removed I replace the statement.

Now, i say there is a rope. The correction is in visesa amsa and not in the samanya amsa because samanya is sathyam. Instead of saying snake, I say it is rope when the correction takes place. The fear caused by snake is gone one I know what it is whether it is rope or snake. In the same place, a person says I am a samsari, Adhi Sankaracharya says that there is samanya amsa and visesa amsa; I am samanya amsa 'chit', the consciousness being; it is anavruta amsa and also sathya amsaa; 'I am' is real, there is no covering; it is self-evident and ever-evident and jnana swarupah. There is visesa amsa that reveals that I am a samsari. Samsari is a visesa amsa, which is unreal like our snake.

This unreal visesa amsa has come because of the covering of the real visesa amsa. Unreal visesa amsa has come because of the covering of the real visesa amsa replaced by unreal visesa amsa. Samanya amsa remains in tack. Samanya visesa amsa is ananda amsa and anantatva amsa or purnatva amsa or Brahmatva amsa or asamsaritam amsa; when the visesa amsa is covered I become apurna, I become a samsari.

Aham samsari is an error that is the cause of the entire problem. You need not change the samanya amsa and you have to remove the visesa amsa of samsaritam by gaining the right knowledge to know the real truth. Guru is having *tat tvam asi* button of the upadesa torch light and then poornatva amsa becomes evident.

Aham Brahma asmi jnanam comes and it eliminates the visesa amsa or samsara amsa goes away. Aham mukta knowledge comes and that is the aim of prasthanatrayam. This error can



be defined differently from different angle. This science is called epistemology. This is the study of knowledge and error. Books and books are written on error. Adhi Sankaracharya writes a bashyam on error. There are erroneous opinions about error. It is called kyativada. I will give you the condensed form of error

Mistaking the rope is an error. The same error can be defined from the standpoint of snake. Error is superimposition of snake or non-existent snake is superimposed. It is called adhyaropah or adhyasah.

First it is anyata grahanam from the standpoint of rope. From the standpoint of snake it is superimposition or adhyasa. The third definition is a combination of a real rope and an unreal snake. When you say there is a snake, there is refers to the rope, that is samanya amsam; the visesa amsa is unreal in the form of snake. It is mixing up of sathyam and asathyam, sathya or mithya. More in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

**Class 8**

**Anumanam in sastric studies contd.**

Adhi Sankaracharya introduces Brahma sutra discussions through adhyasa bashyam. The purpose is to show that samsara is based on the Self misjudgement and we see that the wrong conclusion is the cause of samsara and its problems. If the error is the cause of samsara, you have to remove it through knowledge. Self-error is corrected by self-knowledge. This is the aim of Adhi Sankaracharya in writing the bashyam. In the rope snake example, rope is erred because of partial knowledge. First the error is mistaken rope from the standpoint of rope; you miss the right and take the wrong is called mistake.

When you look at error from the snake point of view and it is superimposition of snake on rope. The first one is anyatha grahanam and snake one is superimposition or adhyasa. Third way of looking at is the rope is real snake is unreal and the error is mixing up of the real rope and the unreal snake.

The mixing up these two you creates a third entity, which is a singular entity where there is a real part as also unreal part. Error is mixing up of real and unreal. sathanruta mithnikaranam. I use this word because Adhi Sankaracharya has used that expression.

This person who commits a mistake makes a statement that there is a snake. He does not know there are two entities. As for as the mistaker is concerned, he is not aware that there are two things. In his cognition there is one entity only but on an analysis we find that there is the real as also the unreal part. This he takes it as one, which is a mixture of, real and unreal. There is the sathya amsa, which belongs to the rope. The existence part is sathyam. When we say the snake and the 'snake part' of the rope as seen by us is mithya.

The snake is frightening is anruta amsa which belongs to snake which is false. It is a long snake and it is sathya amsa. Length is sathya amsa; sanke is anruta amsa; frightening is anruta amsa. It is curved one and ti is sathya amsa because it belongs to the rope that is curved one. Some are sathya amsa and some are anruta amsa but the person who sees or mistakes does not know this.

If a person says I am so and so. He takes himself as unitary entity. There are two amsams in his statement sathya and anruta amsa. When he says I am conscious being. Conscious is sathya amsa. When he says that he is person, it is anruta amsa. I want to slim I am fat etc., are anruta amsa.

Jiva is neither pure Atma nor pure anatma sathya and anruta amsa and this 'sat'hanruta amsa strives for liberation. This sathanruta amsa is adhyasa. Mixing up of rope and snake is sathanruta mithunikanam. Sookshma sariram knot; sthoola sariram knot and karana sariram knot and disentangle and you gain moksa. This is adhyasa discussion in general.

This discussion of Adhi Sankaracharya is classified into six topics.

1. Adhyasa sankha; objection to the theory or idea of error raised by other systems of philosophy; answering the objection
2. Adhyasa sankha sampadhanam negating the objection;
3. Adhyasa laksanam definition of error;
4. Adhyasa sambhavana the possibility of error;
5. Adhyasa pramanam the proof for adhyasa; the pramanam and finally
6. Adhyasa upa samhara the conclusion of adhyasa topic.

For the sake of convenience i will rearrange the topics slightly. I will take the third topic first.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives two definitions to adhyasa directly and the third one is indirectly available. One definition is parastra purva drista ava basah adhyasah. It is perception of an experienced object on a wrong locus. One more word he adds smriti rupah. If you take rope snake example one perceives the snake already experienced before. I cannot superimpose a snake if i have no knowledge of snake. Here snake is an experienced snake. I perceive experienced snake on a wrong locus, which is the rope. It is called error here

The second definition is simpler and it is atasmin tad buddhih. Perception of an object is seen on a wrong locus. Here object is snake and it is seen on a rope, which is on wrong place as in the case of perception of silver on a shell.

Third indirect definition is sathya anruta mithunikanam mixing up of sathyam and anrutam the real and unreal. When I say I am the body. Mistake is seeing the body on a wrong locus. Atma is not the body but I see the body therefore it is an error. I the immortal is seen as mortal is an error. I the 'All Pervading' is seen as limited. This is adhyasa laksanam.

Now we will adhyasa sankha. This is raised by all other systems of philosophies. All bounce and say adhyasa introduction is proper. Atma anatma adhyasa they say is impossible. Rope snake adhyasa is possible I can accept but I cannot accept Atma anatma mixing or adhyasa. This is purva paksa's argument. He gives argument to establish his view

He says any superimposition like rope snake requires four conditions. If those conditions are fulfilled there will be this adhyasa. If the conditions are not fulfilled adhyasa will not take place. In the case of Atma anatma adhyasa all the four conditions are not fulfilled hence there is mistake.

Take rope snake example. Firstly rope is pratyaksa visaya, an object perceived in front. Pratyaksa visayatvam. Rope has to be here and also it should be within the range of perception. Secondly, that the rope should not be completely known and one should be ignorant of the fact that it is a rope. Ajnatatvam is the second condition; third condition is that sadrisyam.

There should be a similarity between what is superimposed and what is in front. I mistake a rope similar to the rope. I don't mistake a rope for a cucumber. There is no similarity. A shell

is mistaken as silver because shell and silver are similar. Shell shines and silver too shines. There is shell silver confusion. Sadrisyam similarity is the fourth condition.

Fourthly false snake is superimposed because I have experienced the pratyaksa visayatvam. In the case of Atma is it an object perceived in front to commit a mistake. Atma is aprathyaksa or avishayah. Pratyaksa visayatvam condition is not fulfilled. Atma is aprathyaksam. Pratyaksa visayatvam is not there.

Ajnatatvam ignorance with regards to rope is there. In the case of Atma you accept Atma is swayam prakasah nithya chaitanya swarupah. It is self-evident and ever evident. How can there be mistake with regard to self-evident Atma. How can there be mistake on swayam prakasa Atma. So there is superimposition. Then sadrisyam means similarity. Rope is not seen as a brinjal.

Between Atma and anatma tell me what similarity is there. In fact they are diagonally opposite. One is Atma and another is anatma. Atma is subject anatma is object Atma is chetanam and anatma is jadam; Atma is niravayanam and anatma is saguanm. They are diagonally opposite like light and darkness. Fourth condition is you say that anatma is unreal. Atma is real.

Satya anruta mithuniharannm. sathya mithya is mixed up. In the rope snake, unreal snake is possible. In the case of Atma anatma, the unreal anatma should be based on the experience of real unatma. In the case of unreal silver is possible because I have experienced real silver. Unreal dream is possible because I have experience real waking experience. Unreal snake is possible because I have experienced the real snake.

Unreal anatma you can talk about only when you experience real Atma. You say Atma is real and there is no real anatma at all. There is no vasana in this regard. So samskara the fourth condition is not there. Four conditions are not there and hence Atma anatma adhyasa is impossible. When you cannot adhyasa how you base all the teachings on the adhyasa. This is the first topic and it is called adhyasa sankha.

Third topic is adhyasa sankha sampadhanam and the fourth is adhyasa sambhavana. These two topics are very similar. Answering and showing the possibility are close topics. The third and fourth topic we will discuss. In this Adhi Sankaracharya answer the objection with regard to each condition. It is mistaken should be pratyaksa visaya objection perceived in front. Our answer is that if the condition is not exactly the same, we have to modify the first condition.

For a mistake to take place the object should be evident and it should be known object. Unknown object will not be mistaken. It need not be necessarily object in front. The condition is that it should be known object.

As regards Atma is concerned Atma is evident enough to commit the mistake. The first condition is that it should be evident. Atma should be evident as object or subject.

First condition is prakasamanatvam. It means it should be evident. First condition is fulfilled in both the cases. Therefore error is possible. Second condition is ajnatatvam. Rope is not known as rope. It is partially unknown. It is not fully known. Partial ignorance is the second condition. In the case of rope, it is partially known due to bad light. In the case of Atma it is partially known and partially unknown. The condition is fulfilled. Atma is partially known

aham asmi. I indicate the chit amsa and am indicate the 'sat' object but it is not fully known aham anandah asmi.

You see the vyavahara and they say I am and then they add the bio data, which is not real. Every jiva says *aham pariccinnah asmi* and there is self-ignorance. If it is not there, upanisad need not teach self-knowledge. In Chandogya upanisad there is a statement knower of self crosses over sorrow. Samsari don't have the self-knowledge. They instead have self-ignorance. This is the second condition of partial knowledge and partial ignorance.

Third condition similarity should be there between the rope and superimposed object the snake. For that our answer is similarity is the general condition but there are exceptions to the general condition. Isvara the lord both is intelligent and material cause. Generally both the causes are different.

But there is exception as in the case of spider. Sadrisyam is also a general condition but there is exception and adhyasa is possible for adhyasa. Atma anatma adhyasa comes under exception. This we will see in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

**Class 9**

**Adhyasa bashyam of Adhi Sankaracharya contd**

Adhyasa bashyam is classified under six categories.

1. Adhyasa sankha; objection to the theory or idea of error raised by other systems of philosophy; answering the objection
2. Adhyasa sankha sampadhanam negating the objection;
3. Adhyasa laksanam definition of error;
4. Adhyasa sambhavana the possibility of error;
5. Adhyasa pramanam the proof for adhyasa; the pramanam and finally
6. Adhyasa upa samhara the conclusion of adhyasa topic.

We have discussed adhyasa laksanam, adhyasa sankha in the last class. We have taken up third and fourth topic together i.e., here we have said all that under the conditions such as pratyaksa visayatvam Atma available for adhyasa to take place; we have Atma that need not be prathyakswa as Atma is neither evident nor knowable through sense organs nor self evident as it is prakasamanatvam, it is an ideal locus to commit mistake.

Second condition is also fulfilled that even though Atma is self-evident it is only partially evident. I am conscious is evident and Brahmatva is not evident. 'sat' and chit amsa is evident but ananda amsa is not evident. Hence second condition for possible error is fulfilled.

The similarity between the shell and silver is mixed up and what similarity between Atma and anatma and for that we said that sadrisyam or similarity is a general condition but it is compulsory condition. Because we do have cases where error takes place without any similarity. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the example of blue sky. Sky is nothing but akasa. Blue sky is an error. Akasa is rupa rahitaha. When we use the expression we superimpose the blueness upon the sky. The sky seems to be a vessel turned upward.

This concavity and neelatvam blueness and also space pollution we talk about they are all falsely superimposed and when such an error takes place what kind similarity we can talk about between akasa and the blueness etc. for space what comparison is there. Space is like space. Ocean is like ocean there is no comparison. Akasa is not similar to anyone and with regard to akasa no sadrisyam is possible with anyone. Still adhyasa takes place. Third condition is not compulsory for possible error.

Fourth condition is samskarah. You said Atma anatma is mixing up of real Atma and unreal anatma. In the case of rope snake example I have already experienced real snake and because of that vasana I superimpose false snake. False snake is possible because of snake vasana. In

the case of Atma we have not experienced Atma and hence superimposition of anatma is not possible.

How can I have samskara and how can there be false anatma. False snake is possible and false anatma is not possible. We say samskara is required. Accepted. And samskara or vasana comes from the previous experience. It is the previous experience of snake. You say previous experience of real snake is required but it need not be a real snake. I can have previous experience of false snake and it can create an impression and it can produce another false snake. I experience a snake in a snake movie. Movie snake is not a real snake. I experienced a false snake in a movie and I do remember false snake. How does sarpa adhyasa come and it is because of purva anubhava and it is false snake experience.

Adhyasa is possible because of previous unreal snake. So in the case of anatma also it is possible. It comes because of previous anatma adhyasa and how did anatma adhyasa come and it is anadhi adhyasa. We never talk about the beginning of adhyasa. It is beginningless. It is because of samskara born out of previous adhyasa and it is born out of previous adhyasa and so it goes on.

Fourth condition is that samskara is gained by previous anatma anubhava. The real anatma is not there and unreal anatma is there from very the beginning.

Since all the conditions are fulfilled Atma anatma is possible. This is the first answer to the purva paksi. It is only a temporary answer. Then we have the second answer, which is the real answer. This we should know fully.

First we say adhyasa, which is Atma anatma about which we talk about, is based on the Veda pramanam. Rope snake example is given not for proving adhyasa. Adhyasa is derived from Veda pramanam. Rope snake example is given to show the secondary idea of adhyasa. Therefore one should not focus too much rope snake example because it is not to prove adhyasa. Proof is there in Vedanta. Many philosophers attach too much importance on the rope snake example and cross-examine the example without knowing that Atma anatma that we talk about is based on the Veda pramanam.

We say don't focus too much on that and even when rope snake example is dismissed adhyasa will be valid because it has the sruti pramanam.

Second point is that this adhyasa should not be questioned because purva paksi themselves have accepted adhyasa in their system which they are not aware of. Purva paksi means all the asthika purva paksi. Atma anatma is there. They all talk about an Atma and they accept it based on the Veda pramanam that Atma is nityah. They accept Veda pramanam; they accept karma kanda; they accept surviving the death and also the fact of *punarabi jananam punarabi maranam*. All believe in continuity of Atma.

All the philosophers say I the Atma is immortal based on Veda pramanam. Even though it is a fact accepted by purva paksi and even though it is a fact we say I am male I am husband I am a father. When a person says I am a human being what is the meaning of the word I. whether the 'I' belongs to the 'Atma' or the 'body' is the question.

Certainly it refers to the body only for Atma is not a father, not a mother, and not a human etc. According to yoga samkya and other systems of philosophies. I am a human being is

itself an error. Similarly I am mortal also is an error. It is dehatma buddhi error. It is an error accepted by all asthika systems. It is called sookshma sarira adhyasa. I don't talk about the nasthika system now. This I will discuss in the second chapter.

They have to say we accept sookshma sariram adhyasa. But they don't accept it as error and then they will become carvakas. Dehatma will become caravaka. To escape from carvaka philosophy they have to say that dehatma buddhi is an adhyasa. Purva pakshi already accepts adhyasa. Adhi Sankaracharya says not to harp on the rope snake example because adhyasa is based on the Veda pramanam.

Third point is that purva paksa should not question Atma anatma adhyasa because purva paksa already has got Atma sthoola sarira adhyasa. You should not ask for explanation. If you ask me questions I will ask for sthoola sarira adhyasa what conditions are fulfilled. Here adhyasa is sthoola sariram is superimposed on Atma even though Atma is not pratyaksa visaya. How do you accept sthoola sarira adhyasa.

Secondly when you talk about sthoola sariram adhyasa what similarity is there between Atma and sthoola sariram. All say Atma is all pervading and it is formless. But sthoola sariram is limited and it is formed and it has parts etc. Then accept adhyasa based on sruti pramanam that Atma is not the body for Atma is nithyam and body is anithyam. From anubhava we know that the body is anithyam. Still adhyasa takes place based on sruti pramanam. Therefore Atma anatma adhyasa based on sruti pramanam is acceptable to all of us. Don't bring loukika condition when we talk of Atma anatma adhyasa because it is based on sruti accepted by all.

Atma anatma is acceptable to you and in the same way rope snake adhyasa also cannot be questioned because that adhyasa is experienced by all of us. Anubhava based rope snake adhyasa also you cannot question. How it takes place different philosopher give different explanation. It is called kyadivadah. We say it is anirvacaniya kyati. Adhi Sankaracharya says whatever be the explanation you accept the error and you cannot question the adhyasa because it is based anubhava. Atma anatma adhyasa you accept and why you ask question. Therefore adhyasa is very much possible.

Then where is the problem? The problem is only in the extent of adhyasa. To what extent error has taken place. There is no problem regarding the existence. Extent of adhyasa is the problem faced by us. In this context different philosophers disagree.

Nyaya philosopher says mortality is superimposed is not a fact. Aham nithyah is correct. I am karta and I am bogta are fact. He accepts adhyasa partially, he says I am anithyah is adhyasah but I am karta and I am bogta he says are not acceptable as it is adhyasa to the nyaya philosophers.

Samkya philosopher says that aham anithyah is an error. I am karta is also an error. Therefore, he says anityatvam is adhyastam and kartritva adhyastam is an error. Atma they say is jnanam.

If you ask advaidins, they says that anityatvam, kartritvam and bogritvam are anityatvam. Our quarrel is not with regard to the presence of adhyasa but it is with regard to the extent of adhyasa. Therefore adhyasa is very much possible. With this the third and fourth topics i.e., adhyasa laksanam definition of error and the adhyasa sambhavana, the possibility of the error are over.



Now we will go to the fifth topic of adhyasa pramanam. What is the proof for adhyasa. I have already indicated that adhyasa is based on the sruti pramana, which the purva paksi also has accepted. Then, why cannot I quote sruti for basing adhyasa? The whole thing is based on arthapatti as also anumana pramanam. One is postulate and the other is inference. It is sastriya anumanam. Loukika anumanam will work only on anatma prapancha. In the case of sastra we have to take only sastriya anumanam.

Arthapatti means an idea postulated to explain a proven fact. It is postulate. For example I get up in the morning after sound sleep and I see plenty of water all over stree and I postulate that last night it must have rained. Night rain is a postulate. I had directly experienced downpour and then I don't require arthapatti for it is pratyaksa pramanam. Because of my being sleep, morning flooding is a fact and I had seen with my own eyes. Hence the question is whether it rained or not.

I cannot explain the fact without presuming the night rain. I cannot explain the flooded roads. Late rain is a postulate to explain a proven fact proven through pratyaksam next morning. On the basis of that I want to prove kartritvam, bokrtitvam etc., are errors. I am a bogta is error. I am karta bogta feeling in itself is adhyasa.

I go to sruti pramanam, which tells me a particular fact. In support of this I quote Kathopanisad sloka 1.2.19, which reads as *hanta cen manyate hantum, hatas-cen-manyate hatam; ubhau tau na vijanito, nayam hanti na hanyate*. The meaning of the mantra is if the slayer thinks 'I slay' and if the slain thinks 'I am slain' then both of them do not know well. This does not nor is. This claim. I quote Veda, which is superior pramanam. It says Atma is akarta and abokta. Purva paksi being an asthika, he has to accept the sastriya pramanam.

The killing refers not to Atma again in 5<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita it is said Atma does not take punyam and papam if Atma is karta and bogta it has to undergo change for experience requires change. Atma is nirvikarah and it cannot be karta and bogta. Then I postulate that I am karta is error. Intelligent people do not wave means what unintelligent one wavers and it says Arjuna is ajnani. This is quoted from Gita. So I take aham karta bokta is an error. More in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 10

**Adhyasa bashyam of Adhi Sankaracharya contd**

We have seen adhyasa laksana, adhyasa sankha, adhyasa sankha samadanam, adhyasa sambavana. Having covered the four topics we have come to adhyasa pramanam the proof for adhyasa. It is based on sruti. It is twofold. One is arthapatti pramanam and the other is anumanam pramanam.

Arthapatti means postulation of an idea to establish a fact. Implication or presumption as an independent means of valid knowledge is arthapatti. Implication or presumption is the assumption without which the perception of a thing cannot be explained. The fact can be explained by postulating an idea, which becomes valid knowledge. I gave you the example that the road being flooded in the morning. Therefore we do not have any doubt of the flooded road. It is a fact. Here I postulate an idea that there was rain in the night because I had the experience it rained during my deep sleep. If I had experienced the rain in jagrat there is no need of postulation because I would have experienced the rain and it would have become a pratyakasa anubhava.

Even though it is postulate and it is not directly experienced by me it is a fact because it is based another pratyakasa experience. Knowledge gained by that is arthapatti prama. Night rain is known through arthapatti pramanam. Here we find that the night rain is postulated on pratyakasa anubhava.

Therefore this is pratyakasa based arthapatti pramanam. Whereas, when you postulate something to explain the scriptures then it is postulate based on the sruti and such an experience is called srutarthapatti pramanam. Adhi Sankaracharya points out that it is idea postulated to experience a sruti vakyam. It is not directly said in sruti.

At the same time it is not Adhi Sankaracharya projection or imagination and adhyasa is valid knowledge for it is based on sruti pramanam. How do we do that? We, alone do not take sruti pramanam but other philosophers also do it.

All the other people say that I am mortal. This notion is an error. Samkya naiyayika accept. They come to the conclusion that sruti says I am immortal. I the Atma is immortal and I go from body to body I take one body and I take to another body shows that I am immortal. I am mortal notion then must be an error. That I am mortal is an error a postulate based on the fact given by the sruti that I am immortal. Atma anitvatva adhyasa is based sruti vakyam Atma is nityah.

Therefore it is sruti arthapatti pramanam alone. If the other people accept mortality is error based on sruti we arrive some more conditions based on postulates. Others say Atma is karta. Atma is karta nyaya philosopher says. Adhi Sankaracharya says Atma is karta is error adhyasa. Adhi Sankaracharya says because sruti clearly points out that Atma is akarta.

If Atma is akarta is a fact Atma is karta must be adhyasa based on sruti arthapatti pramanam. When you go to samkya yoga philosophy they are little bit advanced and they say Atma is

karta is adhyasa. Kartritvam is adhyastam they accept. They say Atma is bogta is a fact. Now advaidam says that it is postulated on the basis of the fact sruti says Atma is abokta akarta. If Atma is abokta based on sruti, then Atma is bogta must be an error and therefore it is adhyasa.

Anityatvam adyastam, kartritvam is adyastam, bogrtitvam adyastam all based on sruti pramanam. Where do you find the sruti vakyam that Atma is akarta and abokta. We have got innumerable statements, which I said, in the last class. Atma does not kill, killing indicating all action. Therefore, Atma is not a killer and is not an actor. Similarly Atma is not killed means it is not an object of killing action which means it is not an object of any action and hence abokta.

Refer also to *Gita 5.14 na katrtrivam na karmani lokasya srjati prabhuh na karmaphalasyamyogam svabhavas tu pravartate* the sovereign self does not create for the people agency, nor does he act. Nor does he connect works with their fruits. It is nature that works out these.

There is another better sloka is there in Gita 5.13 *sarva karmani manasa samnyasya ste sukham vasi navadvare pure dehi nai va kurvan na karayan* the embodied soul who has controlled nature having renounced all actions by the mind inwardly dwell at ease in the city of the nine gates neither working nor causing work to be done. Atma does not do anything. Atma does not instigate anyone to do anything. Atma means I, I am never a doer and 'I am a doer' concept itself is an error. Therefore anityatvgam kartritvam bogrittam are superimposed as per Vedanta.

Similarly the next superimposition is the feeling that 'I am a knower'. This notion is also superimposed one. I am the consciousness is not superimposed. I am a knower is superimposed. Again it is postulation based on the sruti vakyam, which clearly says that Atma is not a knower. Atma is jnanam and not a jnata. Not pramata.

It is said in Mandukya upanisad *nanatah-prajnam na bahis-prajnam nobhayatah prajnam na prajana-ghanam na prajnam naprajnam,adrstam-avyavaharyam-agrahyam-alaksanam acintyam avyapadesyam-ekatma-pratyaya-saram prapanco-pasamam-santam sivam-advaitam caturtham manyante sa Atma sa vijneyah*. Here it is said Atma is unseen, incapable of being spoken of, ungraspable, without any distinctive marks, unthinkable, unnamable, the essence of the knowledge of the one self, that into which the world is resolved, the peaceful, the benign, the non-dual, such they think is the fourth quarter. He is the self; he is to be known. He is not a waking knower; not a dream knower and not a sleep knower. Waking knower is called visva; dream taijasa sleep knower is prajna.

Now you know why said upanisadic background is useful for Brahma sutra study.atma is visva jnata Atma is not taijasa jnata Atma is not even prajna jnata and Atma is non-knowing consciousness it is. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says I am a knower is also an adhyasa based on srudarthapatti pramanam. All these ideas can be derived from another sruti statement also. Anityatvam etc. are superimposed. All are adhyasa we can through another sruti vakyam also.

Atma nirvikarah. Atma is free from changes. If Atma is karta bogta or pramata then Atma becomes savikaram subject to change. If it is karta it is subject to modification. To be a bogta you have to undergo a change it is anubhava. Similarly to be a knower you have to undergo a

change. Kartritvam, bogritvam and knowing are process and it is subject to change. In English any suffix 'er' indicates modification. Any 'er' suffix indicates an action, action indicates a process and the process indicates a modification.

Therefore sruti says Atma is nirvikarah that means Atma is not a karta because it is nirvikaratvad. It is not bogta it is nirvakaratvad. From nirvikara statement we come to know that Atma is akarta apramata abokta etc. if I have known these does not belong to me then naturally anityatvam bogritvam and kartritvam is adhyasa and this is another method of deriving and proving adhyasa.

Then there is third method also. This Adhi Sankaracharya indicates in his adhyasa bashyam. Suppose Atma is karta bogta pramata, naturally you should know any karta has to be associated with a karanam an instrument. A doer cannot be a doer without associating without an instrument like the sense organs or anthakaranam or bashya karanam. The karta is associated with upa karanam while the bokta is associated with bojana karanam; Karta, bokta and pramata have sankha, the instrument. If I am karta I am sa sangah and if I am a bogta I am sa sangah. All these things require myself to be sangah.

Surti says Atma is asangah. If Atma is asangah can it be a pramata. it cannot be a pramata. If it is a pramata it has to be associated with pramanam. Similarly if Atma is asangah cannot be a bogta therefore Atma asangatvad Atma akarta abokta apramata. If Atma is agarta kartritvam is error. If Atma is abokta bogritvam is error if Atma apramata pramata is error. Anityatvam kartritvam pramatritvam four things are superimposed on Atma. I mistake myself as mortal I mistake myself as enjoyer knower. Then let us take two more adhyasa. Next one is paricchinatvam that I am limited finite I am here. This is also adhyasam.

When you say I am here automatically you say I am not elsewhere. That paricchinatvam is also adhyasah. Because sruti says Atma is aparicchinnah. Anadi anantam means limitless is Atma. If limitlessness is a fact limitation must be an error based on sruti arthapatti pramata. Limitlessness is called brahmatvam and limitness is jivatvam. Jivatvam is error. Anekatvam is also error. That there are many Atmas sitting in the class is error. Other philosophers accept this view.

Even after coming to Vedanta some have taken Atmas are many like vishistadvaidins. Anekatvam is superimposition based on sruti statement that Atma is ekah. When the wise man sees everything is ekah Atma *ekatvam* is a fact and Atma anekatvam must be error. This is another adhyasa. Adhi Sankaracharya thus shows kartritvam, bogritvam, anekatvam, anityatvam, pramatritvam paricchinatvam sarvam anithya. This is the first pramanam.

Second pramanam is anumanam pramanam inference. Anumanam pramana is based on vyaptih the coexistence of two things. Once we have vyapti jnanam we take the anumanam, when the mountain if fiery it is smoky. Similarly we prove adhyasa through anumanam and for that we need vyapti. Vyapti jnanam is yatra yatra vyavaharatvamtatra tatra adhyasa. Wherever there is transaction there is adhyasa.

The example is pasvadi vyavaharivad. Adhi Sankaracharya says Atma cannot do any transaction. Atma is different from the body. The cow is different from cow's body. He shows some fresh green grass to the cow. Cow comes towards the grass. Cow has the notion that I am the body and I am the body and grass is suitable to my body. If the cow is to face

the grass it is only because that it has the notion that I am the body and grass will 'satisfy my hunger.

Deha adhyasa eva pasuh trinam abimukhi karodi, this is called pravritti vyavahara. This cannot happen without deha adhyasa. If the cow has not notion I am the body it may not go towards the grass. The pasoho pravritti vyavaharah deha adhyasa bhavati.

Suppose the very same person puts the grass and take the stick and take to the cow, the cow knows that there is some danger and cow go away from that person and even the grass. This is nivritti vyavahara and it is because of adhyasa. *Sthoola sariram adhyasad nivrittade*. Both pravritti and nivritti vyavahara takes place only due to adhyasa. This we learn from cow.

We apply that to human beings also. He is not different from cow. He also gets away from coovam. *Manusyaha adhyasavan vyavaharatvad pasuvad*. Manusyaha is paksa hetu is vyavaharatvad dristanda is pasuvad. All human activities are based on adhyasa.

All human are either in the form of going after or going away; either getting or getting rid. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says all human beings have got adhyasa. With this adhyasa pramanam topic is also over. From this it is clear that we have adhyasa and all transactions have got Atma *anatma mithunikaranam*. Even though mixing up is taking place we do not know that two things are there. The person who commits the mistake does not that two things are there.

When i say i know, aham janami it looks as though there is one single entity knower there is knower one chetana tattvam, which belongs to Atma and knower vritti modification, involved and it belongs to anatma. Chetana Atma and achetana vritti combined we have knower mixture. Chetana Atma does not have modification; achetana vritti does not have consciousness chetana Atma is nirvikaraha and achetana vritti is savikarah jadam and the two mixed a single entity is born which we call 'knower'. Atma chit and anatma vritti both combined we get knower hood.

Similarly chit Atma belongs to Atma and changing 'sat' Atma belongs to anatma. Thus we have got all transaction based on anatma. Atma cannot be a knower for it cannot go through the knowing process. Anatma is jadam and it cannot know anything. By combining the two the knower is born the chetana Atma and achetana jadam. Then we come to the final topic adhyasa upasamhara the conclusion of the adhyasa bashyam.

In this Adhi Sankaracharya says that this adhyasa is dangerous and it is harmful to all. It is because adhyasa alone brings in anityatvam or mortality. There is fear of death due to this. On hearing death news I am frightened and I get constant fear of mortality. Money becomes very important because I get security with the help of money. Insecurity is due to adhyasa. Adhyasa alone is samsarasya karanam. Not only it is a problem for the; present and it is so for future also. Adhyasa alone is cause for pravritti and nivritti vyavahara.

All types of karmas are due to adhyasa alone and they produce punya papa phalam and it is the cause of punarabi jananam and punarabi maranam. Adhyasa is a problem for the present as also future. In short it is said that adhyasa eva samsara karanam. Adhyasa is the cause of samsara and once adhyasa goes samsara goes. Adhyasa goes only when adhyasa karanam goes away. The cause of adhyasa is ajnanam. Ajnanam goes atha to Brahma jinjnasa. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 11

#### Adhyasa bashyam of Adhi Sankaracharya contd

The concluding part of adhyasa bashyam in which Adhi Sankaracharya has given elaborately that there is error in recognizing Atma. This is a fact revealed by the sruti. the notion that I am a karta bogta etc., are errors alone. In conclusion Adhi Sankaracharya points out that the samsara is due to basic error alone. Due to this error alone we enter into different types of activity. Because of I am bokta I am karta I enter into loukika karma and spiritual karmas. Both require kartritvam buddhi.

Therefore all karmas are based on error. Because of this only all errors take place. Because loukika karma alone one reaps karma phalam. Loukika karma will produce drista phalam and aloukika phalam will produce adrista phalam and because of this alone there is *punarabi jananam and punarabi maranam* cycle and because of this there is janma, jara, vyadhi, hence Adhi Sankaracharya points out that root cause of all problems is adhyasa. He also points out that this adhyasa or exists and the first adhyasa is mixing of Atma and anthakaranam and the primary adhyasa is the knower and it flows from sense organs also and there is mixing up of I and sense organs and therefore originates secondary error that i am blind; it is a problem of sense organs but i superimpose it on Atma and say i am blind etc.; it is secondary adhyasa.

Through the sense organs error further goes down to the level of the body also and the andhakarana adhyasa leads indriya adhyasa, which leads to sarira adhyasa and then comes down to the body level. Than I say aham vriddhah young diseased etc., and all belongs to the body. All are properties of the body and definitely not of the Atma. Atma is na sthree, na man na woman not knowing that there is error at sariram level and again the adhyasa goes further to the surrounding also like the root of a tree which gradually spread. Through the body, I get sambanda, all types of things; properties etc. Really speaking Atma being asangah asambandah Atma does not have any relation.

Therefore comes further adhyasa it spreads very much. Not only it spreads in india but also it spreads abroad. If there is earthquake in some corner of america, I get worried because my distant relation is settled there. So the relation has spread. A person constantly experiences janma, mrithyu jara dukha etc. It is called ahankara or mamakara adhyasa. I and mine relate to ahankara and mamakara. Adhi Sankaracharya points out since adhyasa is cause of anarthah or samsara and one has to remove anartha for samsara to go away. Anartha hetu is the cause of all the problems in life. Lone has to work for removal of adhyasa. How to remove adhyasa?

Adhi sankaracharya points out that adhyasa are product of some other cause. Even though adhyasa is cause of all problems and any error is born out of ignorance. The ignorance is with regard to self so adhyasa is centered on I and self-error is born out of self-ignorance. Any other knowledge we gain we are not able to remove self-ignorance. That is why one has got long degree but in spite of all knowledge samsara does not go and he is erudite samsari because he has got anatma knowledge, which cannot remove samsara. Samsara can be removed by Atma jnanam alone.

In Chandogya upanisad Narada goes to Sanatkumara for Brahma vidya. He is very learned but he is full of sokha and grief. He is worried. Then sanatkumara says that grief can go only by one method that is self-knowledge and it only will correct self-error and correction of self-error alone will remove samsara and take one to liberation.

All upanisad begins with intention of Atma jnanam. When I say Atma jnanam has to be gained to remove Atma ajnanam and adhyasa is due to ignorance and it is due to partial ignorance of adhistanam and it is not total ignorance. If the rope is not totally seen there will be no error. If it is seen clearly in daylight there is no error. I see partial knowledge of rope samanya jnanam and i do not know the specific nature of rope.

Self-error is because of not total ignorance of self not because total knowledge of self it is because of partial knowledge or partial ignorance. Which part I am not aware is the question. I know aham asmi. 'satt' part is known chit part is known sathyam part is known jnanam part is known hence I say *aham asmi. Aham Brahma asmi* I do not know. Brahman feature of mine is not known. Brahmanhood of mind is not known Brahman status is now known.

Whenever we say Brahma jnanam don't think we will learn a new things called Brahman. Brahma jnanam means knowing Brahman status of the mind. Brahma jnanam is equal to Brahman status of mind. We know only a new status of old I the familiar I the good old I. The status of mine is known. Because that Brahman status is not known commit a mistake with regard to the status, and when the real status is not known, the false status is taken up and it is the jivatvam status which is one familiar to all of us.

What we require is the self-correction, which involves knowing Brahman status and displacing it jivatma status with Brahman status. Therefore, Brahma sutra starts with the words '*athatho Brahma jijnasa*' which means now therefore the desire to know the Brahman so we study Brahma sutra. I should learn my own superior status and for this purpose alone all the upanisads begin. All sastrams are there. All sastrams take our inferior status as a fact. Jivatma is a fact. They assume inferior status as fact and prescribe methods of improving status and one of the methods is to earn money or mla., status. Therefore the whole life we have been working to improve the status, gain popularity etc.

All time I waste to improve the status and even karma kanda promote the mistake and assuming the inferior status as fact recommend method to gain indra status. That means all sciences take for granted inferior status as fact. Vedanta alone questions whether there is a need to improve the status. Is it a fact I have low status image. Upanisad says you need not work for improving the status. It says you be as you are. It says there is no competitor for you because your are 'ekah'. All are for self-correction.

Vedanta is not for image building and it is negation of superimposed low image. With this adhyasa bashyam is over. Now we will enter Brahma sutra proper.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1		
Classes: 011 to 035 - Sutras: 1-1-1 to 1-1-4		
Page Detail & Content		
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Content of Sutra</i>
11	32	1 . 1 . 1
12	34	1 . 1 . 1
13	37	1 . 1 . 1
14	40	1 . 1 . 1
15	43	1 . 1 . 1
16	46	1 . 1 . 1
17	49	1 . 1 . 2
18	53	1 . 1 . 2
19	57	1 . 1 . 2
20	60	1 . 1 . 2
21	63	1 . 1 . 2
22	66	1 . 1 . 2 and 1 . 1 . 3
23	70	1 . 1 . 3
24	73	1 . 1 . 4
25	76	1 . 1 . 4
26	79	1 . 1 . 4
27	82	1 . 1 . 4
28	85	1 . 1 . 4
29	88	1 . 1 . 4
30	92	1 . 1 . 4
31	95	1 . 1 . 4
32	98	1 . 1 . 4
33	102	1 . 1 . 4
34	106	1 . 1 . 4
35	109	1 . 1 . 4
	112	



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1

Class 11 contd.

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1]**

*Atha atah; Brahma-jijnasa*

#### **Now therefore the desire to know the Brahman**

I pointed out in introduction that Brahma sutra has got four chapters known as adhyaya and each chapters have got four sections or padah and each section has got varying topics known as adhikaranam and each adhikaranam has got varying number of sutras.

This one is aththo Brahma jijnasa is firsts sutra of first pada of first chapter. It is known as samanvaya adhyaya. I will discuss the significance later. First pada is called spasta Brahma linga vakya samanvau pada. Each adhikaranam is also given a name. The name of the topic is based on the first sutram of the topic. Here, the first sutra is *athatho Brahma jijnasa*. First topic is jijnasadikaranam. Every topic is named after first sutra.

The first topic has got only one sutra. I will like to say how I propose to teach you. First I will analyse the sutra generally. Then I will do word analysis. Then conclusion of the sutra in which any general remarks will be detailed. Samanya vicara sabda vicara and upa samharah will be the way in which sutra will be taught.

First sutra is introduction to Vedanta sastram or Brahman vidya. In any book we see the forward or introduction. In Sanskrit we call upodgathah or anubandah. This introduction is required for every sastram. You cannot treat it as outside the sastram or inside the sastram. It is connecting link between outside and inside. It is like door of the house.

The door connects inside and outside. Introduction is door to enter the sastram; it is neither inside nor outside the sastram. That is why it is called appendix or anubandah. It is integral part but it is not within sastra. It is like first chapter of Gita. It is either inside or outside the main teaching.

Then the question is where does sastram begin. It begins from second sutra only like Gita begins from second chapter only. An introduction should present four factors known as anubanda chathustayam. We say first sutra presents anubanda chatustayam. What are the four factors introduced here.

I have discussed this before. First one is adhikari. It means the competent student. The second is called visayah the subject matter. Third one is prayojanam the benefit of the study of the sastram. Last factor is called sambandha the relationship. With regard to Brahma vidya the adhikari is one who is sadhana chadhustaya sambanna the four qualification, which we have seen in tattva bodha. In fact tattva bodha is based on Brahma sutra alone. The four fold qualification is vivekah discrimination; discrimination self-knowledge correction of self-error is important and all other knowledge only improve our image through dharma artha kama pursuits. Remove low image for moksa pursuit. Other methods will not work. It is called

vivekah. The capacity to discriminate between shreyas [spiritual path] and preyas [material way] is vivekah.

Second one is vairagyam or dispassion. Considering all other pursuits to be secondary subservient to the main pursuit. Earning money going through family life education of apara vidya is incidental. They are only means not the end. Seeing the means as the end is called passion. If you see means as means is dispassion. If you see means as not means is foolishness. If you see money as end is passion. If you see money as means it is dispassion. If you don't see money as means it is foolishness. Similarly, if you see family, as end it is problem family is useless means foolishness and if you see family as means it is dispassion.

Third one is shadka sambatti sixfold inner discipline. They are samah mind control, damah sense control; upamah reduction of extroverted ness; titiksa forbearance capacity to ignore discomforts in life; for life is full of discomforts. You choose certain discomfort but you should correct every pinprick. This is titiksa. Shradda means faith in guru scriptures and god. Baghavan comes under guru. Next is concentration commitment to achieve the goal.

Fourth is the desire for moksa or the liberation, which we will discuss, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 12

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1] contd**

#### **Anubanda chatustayam - four factors**

We are seeing the first adhikaranam that is the first topic of Brahma sutra known as jijnasa adhikaranam. It has one sutra. Athatho brahjna jijnasa. Now we do the general analysis. It is an introductory sutra. Introduction to any sastra should provide which are necessary for the study of the sastra. They are called anubanda chatustayam. The first sastra provides anubanda chatustayam. It can be called anubanda chatustaya sutram also.

Anubanda chatustayam consist of four factors, which we elaborated, in the last class. The benefit of the four factors is sastric study. Whenever an author writes a book, the author will a particular set of people in his mind whoare interested in the and competent enough to understand the writing. They are called the target group. The same thing is true in regard to the products also. Whether introduction of product or text and that group is called adhikari audience in the mind. The adhikari should have four qualifications viveka, vairagyam, samadhi shatka sambatti and mukuksutvam.

Next is subject matter the visayah. The subject of Vedanta sastram or Brahma sutra is as the very name shows Brahman is the subject matter of Vedanta. That is why it is called Brahma vidya. Brahman means we use it not as a new substance revealed by Vedanta and Brahman is new status of the listener the Atma. It talks about my own higher status para prakriti. Whenever I say Brahman you should understand, as Atmanah Brahmatvam is the subject matter. This alone is presented as Atma Brahma aikyam.

Third one is prayojanam or benefit. The benefit I get by study of Vedanta sastra is that I will negate abrahman [nonbrahman] status of mine, which is my misconception. When I say if I know it is rope I get the benefit of snakesness misconception. Similarly Brahmavam knowledge will displace jivatvam status of the jivatma misconception of mine. Jivatvam is samsara. Brahmavta jnanena samsara nivrutti is the phalam. Nivrutti means negation, sublation etc. Samsara nivrutti aline is called moksa or freedom. Prayojanam is moksa. Moksa is freedom from the sense of limitation, inadequacy, smallness, want etc.

Fourth factor is sambandha means relationship. The moment you say relationship between what and what. Relationship rests on two things. We can take any pair. Relationship is between the textbook and subject matter that is Brahma sutra and the contents. We call it pratipadya pratibadhaka sambandha. Brahman and upanisad have got pratipadya pratibadhaka sambandha. The significance of this is that a topic can be considered as subject matter of the book only if the topic is discussed as the central theme of the book. If a topic is discussed casually in a book it cannot be taken as subject matter.

In Gita there is a discussion on diet discipline regarding the rule of eating. Suppose someone asks the question what is the subject matter of Gita. The reason is even though diet is discussed it is not discussed as central theme. Similarly so many other things are discussed.

But Atma vidya is the central these of gita. If you translate into English revealer revealed relationship. This is *anubanda chatustayam* of Vedanta sastram.

The anubanda chatustayam is introduction and is the content of first sutram. It is directly revealed by the sutram. *Athatho Brahma jijnasa*. Therefore we say anubanda catustayam of first sutra and it is implied meaning of the first sutra. In Sanskrit we call arthika arthah indirect or implied meaning. If anubanda chatustayam is indirect meaning what is the direct meaning of the sutram. It is called srotah arthah.

Direct meaning of the sutra is this. Thereafter, therefore, Brahman enquiry should be done. This is the meaning of the sutram. Incidentally we should note a point here. Vyasacharya is not propounding new philosophy unlike other philosophies. His aim is to extract the philosophy, which is contained in the upanisads.

Atma jnanam is taken out of the upanisad. When he writes a sutra he has in mind a particular portion of upanisad. To understand the right meaning of the sutra we should know upanisadic portion, which he has kept in mind while writing the sutra. It is very much required because sutra is the critical analysis of the Brahman as defined in the upanisads.

Anything cryptic can present vagueness. The first job we do is that we try to find out which upanisadic statement Vyasacharya had in mind while writing the sutram. It called visaya vakyam corresponding upanisadic vakyam. Vyasacharya does not say that in his Brahma sutra. We are left in lurch as to what he wants to discuss. That is why we take the help of commentators. Without bashyam we will not know the visaya vakyam of every sutra. Here we have Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam who gives all the details. Adhi Sankaracharya says he came to know from his teacher.

The visaya vakyam for the first sutra is Taittiriya upanisad sloka 3.1 *bhrgur vai varunih, varunam pilaram upasara, adhihi bhagavo brahmeti, tasma etat provaca annam pranam caksus srortram mano vacam iti tam havaca yato va imani bhutani jayate yena jatani jivanti yat prayanty abhisamvisanti tad vijijnasasva tad brahmeti sa tapo tapyata sa tapas taptva*. This is the first mantra of third section of Taittiriya. One sentence we have to note *tad vijijnasasva* and in Brahma sutra also *tad jijnasasva* is there. There to brigu it is stated you conduct Brahman enquiry for fulfillment in life. These are basic problems of life sense of in security etc. They are the fundamental problems it is a statement of commandment it is not ordinary statement. It is vidhi vakyam. It is commandment. You gain moksa only through jnanam. You cannot gain moksa through nama sangirthanam. What is said for all time and it is for all yuga. In any *yuga jnanad eva kaivalyam*. So upanisad says know Brahman.

Second one occurs in Chandogya upanisad. 8.7.1 *ya Atma apahata papma vijaro vimrtyur visoko vijighatso pipasah 'sat'ya kamah 'sat'ya samkalpah, sonvestavyah, so vijijnasitavyah sa sarvams ca lokan apnoti sarvams ca kaman yas tam Atmanam anuvidya vijanati; it ha praja patir uvaca*. In this mantra the whole matra is not relevant. Sada vijijnasi tavyah. Here tavyah means command you have to know and there is no short cut. This is the second quotation quoted by the commentator.

The third sruti vakyam is 2.4.5 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad where yajnavalkya gives a long mantra. He gives a big list nobody loves anybody but everybody loves self-alone and self-alone is ananda swarupa. Whatever is the object of love is in the nature of ananda. Upanisad says Atma alone loved by everyone. A person even gives up the children. They disown the

children. Husband disowns wife and wife husbands. Initially all are for my sake and afterwards I drop all of them like hot potato. Self-alone is loved by all.

Then yajnavalkya says to maitreyi Atma va srortavyaha mantaha and therefore Atma enquiry should be done. In the entire upanisadic portion Brahman enquiry is emphasized. In keeping with those upanisad portion condenses all and say *athatho Brahma jijnasa*. To show it is compulsory we supply the verb to the sutra, so we add a word kartavya. Brahman enquiry should be done to gain liberation.

This direct meaning let us analyse. You cannot Brahman enquiry independently as Brahman is not available as object for you to study, independent enquiry cannot be done without upanisad study. Brahman is given the title aupanisadam to indicate Brahman can be enquired through Vedanta alone. We revise the Brahman enquiry and replace it with Vedantic enquiry.

It is Vedanta sastra vicara. It is studies to gain Brahma jnanam. Thereafter, therefore Vedantic should be done Brahma jnanam. This is the revised direct meaning, Brahma sutra is a logical work and it will study on logical basis only. It should be a jnana vakyam. It is nyaya vakyam or anumanam vakyam, what is anumanam vakyam corresponding the sutra.

First sutra must be logically presented, it should be studied critically *anubanda chatustaya bakvad* the fourfold factors should also be studied. Drastanda is dharma sastravad. Vedanta *sastram arambaniyam anubhava chatustaya vatvad dharma sastravad*. For this vakyam there should be a vyapti.

A generalization where there is smoke there fire, it is a statement of coexistence, all the sastras are worth studying and we get prayojanam and prayojanam is moksa. This is the revised direct meaning of the first sutra. Here we saw implied meaning and direct meaning. Now i will do the word analysis. Three words are athah and Brahma jijnasa. It is common word consisting of Brahman and jijnasa and we will see the significance and corollary of the three statements.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 13

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1] contd.**

#### **Anubanda chatustayam - four factors**

Until now we made the general analysis of the sutra. Athatho Brahma jijnasa. Now we will make a word analysis. Three words are there. While talking about sutra bashyam we made a condition that we should comment the word in the order in which it is stated. Adhi Sankaracharya does not alter the order of the word in his bashyam.

First word is atha. Adhi Sankaracharya points out the expression atha have twofold function. One is atha as sound. The second is atha as a word padha rupena. Suppose we are listening to the news from radio when we hear the news we hear the sound. The news is in the form of series of sound known by pratyaksa pramanam. Srortra indriya pramanam it is. It comes into our mind. The sound heard is a prameyam known through srortra indriyam. Prameyam means the object of any pramanam.

The sound functions as prameyam whoever has healthy ear. If he is a literate person who knows the language, then the very sound, which has entered into, his mind as prameyam begins to function as sabda pramanam. Not for all people only for the literate one who knows the language. Those who don't know the language the sound are not a pramanam for them. Every word has got two statuses prameyam as you listen and pramanam if you know the particular language. Prana rupa padham.

Adhi sankaracharya says when the teacher utters the word atha, the word atha has got two fold status. Whoever is not deaf hears the sound and it is prameya rupa for all the people. In a people is trained in language the word atha is sabda pramanam and it has got two functions as one as sabda and the other as padha. Sabda rupena mangala janakam. The very sound is the mere vibration sabda rupena mangala janakam bhavati. It produces auspiciousness.

When it is padham or language, it produces a particular meaning. Padha rupena artha bodhakam. Vyasacharya uses the word because he feels this is the first sutra we have to begin with mangalam auspiciousness. There is tradition of writing mangala sloka whenever any sacred book is written. It is to gain blessings of lord Isvara. He writes the work in sutra form. He has no opportunity to write a mangala sloka. So he has condensed it in one word. The sound atha is auspiciousness because we have got pramanam. The two words 'om' and 'atha' are mangala sabda. This is explained in dhyana sloka. It is mangalam because Brahmaji started creation of the world uttering these two words.

Panini the grammarian also does a similar way. Therefore it is auspicious word vritti in twofold function as sabda it is mangalam and as word it has technical meaning.

Second function conveys a meaning. Atha has many meaning. Adhi Sankaracharya analyses various possible meaning. He arrives at one particular meaning. The final meaning arrived at is anantaram. Anantaram means 'thereafter' or immediately after. Why he takes this particular meaning. If you take the meaning thereafter the question will come where after.

Vyasacharya by implication can convey the pre-requisite of the qualification. Because any study should be after preparation *yogya siddhi anantaram Brahma jijnasa*. This is the case with *apara vidya* also. We have qualifying round for entry of any study or any competitions. The qualification should invariably precede the study. What is the invariable necessity for the study of Vedanta?

Adhi sankaracharya says *sadhana chatustayam*. This is not directly mention by Vyasacharya. It is indirectly implied and he saves two words *sadhana chatustayam*. He has reduced the size of the sutra. Of this *anantaram* is directly mentioned and *sadhana chatustayam* is indirectly mentioned. After acquiring fourfold qualification is the meaning of *atha*.

How do you know *sadhana chatustayam* is the qualification? For that we have got two *pramanams*. The first *pramanam* is *yukti pramanam* the logic and it is called *anvaya vyatireka*. When you add milk is sweet and if you don't add it, it is not sweet. Sugar is the cause for sweetness. Whoever has got *sadhana chatustayam* derive the benefit of Vedantic study that is *moksa*.

Qualified student gets the benefit and the student with no qualification will not get any benefit from the study here Brahma sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya puts in *viveka cudamani* the wise people say four qualifications are required. Only if the qualification is there, one becomes a *mukta*. This is logical establishment. If we lack the qualification it becomes academic time pause. If preparation is not there the study of Brahma sutra will not transform you but you will be informed person.

Then we have *sruti pramanam* also. Refer to *Mundakopanisad sloka 1.2.12 pariksa lokan karma citan Brahmano nirvedam ayan nasty akrtah krtena tad vijnan artham sa guru mevabhi gacchet samit panih srotriyam Brahma nistham* which means 'having scrutinized the worlds won by the works let a Brahmana arrive at non-attachment. The world that is not made is not won by what is done. For the sake of this knowledge, let him only approach with sacrificial fuel in hand, a teacher who is learned in the scriptures and established in Brahman'. The *upanisad* indicates one should have *nithya anithya viveka*. He should know the hate for *anithya vastu* and be attracted to the *nithya vastu*. He should be tired of *samsara* and he should look for *vairagyam*.

Again refer to *Kathopanisad* *upanisad* presents more concretely. *1.ii.2 sreyas ca preyas ca manusyam etah tau samparitya vivinakti dhurah sreya hi dhiro bhi preyaso vrnite praeyo mando yoga ksemad vruite* *naciket* comes to have Brahma vidya but *yama* gives all *ika para loka sukha* but *naciket* gives a blank cheque for pleasure. *Naciket* has to choose between *dharma artha kama* and *moksa* but he chose the latter. Seek *shreyas* or *preyas*.

Refer to the *upanisad sloka 1.ii.3 'sat'van priyan priya rupams ca kaman abhidhyayan naciketo 'tyasraksih naitam srnkam vittamayam avapto yasyam majjanti bahavo manusyah and also* *naciket* has renounced all the desires and pleasurable objects of pleasant appearances, judging them by their real merits, you have not accepted this 'road of wealth' in which many mortals sink says *yama* to *naciket*.

The idea conveyed is that if I am to get the benefit of Vedanta study, I should throw *dharma artha kama* like *vairagyam* towards the droppings of the crow refer to *aparoksanadhi bhudhi*. We immediately wipe it out and then we don't claim it as an achievement. The fourteen *loksas* should become *kaka vrsta samanam*. It is *thivra vairagyam*. We get *shreyas* *preyas*

viveka we get from the study of this story. Of course in these two mantras we get viveka, vairagyam and mumuksutvam. In brahadharaynaka upanisad samadi shatka sambatti is given. Thus through yukti and sruti pramata sadhana chatustaya anantaram is established.

### **Adhi Sankaracharya condemnation of other views**

Another philosopher who comments upon Brahma sutra gives another meaning for 'atha' sabda. He says that should not be the meaning given by Adhi Sankaracharya. He says purva mimamsaka should be the meaning. He accepts anantaram. Others suggest purva mimamsa is anantaram. It should be studied after studying purva mimamsaka. Adhi Sankaracharya elaborately refutes this commentary. This is the next topic.

Purva mimamsaka is the analysis of the first portion of the Veda. Brahmins are called utara mimamsaka, which is the analysis of final portion of Veda. The first portion of the Veda deals with karma and upasana and the last portion deals with Brahman or jnanam. The word indicates purva mimamsaka should come first the very word utara mimamsaka should come later. Therefore atha should refer to purva mimamsaka only. The word clearly shows that. They have logical support. Purva mimamsaka deals with karma and upasana, which is the qualification for gaining jnanam.

Since everybody requires qualification and qualification requires purva mimamsaka you should translate atha as purva mimamsaka anantaram utara mimamsaka. This is krama and that is the procedure. Else it is akrama. It is not in order. Purva mimamsaka sutras are written by jaimini rishi. It has got twelve chapters.

Adhi sankaracharya gives both yukti and sruti support to refute the purva mimamsaka views. Adhi Sankaracharya gives four reasons to refute this view. After purva mimamsaka alone one should come to utara mimamsaka. First is lack of consistency.

Suppose the word atha is translated, as after study of purva mimamsaka then there will be two problems. He may study purva mimamsaka thoroughly. He will then say i have studied purva mimamsaka and i am ready to study utara mimamsaka. Even after study of purva mimamsaka, he may not have sadhana chadhustaya sambatti. He is a scholar of purva mimamsaka. Yet he may not have the qualification to take to Brahma vidya. After study of purva mimamsaka he may not have the basic qualification require for study of Brahma sutra. Therefore the chances are unqualified person will not understand the jnana kanda. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 14

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1]contd.**

#### **Adhi sankaracharya condemnation of other views.**

We analyse the word 'atha;'. Adhi Sankaracharya said that the word atha refers to sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi that is after acquiring the fourfold qualification one should enquire Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya has now taken up one of the view of the other commentators for the word 'atha'. This commentator accepts atha means anantaram. Instead of saying sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi anantaram he says it should be taken as 'purva mimamsaka. Purva mimamsaka means karma kanda analysis. Purva paksa contention is the very word purva mimamsaka shows it comes in the beginning. Vedanta vicara shows it comes later. Therefore it is common sense knowledge only after purva mimamsaka karma kanda vicara one should come to Vedanta vicara. Purva paksa hence says one should go to jnana kanda vicara after karma kanda vicara. Adhi Sankaracharya gives various reasons and also sruti contentions in support of his view.

Vipicara dosa Adhi Sankaracharya points out two fold problems in purva paksa views. If you say Vedanta vichara should come after karma kanda vichara and one may go through purva mimamsaka and completion of purva mimamsaka does not guarantee sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi. He may be ritual but that does not eman he has sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi. He need not develop vairagyam. He may be interested in swargam and various ika loka and para loka phalams. Ritualists have no interst in Vedanta and they want to perform more and more rituals. Hence he may be interested in rituals but he may not have qualification at all for study of Vedanta vicara. If such a person who has completed and not acquired sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi1 enters Vedanta vicara he may not benefit from the study.

Second problem also that there are some rare cases that persons are born with sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi because of purva janma sadhana some spiritual geniuses are born with sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi to a reasonable measure. They do not require purva mimamsa. Rituals are meant for sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi. These people are born with sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi. Why should they waste their time in rituals etc. In such cases he will waste his time studying purva mimamsa before taking up Vedanta vicara although he is otherwise qualified for such a study. Adhi Sankaracharya's statement sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi after acquiring the qualification either gained last birth or this birth. Sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi becomes compulsory for all. While purva mimamsa acquiring sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is not compulsory for all. For the unprepared people purva mimamsaka is compulsory and for prepared mind purva mimamsaka is not necessary. He gives some more reasons.

To understand the three reasons you should know the background while writing the commentary. When this person says one should come to Vedanta after studying purva mimamsa and this philosopher has particular philosophy in his mind, which was prevalent in Adhi Sankaracharya's time. That is mere knowledge cannot give liberation. As an example philosopher quotes all Vedantic students who studied and if you see their behaviour they are worse than illiterates. He shows such philosopher and says that they studies Vedanta and they

have not benefited at all. Therefore jnanam must be combined with karma. This is needed to gain moksa. Jnana karma samuchaya vadi Adhi Sankaracharya is going to refute. His contention is that everyone should study purva mimamsa first and know all about the rituals. Thereafter wards he should practice that. While implementing it he should simultaneously do Vedantic enquiry and pursue jnana yoga. One should enter to Brahman enquiry while it goes on he should perform ritual and therefore purva mimamsa study is important to combine karma with jnanam. This is the contention of purva paksa.

Adhi Sankaracharya refutes this theory jnana karma samuchaya. He says he cannot agree with the theory of combining jnana with karma. He gives his reason.

The reasons are karma jnana kandaho visaya bedad; karma jnana kandayo prayojanam bedad and karma jnana kandaho pravritti bedad. The first reason subject matter of karma kanda and jnana kanda are diagonally opposite and therefore they cannot be combined. Combination is possible only when the subject matter is similar.

Grouping is possible only when they have common interest. Here these two have no similarity. Karma kanda deals with the unaccomplished goal whereas jnana kanda deals with goal already accomplished. One deals with sadhyam another with siddham. One deals with anatma and the other with Atma. One deals with extroverted dependence on the world while another introverted dependent on my self. One deals with anithya phalam while the other deals with nithya phalam. One is based on kartritvam and the other on akartritvam. One is full of relationship and the other is without relationship. One deals with sangha and the other is with 'self'. One deals with avidya and the other with vidya.

Refer to Kathopanisad mantra 1.ii.4 *duram ete viparite visuci avidya ya ca vidyete jnata vidyabhi psinam naciketasam manye na tva kama bahavo lolupanta*. This means widely apart and leading to divergent ends are these, difference and what is known as wisdom. I know thee naciketetus to be eager for wisdom, for even many desires did not distract thee. Karma and jnana. Karma is avidya and the other one is vidya. One is preyas and other is shreyas. Therefore you cannot say purva mimamsa is anantaram.

Next is prayojanam bedad. The benefit is also different. Karma kanda gives anitya phalam whereas jnana kanda gives moksa. One gives punar janma phalam another gives apunar janma phalam. One goes towards south and the other the north. South is presided over by yama and the north is by soma deva who has amrita kalasa compared to moksa. Karma kanda goes southwards jnana kanda goes northward the moksa. This is the second reason.

Third is pravritti bedad. The difference is found in their functions. Karma kanda teaches a person and it persuades or incites a person into action. It is to make a person active. It discusses swarga, which is the phalam of karma. After tempting karma kanda says you do jyotisyoma yaga. Readers will be tempted to do yagas. It achievement oriented. Jnana kanda does not tempt you by providing various goals.

All fulfillments are your very nature it says. One who has discovered Brahman has accomplished everything in life and he has nothing to accomplish. It reveals the nature it never pushes you into action. Even if you are tempted to do action, it will say you are akarta. By revealing purnatva nature jnana kanda is apravartakam and nivartakam and it make a man so much contented. How to be full and completing by knowing what i am is Vedanta teaches. Because of all these reasons you cannot say purva mimamsa anantaram.

Thus logically Adhi Sankaracharya has refuted purva mimamsa contention. Now we come to scriptural refutation of purva paksa views. This is very technical. He wants to establish Vedanta vichara need not be compulsorily preceded by purva mimamsa. He wants to establish that karma kanda study and jnana kanda study are not sequential. That is one first study and thereafter study jnana kanda is no compulsory for all. He says there is Veda pramanam for this sequence or that makes that karma kanda and jnana kanda are sequential. He goes to purva mimamsa of the Veda is to establish this fact. He applies certain purva mimamsa idea. In purva mimamsa naturally they have to analyse many rituals. One of the conditions is that few rituals in the Veda should they be done simultaneously or they should be done in order. This is the point of their discussion. To establish they put a particular condition. If many rituals are to be done simultaneously they have to be done by many people since one ritual can be done one person at a time.

Simultaneously four-purna ahuti ritual can be done because there are many priests. This requires many performers. But if many rituals have to be done by one person it cannot be simultaneous. They have to be done one after the other. The condition is there for krama eka kartritvam. One has to follow a krama to do more than one ritual. There is no other way. If it is simultaneous more than one will be there. How do we know whether the rituals have got *eka kartritvam* or *aneka kartritvam*. He says any one of three conditions indicate *eka kartritvam*.

First condition is eka pradana sesatvam; sesa sesatvam adhikrita adhikaratvam. The first one is if many rituals are subsidiary to one ritual it is called eka pradana seshatvam. If it is there only one person has to perform the main ritual. Then only his performance is complete. Second condition is if there are two rituals in which one is subsidiary and the other is main, sesa seshi sambanda then also both the ritual should be done one person only and it is sesa seshitvam.

Suppose there are two main rituals and if one is qualified to do one ritual only if he has done one main ritual then alone he can do other rituals. This is called adhikrita adhikaratvam. They cannot be done simultaneously but have to done one after the other. In purva mimamsa they group ritual and they say they have to be done together or in order. The next headache is what should be the order. For that they have got six pramanam to analyse or establish the order. Six methods they use to arrive at the order.

Adhi Sankaracharya's question is 'do we have any one of these conditions to prove that purva mimamsa and utara mimamsaka should be done in order'. Adhi Sankaracharya says that there is no order is there since none of the three conditions are there so you cannot say there is order in purva mimamsa or utara mimamsaka. This we will discuss in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 15

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1] contd.**

#### **An analysis of the first sutra word by word.**

In the last class we saw that there is no eka pradana sesatvam relationship and sesa seshitvam relationship between purva mimamsa and Vedanta and therefore there is eka kartrikartritvam condition with regard to purva mimamsa and uttara mimamsaka and there is krama between Purva Mimamsa and Vedanta and they are of the view that 'atho' does not have the any order for teaching. There is Veda pramanam to prove that purva mimamsa is compulsory for study of Vedanta. This is the technical reason.

Another purva mimamsa reports that there is Veda pramanam for study of purva mimamsaka is compulsory. The brahadharaynaka upanisad says one has to go through three asramas to gain the qualification for Vedanta study. In another upanisad known javala upanisad it is stated more clearly. After completing student life one has to become grahastha. Then he should become vanaprasta. Then he should become sannyasi.

In javala upanisad also it is clearly said that one has to go through various stages before taking up Vedantic study. Purva mimamsa is compulsory we also say. It is because one has to practice karma and upasana in the first three asramas and gain sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi.

For this we answer you talk about jabala upanisad statement but the same jabala upanisad you don't read the next statement. That says 'athava' otherwise there is an option. Otherwise three asramas are not compulsory if one takes to sannyasa from Brahmacharya asrama itself. He need not take to grahasthasrama and vanaprastha. This person who takes to sannyasa direct from Brahmacharya does not require purva mimamsa and even though Veda pramanam says it is not asking it compulsory.

The next question is if purva mimamsa is not compulsory then what is compulsory. We have said sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is compulsory and purva mimamsa is not compulsory. You say purva mimamsa is not compulsory and you say karma and upasana is not compulsory and sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is compulsory but karma is not compulsory but unfortunately sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is itself is possible because of karma alone and once you say sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is compulsory and karma yoga alone give sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi and once you say sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is compulsory the purva bagha of Veda is compulsory it is like saying your presence in asthika samaj is compulsory but your travel to the samaj is not compulsory. How is it possible how can one reach the samaj without traveling to the samaj? So they conclude sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is not possible without going through purva mimamsa. For them if sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is compulsory purva mimamsa are equally compulsory. We say that purva mimamsa is not compulsory for all.

Purva mimamsa is not compulsory for all people for majority it is compulsory at least for one it is not compulsory karma yoga is not compulsory upasana is not compulsory and these

people who are born with sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi because of their karma and upanisad of purva janma. When they are born with sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi why should we insist sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi for those people. We agree purva mimamsa is required for majority.

Three asramas are required for majority and for some few it is not required. Finally concludes 'atha' is sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi anantaram. Therefore we say word atha directly require sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi but indirectly the word atha require signifies adhikari. With this 'atha' sabda vicara is over. Now we will move to the second word 'athah'

The literal meaning of the word 'athah' is therefore. Therefore Brahman enquiry should be done. Therefore always indicates reason. I am sick therefore i require medicine. Sickness is the cause for taking medicine. Here therefore is reason for making Brahman enquiry to be conducted. Vyasacharya does not mention the reason being it is a sutram. We have to supply the reason and say therefore Brahman enquiry must be done.

Adhi sankaracharya gives two reasons. First is karma cannot give moksa. Second is Brahma jnanam alone gives moksa. Therefore Brahman enquiry should be done. First reason is karma cannot give moksa. It is because we have to recollect all the reasons why karma cannot give moksa. We can prove through yukti pramata through anubhava pramata and through sruti pramata.

By karma moksa cannot be attained. He gives one from chandogya upanisad. Karma phalam is anithyam ika karma phalam and para loka karma phalam anithyam sarvam karma phalam anithyam you cannot gain moksa through moksa even karma yoga cannot give moksa and it gives siddha suddhi.

What is the logic that karma cannot give moksa. Karma is anitya and anithya karma can give only give anithya karma phalam. Why karma is anithyam. It is so because karma is born out of ephemeral ingredients the perishable materials. Anithya karaga janyatvad kriya anithya bhavati. Since action is anithyam so also the phalam gained through action. This is the logic. Example is salary. Salary is karma phalam and salary born out of one-month work is also anithyam. Yukti pramanam shows karma will not gives moksa.

Anubhava pramanam also shows that karma is anithyam. All the materials made are anithyam. So through sruti, yukti and anubhava karma is anithyam and it cannot give moksa.

Second pramanam is that jnanam alone will give moksa. This we have to establish now. Sruti pramanams there are plenty. Through Brahma jnanam alone one gets moksa. Adhi Sankaracharya1 quotes Brahma vid apnoti param occurs in taittiriya upanisad. Thus sruti pramanam is there.

The logic is that moksa means samsara Nivrutti and it is freedom from samsara. Then we say samsara nivrutti can take place only through jnanam because samsra is superimposed. Samsara jnana nivruttiyah. Samsram will go only through jnanam alone because samsara is superimposition like rajju sarpavad. You destroy rope snake only through jnanam alone. The samsara superimposition is removed only through jnanam. How do you say samsara is superimposition? Adhi Sankaracharya says it is explained in adhyasa bashyam. This is yukti.

What is anubhava. Any superimposed problem goes only through knowledge as we see in the case of rope snake and mirage water. The person frightened by rope snake will go only if he goes near and sees it is nothing but rope. So also dream. Dream fear goes only on waking. The problems in dream also go on waking only. Thus it is proved through sruti yukti and anubhava jnanam only gives moksa and therefore continue the Vedanta vichara. With this athah sabda vicara is over.

Now the third word is jrahma jijnasa. The final meaning is Brahman enquiry. Brahman jnanaya Vedantic vichara. Vedantic enquiry is a must for gaining Brahma jnanam. This is the final meaning.

Brahma jijnasa has three parts. Brahma is first part jijna is second part and sa is the third part. Brahma means jagat karanam Brahma. Brahma has different meaning at different places. Brahma means Veda, omkara, Brahmana, sometimes it means hiranyagarbha. Brahma vid means knowing a Brahmana.

According to the context we have to take the word of the meaning. Based on the second sutra Brahman means sathyam jnanam anandam Brahman. Second part is jijna. Here it means jnanam. It is not vague jnanam. It is clear-cut jnanam. It is aparoksa jnanam of Brahman.

Sa means it is suffix. It means iccha or desire. That is the vachyartha. It is desire to know Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says desire is vachyartha of sa but here we have to take the implied meaning. Implied meaning is vicarah the connection between desire and enquiry. Iccha janyah vicara. Enquiry will lead to the knowledge. Now we have three words Brahma, j jnana and iccha and we call it Brahma vichara. Final meaning is Brahma jnanaya Vedanta vicara kartavyah.

Why Vedanta vicarah? Why make self-enquiry within myself? Therefore self-enquiry is enquiry of the self with the help of guru sastra. It is not self-enquiry without any help. One has to come to Vedanta to know anything about 'self'. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 16

### **Sutra 1 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Jijnasadhikaranam Topic 1] contd.**

#### **An analysis of the first sutra word by word.**

We analyse the first sutra. The word iccha gives in the context the vicara. Brahma jnanam vicara means Brahma jnanaya Vedanta vicara. It is enquiry into Brahman to gain liberation. Vyasacharya only says Brahman enquiry and the question is why it Vedanta enquiry. Any knowledge can take place only through operation of pramanam.

We have got six pramanam enumerated. Pratyaksa, anumana, sabda, anupalapti, upamana etc are there but enquiry is not accepted under any of the above pramanam. If one goes on enquiring without using any pramanam will lead to speculative nature of philosophy and it cannot lead to knowledge. If it is to lead to knowledge it should involve pramanam.

In the case of Brahman we have only one pramanam, which is sabda pramanam. If we make independent enquiry it will not lead to Brahma jnanam. So vicara should be associated with sabda pramanam. Hence we supply the word Vedanta vicara. Vyasacharya tells in third sutra Vedanta enquiry is needed and it a pramanam.

Now one more important point makes clarification. Why say Brahma jnanam enquiry is required because we are interested in Brahma jnanam and why Brahma jnanam and it is because we are interested in samsara vritti. Why Brahma jnanam removes samsara? Why jnanam alone gives moksa? The logic is since samsara is superimposed, it can be removed by jnanam alone.

Now the question is any superimposition goes by knowledge like rope snake. When we say superimposed snake is removed knowledge and what knowledge removes the rope snake. Snake will be removed by the knowledge of the rope, which is the adhistanam of the snake. From this we get a rule any adhyasa is removed by adhistanam jnanam. Any superimposition is removed by the knowledge of its anityatvam. Whatever is superimposed is removed by its substratum. Applying this knowledge we say that samsara can be removed by its adhistanam that is Brahman knowledge like the rope knowledge removes the superimposed snake.

Now purva paksi attacks us. Adhi Sankaracharya points out that entire samsara or jivatvam is superimposed on the adhistanam of Atma. In adhyasa bashyam we saw the adhistanam of samsara is Atma. The entire jivatvam is superimposed on Atma and the adhistanam is Atma. If we have to remove samsara it will be removed by adhistanam jnanam and adhistanam is Atma and therefore we derive Atma jnanam alone will remove samsara.

Atma happens to be adhistanam of samsara. Therefore if I am interested in samsara nivritti and I should get adhistanam jnanam and adhistanam is Atma and for getting Atma jnanam and I should make Atman enquiry to gain Atma jnanam. Therefore purva paksi argues you must conduct Atma vicara and why Vyasacharya writes Brahma vicara. Atma vicara will give Atma jnanam.

How Brahma vicara will help you. Purva pakshi says we need Atma jnanam and why do you make Brahman enquiry. We give two answers. We say that Brahman is the same as Atman. That is what Vyasacharya means. So Brahman enquiry is Atman enquiry. Here indirectly it is confirmed that Brahman and Atman are one and the same.

Brahman Atman aikyam is confirmed by the first sutra of Brahma sutra. You can say this in different way also. Once we say Brahman enquiry we should not think it is something new. With scriptures for years after years we look for Brahman for meditation. Brahman is not a new substance and it indicates only a new status with already available status of mind 'aham'.

This is already available with us in the form of 'aham'. Therefore when we say Brahman knowledge the meaning it is the knowledge of Brahmatvam status of mind. I am lost in para prakriti and we look for apra prakriti that is Brahman status. Brahman enquiry is nothing but gaining Brahmatvam status of Atma.

The old status before enquiry is jivatvam. Jivatvam is present status by discovering Brahmatvam status I want to displace my jivatvam status. Therefore Vyasacharya has not committed any mistake. Athatha Atmanah Brahmatva jijnasa. This is the meaning of the word Brahma jijnasa. Here Vyasacharya reveals the subject matter of Brahma sutra.

The subject matter is jivatma paramatma aikyam. Atha revealed adhikari has been revealed prayojanam has been revealed.

Now there is a fourth word, which we have to supply to complete the sentence. Kartavya means should be done. Vedanta enquiry should be done for Brahma jnanam. Kartavya word is used because Vyasacharya wants to reveal the rule prescribed in the Veda Atma ve arey mantavyah srortavyaha nididysatavyah etc. All tavyas put together he uses the word kartavyaha. Tavya indicates the imperative mood and without that you cannot escape samsara.

For this one should do sravanam mananam nididysanam. The final meaning is through sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi you do sravanam mananam nididysanam you gain moksa through Brahma jnanam. After acquiring fourfold qualification one should do sravanam mananam nididysanam of Vedanta for the sake of Brahma jnanam because Brahma jnanam alone gives moksa not karma. This is the final expanded meaning of athatho Brahma jijnasa.

Suppose one asks Vyasacharya what should i do. Vyasacharya will ask whether you have done sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi. If you have done it he will say do Vedanta vicara. Suppose one says I have not acquired sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi then he will say through purva mimamsaka you gain sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi and come for Vedanta vicara. Either by studying purva mimamsa or aksing someone who has studied purva mimamsa, it is not compulsory to go through purva mimamsa. The idea is we have to follow the lifestyle namely karma yoga and upasana. Does that mean that we should stop Vedanta study now? Is it necessary to take to karma kada. We can continue the study of Vedanta and continue to intensify our sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi and this will become more and more significant as we acquire qualification. Let it start with academic study and as we acquire qualification it will be relevant to gain jnanam. We can continue our Vedanta study and continue our asrama dharma also. One side refines our qualification and on the other side continues our asrama dharma.



Now I will go to the final topic. I will present topic in technical format in which Brahma sutra should present. I will not give you any new idea. Each topic is called adhikaranam, in the first topic one sutra is there. It is the first topic also. The topic is jijnasa adhikaranam. Every adhikaranam is presented in a particular format. In this verse it is said that adhikaranam has got five factors. The first factor is vishyah subject matter, next visayah this means samsayah means doubt; the doubt is presented; next is the view of purva paksa the non-vedantin's view; he is opposed to Vedantins. fourth factor is siddhantah and what is our conclusion.

Next is sangathih the connection between this topic and the previous topic. This is called adhikarana nirnayah. For this jijnasa adhikaranam the first factor is Vedanta sastram. The whole Vedanta sastram is the subject matter; doubt is vicaraniyam va na vicaraniyam va. Whether it is worth studying or not worth studying. Should we attend the class or not. It is the question.

Third factor is purva paksa the view of the non-vedantins. He should not present his views with reasoning. It is in the form of anumanam always. Purva paksa anumanam we call it. His anumanam is Vedanta sastram need not be studied. Anubanda chatustaya abhavad. It does not have anubanda chatustayam unlike dharma or tarka sastram. According to purva paksi there is no anubanda chatustayam. He will say elaborately. He says no adhikari is possible viveka is impossible sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi is not there therefore sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi asambavad adhikari nasti. There is no adhikari in the world; who has got sama dama titiksa etc. There is no adhikari.

Similarly vishyah nasti. Who has seen Brahman? How can there be nirgunam vastu at all. You say you cannot know it. You see means you cannot see. It is consistent brain washing and they say it is only a brama between student and guru. If you say Atma, they say there is no Atma and there is no independent consciousness and matter alone is proved. Consciousness is illusion happening in brain matter. You talk of consciousness and there is no subject matter, no Brahman, and when Brahman is not there where is the prayojanam.

The whole Brahman seems to be emperor's cloth not visible to anyone when the emperor is going naked. Adhikari, vishaya and prayojanam is not there and how there be Brahman. Our siddhanta anumanam is our logical statement Vedanta sastram vicaraniyam. Dharma sastravad. It is like dharma sastra all are there including sambanda. Just because adhikari is few we cannot say adhikari is not there. Adhikaris are rare and don't say they are not there. Brahman is yourself and how can Brahman is not there. Brahman negation is self-negation. Many have attained moksa and you can also study and gain moksa.

Then the fifth factor connection with previous topic. In the case of first topic connection is not there. Second will have with one and third with second. Fifth factor is not there for the first adhikaranam. With this first sutra is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 17

### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2]**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Janmadi; asya yatha*

**[Brahman is that] from which [subsistence and dissolution] beginning with the origin of this [world proceed]**

We have completed the first sutra of Brahma Sutra. It gives introduction of the study. The first sutra indirectly presented anubanda chatustayam also. Now the stage is set for Brahma vicara. Now he enters the sastram proper. The second sutra is the beginning of the sastram. Just as in Gita second chapter alone is Gita sastram.

Here also the second sutra alone sastram begins. It happens to be second Adhikaranam also. There is only one sutram is there. This Adhikaranam is known as janmadi Adhikaranam. This sutra contains the word janmadi. The name of the Adhikaranam is based on the name of sutra. In this sutra or in this Adhikaranam the topic is Brahma laksanam or definition of Brahman. Therefore this sutra is called Brahma laksana sutram. Laksanam means definition.

There is a well-known statement in sastra laksana pranabyam vastu siddhih any object is established only through laksanam and pramanam. Pramanam meaning a means of knowledge and only if the object is established there is a possibility of enquiry of the object. When the object is not established where is question of making an enquiry.

The enquiry presupposes siddhi. Analysis presupposes the existence or knowledge of the vastu. First you require the laksanam of Brahman here. Once you know the laksanam you make the enquiry. Even for that enquiry you require a pramanam. If laksanam is there without pramanam it is useless. If pramanam is there laksanam is useless. Let us take an example. I ask the child whether there is moon in the sky. The child has got the eyes the pramanam.

Suppose the child does not know what the moon is. With the eyes he will see the moon, stars etc. But unless he knows the definition of moon he will look at the sky but will not be able to say whether the moon is there or not. Even with eyes I cannot talk about it. You have laksanam you should have eyes the pramanam. Without knowledge you cannot identify the moon. Definition and pramanam is there, there is the vastu. If moon is established with laksanam and pramanam, you can spend the lifetime on enquiry on the moon. Vicara is possible only when moon is established.

Vicara presupposes siddhi and siddhi presupposes laksanam and pramanam. This is development. Now we make enquiry into Brahman. Brahman and we only if Brahman is available know Brahma Vidya is possible. We require Brahman siddhi for the sake of enquiry. For Brahma siddhi we require Brahma laksanam and Brahma pramanam.

In second sutra Vyasacharya gives Brahma laksanam and in the third sutra Vyasacharya gives pramanam and in the fourth sutra we get Brahma vicara. Therefore the sutra is Brahma laksana sutram. In this context I will briefly mention the discussion Adhi Sankaracharya has at the end of first sutra commentary. It is relevant in this context.

Adhi Sankaracharya asks a question. Vyasacharya starts Brahman enquiry. Are you talking of Brahman unknown or Brahman known? He says either way enquiry is not required. If Brahman is unknown how can you make enquiry, which you don't know. Without knowing Brahman it is not possible to make enquiry. Unknown Brahman cannot be enquired into.

Suppose Brahman is known where is the need for enquiry into Brahman. Then Brahma Sutra need not be studied. This book is not required. Adhi Sankaracharya says Brahman is not unknown and it is known through Veda pramana. That is why word Brahman is familiar who are conversant with Vedas. If Vedas are not there you cannot talk about Brahman at all.

Adhi Sankaracharya says when vaidhika studies Veda he comes to know something called Brahman. Then he says the very word Brahman indicates the existence of a thing or an entity. The very word tells me that it is big infinitely. The word is derived from the word 'brih'. The word 'brih' means big. The word big is relative word and the meaning vary from situation to situation. Big mountain means it is very big. Also length must miles miles. A few miles of height is also seen. Suppose I say big mosquito in my net. Certainly it is not as big as mountain.

When a person says book is big it is different. The bigness is based on the noun. The adjective or dimension of adjective depends upon the type of noun. The upanisad uses the big not as an adjective but as the noun itself; Brahman is 'The Big'. There is no noun to condition bigness; because here big is used as noun Brahman. Since there is no noun to condition the bigness it is unconditionally big which means infinite. Existence is not as an adjective but as noun Brahman.

Adjectives are converted into noun in the scriptures. Similarly conscious we use adjective but in Vedanta it is Consciousness. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says at the end of first sutra I come to know there is infinitely big entity called Brahman. I doubt the very existence of the entity because I have never experienced such a big entity, which is infinite. So I get the doubt regarding its existence.

Scriptures say that Brahman is Atma and you 'yourself'. Since Brahman is I the self I should not doubt the Brahman existence and doubting existence of Brahman means I doubt the existence of my own self. We can never have doubt regarding my existence. Doubt presupposes my existence. Doubt cannot exist without doubter. Nobody says that I am not there. So there is no doubt regarding the existence of my 'self' that self is Brahman.

Such a Brahman I come to know through Veda pramanam. The enquiry is about known Brahman only. Purva Pakshi asks why should you make an enquiry. If you say Brahman is Atman and is very big then why enquiry. Adhi Sankaracharya says sastra says there is Brahman and that Brahman is Atma and my problem is what is that Atma and who am I is not clear. I don't know the clear knowledge of myself. It is because different philosophers have got different contention regarding 'the I', the self.

Carvaka says I am the body. He says who has seen the Sookshma Sariram. He says the mind is electric phenomenon of the brain and it is not the substance. Therefore what is thought what is thinking etc., are the brain's electric phenomenon is the argument of carvaka philosopher. You complicate by introducing Sookshma Sariram of which nobody knows. Individual is the body. Carvaka says that I am the body. Some others say sense organs are the Atma. Some say mind is the Atma. Some say buddhi is Atma.

Naiyayika says there is self, which is beyond mind, and it is Atma. Every individual has one Atma. So every one has one Atma each. Why Advaidins talk of one Atma. Thus they talk about many Atma and each Atma is infinite in size. Aneka vibu Atmanah. That Atma is karta bokta ca. All deal with who am I.

Then Samkya and yoga says there are many Atma but they say Atma is not karta but they are bokta. Body is karta and mind is karta but Atma will enjoy. It is like husband and wife and wife is the body and mind and Atma is husband. Whoever eats without cooking is Atma. Of course finally there is Vedanta Atma, which is real one that is Atma ekah sarvagatah. Regarding Atma there are so many confusions and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya concludes enquiry is required. Brahman is neither it is clearly known nor clearly unknown but it is unclearly known.

Abasa jnanam vartate. Abasa jnanam means partial knowledge or unclear knowledge or paroksa jnanam. Therefore Brahman being unclearly known Brahma Vidya is required to convert unclear knowledge into clear knowledge. There Adhi Sankaracharya shows there is pramana for Brahman and there is Veda pramanam is there. There is laksanam also. Now we will go to one more topics.

I give the general analysis for the second sutra. The laksanam or definition is of two types. One is called svarupa laksanam. The other is called tatastha laksanam. When an object is defined through intrinsic feature it is called svarupa laksanam. When an object is defined through incidental feature temporary feature, which is not intrinsic to object then it is called tatastha laksanam. Tatastha means banks of river. Sthah means remaining.

Tatastha means that which is not part of the river, or that which is not inside the river, but it relates to the one that is away from or aloof from the river. Here tatastha means something that is not intrinsic but that one which is aloof. One lokaik example that they give is that moon is that object most luminous in the night sky. That which is brightest in the sky is the moon. I use this definition for the moon. So many luminaries are there in the sky. The brightness of the moon I have defined the moon. Brightness of the moon is intrinsic feature of the moon because whenever I experience the moon in the sky so it is intrinsic.

In sastra when you say Brahman is jnanam that jnanam is intrinsic feature of Brahman so it is svarupa laksanam of Brahman. 'Sat' Brahman is svarupa laksanam of Brahman anandam Brahman is svarupa laksanam of Brahman. Therefore what is svarupa laksanam. Svarupa laksanam is that intrinsic feature of an object, which defines an object. I will give you an example for tatastha laksanam.

When you show Deva Dutta graham. Somebody wants to know the house of Deva Dutta. You can define by telling the features of the house. If you tell the intrinsic features it is svarupa laksanam. I see the crow is sitting on Deva Dutta's house and I have defined his house as the one in which the crow is sitting. Crow is incidental feature of the house. When

the crow goes away it will not be Deva Dutta's house. If the crow shifts that house will become Deva Dutta's house. In other words wherever in whichever house there is crow that house will become Deva Dutta's house. The crow is tata sitta of the house or svarupam of the house. The worldly example is kakavat graham Deva dutta graham.

Tatastha laksanam of Brahman is jagat karanam Brahman. Brahman is that which is cause of the universe. You should know it is tatastha laksanam or svarupa laksanam. Whether world is intrinsic feature or incidental feature of Brahman. Jnana anantaram sarvata nasti therefore it is tatastha laksanam of Brahman. Second sutra presents tatastha laksanam of Brahman. Brahma tatastha laksanam sutram is the second sutra.

The general meaning of the sutra is this. This sutra is grammatically incomplete. We supply two words to this sutram. We have to supply the missing word to complete the sutra grammatically. Tad Brahma two words we have to supply. *Janmadi asya yatha tad Brahma bhavati*. Brahman is that from which origin etc., of the world takes place. Final definition sristi sthithi karanam Brahman and Brahman is the origination, existence and destruction takes place. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 18

### Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.

#### Definition of Brahman

*Janmadi; asya yatha*

We now analyse the second sutra. This sutra gives Brahman laksanam. To be specific we give the tatastha laksanam of Brahma. I gave you the general meaning of this sutra.

Janmadi means janma etc., etc., mean sristi sthithi laya the origin etc., which includes the existence and resolution. The word asya means 'of this'. He uses a pronoun. Asya means asya jagatah of this world. From which cause tad Brahma is our analysis. Final meaning is the cause from that causes the origin of the universe takes place. In simple language it is jagat sristi sthithi laya karanam Brahma. This is the general meaning of the whole sutra.

Before going to the word analysis two more points in general analysis itself. It is a nyaya grandha. That is every sutram presents a logical statement. This sutra also presents Nyaya and anumana vakyam. Brahma asti. Laksana tatvad dharmavad. Brahman exists because there is laksanam for Brahman just as dharma. Once we prove existence of Brahman then we can do enquiry of Brahman. Second sutra talks about Brahma siddhi. This is Nyaya vakyam.

Vishya vakyam of this sutra we will discuss now. Brahma Sutra is not independent work of Vyasacharya. This is Veda anta vakyani. No idea is Vyasacharya. He only analyse the Veda vakyam. He does not explicitly state in his sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya gives vishaya vakyam wherever it is there. Here the statement occurring in Brigu valli is kept in mind. Brigu valli 1<sup>st</sup> mantra is defined here. Refer Taittiriya upanisad Brigu Valli 3.i. *Yato va imani bhutani jayante, yen jatani jivanti, yat-prayantya-bhisamvisanti, tad vijijnasasya, tad brahmeti, sa tapo; tapyata, sa tapas taptva* the meaning of this mantra is **That, verily, from which these beings are born, That, by which, when born they live, That into which, departing, they enter, That, seek to know, That is Brahman.**

This brigu valli vakyam is Brahma tatastha laksanam vakyam. Brahman is sristi karanam Brahma is sthithi karanam and Brahma is laya karanam. So says the above mantra. This is the vishaya vakyam of the second sutra.

Now I will see the word analysis of this sutra. Janmadi consist of two words janma and adhi. Adhi Sankaracharya points out etc., includes two more phenomena sristi and laya of course of this universe. One Purva Paksi comes and gives another suggestion.

Adhi Sankaracharya has interpreted janmadi as sristi sthithi laya three phenomena to the universe. It refers to janmadi triyam sristi sthithi laya. Purva Paksi says that there is another book named as Niruttam, which is written by Yaska Muni. In that nirutta work Yaska points out that every object in the creation goes through sixfold phenomenon that he calls shad bhava vikara. Bhava means padarthah. Vikara means change. Six conditions or states or modifications take place.

After mentioning the six vikaras he enumerates them. He starts the enumeration first with asti [potential existence], jayate [is born], vardhate [grows] viparinamate [matures] apaksiyate [decays] and ends with vinasyati [dies]. This refers to Sthoola Sariram. First one is janma. From nirutta we come to know every object in the creation goes through janmadi shadkam.

Therefore the suggestion of Purva Paksi is in sutra when Vyasacharya writes janmadi Adhi Sankaracharya takes it as janmadi triyam Purva Paksi interprets as shatkam. Therefore Brahman is janmadi Shadka karanam not triya karanam. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two answers for that. By studying the Mundakopanisad I discussed the word Niruttam. Niruttam is sastram derivation of Vedic words.

Yaska writes the famous niruttam. Nirutta is pouruseya grandha. If he discusses modification, he can talk about objects within the creation alone. He cannot discuss the whole universe for human intellect does not have the access to the whole creation. He cannot talk about Akasa, vayu etc., utpatti at all and therefore his discussion is confined to bouthika Prapancha the object obtaining within the universe. Therefore janmadi shadkam he talks about only Boudhika Prapancha objects within the creation.

Here we discuss about the whole cosmos, which includes about Boudhika, bhuta desa kala utpatti. And therefore sicne context is samasti Prapancha since yaska deals with part of universe; yaska's discussion is irrelevant here in discussion of jagat karana Brahma. Why do you say yaska's work is pouruseya grandha?

Why cannot you say it si based on Smriti grandha. If nirutta is Smriti grandha the advantage is even though it is pouruseyam it gets the validity of apouruseya grandha for it is not intellectual knowledge but it is based on sruti pramanam.

All Smriti grandhas are pouruseya grandha but enjoys apouruseya grandha because they are based on sruti. So Purva Paksi says janmadi shatkam can be taken as dealing with entire cosmos. Even though he cannot discuss this, his discussion is based on sruti pramanam so yaska's views are relevant to us. What is the advantage? The meaning of janmadi will be janmadi shadkam instead of janmadi triyam. You say yaska vakyam is relevant because it has the borrowed validity.

Do you want yaska vakyam has borrowed validity but I have discussed based on original intrinsic validity. I am commenting based on sruti vakyam which has intrinsic validity but you ask me on yaska vakyam based on borrowed validity. Which one is better? Do you want to depend upon yaska who depends upon sruti? I depend directly on sruti and sruti talks about janmadi triyam only and not janmadi shadkam. Answer is yaska deasls with Boudhika Prapancha and we deal with bhuta Boudhika Prapancha and there we have to take the sruti pramana.

Second answer is simple and Vyasacharya has written the Brahma sutra to analyse the Brahman and Vedanta vakyams. That is why it is called Vedanta sutrani and it is also called Uttara Mimamsa sutrani. When Vyasa uses the word janmadi you should take the Vedanta vakyam not Yaskas grandha. Therefore also we should give the meaning with Vedanta vakyam and Vedanta vakyam deals with sristi sthithi laya of jagat only. Shat vikara shold be included in the three.

Therefore the primary meaning of the janmadi is sristi sthithi laya but by implication we may include other three also. With this first Purva Pakshi is answered.

Now comes the second Purva Pakshi. You say in Vedanta and sastra sristi sthithi laya are a cyclic process. You do not accept a linear creation. If this sristi is because of Purva karma and its Purva karma is because of its Purva karma then you will ask how the first Purva karma came. We circumvent that we say it is a cyclic process. All indicates that sristi sthithi laya is a cyclic process.

Having quoted our statement he says if sristi sthithi laya is a cyclic process you cannot say which one is beginning. The beginning point is an end point also. This being so Purva Pakshi asks how did Vyasacharya says janma adhi adhya jagatah. The word 'adhi' means beginning with. Janma adhi means begin with. So the translation would be three phenomena of the world beginning with janma and Purva Pakshi asks how it is taken as beginning with janma and why cannot we take it, as beginning with laya being the entire thing is a cyclic process.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives two answers. One answer is even though it is a cyclic process and therefore we cannot talk about beginning in these phenomena our comprehension goes in a particular order. In our understanding there is an order. If I have to talk about destruction of something the topic of death presupposes the existence of the thing. An existing thing alone can have resolution. If I have to talk about the existence of something the existence presupposes the origin of the thing. Understanding of laya presupposes the concept of sthithi and the understanding of sthithi presupposes the concept of sristi.

Once the child is born you can talk about existence and once existence is there you can talk about laya. The understanding requires this logical sequence. Born sristi is sthithi gone laya. Vyasacharya presents Pratipatti krama. This is the first answer. Janma adhi you should say not sthithi adhi and laya adhi.

Second answer is after all Vyasacharya writes a sutra keeping sruti vakyam in mind. His aim analysis is the upanisad vakyam. When he writes sutra he keeps sruti vakyam. Even though there is no order sruti gives a particular order. Therefore choice of the order is not of Vyasacharya and the choice of the order is that of sruti. If you have objection to the order you should ask Isvara who is the author of the srutis.

Not only Vyasacharya says and you will find anywhere also the phenomena that maintain this order. Gita says in sloka 11.2 *Bhavapyayau bhutanam srutau vistaraso maya tvattah kamalapatraksa mahatmyam api ca vyayam* Arjuna says that I have heard from you in detail about the origin and dissolution of beings and your immutable glory. In Gita sristi sthithi laya order is given. Bhagavatam deals with Brahman and Dharma. Therefore, all sruti Smriti Ithikasa and grandha talk about janmadi alone.

Now we comes to the word asya a simple pronoun which means 'of this' sristi sthithi laya of this. Pronoun can stand for any noun. We should include all nouns for this pronoun. Vyasacharya has used 'this' pronoun 'this' and not 'that'. According to pronoun 'this' for something 'that' is available in front and if it is not accessible we will use the pronoun 'that'. Final meaning is asya means pratyaksa Prapancha.

The sixth case of this should be connected with sristi sthithi laya. The origin etc., of this visible objectifiable universe takes place of which cause that cause is Brahma. With this the



meaning of the word 'asya' we have seen. Yathah means yasmad karanad. Of which cause all these takes place. All these mean pratyaksa Prapancha sristi sthithi laya.

Which karanam sruti refer to. The karnam is twofold. Niomitta and upadana karanam. The two are intelligent cause and material cause. Both are required for any thing to take place. Since Vyasacharya talks of sristi sthithi laya the karanam here refers to upadana karanam. The reason is that nimitta karanam or intelligent cause is for origination and it si not responsible for sristi and sthithi.

Nimitta karanam is defined as sristi karanam material cause is defined as sristi sthithi laya karanam. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 19

### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.**

Definition of Brahman.

*Janmadi; asya yatha*

Now we do the word analysis of *janmadi asya yatha* instead of using the word *laya* he uses the word *janma sthithi bangam*. The word *asya* means of this and this refers to *pratyaksa Prapancha*. Or the sake of convenience we should take it *asya janmadi pratyaksa Prapanchasya sristi sthithi laya*. We analyse the word *yatha*. *Yatha* means from which cause that is *Brahma*.

*Brahma* is that from which takes place the *sristi* of whole creation naturally the question comes whether *Brahma* is *nimitta* or *upadana karanam*. In the last class I pointed out between the two. *Sristi matra karanam* is *nimitta karanam* and *upadana karanam* is *sristi sthithi laya karanam*. Pot maker creates the pot and he is not responsible for the maintenance of the pot.. Out of the material alone the product comes and because of the product alone material exists and unto the product alone the material resolves. We talk about *sristi sthithi laya karanam*. Therefore primarily *yathah* conveys the *upadana karanam*.

Thus the primary maning o *yathah* is *upadana karanam*. On enquiry we find *jagat* cannot have two *karanam*. In the case of worldly object we can have separate *nimitta karanam* and separate *upadana karanam* but we talk about the cause of the entire universe, which includes *desa* and *kala*. So we talk about *karanam*, which is above *desa* and *kala*. If we talk about that cause which beyond *desa kala* that *karanam* has to be one only. If it has to be one then we can say it should itself serve as *upadana karanam* as there is no second thing it itself is the *nimitta karanam* also.

Therefore the second meaning of the word *yathah* means *nimitta karanam* primary meaning is *upadana karanam*. Therefore the final meaning of *yathah* is *abinna nimitta upadana karanad*. That from which the world has been created is *Brahman*. In the definition *Brahman* ius that which *sristi sthithi laya* takes place. *Upanisad* uses the pronoun that from which but it does not say from which. That is the homework for *Brigu* it is said in *Taittiriya upanisad*. *Varuna* did not give complete teaching and he said that x from which *sristi sthithi laya* takes place is *Brahman*. He gave only *tatastha laksanam* and he did not give *svarupa laksanam*. That was left for *sishya* to enquire and find out. Here x is substituted by *annam*, *prana*, *vijnana* and finally he discovered *ananda* is *Brahman*.

*Taittiriya upanisad 2.iv.1* reads as *anando brahmeti vyajanat, anandad dhyeva khalvimani bhutani jayante, anandena jatani jivanti anandam prayanty abhisam visantiti sisa bhargavi varuni vidya parame vyoman pratisthita sa ya evam Veda pratitisthati, annavan annado bhavati, mahan bhavati prajaya pasubhir Brahma varcasena mahan kirtya* it is because of *ananda svarupam Brahma* because of which *sristi sthithi laya* takes place. The word *yathah* means *ananda svarua Brahma*. *Jagat karanam* is *tatastha laksanam Brahmam*. Therefore word *yathah* means *ananda svarupam*.

First we said yatha is upadana karanam and yathah means nimitta karanam and now we say it is ananda svarupam. The word yatha reveals both tatastha laksanam and svarupa laksanam of Brahman. Primarily it is tatastha laksanam and indirectly it is svarupa laksanam also. So this sutra is called tatastha laksana sutra. With this the analysis of the word athah is over.

Now two more words left which we have supplied tad Brahma. Adhi Sankaracharya adds one more feature of Brahma. We have seen three features. Adhi Sankaracharya arrives at one more features. It is based on the idea once we know the intelligent cause and the amount of intelligence can be inferred from the nature of the product. Greater the product is more intelligent one must be the greater.

Similarly from the nature of sishyas the capacity of the Guru is assessed. Therefore this is a general thing as the product is so much is the intelligence of the product. As you see the vibhuti of the world we can definitely conclude that Brahman the jagat karanam is sarvajnana and Sarva Saktiman. When Brahman is seen as karanam he gets the word Isvara. Therefore` we are in this context indiscriminately use the word Brahman and Isvara because we discuss the karanatvam. Adhi Sankaracharya talks about the glory of the universe by giving four adjectives.

Brahman has created well-designed universe. You cannot say it is some simple evolution has taken place. Here it is quoted that the entire Shakespeare work is not the creation of accident. All the English alphabets have not been thrown into a printing press and the words got arranged in a big bang and the entire work of Shakespeare got written of 'themselves'. How ridiculous it looks and how one will say it is the genius of Shakespeare who has written the whole work. It is said to be a grand design. When you are not be able to accept the ordinary work of a human being Shakespeare how can you say the whole world has accidentally taken place. Hence it has Chetana karta and intelligent person is required to create the universe. This universe has countless jivas who are kartas and boktas. Jivas falls within the creation, as product and therefore the producer must be a non-jiva. Therefore jiva binnatvam is shown.

Not only he is jivah binna but he is omniscient. We find that there is any accident and we see it is an incident with specific place and specific reason. It is cosmos and it si not chaos. Every event is specific desa, specific kala and specific reason is there. We do not know the reason. Countless number of jivas and every jiva experiences desa kala nimitta and there are countless jivas going through countless experiences and imagine the amount of knowledge require to run the mortal show of jiva, desa, kala and it require infinite intelligence and sarvajnatvam.

There are certain instances common to the jivas and Baghavan ahs to design in such a way one event to give punya phalam to one jivah and papa phalam to another jiva. The class itself is gone to one and not understandable to the other. So every action is good to one and bad to the other. That is how the Isvara designs the whole process. Class event remaining the same Baghavan makes it in such a way that for one person it is hood and for the other it is bad.

From one standpoint it is punyam and from another standpoint it is papam. One incident gives one to punyam and to another papam. Every event is designed according to karma phalam of countless jivas. Lord has to take into account of the other creations like animals and plants also. The whole creation comes under Hs regime. This can be done by sarvajnah only.

Then Adhi Sankaracharya uses the fourth adjective. A scientist can know how the brain functions. But he cannot create a brain. Therefore even if we know the functioning of many things in creation we have the knowledge of it but we cannot create it. We cannot reproduce any of the god's creation. Not only the Lord is omniscient but also Lord is omnipotent and He has enough power to create the whole world. The ants we can see and destroy but we cannot produce the ant.

Similarly we talk of producing rain. Then they write when there are clouds we will have rains. We admire scientist but we have understand the limitations of the scientists. Many things, inconceivable Baghavan has implemented it and hence He is Sarva Saktiman Sarva karanatvad vyatirekena gadavad. He is Sarva karanatvad vyatirekena gadavad. Sarvasya karta Sarvajna gadavad. He is Sarva Saktiman. This is the final meaning of the sutra.

Now he enters a discussion by introducing a Purva Pakshi. He is Naiyayika Purva Pakshi. Since this discussion is useful I will discuss it. First sutra we said we have to make Brahman enquiry. Then, we said that enquiry is possible only when we establish Brahman is there. Something is established only when we give its laksanam. The second sutra gives Brahma laksanam. The third sutra presents Brahma pramana the means of knowing. The pramanam for Brahman and jagat karanam is sastram. This is what we said earlier.

Naiyayika gives a suggestion, which we will refute later. He says why cannot we take the second sutra as pramanam for Brahman. It does not deal with laksanam. He explains that further. He says the second sutra defines Brahman or Isvara as jagat karanam. It is very simple. If dasarata is Ramas father, Rama is Dasaratha's son. Jagat karyam Isvara karanam. Since Isvara is karanam, world is karyam. The invisible Isvara can be inferred from the visible world. The invisible father who is in US can be inferred from the son. Invisible fire can be inferred from visible smoke. So invisible karana Isvara can be inferred from karya Prapancha.

The pramanam for Isvara is anumanam. This anumanam is popularly known in Tarka sastra as karya linga anumanam. The inference of karanam from karyam is karya linga anumanam. So he says sastram is not require for proving Isvara and logic can prove Isvara. The final idea is that Isvara can be established through reasoning. What are we going to do? We will say no. It is not possible. Isvara cannot be established through logic without the help of sastram. Isvara this is proved through sastram. There is radical difference between Vedantins and tarkikas. They say logic is necessary to prove Isvara but we say sastram is enough to prove the existence of Isvara.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 20

### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Janmadi; asya yatha*

After commenting upon all the words of the second sutra Adhi Sankaracharya discusses two general points, which are very important/. I said in the introduction Brahma is established and pramanam. Anything is established only when it has specific definition and revealing pramanam. Therefore if Brahma vicara is to be done we have to establish Brahma with proper laksanam and proper pramanam.

Third sutra presents the pramana. Brahma laksanam as presented by the second sutra is jagat karanam Brahma; Brahma pramanam as presented by third sutra is sastram that is Brahma pramanam. Keeping this background we have to commence our discussion.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya raises a Purva Paksi raised by Naiyayika a Nyaya philosopher. He asks that you take second sastra as Brahma laksanam and why cannot you take this sutra as Brahma pramana also. He says you define Brahman as jagat karanam. Naiyayika does not use Brahman but he uses the word Isvara. He argues if Isvara is defined as jagat karanam and world is Isvara's karyam a product you can know Isvara through inference. That inference alone is famous as karya linga anumanam.

Karya linga anumanam inference of karanam from the karyam is karya linga anumanam. Whenever I see a person even though I don't see his parents I know he/she has got parents. Existence of parents is known through inference. If a product called product there must be a producer whose existence I can know from the parents. From the very existence of the world, I can infer the sristi karta in the form of Brahman.

Isvara can be established from the product. It is deduced through the method of inference. For establishing Brahma anumanam is sufficient and sastram is not required. This is Purva Paksi's argument. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is not so. Second sutra does not need anumanam pramanam for Isvara siddhi. Adhi Sankaracharya gives a simple reason for that. The simple reason given by Adhi Sankaracharya is that if the second sutra is providing anumana pramana for Brahman or Isvara Brahma Sutra cannot be called Vedanta sutra at all.

Vyasacharya does not propound a philosophy by using his reasoning power. All the other darsanam have propounded a philosophy by using the reasoning power. Samkya is anumanam based; yoga is anumanam based vysesika is anumanam based. That is Adhi Sankaracharya calls them as Tarkika based. Nastika do not accept sastra pramana all others accept sastra pramanam. They give a step motherly treatment to sastra pramana. He uses reasoning only to derive a philosophy from the Veda. It is not to propound a philosophy but to understand and to derive a cogent systematic philosophy out of the upanisad.

Every sutra has got Vedanta vakyam for analysis. Therefore if you say second sutra provides anumanam pramana for establishing Isvara or Brahman and the importance will go to anumanam and it will not be sastra based system. If we do so we will defeat the intention of Vyasacharya. He says every sutram provides an anumanam all right but this anumanam is not independent anumanam and this is used to bring out the Vedantic teaching in a cogent form. It is like a thread used to make a garland of sastra Vedanta darsanam made of the flowers of Vedanta vakyas.

Tarka is only hiding behind the flowers to keep them in orderly form. It is secondary thread. Therefore no sutra provides anumanam as a main thing. Therefore second sutra is independent vakyam. Therefore second sutra is lakshana sutra and not pramana sutra.

Sub-commentators of this Brahma Sutra go further and they bring out some more ideas. Naiyayika says second sutra says that anumanam is pramanam to establish Isvara. From this it is clear Naiyayika believes that Isvara can be logically established. Vedantins is against this view. Isvara can be established or revealed through sastra alone. Isvara, which is revealed through sastra, can be assimilated by logic.

When Naiyayika logically establishes Isvara Vedantins prove that logic is defective, when you see Vedantins argument it will look Vedantins is nastika. It will look as if we join nastika. We only argue Isvara is only revealed through sastra alone. We don't use logic to establish logic independently.

First we have to Naiyayika establishes logically. Thereafter wards we have to point out defects in their logic. Naiyayika is going to establish logically.

Naiyayika arrives at Isvara through three logical statements. All are clean anumanam. Firstly, jagat sakatritam karyatvad gadavad. This is anumanam one. In fact he does not use the word jagat. But he uses a technical word for the same. He says that the world must have a creator. It is because it has an effect and it has a created effect. Take the pot. He uses a Vyapti a generalization.

Whatever a product must have a producer. The world is a karyam and therefore it must have a karta. Through the first step he arrives at is that there is a creator.

Then he gives second anumanam.jagat karta Isvarah. Jiva binnatvesati chetanatvad. Vyatirekena kulalavad. In the first anumanam he said there must be a creator. Now he says the creator must be Isvara alone. It is because I know there is creator and I also know that no jiva has created the world. There is a creator other than jiva. Not only he is other than jiva and he is an intelligent creator. What is the intelligent being other than jiva? Only Isvara can do it. Jagat is other than jiva but is not intelligent.

Second anumanam is jagat karta Isvara unlike a pot maker. Yad jiva binnatved binn Achetanam Isvara. Whatever is Conscious other than jiva is Isvara. Then he gives another reasoning. Isvara sarvajnah. Sarvakartritvad vyatirekena kuallavad. He is omniscient the creator of everything unlike a pot maker. The Vyapti is yatra Sarva kartritvam tatra Sarvajna it vyaptah. Through these inferences Naiyayika logically establishes Sarvajna Isvara also. So they say we don't require Veda for Isvara siddhi. Scientists don't accept sastra. We say that we can establish Isvara through sastra. Naiyayika establish things through reasoning.

Now we want to negate this view. We say all anumanam are defective. First anumanam is world has a creator because it is a product like a pot. Whatever a product there must be a creator. Pot is product and there is a creator. World is a product and there is a creator. In anumana you require a Vyapti and the most important thing is Vyapti jnanam is gained through pratyaksa pramanam.

Vyapti jnanam has to be gathered by anumanam or sastram. Therefore Vyapti you have to prove pratyaksa alone. Mountain has fire because there is smoke wherever there is smoke there is fire. This Vyapti we have done by observation. Wherever there is a product there is a creator. Vyapti arrived at observation is acceptable only when it holds good in all the cases. Also exception should not be there. Then Vyapti will collapse. Suppose someone gives a Vyapti wherever there is fire there will be smoke. Will you accept this Vyapti? No.

There are exceptions because of our own perception. Vyapti has to be proved by perception. Vyapti proved by perception should not have any exception. Vedantins argues you say whatever product there is a creator. It is proved through perception. Vedantins say only in the case of artificial product you are able to prove a creator through perception whereas in the case of any natural product like a tree in a jungle etc., it is a product and can you prove a creator through perception in the case of natural product. Wherever there is a product there is a creator, the Vyapti is not perceptually proved.

Now let us come to the second anumanam. Jagat karta Isvarah. In this Vyapti he is assuming is whatever is conscious being other than jivah is involved that conscious being must be Isvara this is the Vyapti here. This is Naiyayika Vyapti jnanam. That means you talk of conscious being other than jiva. What is the rule and Vyapti jnanam must be gathered by perception alone and how can you talk about conscious being other than jivah because you cannot talk of person without perception other than jivah. Have you seen or perpetually seen Isvara. In the absence of perception of Isvara, this Vyapti is not acceptable for it is defective in the absence of perception of Isvara.

Now comes the third anumanam. Isvarah sarvajnah sarvakartritvad. Isvara is omniscient because he is the creator of everything. To negate this argument we should know some axiom Naiyayika has assumed. Naiyayika says any knowledge is born out of mind. He depends upon perception and anumanam. He has made another statement thoughtlessly. That is all logically derived systems and try to make consistent we will have problem. Science is good because it does not want to discuss Consciousness. Each system do not want to discuss Consciousness.

Similarly Consciousness whether it comes in any form of science each one is not able to make anything about Consciousness. All the darsanam are in problem when it comes to the question of Consciousness. The problem is Isvara is sarvajnah for he has taken away the mind in the case of Isvarah to save him from samsara. Third anumanam is also wrong. Establish Isvara with Sastric anumanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 21

#### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Janmadi; asya yatha*

After analyzing the second sutra Adhi Sankaracharya in commentary discusses two important points, which is based on the suggestion of Nyaya philosopher. The suggestion is the second sutra should be taken as pramana surta not only laksana sutra. As pramana sutra it is anumana sutra therefore his contention is Isvara can be proved logic and through different anumanam he arrives at Sarvajna Isvara.

In Vedanta we refute this contention of Naiyayika and points out that anumanam or logic cannot prove Isvara. Our logic is blessed by sastram alone. Sruti samana tarkena Isvara siddhi. Naiyayika contents Isvara siddhi possible with anumanam. Jagat karta Isvarah.

Third anumanam is Isvarah sarvajnah. Vedantins pointed out that in the first anumanam Vyapti is defective and you assume that all product has got creator and all artificial product there is creator and natural product is not perpetually proved and the Vyapti is always proved through perception. In second anumanam also there is defect in Vyapti.

Wherever conscious being involved it must be Isvara. Conscious being, which is other than jiva, creates the earth and then it must be Isvara. You assume there is conscious being other than Isvara and Isvara is not perpetually proved so the vyapti is defective.

Third is Isvara is omniscient being creator of all. Creator of something must be knower of something. Here defect is contradicting his own philosophy. The contradiction is that he has got two axioms, which are mutually contradictory. Any knowledge is born of mind. This is one of the axioms the basic assumption. The second basic assumption is that Isvarah is without Body Mind Complex. So Isvara is mindless.

The mind is part of sariram in Vedantic language Sookshma Sariram. Isvara has no mind and mind alone is creator of knowledge. Isvara cannot be even alpajnah like jivah. You are trying to give him higher status because you want to establish without sastram.

Therefore the defect is self-contradictory. Isvara's omniscience contradicts that knowledge is product of the mind. All the anumanam are defective and we say that Isvara cannot be established by anumanam. Isvara established purely by anumanam can be negated by anumanam. This is the job done by sub commentators. The upanisad tells never go to logic when the truth comes. When this is said we might get into misunderstanding that Tarka is totally useless we may conclude. We ever talk of the defect of Tarka.

Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says it is not so. He says Tarka is very important in Vedanta. Total rejection is not correct. So sruti says srotavyah mantavyah the word matavyah indicates Tarka is important to understand Brahman. The whole Brahma Sutra is logical analysis of



Brahman said in Upanisads. Use Tarka as subservient means in understanding Vedanta. Use Tarka as a funnel for pouring Vedantic teaching. Our brain is too small therefore we require Tarka funnel to pour the Vedantic knowledge.

There are two types of tarkas one based on sastra and the Kevala or independent Tarka we don't accept.. Some misconceptions are removed by tarka. Adhi Sankaracharya compares or contrast Karma Kanda and jnana kanda. In Karma Kanda Tarka is not very important and it has limited role because in Karma Kanda the procedures of doing are important. We should have sufficient knowledge how to perform the ritual.

In Karma Kanda knowledge does not produce result and after knowledge performance is required. The action is required. I need not have knowledge but I should do. Knowing has indirect role in Karma Kanda and doing has direct role in Karma Kanda. In Karma Kanda benefit is a product to be accomplished in time. Keep on doing and one day the benefit will be enjoyed. It deals with something to be produced in future and doing is important and knowing is not so important.

By the study of Vedanta I know the procedure and after study I have to practise. This is not so. Here alone we commit a mistake Vedanta does not deal with a future event created or processed. We don't lean any technique through Vedanta no procedure we learn no method we learn we don't want to implement anything what Vedanta deals is it deals with a fact an accomplished fact of knowing Brahma. No moksa or event happens. No event no creation. An accomplished fact is moksa, which you have to understand.

The whole Vedanta process is process of understanding only. There is no need of any action. Pranayama learning is not sufficient but you have to implement that means knowledge should be followed by implementation for the learning to be effective e.g. Pranayama. In Vedanta we don't learn anything to be implemented.

Moksa is not to be accomplished because it is already an accomplished fact. There is nothing to be implemented. There is no need of any action to gain moksa once we own up with Brahman. In Vedanta understanding is an end in itself. Whatever obstacle in understanding should be knocked of. There is nothing to implement in Vedanta. One of the main obstructions comes from intellect in the form of samsaya or in the form of doubt. Therefore Tarka or mananam is very important not an independent Tarka but to assimilate the Vedantic teaching.

Never compare Vedanta to Karma Kanda. There is no implementation in Vedanta. Sruti is important Yukti is important anubhava is important in Vedanta to understand and once understanding is over there is nothing to be performed. The entire samsara is disturbance inadequacy etc. Moksa is freedom from samsara. If samsara is anubhava moksa is santi from sense of limitation.

Samsaratvam is also an anubhava that is the smallness limitation etc. The understanding is complete when the viparida Bhavana goes away. In Karma Kanda swarga anubhava is eternal hope. One has to wait for death to gain swarga loka. This is the plight of Karma Kandist. In Vedanta sruti Yukti anubhava pramana is there. All the benefits of Karma Kanda is gained only after death while the benefit of jnanam is gained when alive here and now. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes Sruti sammada Tarka in the second sutra.

Now I will give the conclusion of the second sutra wherein also we have to discuss many important points. First is the technical presentation of this topic. First you should know all about Adhikaranam. Five factors are there in technical presentation of Adhikaranam.

First step is subject matter; second is doubt, third view of Purva Paksi fourth our conclusion fifth is connection between previous and present topic. Here subject is Brahma laksanam. Definition of Brahma; doubt is astiva or nastiva. Is there definition or no definition? Purva Paksi takes wrong step. He says there is definition of Brahma. He says definition is given only through unique feature of the object. Therefore definition is defined as unique feature. Purva Paksi says definition has to be through unique feature and you say Brahman is featureless and how can the featureless Brahman have unique feature. Because it is said Brahman is attributeless. Upanisad says Brahman is undefinable. So Brahma laksanam nasti.

Siddhanta says Brahma laksanam asti. We say even though Brahma is really featureless we can define Brahman through superimposed/or mithya feature we can define Brahman. It is like defining rope of our snake. Even though rope is snakeless there is superimposed feature of snake I can define rope as adhistanam. Through superimposed universe Brahma can be defined as jagat karanam.

Fifth step is connection between this and previous topic. The previous topic is one should enquire Brahma. Here it is Brahma laksanam jagat karanam karanatvam. The connection is seen to be akseba sangathih. It is the first topic leads to an objection and that is answered in the second topic. What is the objection in the first topic? You enquire Brahman? One says Brahma you have not proved Brahman existence through laksanam or pramana. Without proving existence of Brahma how can you talk of enquiry of Brahman. In second topic we prove the existence of Brahman through laksanam. This connection is called akseba sangathih.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 22

### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Janmad i; asya yatha*

We conclude the second sutra, which happens to be second Andhakaranam. This is a significant sutra and the foundation sutra of entire Vedanta sastam. I will now discuss some of the significant points of the sutra. This gives the definition of Brahman.

Brahman is the material cause of creation. This definition is called tatastha laksanam or indirect laksanam and not svarupa laksanam or direct laksanam. When you define a thing in terms of its own innate features it is called svarupa laksanam. But when define because of some reason, you define the thing through some extraneous features the hosue of Deva Dutta over which a crow is seated [crow is not innate feature of the house] here the house is defined through extrinsic feature is tatastha laksanam. Brahma also we have svarupa laksanam and tatastha laksanam.

The famous svarupa laksanam of Brahma is sathyam jnanam; jnandam Brahman the definition through intrinsic feature of Brahman, it is svarupa laksanam. Tatastha laksanam of Brahma is jagat adhistanam Brahman. In this second definition Brahman is revealed through jagat and you take the world feature as the feature to define Brahman. World is not intrinsic nature of Brahman.

If Brahman is compared to house world is like the crow. The world is reduced to crow. Just as crow disappears the crow also disappears in the Pralaya kale as also in Sushupti kalam also world disappears. Jagat karanam Brahma is tatastha laksanam, which revealed through sastram. The question is that may arise why Vyasacharya chose tatastha laksanam to define Brahman when both tatastha laksanam and svarupa laksanam were available before him.

The reason is this that in the case of Brahman tatastha laksanam is easier to understand than svarupa laksanam. It is because in tatastha laksanam we take the external features of a thing, which are clearly available and visible to assess the thing. Through we go from the known to the unknown. Through the known world to unknown Brahman is easier to understand. Jnanam anandam etc., is not easily understandable as they are subjective.

Jnanam is nirvishesha Chaitanyam and I do not know jnanam itself. I want to know Brahman. I chose to know jnanam to know Brahman. Brahman is attribute-less and one unknown to another unknown is very difficult to follow. What is Brahman and it is pure Consciousness. Definition of jnanam itself required tatastha laksanam.

Through vritti jnanam alone I can know svarupa laksanam. Svarupa laksanam jnanam required tatastha laksanam to know jnanam. Sathyam jnanam anandam is useful only after knowing tatastha laksanam. In the case of house svarupa laksanam is ok colour is visible area

is experienceable. In the case of Brahman sathyam is known jnanam is unknown and anandam is unknown hence Vyasacharya chose tatastha laksanam to define Brahman.

Here he has defined as jagat upadana karanam. Brahman is material cause of the jagat. In upanisad often we say Brahman is material cause of creation. Here Prakriti/maya is presented as material cause of the creation.

Svetasvatara upanisad mantra 4.10 reads as *mayam tu prakritim vidhi mayinam tu mahesvaram tasyavayava phutais tu vyaplam Sarvam idam jagat* that means know that prakriti is maya and the wielder of maya is the Great Lord. That whole world is pervaded by beings that are parts of Him. In Mahanarayana upanisad also Prakriti said to be the material cause. It is a famous quotation, which is going to be analysed later.

In 13<sup>th</sup> chapter sloka 19 of Gita reads *prakritm purusam caiva viddhy anadi ubhav api vikaramsca gunams caiva vidhi prakritisambhavan* it says the prakriti is said to be the cause of production of physical body and organs of perception and action; the purusa or the Consciousness is said to be cause of experiencing the pleasure and pains. Here also it says Prakriti is the material cause of creation. In Tattva Bodha also there is a mention of the maya is the material cause of creation.

Sometimes upanisad says Brahman is the material cause and sometimes upanisad says purusa is material cause of Brahma. If Brahman is material cause it is Chetanam and it Prakriti is material cause it is Achetanam. Vyasacharya has chosen to say that Brahman the Chetanam is material cause of Achetana creation. This cause has got lot of significance.

Between Chetanam or purusa or Achetanam Prakriti or maya Vyasacharya has chosen the former. Why he chose, I will give five reasons.

First reason is that Vyasacharya wants to clearly differentiate Vedantic teaching from Samkya philosophy. In fact in most of the Brahma Sutra Vyasacharya wants to criticize Samkya and separate himself from samkya. Predominantly Vyasacharya's attack has been against Samkya. Vyasacharya has to differentiate from Samkya for many words are common between Samkya and Veda. They also use the word purusah.

In Vedanta we use the word purusa. In Kathopanisad also purusa is used to denote Brahman. It is defined as asanga Chaitanya Atma. Prakriti also is used in Samkya and Vedanta. In both Prakriti is changing and the very word samkya is used to teach Vedantic teaching. In Gita 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter is called Samkya Yoga. In Bhagavatam Samkya Kapila Rishi gives his teaching. Vyasacharya wanted to show that Vedanta is different from Samkya. Samkya says Prakriti is material cause of the universe and Vyasacharya says Chetanam Brahman is material cause of the universe.

Second reason is that in all system of philosophies all talk of from where the world originated. Even scientists are interested to know about the creation. They want to arrive at the basic stuff of the matter. Even the energies are many.

As long as plurality they are not able to arrive at the basic stuff. Most of the philosophies arrive at the cause and all of them say that material cause is the material or matter principle only. For Samkya Achetana Prakriti is the material cause. If you take Nyaya and vaishesika the basic material cause is atom or paramanu vadah. They say during Pralayam only atom existed

and at appropriate time all atoms built up to get everything. They say the paramanus also Achetanam. Their theory is Achetana karana vada. If we go to nastika system also take to Achetana karya vada. They talk about asti kayas etc. All are reduced to Achetana matter is basic cause of creation.

Modern science also assumes matter alone is fundamental of all creation. They say Consciousness has originated recently and that came out of the matter. They say Consciousness is parallel reality equal to the matter. Or they say Consciousness is product of matter. Either Consciousness occupies equal importance of lesser importance.

Some say even Atma is one type of matter like any other matter. He talks of nine type of matter and in that nine types one is Atma. If Atma is matter it is Achetanam. Consciousness comes and goes in Atma. When Consciousness comes Atma becomes sentient and when Consciousness goes it becomes insentient. Vedantins teaches Consciousness is neither equal to matter nor subservient to matter but superior to the matter. Uniqueness of Vedanta is Chetana karana vada. This means Consciousness is the basic cause. It means it is the basic stuff or content. Chetana karana vada means Consciousness is the stuff of the universe.

Second sutra presents Chetana karana vada and Vyasacharya distinguishes Vedanta from all other philosophies. It is the second reason Vyasacharya gives.

The third reason is no doubt the upanisad points out Brahman is the material cause of creation and predominantly Brahman is presented as material cause in the upanisad except in few places. That Vyasacharya will show this in the entire first chapter. The Brahman is the material cause of the entire creation.

Fourth reason also is very important. In certain cases upanisad shows Prakriti also as material cause of the creation. Why upanisad contradicts is our question. If the upanisad present both it means upanisad is either contradicting or misleading us or upanisad itself is confused.

Brahman is upadana karanam and Prakriti is upadana karanam is also correct. According to upanisad Prakriti does not exist independent of purusa; maya does not independent of Brahman. It is asvatantram; since maya is non-separate from Brahman whatever is attributed to maya can be attributed to Brahman in the sense when you say Prakriti is karanam it is as good as saying Brahman is the karanam. Prakriti is based on Brahman. Prakriti borrows the very existence of Brahman. Prakriti is Parinami upadana karanam and Brahman is Vivartha upadana karanam. That which lends existence to Parinama karanam is Vivartha upadana karanam.

Therefore upanisad does not contradict because Prakriti does not exist separate from Brahman. In Samkya philosophy Prakriti is independent of Brahman. This is the basic difference between Vedanta and Samkya. Prakriti's action cannot be attributed to Brahman. Samkya has got disharmonious relation.

But Vedanta they have good relation. In Vedanta Prakriti does not exist separate from Brahma representing Arthanari Siva and Parvathi. World has come out of Brahman and Brahman lends existence to Prakriti and through Prakriti lends existence to the whole creation.

Fifth and final reason is the idea, which has come from Mundakopanisad and Chandogya upanisad. By knowing one you can know everything. upanisad says upadana karana vijnanena Sarva karyam vijnanam bhavati. By knowing one material cause all products are known. Because products do not exist separate from material cause.

What is that and the upanisad gives Brahma jnanam is given as the means of Sarva vijnanam. If Prakriti is the material cause the Prakriti vijnanena Sarva vijnanam should have been there. Therefore Brahma vijnanena Sarva vijnanam is said here. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 23

### **Sutra 2 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Janmadyadhikaranam Topic 2] contd.**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Janmad i; asya yatha*

Through the second sutra that is Brahma laksana sutram Vyasacharya presents Chetana karana vada. It means a teaching in which the Consciousness is the ultimate cause of everything. By presenting this Chetana karana vada Vyasacharya accomplishes many things. Firstly he negates most of the other systems of philosophies, which claim Achetana matter as the cause of the universe. They say that matter is the material cause of the matter. But Vedanta says Consciousness is the material cause of the world.

Second point to be noted is Vyasacharya shows the difference between Samkya and Vedanta. Samkya is Achetana karana vada whereas Vedanta is Chetana karana vada.

Third accomplishment is Vyasacharya brings out the primary teaching of the Vedanta that Chetanam Brahma as the jagat karanam.

Fourthly there are cases where upanisad presents Achetana karanam as material cause of the world and Vyasacharya indicates even in such cases it only means Brahman is the material cause because Prakriti does not exist separate from Brahma. In Samkya system Prakriti is the material cause it means Prakriti and Brahman are totally different. In Vedanta both can be interchanged and ultimately no Prakriti/maya separate from Brahman.

Fifthly there is a technical idea conveyed and Brahman is presented as ultimate karanam Brahma jnanena Sarva jnanam bhavati in keeping with the law in Mundaka upanisad karana eka vijnanena karya aneka vijnanam bhavati. Eakjnaha Sarvajnaha bahavati. It is impossible in Samkya philosophy. In Samkya purusa is neither karanam nor karyam. This we will discuss later. Eka vijnanena Sarva vijnanam does not fit for Samkya philosophy. Chetana karana vada is unique in Vedanta darsanam. It is not there in any of the astika darsanam also. Now we will enter into third sutram.

### **Sutra 3 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Sastrayoniadhikaranam Topic 3]**

#### **Brahman is realizable only through scriptures**

*Sastra yonitvad – from its being the source of sruti; or sruti being the means of its knowledge.*

Here also there is only one Andhakaranam and it is called sastrayoni Andhakaranam. Sutra is *sastra yonitvad*.

Sutram should have minimum words and in this case there is only one word. We have two interpretations for this sutram. If one sutra can be interpreted in different ways it is supposed

to be the glory of the sutra, while defining sutra, it may have many faced the sutra may be. It may have many interpretations.

I will take up first interpretation for our study. I will give you the general analysis. The essence of this sutram is that it confirms the omniscience of Brahma, which is indirectly revealed in the second sutra. Brahma sarvajnatvam is confirmed here. This has been indicated in the second sutra. Now we will see how it is indicated in the second sutra. It says Brahma is jagat karanam. That means Sarva karanam. That is the explicit meaning of the second sutra.

From this direct meaning we can derive indirect meaning. Gadasya karta gadajnah Sarvasya karta sarvajnah. Brahma sarvajnam Sarva karanatvad. Brahman is omniscient because Brahman is the creator and is nimitta karanam of everything.

Vyasacharya confirms omniscience because Brahman is creator of Vedas also. Sastra yoni means Veda karta, the creator of Vedas. Karta means nimitta karanam. In the previous sutra Brahman is nimitta karanam of the world and now Brahman is creator of the Vedas.

In previous sutra Brahman is the creator of atha Prapancha, in the present sutra Brahman is creator sabda Prapancha. How does this statement Brahman being Veda karta reveals the omniscience of Brahman by pointing out Brahman is the author of Vedas.

Adhi Sankaracharya says Vedas contain all the knowledge. Veda consists of para as well as apara viday. Veda is considered to be sarvajnah. What we study is only a small part of Vedas. Vedas contains everything particularly Brahadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad. Vedas available are only insignificant portion of the whole Vedas, which have become extinct now. Even from Adhi Sankaracharya's time and now many quotations Adhi Sankaracharya gives in Brahma Sutra are not available now. Even in this available Veda the information is so great and it has got all knowledge.

Adhi Sankaracharya makes a Vyapti. The author of a work always knows more than the content of the work because you can never express everything you know in verbal form. The expressed portion is less than the known portions. One who is the author of particular text knows more than the content of the text.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example. Yatha Paninih. Panini sutras are very famous. The Panini's work is so great and Patanjali wrote commentary on Panini sutras. More you study the sutras more mind boggling it is. If that is so Baghavan or Brahma is the author of Vedas what should be his knowledge and therefore Brahman is sarvajnan.

The general analysis of the sutra is Sarva sarvajnam Veda kartritvad. We should note that it is accepted by us the Vedantins that Vedas are apouruseyam not created by anyone. The question comes if Vedas are apouruseyam how can you Brahman has created the Vedas. For that we say Brahman created Vedas it does not mean Brahman intellectually created Vedas like Vyasacharya writing Maha Bharatam.

This Vedic teaching was already was there in manifest form and Brahman only manifested Vedas exactly like creation. When we say Brahman created the world means the world was in existence in Unmanifest or potential form before creation. So also Veda sastram was anadi and it was in avyakta rupa and Brahman changed the avyakruta Vedas into vyakta rupa.



Baghavan's job is only manifesting. In Nyaya philosophy they say Baghavan created Vedas. In Vedanta Baghavan does not create but manifest already existing Vedas.

The next topic is visaya vakyam. Everything is based on some statement. It is based on statement 2.4.10 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad known as Maitreyi Brahmanam. Brahman is logically revealed as sristi sthithi laya karanam by giving three examples. The mantra reads as *Sa yathardraidhagnerabhyahitatprthagdhuma viniscarantt, evam va aresya mahato bhutasya nisvasitam etad yadrgvedo Yajur Vedah samavedotharvangirasa itihisah puranam vidya upanisadah slokah sutranyanuvya khyananini vyakhyanani; asyaivattani nisvasttani*

For sristi karanam Agni example doomah the smoke comes out; for sthithi dhundubi drastanda and for laya Samudra drastanda is given. In the tenth mantra sristi karanam is talked about. What is the uniqueness of this mantra?

The uniqueness is that in all other sristi statement Brahman is stated as creator of the world and here in this mantra it is said Brahman is the creator of the Veda also. When there is wet fuel what happens is smoke comes out. All this is like the breathing of the Lord. Baghavan created the Vedas effortlessly as if breathing. We don't make any efforts for breathing. So Baghavan did everything effortlessly like normal breathing. Based on this mantra Vyasacharya writes sastra yonitvad.

First word here is sastram and second word is yoni and combined word is sastrayoni. Sastra means it includes entire Vedas Karma Kanda, upasana and jnana kanda of the Vedas. We get commandment in the Purva bagha of the Vedas. For violation of commandments we have punishment also. In Veda nata bagha sastra means revelation of a fact the fact here means you are Brahman. To realize Brahman you need not work. For moksa you need not prepare. Sasanam means commandment in Karma Kanda and in jnana kanda it is revelation.

The second word is yoni. Yoni means nimitta karanam karta creator or author. Sastra yoni means author of Vedas. With this word analysis is also over. Now I will come to the conclusion. Here I will discuss the five factors of the Andhakaranam.

Subject matter is Brahman. The doubt is, is Brahman is author of Vedas or not. Yes he is the creator of all including Vedas as elaborated in 2.4.10 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad. Purva Paksi says Brahman is not the creator of Vedas because Veda being eternal and anadi it need not be created at all. What is created is anithyam. Here Vedas are not created hence Vedas are eternal.

Siddhanta says even though Veda is anadi we talk about the beginning of Vedas because Vedas has unmanifestation and manifestation exactly like the creation. The whole Veda in Unmanifest state is Omkara. By churning the Vedas Brahmaji took the essence and that essence is Omkara. Avyakta sabdah is 'om'. It is Akasa guna. It remained in Akasa and that Akasa was in Brahman. Veda is eternal and still it is there.

What is the connection? Connection is this Adhikaranam answers an objection raised based on the previous Adhikaranam. The connection is supposed to be akseba sangathih. Previously Brahman is said to be the jagat karanam. Brahman is not Sarva karanam and he is not the author of Vedas. Because Veda is anadi. So Brahman is not Sarva karanam. In this sutra it is explained that Brahman is Sarva karanam including Vedas. Therefore Brahman is sarvajnah. Thus objection raised by Purva Mimamsa is rejected. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 24

### **Sutra 3 part 1 adhyaya 1 [Sastrayoni Adhikaranam Topic 3 ]**

#### **Definition of Brahman**

*Sastra yonitvad* – **from its being the source of sruti; or sruti being the means of its knowledge.**

Now we are seeing the third sutra which happens to be third Adhikaranam and it is called sastrayoniadhikaranam. This is interpreted in two ways. We have seen the first interpretation in the last class. We took the meaning of sastra yoni as author of the Vedas and the final anumana is Veda sarvajnam sastra kartritvad. We had assumed that author of Vedas must be omniscience and Veda is as good as sarvajnam, and so Isvara should be sarvajnam being the author of Vedas. We will see the second interpretation.

In the previous Adhikaranam Brahman was seen as cause of the world or Brahman as jagat karanam. Some people had misunderstanding about the second sutra. It gave the anumana pramanam for Brahman. Some philosophers said that jagat karanam can be inferred from seeing the effect they can infer the cause of Brahman. They claimed that anumana is the means of knowledge.

Vyasacharya is worried about such an interpretation and does not anumana for Brahman being the follower of Vedas. The Veda clearly shows that Brahman can never be known through logic or inference and inference is pramana for Brahman and Vyasacharya wants to refute that idea.

Vyasacharya thus wants to say that sastram alone is the pramanam for Brahman. Veda sastram alone is a means for knowing Brahman. This is conveyed through the third sutra. The simple meaning of the sutras is sastra yonitvad means sastra vishayatvad. That means Brahman is the subject matter of Vedanta alone and it cannot be subject matter of logic. It is beyond the scope of logic. If you have to present in a logical form Brahma na anumana vishayah.

Sastra vishayatvad dharmavad like dharma. If you translate it Brahman cannot be subject matter of logic because it is subject matter of Veda alone. It is apouruseyam like punyam. Punyam cannot be known through logic. Punyam is a subject matter of sastra alone apurva vishayah etc. Just as dharma is Adristam apurva aouruseyam Brahma is also Adristam apurva apouruseyam. Now compare both the interpretation.

First interpretation we said Brahman sarvajnam sastra kartritvad. We have Brahma na anumana vishayatvad Brahma sastra vishayatvad. Sastra yoni is sastra karta and in the second interpretation it is sastra vishayatvad. First is Brahman is author of Vedas in the second interpretation Brahma is subject matter of Vedas. When I say vishaya vakyam, it means that sruti statement based on which sutra or topic is discussed.

For the first interpretation we gave one vishaya vakyam Brahadharaynaka upanisad 2.4.10. That Brahadharaynaka upanisad is the basis for first interpretation. Now the sruti vakyam for

second interpretation is Brahadharaynaka upanisad 3.9.26 that reads as *kasmin u tvam catma ca pratisthitau stha iti, prana iti, kasmin nu pranah pratisthita it, apana iti, kasmin nu Apanah pratisthita it, Vyana iti kasmin nu vyanah pratisthita iti, udana iti kasminn udanah pratisthita iti, samana iti, sa ena iti na ity Atma agrhyah na hi grhyate asryah na hi striate, asangah na hi sajyate, asito na vyathate na risyati etany astav dyalandni, astau lokah, astau devah, astau purusah, sa yas tan purusan niruhya pratyuhatyakramat, tam tva aupanissadam purusam prcchami, tam cen me na viveksyasi murda te vipatisyatiti, tam ha mene sakalyah, tasya ha murdha vipapata, api, hasya parinvmosinosthiny apajahruh, anyan manyamanah* it is another well known statement and it is the debate between Yajnavalkya and Sakalya.

Sakalya is one of the contesters in the debate as who is the greatest Vedic scholar and one of challengers is Sakalya and he asked Yajnavalkya questions about devatas especially Hiranyagarbha. Yajnavalkya at the end Yajnavalkya puts a counter question. The question Sakalya could not answer the question. Here the word purusa means Brahman. He asked about nirguanm Brahman that is known through 'neti neti'. While using the word purusa he uses the adjective to purusa, which is crucial to us, and that adjective is aupanisad, which means upanisad eka vedyam. It means that which can be known only through upanisad.

It not through anything it can be known is implied here. The rest of the upanisad is very disturbing portion. He says if you don't answer he says you will lose your head and Sakalya lost his ego. That is the Brihadaranyaka upanisad portion. It says Brahman can be known through sastra alone. It means sastra yoni Brahman. With this general analysis is over.

The sutra consists only one word but it consists of sastram and yoni. Sastram means sastrah and the second meaning is pramanam. Pramana means source of knowledge.

The first meaning means karta. Second meaning is pramanam. This is the first difference. There is second difference also which is purely grammatical difference. As per first interpretation it is Brahman is the author of sastram; in the second interpretation it is that Brahman is the subject matter of Brahman.

One poor Sanskrit poet went to the king and said that both of are the masters of the world. King immediately took the sword and wanted to see that he is the master of the world. He said tha loka natha means that you are the master of the world; but in my case I am the one for whom the world is the master. I am a begger who depends upon the world and I am the slave of the world. I am the protected by the world and you are the protector of the world.

In the same way sastra yoni mans sastrasya karta and second interpretation Brahman is that for which sastram is the pramanam. One is sastra pramanakam. Sastra vedyam; sastra vedyam means sastra vishayah. Final meaning is Brahman is the subject matter of sastram. By doing so the message conveyed is therefore it is not available for anumanam. This is the word analysis of the third sutra.

I will now conclude the sutra. Subject matter of controversy is vishayah. The subject matter is Brahman jagat karanam Brahman; the doubt is because there are more than one options. With regard to Brahman is Brahman knowable through anumanam or not. Does Brahman fall within the scope of logic or science? Can Consciousness be studied by any material science? All the scientists are doing an analysis on Consciousness. Can Brahman be subject matter of science? Purva Paksi says it can be. He says Brahman is anumana vishayah. He is within the

scope of science jagat karanatvad. It is the cause of the world like the clay, which is cause of the pot. He says you have accepted jagat karanam Brahman that you have accepted earlier. We say or Vyasacharya says Brahman is na anumana vishayah. Brahma is not subject matter of anumanam. It is sastra vishayatvad. It can be known through sastram alone like dharma.

The definition of Veda means that which gives the knowledge of such subject matter, which is not available for any other means of knowledge like paratyaksa, upamana, arthapatti anupalapti etc. This is the siddhanta. Finally sangathih it means connection between the second and third Adhikaranam. That connection is technically called eka phala kattva sangathih both Adhikaranam have common phalam or benefits that is Brahma siddhih.

First sutra is one should enquire into Brahman when the existence of Brahman is not clear. First Vyasacharya established Brahma siddhi and then enquire into that Brahman. He proved it through laksanam the definition and pramanam the means of knowledge. First you should know what you want and then only you can know about that thing.

This is discussed in the first mantra in detail. Laksanam and pramanam should be there to know about something. In the second sutra Brahma laksanena Brahma siddhi and in the third sutra it is pramanena Brahma siddhi. Jagat karanam is Brahma siddhi and in the third sastram is pramana is the Brahma siddhi. Both do the same job of Brahma siddhi. With this third sutram is over and third Adhikaranam is also over. One should enquire into Brahman that is the cause of the world and it should done so through sastras only. Therefore, Brahma jnanartham Vedanta vicharah kartavyah. That is why in one of the shanti pada it is said Sarvam aupanishad. Because Brahman is not available through science let me not negate Brahman. This is our development. The fourth sutra we will take up in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

### **Class 25**

Sutra 3 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Sastrayoniadhikaranam Topic 3] contd

**Sastra yonitvat - from its being the source of sruti; or sruti being the means of its knowledge.**

We have seen the first three sutras and three Adhikaranam. Brahman has to be enquired into to become a competent student. Brahma is defined as the cause of the creation of the world. The pramana is also indicated as sastram and Brahman knowable through Vedanta sastra pramanam as it is not available for pouruseya pramanam with this background we will enter the fourth sutra and fourth Adhikaranam.

**Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam topic 4]**

**Brahman the main purport of all Vedantic studies.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

It is called Samanvayadhikaranam. I will take up general analysis. This sutra is the key or the important sutra based on which the entire first chapter of Brahma Sutra is developed. The following 130 sutras of first chapter is the development of this sutra alone. Based on this sutra first Adhikaranam is called Samanvaya Adhikaranam. Thus we know important of this sutra.

Second sutra is the foundation sutra on which the entire Brahma Sutra is resting. Jagat karanam Brahman is the foundation sutra. The second and fourth sutras are very important sutras. If one cannot study the entire Brahma Sutra one can compromise with the study of the first four sutras and they are put together is known as chatus sutri. There are many books dealing with Chatus Sutri alone.

In the third sutra Vyasacharya has mentioned sastra yonitvad. The first meaning was sastra karantvad and second meaning is sastra vishayatvad. We take the second meaning for further development. Sastra yonitvad means sastra pramana kartritvad and sastra prameyatvad means sastriya vishayatvad. It means Brahman is the central theme of Vedanta sastram is the content of the third sutram. How do you say Brahman is the central theme? When many topics are discussed in sastram how do you know which is the central topic is the question? Sometimes central theme will be evident and often it will not be very clear.

In Gita several topics are discussed. Karma is discussed; Bhakti is discussed from 7<sup>th</sup> chapter onwards; jnanam is discussed very elaborately in 13 and 14<sup>th</sup> chapter. Yet, central theme of Gita is karma and bhakti etc are subservient some people say; some say Bhakti is central theme and others are subservient and some claim jnanam is the central theme of Gita.

How to prove this is the central theme. If the author of the book is available the problem can be solved. But Krishna is not available. Sometimes author himself writes a commentary. We

have some such works also. In such cases author's commentary is most authentic. If you analyze all Sastras author is not available for transaction.

Hence, we have to arrive at the central these. Acharyas say that whichever subject matter fulfills the condition is the central theme. The condition that fulfills is called Samanvayah. Samanvaya means Tatparya vishayatvam. Samanvaya means consistency. Whichever subject matter maintains consistency is called Samanvaya. I will give another English word. That is importance.

Whichever theme enjoys importance is called the central theme in sastra. How do you know which theme enjoys importance. For that there is a method of finding. Whichever theme has got factors of proof that theme enjoys importance. Those proving factors are called lingani. Shad lingani is there to prove importance, consistency and once you prove importance of shad lingas that becomes important and becomes central theme.

Brahman enjoys all the six factors and Brahman is the central theme of the sastras. Brahman is the central theme of the sastra because it enjoys importance. It enjoys consistency; it enjoys harmony and it enjoys Tatparya vishayatvam and therefore it enjoys Samanvaya. This is the general meaning.

Since this is Nyaya sastram this idea should be presented in the form of anumanam and logic. The anumana vakyam is Brahma's Vedanta sastra vishayah Samanvaya dharmavad. Like dharma, which is the central theme of Karma Kanda, Brahman is the central theme of Vedanta. Vishaya vakyams are there in each of the sutras we have seen so far. The entire sastram have vishaya vakyams.

Now we will take up the word analysis. Tad tu Samanvayah. Three words are there in the sutram. Whatever noun is used in previous sutra has to be brought here and Brahman is the noun used in all the previous sutras. In the first sutra Brahman is object of enquiry; in second sutra Brahman is seen as jagat karanam Brahma; in the third sutra Brahman is sastra karta karanam and therefore only Brahman is seen as sarvajnam.

Vacaryam Brahman jagat karanam Brahman sarvajnam Sarva sakti Brahman and such a Brahman is discussed in the previous sutras and that in the fourth sutra indicates that Brahman alone. We supply a word to complete the sentence and that is sastra vishaya and is the central theme of the sastram. In sutra literature it is called anu vritti to shorten sentences. The advantage of anuvritti is saving words. In sutra literature authors use this method. With this we have seen the meaning of 'thad'.

The third word is 'samanvaya' because Brahma enjoys importance and Brahman enjoys consistency. Brahman enjoys importance is proved by six lingas six factors. Vyasacharya has to show that Brahman is the central theme of the Brahma Sutra through analysis by making use of six lingas. This Vyasacharya will do it from sutra number 5 to 134 by using shad lingas he prove Samanvaya. That means it requires lot of patience. This point Adhi Sankaracharya briefly establish that Brahman is central theme through shad lingas. Se will do such an analysis now.

What are the six lingas? I have discussed already the shad lingas in the upanisadic discussions. To establish the importance of the topic six indicators are there. Identity or oneness of beginning and the end, the repetition, apurvata whatever is the new topic, phalam

the fruitfulness or benefit; arthavadah sthuthi glorification whatever is glorified enjoys importance; upapattih the reason or logic whatever fulfills reason or logic is important. Whatever is irrational cannot be the central theme. In tradition the commentators takes one example for study. It is the sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad. It is called tat tvam asi prakaranam. When you take that chapter it indicates that Brahman is the central theme.

The chapter begins with Brahman and ends with Brahman. It is like radio news the first four sentences will give the headlines and also in the end it will give the main points. Upakrama Upasamhara proves Brahman is the central theme of the chapter. The teaching in Chandogya Upanishad begins with *sad eva idam agra asid ekam evaditiam, tadd haika ahuh, asad evedam agra asid ekam evadvitiam, tasmad asatah saj jayata* – he meaning being in the beginning, this was Being alone, one only without a second .

Some people say ‘in the beginning this was non-being alone, one only; without a second. From that non-being, being was produced. The chapter ends with *sa yatha tatra na dahyeta aitat atmyam idam Sarvam, tat satyam, sa Atma, tat tvam asi, svetaketo, iti, tadd hasya vijajnav iti vijajnav iti* – and so in this case he would not be burnt, thus has all this that for its Self. That is the true. That is the Self; that are thou; Svetaketu. Thus he understood it from him, yea, he understood.

In sixth chapter one subject tat tvam asi is repeated that is Brahman. It is repeated nine times indicating to stress or emphasize the importance.

Vedanta sastra wants to reveal Brahman the topic, which is new. New is defined as pramanantra avedyam not known through any other instruments of knowledge. Even Karma Kanda does not reveal Brahman. Brahman alone is to be revealed by Vedanta. Therefore central theme is Brahman alone not anything else.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 26

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4] contd.**

#### **Brahman the main purport of all Vedantic studies.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

We see the meaning of the word Samanvaya. It means consistency, harmony, concordance or importance. Through the sutra Vyasacharya says Brahman is important in the entire Vedanta sastra and all other topics are secondary topic only. We know Brahman is important through technical analysis of shad lingani, which we took up in the last class. This is adapted by Vedanta sastram also. As a model we have taken sixth chapter in Chandogya Upanishad.

The beginning and Vedanta stresses Brahman. This is the first factor. We find that the statement tat tvam asi is repeated nine times indicating that it is not casual but committed remark. It is Brahma lingam. Brahman is unique which cannot be known by other pramanas or means of knowledge. What cannot be known by other pramanas alone is the subject matter of Veda. Veda need not teach you what you already know.

Brahma is not available for other pramanam. Brahman is not known through Purva bagha or Karma Kanda for it deals with para loka and rituals etc. Since Brahman is apurvam Vedanta chooses to talk about new subject called Brahman. It is indicated in sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad.

Here salt-water story is repeated. Salt water is tasted at various places and student says water is saltish. The teacher asks can you see the salt in water. Student says no. I know I can feel the taste and even though I know salt is there but I cannot see. Water is pervaded by something other than water yet I cannot see or which is not perceptible. In the same way body is bundle of matter, table is bundle of matter, physical body is also panca bouthikam.

You experience body to be sentient one such as saltish water. That means just as water is pervaded other than water body is also pervaded by something other than body. That extra something water saltish and extra something keep the body alive and active. It has form and colour so also the body. I know it is pervaded by something, which I do not know. The teacher says that it is Brahman. He says don't run after Brahman. Brahman is within you. You do not see Brahman but it is. By this example teacher says Brahman is therefore apurvam Brahman. Brahmanah apurva is established. From this we have to derive an important corollary. Brahman is vishayah or prameyah of the Vedanta. Brahman is unique subject matter of Vedanta. Brahman is known through Vedanta alone and not known through any other pramanam, if you reverse you can say Vedanta is unique pramanam for Brahman. Vedanta pramanam and Brahma prameyam are made for each other couple. Vedanta pramanam alone can reveal Brahman. When you say Brahman is unique Prameyam it is said 'sat'tu Samanvaya. Sastra yonitvad says Vedanta is unique pramanam for Brahma. Therefore fourth sutra corroborates with the third sutra.



Wherever phalam or prayojanam is mentioned that alone should get primary important. In Upanishad we say Brahma is apnoti param. Importance is given to Brahma jnanam. If you go to sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad the essence of this statement is Brahma jnani will jvian mukti and at the time death he will get Viveka mukti. He gets jivan mukti phalam and Viveka mukti phalam are given there and because of that Brahma jnanam is considered important. This is called phalam, which is also Brahma lingam.

Then comes the glorification. In the Upanishad Advaida jnanam is glorified by pointing out eka vijnanena Sarva vijnanam bhavati. This should be understood properly. Here Sarva jnanam means Sarva Atma Jnanam. This as good as knows everything. The sixth chapter glorifies Brahman only. Not only Brahma jnanam is glorified and it condemns other source of knowledge also. One who dies without gaining Brahma jnanam is an unfortunate person and the one who gains Brahma jnanam alone is Brahmana. None deserves the status Brahmana. Brahma jnanam is criticized and anya ninda is arthavada. Through both of them the Upanishad points out that Brahman is important.

Finally upapatti means logic. The Upanishad wants to show it is not illogical and it is not dogmatic. It is not blind belief and it has got support of logic. Upanishad says Brahma 'sat'hyam jagan mithya. It does not blindly asset but gives logical support. Upanishad reveals Brahman as karanam and Upanishad reveals world as Karyam and it shows that karanam, alone is 'sat'hya because it has independent existence.

Any Karyam, which means a product, and no product have got independent existence. This makes an anumana vakyam jagan mithya karanatvad. Brahma sathyam karanatvad. If this is not understood, Upanishad gives an example when there is an earthen product, a pot we know clay alone is 'sat'hyam and there is other substance called pot. There we shave to note that it says mrittika eva 'sat'hyam clay alone is sathyam. Pot is namke vaste 'sat'ta. There is no pot as such. Through that Upanishad reveals Brahma 'sat'hyam jagan mithya.

By taking the sixth chapter as model we have established that Brahman alone is important. The conclusion is that Brahman is sastra Prameyam because of consistency therefore Vedanta is pramanam for Brahman. We thus complete the word Samanvaya.

Now we will take up the word 'tu'. This is the most important word of this sutra. Maximum commentary is written on this word 'tu', tu means emphasis. We have Brahman is subject matter of Vedanta. By adding tu Vyasacharya says Brahman alone is subject matter of Vedanta. When he says Brahman alone is subject matter he says nothing else is the subject matter.

Anytime you emphasise something, indirectly you negate something. Rama alone visited temple means none visited the temple. If said Rama visited temple only means he has not visited any other place. Every emphasis of x implies the negation of 'non-x'. Adhi Sankaracharya says 'tu; is Purva Paksa and other interpretations all those who claim that subject matter of sastram is not Brahman.

Certainly Purva Paksas are those who analyse the sastram. We discuss subject matter is Brahman. Those who don't have belief in sastram are not taken into account. We negate Asthika Purva Paksa. Asthikas are those who have belief in Veda pramanam.

There are six Asthika darsanam Sankya-yoga, Nyaya, vaisesika, Purva Mimamsa, Uttara mimamsa, Vedanta and there are five Purva Paksas in Asthika darsanam. We reduce them into three. The Sankya and yoga have got common philosophy. They are practically same. Sankya practices in theory and yoga practices in practice. By negating Sankya philosophy we negate yoga philosophy also. That means both are one and the same.

In the same way Nyaya and Vaisesika are almost the same. We say Nyaya vaisesika system when we discuss the two. Tarka sangrah takes ideas both from Nyaya and Vaisesika. Thus we have second Purva Paksa. Then we have Purva Mimamsa. Three purva paksas are negated by the word 'tu' in this sutra.

Now he looks upon Sankya yoga as most powerful purva paksa. It appears Sankya yoga must have been most powerful to negate Sankya yoga purva paksa. From the fifth sutra onward, the entire first chapter establishes Vedanta and negating other darsanas. All are 'tu' vakyanam.

Even in the second chapter he goes on refuting Sankya yoga. He does not look upon Naiyayika and Vaisesika as not so powerful purva paksa. Purva paksa status is not given to Naiyayika and Vaisesika. Purva Mimamsa is ritualist section of Purva Mimamsa.

For Purva Mimamsa also there is a bashyam written by Sabara Swami and his bashyam is called Sabara Bashyam. Adhi Sankaracharya respects the above bashyam. Even he follows the style of this bashyam. Purva bagha of Veda is useful for two things. One is it is a means for dharma Artha and kamam or Karma Kanda. Even now we accept all ritual and it is based on Purva Mimamsa. It is useful to gain Siddha suddhi. That is why it is called dharma sastra, which alone gives Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi.

Purva Mimamsa is really not a purva paksa. Purva Mimamsa cannot give moksa this we emphasise. This is our contention. According to us Jaimini also accepts. Vyasacharya is not angry with Jaimini. Even Sabara Swami also accepts this fact that Purva Mimamsa cannot give moksa. Some sub commentaries were written on Sabara Bashyam. They presented that Purva Mimamsa as a means of moksa. Later they started saying Purva Mimamsa alone gives moksa. Then they started saying Uttara Mimamsaka is useless. They said it is like barren land in a country. Purva Mimamsa as presented by the sub commentators has become our purva paksas. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 27

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikarnam Topic 4] contd.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat* – **but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony**

The sutra reads as *tat tu Samanvayat sastra yoni* that Brahman is the subject matter of Vedanta because it has importance. We have commented ‘tat’ and ‘Samanvayat’ and now we have taken up the word ‘tu’ that emphasizes the Brahman alone is the subject matter of the Vedanta sastra and Vyasacharya indirectly negates the other systems of philosophies which claim anything other than Brahman is the central theme of Vedanta.

The purva paksis are broadly classified into three the first being Sankya yoga, Nyaya Vaisesika and Purva Mimamsa. Some may ask why you don’t talk about Vishistadvaida purva paksa and Dvaida purva paksa. You should note Vishistadvaidam and Dvaidam are two types of commentaries on Brahma sutra and as such they cannot become purva paksas. They have common parentage that is Vyasacharya. They are children of Vyasacharya as such.

All the three are one and the same Vedanta darsanam because they have common source of Brahma sutra. All the three are Vedantins. The aim of Vedantins together deal with non-vedantins like Sankya yoga, non-vedantins yoga and non-Vedantins Nyaya and we deal with non-Vedantins Vaisesika. We don’t deal with Vishistadvaidins and Dvaida Vedantins. Dispute is an internal one within the Vedantins is not discussed here.

We have Sankya yoga, Nyaya Vaisesika and Naiyayika. Of these three-purva paksa Vyasacharya deals with Sankya yoga in this chapter as also in the second chapter very elaborately. They are the main challengers to Vedantic teachings. Nyaya Vaisesika is dealt with in the second chapter. Vyasacharya does not deal with Purva Mimamsa. He takes the opportunity of ‘tu’ and comments upon ‘tu’ as Purva Mimamsa nishedartah. He writes an elaborate commentary on samanvaya Andhakaranam and negates Purva Mimamsa.

The main source of Purva Mimamsa is the sutras of Jaimini, which is considered to be the oldest one compared to the other sutras. Jaimini is considered to be the contemporary of Vyasacharya and also a disciple of Vyasacharya. He has written 12 chapters with more than 2000 sutra as compared to around 500 and odd sutras in the Brahma Sutra.

For these sutras there is a standard commentary written by Sabara Swami which is accepted by Adhi Sankaracharya himself. It is called Sabara bashyam and he quotes often. The original Jaimini sutrams and sabara bashyam and Vedanta accepts and we don’t consider the sutram and bashyam as purva paksa at all. We consider them as complementary to Vedanta sastra. Dharma sastra alone gives Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi and the sutra starts ‘atha tho dharma sastra’ which means it aims at Artha kama and dharma sastra. It became purva paksa when two people wrote commentary upon Sabara bashyam.

The two commentators are called Kumarilla Kattah and Prabhakarah. They wrote commentaries with slight differences. Kumarilla Patta presented a commentary in varthiam and presented a Batta matham through his commentary. It gives a new version of Purva

Mimamsa. Prabhakara also through his prose commentary, he presents another version of Purva Mimamsa called Praabhakara matham. Thus, we have got two types of Purva Mimamsa. The version of Purva Mimamsa given by the above two people we don't agree. The Bhatta Purva Mimamsa matham and Praabhakara Purva Mimamsa matham Adhi Sankaracharya negates. What are their views of their mathams we may now analyse.

First I will talk about the basic rules of Purva Mimamsa, which is common to both the mathams, and then we will see the differences between them. The entire Veda or the Vedic statements can be broadly classified into two types. They are Siddha Bodhaka vakyani is one and Karya Bodhaka vakyani the other. Siddha Bodhaka vakyani means those statements, which talk about facts. Facts are the statements of the things as they are. They are called Siddha Bodhaka vakyani.

Karya Bodhaka vakyani are the statements of commandments which are injunctions persuading the people to do actions. They goad people into action. They are the statements containing imperative moods. They are known as Karya Bodhaka vakyani. Through the statements of fact, we will get the knowledge alone whereas the statement of action or commandments will lead to action. One leads to jnanam and the other leads to action.

Siddha Bodhaka vakyam gives only knowledge and it will not help to accomplish anything and the jnanam is otherwise useless.

Jnanam does not give any Purusartha therefore it is utterly useless. By knowing there is a heaven what use it is to me. You go to a doctor and the doctor diagnoses that this is the disease and have got clear knowledge about the disease. Tell how does the blessed knowledge help me to release me from pain. This knowledge neither gives Sukha prapti nor is there dukha Nivrutti or both. Jnanam does not you give any Purusartha or any benefit. In fact after gaining the knowledge one becomes more miserable when it does not give any benefit.

Siddha Bodhaka vakyani is aprayani and it is useless. The knowledge does not add to anything or add to our benefits and what use is to know 'aham Brahma asmi' and Vedantic jnanam. Whereas Karya Bodhaka vakyani makes you do something and by doing alone we get some Purusartha in the form of dukha nivrutti or sukha prapti. Medicine knowledge does not give you any benefit but the consumption of medicine alone helps me. The action of consuming medicine alone gives me some benefit. So also is the knowledge of heaven or swarga.

By knowing that what is the use of that knowledge. On the other hand if I do Jyothistoma yaga as directed by Karya Bodhaka vakyam will lead to swarga. He asserts that all Karya Bodhaka vakyam either helps to gain dukha nivrutti or sukha prapti.

From the above we derive that any amount of Vedantic study will not give any benefit since Vedantic study does not lead anyone to do any action. Both the mathams agree that action alone will give benefits and not knowledge. Purva Mimamsa also agrees with other asthikas that Veda is a pramanam unlike Bouddhas.

In fact it is said Bouddhas are driven out of India the credit goes to Purva Mimamsas by establishing the supremacy of Vedas. Purva Mimamsa accepts Veda pramanam. Pramanam means anathigatha abadita artha bodhakam pramanam. Pramanam is a revealer of something,

which is not revealed by other pramanams like eyes, tongue and skins and other logic and science. To enjoy the pramanam status, Veda should reveal something that is beyond even the science and all other pramanams.

Abatitam is something, which is not contradicted by the other pramanams. That means Veda should not reveal something that contradicts other pratyaksa pramanams. It should not contradict logic also and it should be beyond logic but should not illogical. It should not contradict pratyaksa and science. Veda should be un-contradicted and unrevealed by any other pramanams.

In this definition, Purva Mimamsa adds one more condition. Vedantins accept the third condition. He says that anatdikatha abahita phalavat artha bodhagam. It has got utility and it is useful. Pramanam is that which is useful and is unrevealed and un-contradicted by other pramanams. Now we have said that the statements of fact are useless and the statements of commandments are useful. Siddha Bodhaka vakyani are useless because it is Artha bodhakam. Karya Bodhaka vakyani is useful and it is pramanam.

The key sutram of Purva Mimamsa is that in Veda Karya bodhakatvad statements of injunctions being important. Only through this you can gain something. All other statements are apramanam. All of them are useless and they are invalid. In Siddha Bodhakanam statements are facts and they are invalid. But the statement of commandments is valid while all others are invalid. All these are based on Jaimini sutram.

In Veda Karya bodhakatvad statements of injunctions are important because you do something useful. All other statements are apramanam or invalid. Statements of commandments are valid and statements of facts are invalid more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 28

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4] contd.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat* – **but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony**

We analyse the meaning the word ‘tu’. Adhi Sankaracharya points out ‘tu’ indicated the negation of all the Purva Paksas. We have established Brahman is the subject matter of Vedanta. All other Asthika darsanams who don’t agree with our view are purva paksa. We see the views of Purva Mimamsa.

The first point we saw was Purva Mimamsa’s views are broadly divided as statement of facts and the statement of action. They also say they statement of facts give only knowledge and they are not of any use directly and on the other hand if do any ritual it will give me some benefit. Knowledge by itself of no use without any follow up action as the pure science is of no use unless there is application of science knowledge into technology.

Karya Bodhaka vakyas are commands for doing some action. By doing so we get something or we get rid of something. Thirdly since Siddhabodhaga vakyas are aprayojanam they are useless and invalid. Invalid because a pramanam is pramanam only when it reveals something that is useful. Since Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are aprayojana vakyam they are apramanam. Karya Bodhaka vakyas are useful and hence they are pramanam.

He says the entire jnana kandam deals with Siddhavastu and it talks about Atma and it does not talk about any karma to perform. Jnana kandam gives knowledge only and since Kevala jnanam is of no use we conclude that entire jnana kanda is apramanam and Siddhabodhana vakyatvad. What benefit I get whether we have panca kosas or that there is a sristi by knowing the nature of Brahman I don’t get any benefit as our knowledge is Siddha Bodhaka vakyani and such knowledge is compared to the barren land without any use.

Vedanta is compared to barren land and the Karma Kanda is compared to fertile land with all greeneries. Purva Mimamsa says there is a problem. All these ideas Jaimini present in one important sutra manayasya Kriya satvad anarsathyam atharthanam. They are Siddhabodhagka vakyanam. Since Karya Bodhaka vakyas are useful all Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are useless.

He takes to a new problem now. He accepts the whole Veda as pramanam. He says it is apouruseyam. It does not have any defect and therefore it is defect free pramanam. We accept God as revealer of Vedas but Purva Mimamsa doesn’t believe God as revealer of god and they say Veda is ultimate.

For Purva Mimamsa Vedas enjoy the status of God. If God did not reveal the Veda come, for this he says Vedas are anadhi and it never came as such. Anadi Veda apouruseya Vedas he accepts as pramanan. He says Siddha Bodhaka vakyams apramanam. Siddha Bodhaka protion of Vedas have become apramanam. If you accept the whole Vedas as pramanam how can you negate part of Vedas as apramanam?

For that he answers when I say Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are apramanam direct and directly they are not pramanam. It means indirectly they are useful like science. Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are indirectly useful. All such vakyams help in the implementation of Karya Bodhaka vakyams. Form example when Vedas glorifies swargam, we get the desire to go to swarga.

Once a desire comes, we act and do jyoditoma yaga to gain moksa. It is Karya Bodhaka vakyam and for doing it only when we read Siddha Bodhaka vakyam. Swarga glorification helps in the implementation of Karya Bodhaka vakyam of performing jyotisoma yaga. Here pramanam is useful. After Siddha Bodhaka vakyam, it says one should do a ritual of offering something to vayu devata; it is Karya Bodhaka vakyam. Karya Bodhaka vakyams are effective only with Siddha Bodhaka vakyams.

Siddha Bodhaka vakyams following by Karya Bodhaka vakyams are very useful. Railway coaches are compared to Siddha Bodhaka vakyam and Karya Bodhaka vakyams are compared to engine. Karya Bodhaka vakyam are direct pramana and Siddha Bodhaka vakyams fire indirect Bodhaka vakyam by assisting Karya Bodhaka vakyas Siddha Bodhaka vakyas becomes very useful. Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are sesha and Karya Bodhaka vakyams are seshi. By joining together the entire Vedas become pramanam. Entire jnana kanda consisting of Siddha Bodhaka vakyams are useful. All Veda vakyams are linked to one Karya Beda vakyams or the other.

What about Brahman? Either connects Brahman to devata or some karta or the other. People say Vedanta should be put to practice. In all the Upanishad Brahman has been revealed and they say that there is no such thing like Brahman at all. It is only a prama. According the Purva Mimamsa Brahman nasti. In both the mathams, there is such thing called Brahman. He says that Veda will not reveal Brahman because Veda is utterly useless, totally useless, what is the benefit of Brahman asks Purva Mimamsa for Brahman is neither attainable nor knowable. In what way Brahman is useful when not made non-available.

Some people are not useful but sometimes they are useful as an instrument, for attaining something else. Brahman is avyavakaram. It is not available for any transaction. That means it cannot be a subject, object or any locus. It is not karta karanam etc. It is neither an end nor a means to attain any end. Therefore, purva paksa concludes Brahman asti.

What about Atma jnanam? Self-jnanam is also useless. You accept it Self-evident and why Veda should reveal what is already known. A pramana should reveal which is not known otherwise. Since Atma is already evident why should Veda reveal what is already evident.

Then what is the use of Vedanta? Whenever Atma is talked about in Vedanta you should take it as glorifying statement glorifying the yejamana of the ritual. They are arthavada vakyams. By this yejamana will do the rituals? Similarly by saying that you are suddham you are sathyam etc., one will be happy and do the work properly. He says Atma Bodha vakyam should be taken as yejamana sthuthi vakyam.

Wherever Brahman is talked about we should know that there is no such thing called Brahmabut it should be taken as glorification of yaga devatas and you are encouraged to do yagas. Devatas sthuthi para vakyani. All jnana kanda vakyam should be connected with Karya bodha vakyams.

All Vedanta vakyams should be connected with Karya bodha vakyam. To which vakyam we will connect. Is there any rule for connection? This point the two mathams disagree. Up to this, they travel together. How should you connect that they have disagreement.

Bhatta madham says all jnana kanda vakyam should be connected to Karma Kanda vidhi [Kriya vakyani] vakyam. This is the opinion of Kumarilla Bhatta. Prabhakaran does not accept with that. You cannot connect Siddhavakya with Karya vakya and you should observe some rule. Suddha vakya should be connected to the nearest Karya vakya. He says kumarilla bhatta is wrong saying connecting jnana kanda vakyam with Karma Kanda vakyam when the Siddhavakyas of Karya vakyas of Karma Kanda. He says in the jnana kanda there are many Upasana vakyams.

And Upasanas are also Karya Bodhaka vakyam since something to be implemented and it is manasam karma. Instead of Siddhavakyam of jnana kanda and connect Siddhavakyam of jnana kanda to the Karya vakyam of jnana kanda. Therefore, he says that all the Brahma bodhaka vakyam should be connected to the Upasanas prescribed in the jnana kandam of Vedanta. Brahma vid should be Brahma upasanah. Aham Brahma asmi iti Upasanam kartavyah it is stressed by Purva Mimamsa that there is no Brahman. The Upasana you should practise. This is how Siddha Bodhaka vakyam should be validated. More in the next class



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 29

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4] contd.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat* – **but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony**

We see the significance of the word ‘tu’ that stands for negation of the Purva Mimamsa purva paksas. We see the salient features of Purva Mimamsa. They divide Veda into siddha Bodhaka vakyam with no use and karya Bodhaka vakyams that are useful. Since siddha Bodhaka vakyams are useless and the karya Bodhaka vakyams are useful. They also said that siddha Bodhaka vakyams should be connected to karya Bodhaka vakyams to be useful.

On the basis of this they analyse Veda vakyams also. They say Brahman is nonexistence and Brahman is neither a goal to be attained nor it serves as a means to achieve the goal. They say Brahman is non-existence. They also say all Vedanta vakyams are siddha Bodhaka vakyams statements of fact. We don’t get any benefits from them. They should be connected to karya Bodhaka vakyam else Vedanta vakyams will be invalid.

Which karya Bodhaka vakyam one should join? Here batta madhams and the praabakara mathams don’t agree. All the Veda vakyams they say are only glorification of Brahman to make one to do action enthusiastically. Vedanta inspires karta to do vaidhika karmas. Kumarilla Batta says this. Praabakara madhams says the siddha Bodhaka vakyams should be connected to Vedanta itself not as said by Batta madham that it should be connected to the karya Bodhaka vakyams of Karma Kanda.

The karya Bodhaka vakyasm are all the Upasana vakyams like aham Brahma asmi it is knowledge for Brahma is nonexistence. It is a Upasana to be regularly practiced. It is not a fact Upasana is defining as seeing something upon something. In jivah you have to imagine Brahman. Because of this action, a person will get Purusartha and this is the aim of Vedanta. There is no use of jnanam and you have to do something in the form of meditation, karma or Upasana and the action is the result of Veda. This is purva paksa contention.

Now let us what siddhanta has to say and how siddhanta refutes Purva Mimamsa in the form of purva paksa. The first point they said is all siddha Bodhaka vakyam alone that is useless. Siddha Bodhaka vakyams is statement of fact and karya bodhaka vakyams is statement of action. Karma alone can give result in the form of sukha prapti or dukha Nivrutti. Adhi Sankaracharya says that you are right. He says it is a general rule and there are many exceptions to the rule. Normally knowledge does not give any benefit.

By knowing yogasana will not give any benefit and one has to implement the knowledge for yoga to give benefit. Karma alone is Purusartha sadhanam. There are exceptions where Kevala jnanam alone without requiring any action we get the benefits. They are wherever there is problem caused by ignorance in that case mere knowledge alone can solve the problem. In the case of disease the problem is not the cause of ignorance but you have to take action to free from disease.

In the case of ignorance what you require is knowledge exactly in the case of rope snake example. All the problems of bhayam and palpitation are due to rajju ajnanam. If the fear is to go away what homa he has to perform and what Upasana he has to practise. Karma and Upasana will not solve the problem *rajju ajnana nivruttu sarpa adhyasa* Nivrutti sarpa adhyasa Nivrutti bhaya sambava Nivrutti. Here the very knowledge is sufficient to get rid of the Bhayam.

We say that there are many cases where ajnanam is source of problem where we require knowledge alone to solve the problem. Siddha Bodhaka vakyam are prayojanani and hence it is a pramanam. It produces knowledge and if gives prayojanam. Where siddha Bodhaka vakyam does not give benefit, then it may be joined with karya Bodhaka vakyam. This is general rule. The exception is the cases where the knowledge gives the benefit directly as is in the case of rope snake ignorance.

Now our question is Vedanta vakyams are exceptional category or it falls under general category. We say that Vedanta vakyams do give prayojanam directly without any action being necessary. We say Vedanta itself is pramanam for that. It makes it clear jnanam alone is sufficient to gain moksa. In every Upanishad it is said. The examples are;

Isavasya Upanishad manta 7 *Yasmin Sarvani bhutani Atmaiva-bhuta vijanatah tatra ho mohah kah soka edatva manu pasyatah* - when, to the knower, all beings have become one in his own Self [Atman] how shall he feel deluded thereafter? What grief can there be to him who sees everywhere oneness? When a person clearly knows Atma after that knowledge where is dukha or moha for him.

Kenopanisad 2.4 *Pratibodha viditam matam amrtatvam hi vindate. Atmana vidate viryam Vidyaya vidate'mrtam* indeed, he attains immortality, who intuits it in and through every modification of the mind. Through the Atman he obtains real strength and through knowledge immortality; when it is known through every state of cognition, it is rightly known, for [by such knowledge] one attains life eternal; through one's own Self one gains power and through wisdom one gains immortality. Not an iota of action one attains immortality.

Kathopanisad 2.v.12 *eko vasi Sarva bhut-antaratma ekam rupam bhudha yah karoti, tam Atma stham ye 'nupasyanti dhurah tesam sukham sasvatam netaresam* - [that] one [supreme] ruler the soul of all beings, who makes His one form manifold ....those wise men who perceive Him as existing in their own Self, to them belongs eternal happiness and to none else. The one who clearly recognizes Atman, gains moksa?

Mundakopanisad mantra III.ii.9 *sa yo ha vai tat paramam Brahma Veda Brahmaiva bhavati nasya Brahmavit kule bhavati tarati sokam tarati paptmanam guha granthibhyo vimukto 'mrto bhavati* – He who knows that Supreme Brahman becomes Brahman and in his line [family], none who knows not the Brahman will ever be born. He crosses grief, crosses sin, and being free from the knots of the heart becomes immortal.

Aitereya Upanishad III.1.3 *prajna pratistha prajnanam Brahma* the universe has Consciousness as its guide. Consciousness is the absis of all verily, Consciousness [prjnanam] is Brahman this is Maha vakyam].

Chandogya Upanishad the knower of Atma crosses over all the sorrows;

Brahadharaynaka upanisad one who has known Atma what action he has what suffering he has.

Kaivalya Upanishad 1.i.10 *sarva bhuta stham Atmanam Sarva bhutani catmani sampasyan Brahma paramam yati nayena hetuna* - experiencing one's own Self in all beings and all beings in the Self one attains the highest Brahma – and not by any other means. By knowing Brahman he gains moksa.

Gita chapter 5.15 & 16 *Nadatte kasyacit papam na caiva sukratam vbhuh ajnanena vrtam jnanam tena muhyanti jantavah jnanena tu tad ajnanam yesam nasitam Atmanah tesam adityavaj jnanam prakasayati tat param* The Lord does not take the responsibility for] good or evil deeds of anybody. The knowledge is covered by the veil of ignorance thereby people are deluded. But their jnana whose ignorance is destroyed by Self-knowledge reveals the Supreme like the sun [reveals the beauty of objects of the world]

Thus sruti, purana Smriti etc., say what you require is knowledge and through knowledge you gain moksa and therefore Vedanta vakyani are pramana vakyani. There are several instance and the entire Upanisads and other grandhas are full of instances supporting that knowledge alone give moksa and Vedantic knowledge alone give liberation.

The next is he said after studying Vedanta we have to use knowledge to perform action because mere knowledge is useless and the knowledge you have to do action. Adhi Sankaracharya says there is nothing ridiculous more than that. Vedanta jnanam is to be connection to karma and Upasana is impossible says Adhi Sankaracharya.

Now we say Vedanta jnanam cannot be connected with karma and Upasana. The reasons are; first Vedanta jnanam eliminates duality, which is the basis for karma and Upasana. Upasana also require beda karma also require beda and Vedanta knocks of all the duality. After the knowledge of Advaita can be applied in the field of Dvaitam. I apply Advaita knowledge to karma is contradiction.

In Vedanta jnanam Vedanta negates kartritvam and varnasrama status of a person, which are essential for karma. All karma require two basis qualification one is karta; second is Varna; should be Brahmana; raja suya yaga should be performed by raja alone; I have to keep asrama status for what grahastha can do Brahmacharya cannot do and what one can do the other cannot do. Having negated that how can it be combined karma and Upasana. This is the second argument.

Vedanta positively condemns karma and Upasana as banda hetu. Those who hold on to karma hoping to get liberation go to swarga loka come back to manusya loka and then go to swarga loka and thus the cycle continues without getting the real liberation. Refer to Mundakopanisad 1.ii.7 *plava hyete adrdha yajna rupa astadasoktam avaram yesu karma etac-chreyo ye 'bhinandanti mudha jara mrtym te punare vapi yant* undependable [frail] is this boat of yajna, is said to be manned by eighteen supporters on whom depend the lower ceremonials. Those ignorant persons who acclaim this as the highest are subject, again and again, to old age and death.

Similarly pasana also. Karma cannot give moksa therefore do moksa no one will say. Gita 18.66 *Sarvadharmam parityajya mam eam saranam vraja aham tva sarvapapebhyo moksyisyam ma sucah* setting aside all dharma just surrender completely to my will with firm

faith and living contemplation I shall liberate you from all sins or the bonds of karma and do not grieve.

Vedanta jnanam is contradictory to karma and it can never be combined with karma. Therefore you cannot say Vedanta is siddha bodhana vakyam and it has to be connected to karya bodhana vakyam.

Purva Mimamsa said Brahman is not there. He says Vedanta reveals Brahma. To find out what is revealed by sastra you have given the norm of shad linga. By the method of shad linga you have to accept what is based on shad linga. I have clearly shown applying shad linga you have to accept what I have said. When I have shown that Brahman is revealed how can you say that Brahman is not there. Then you have to negate swarga also. You accept swarga on what basis. Because Veda says Brahman is existent and Brahma is revealed by sastram how can you say Brahman is nonexistent?

You say Brahman is not there because it is neither useful as an end nor as a means because Vedanta says Brahman is not a goal nor it is not a sadhanam and means. Therefore you say Brahman is not there. Brahman is neither sadhyam nor sadhanam it means Brahman is something different from your goal and your means and it is very Sadhaka.

By negating sadhya and sadhana status, Upanishad says you the sadhaka is Brahman. If you say Brahman is nonexistent that means sadhaka is not there that mean you are not there. I may say that you have no brain but you are there. There are three things in creation Sadhaka, sadhya and sadhana. When Brahman is not sadhya and sadhana Brahma is Sadhaka the Atman.

Then Purva Mimamsa said Brahman is Atma then why sastra reveal Atma is ever evident. This sastra need not reveal. For that Adhi Sankaracharya reveals that it is well known as Jivatma and it is not clearly understood as Paramatma. Sastra has to reveal Atma as Paramatma. Therefore Brahma asti and that Brahman is I am. The last one more point we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 30

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4] contd**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [ Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

We see the significance of the word ‘tu’ in the fourth sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya points out signify the negation of all objections to Vedanta. Of various objections to Vedanta Adhi Sankaracharya has taken Purva Mimamsa of purva paksa in this commentary. They say Vedanta ahs to be connected to action in the form of ritual, upasana and Vedanta should have karma sambanda. Adhi Sankaracharya has negated this.

First we say Vedanta does not require karma sambanda and then said karma sambanda is not intended and karma sambanda is not possible. Karma sambanda is not required because Vedanta is capable of giving Purusartha by itself. Why should it be connected with karma? It is proved by anubhava and sruti pramanam. Rope snake jnanam gives benefit without connection to any action. Sruti also very clearly says mere jnanam is enough for moksa without any connection with karma. Examples from all Upanisads were quoted in the last class.

The scriptures do not intend karma sambanda. If Vedanta expects us to do this knowledge along with karma, karma becomes very important. Then Vedanta should have glorified karma. If Vedanta require intends alliance with karma Vedanta should have glorified karma. But it is not the case. In fact Vedanta condemns karma. The second argument we gave that karma sambanda is not intended but is condemned.

The karma sambanda is impossible because Vedanta negates all conditions required for karma and after the karma conditions are negated how can the karma sambanda come. I should be karta to become karma sambanda. I should have Varna and asrama. Without Varna asrama designation vaidhika karma is impossible. Duality or Dvaidam is negated. It requires object, karma locus etc. It is called karagam. Vedanta negates all the conditions.

Final condition is Dvaidam. It is negated. Vedanta cannot have karma sambanda and it is not intended and it is not possible and therefore Purva Mimamsa is wrong. Another condition was Brahman is non-existent. Such a Brahman is both sadhanam and sadhyam is not existent also. Brahman is neither sadhanam or sadhyam therefore it is nonexistent. There is third thing, which is other than sadhanm and sadhyam. Never search for that third entity. The very Sadhaka is other than sadhyam and sadhanam. Brahman is I myself and how can you say I am nonexistent. To say I am nonexistent I must be existent. No one can negate the existence of Brahman because the very negator is Brahman.

Brahman is useful also because when I know I am Brahman that Brahma jnanam negates my jivatvam status. Brahman is useful Aham Brahma asmi negates A Brahmatvam and ah Brahmatvam is negation of jivatvam. The very owning up with Brahman gives the greatest Purusartha called moksa.

The final condition is that if Brahman is Atma it should be Self-evident. If Brahman is Self-evident why should Vedanta should reveal Brahman. Pramana is meant to reveal not known and if Brahman is Atma where is the need for Brahman. Even though Brahman is evident it is not fully known. I know I am I know I am existence I know my 'sat' rupam I know my chit rupam but I don't know I am ananda swarupah. By seeing your face I know that you are not happy man.

Any superimposition requires samanvaya knowledge that there is something. I know that I am asmi and I should know I am Brahma asmi. I know myself as Ahankara I don't know myself saksi Chaitanyam. I know myself as tvam pada Vachyartha and I don't know my Self as tvam pada lakshyartha. Vedanta is required not only to give samanvaya jnanam but also to give visesha jnanam. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Purva Mimamsa said Karma Kanda alone id pramana and jnana kanda cannot be pramana and it can be only by giving Karma Kandam. He said Karma Kanda is like flower and jnana kanda is like thread. No body keeps the string but without flower the string has not value. According to Karma Kanda is valid and jnana kanda has no validity.

Vedantins says in fact it is the other way round. Karma Kandam is apramanam. Jnana kanda alone is pramanam. It is our offensive argument. If it gets validity it is because its association with jnana kanda. You say what is definition of pramanam. It should reveal something new, it should reveal something not negated by other pramanam and it should not be aprayojanam and it should be useful. We have proved Vedanta is pramanam aham Brahma asmi; it is not negated by any other pramanam and it is very useful jiva bhava will go and Brahma bhava will come and get moksa. Jnana kanda fulfills all conditions.

Karma Kanda doest it fulfill all the three conditions. First you claim it reveals something new. Punyam papam swarga loka all are new things. And also prayojanam dharma, Artha kama it gives. But now I will ask whether it fulfills second condition. Now we will see whether it fulfills the second condition.

The second condition of whether it is negated by any other condition. Karma Kanda is negated by jnana kandam of the Veda. Karma Kanda reveals duality, which is the main, these of Karma Kanda. It talks about plurality. Jnana kanda there is plurality at all. It talks of non-dual Brahman alone. The Upanishad says yatrava anadivasyad tatra anyavad anya pasye. Only when there seems duality he sees duality. When one recognizes Atma where is the question of duality? From this we come to know ajnana kale Dvaidam and jnana kale Advaidam.

Whatever obtains at the time of apramanam, at the time of ajnanam there is sarpa and at the time of jnanam rope is seen. Karma Kanda reveals invalid duality and therefore Karma Kanda is apramanam. One who says Dvaidam I am different he does not know; he is Devanam pasuh mean he is a mug and he is ignorant. Whoever sees Dvaidam is ignorant. If at all it should validity Karma Kanda has now become thread and jnana kanda has become flower. Karma Kanda has to be associated with jnana kanda.

If Karma Kanda is apramanam in what way it will be useful for jnana kanda. We say that karma kanda has not its own validity and it is a means to come to jnana kanda Karma Kanda is useful. How Karma Kanda will help as a means to help jnana kanda. Karma Kanda is useful only by giving Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi. Vedantins say Karma Kanda is not

meant for Dharmartha kama Purusartha. Because we don't Dharmartha kama as Purusartha at all and they are only exalted samsara. It is like politician's A class prison.

We only tempt other people to go to Karma Kanda and it is only to gain Vairagyam and for Vairagyam alone swarga is prescribed for Vairagyam alone swarga is prescribed and for the Vairagyam pill we give sugar coated pill and Dharmartha kama is given only to get Vairagyam which is a must to come to jnana kanda. Karma Kanda is superficially Dharmartha kama Artham but really it is only to get Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi Karma Kanda is prescribed. Having got kicked sufficiently and having got Vairagyam you come to jnana kanda. Whether you have pramanam?

To this question we say there is pramanam is there. Having experienced fully all the benefits of karma and Upasana one should know everything other than samsara one should get Vairagya. Suffer more in samsara and you will ultimately come to jnana kanda after getting Vairagyam.

All the karma and Upasana is to create interest Vedanta. Entire Karma Kanda and Upasana are to get interest in Vedanta. Interest in Vedanta is directly proportionate to the quantum of Vairagya. When everything fails the same old prayer continues and the intensity continues which directly proportionate towards Vairagya.

Therefore Karma Kanda and Upasana kanda is valid only when it is associated with Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi. We don't condemn karma and the rituals get validated only when you come to jnana kanda. **Jnana kanda is impossible without Karma Kanda and Karma Kanda is incomplete without coming to jnana kanda.** One should not be content with Karma Kanda. He alone will be very successful in Vedanta. With this Purva Mimamsa condemnation is over. This is all as a part of the commentary upon the word 'tu'.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya introduces one more matham, which is more powerful than the other two, and he discusses and dismisses in the commentary. This is very close to Purva Mimamsa matham. That matham is called vrittikara matham. Vrittih means a small commentary like notes. The word vritti has several meaning. Thought is also vritti. A small commentary is also called vritti. It is a philosophy of one of the Brahma Sutra commentator.

Even before Adhi Sankaracharya prastanatriam existed. Several famous commentators are and vrittikara is one. It is not proper name. We do not know the name of the commentator. One vrittikara famous is jnana karma samuschayavadi at the time of Adhi Sankaracharya. Adhi Sankaracharya heavily criticized in Gita bashyam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 31

#### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4] contd**

*Tat tu Samanvayat –*

But that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony

We see the significance of the word ‘tu’ in the fourth sutra *sattu samanvaya*. Adhi Sankaracharya pointed out that the word ‘tu’ signifies the negation of *purva paksas* and as an indication of that Adhi Sankaracharya takes certain *purva paksas* and negates them of which the *Purva Mimamsas* particularly the *praabakara matham*. That *purva paksa* is *vrittikara matham*. *Vrittikarah* means a commentator only. Adhi Sankaracharya takes a particular commentator and the name of the commentator is not told and therefore we will retain the name *vrittikara*. He does not come under exactly *Purva Mimamsa* and some of his views are close to *Purva Mimamsa* and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya discusses with their view. Now we will see what is *vrittikara madham*. He differs from *Purva Mimamsa* in saying that Brahman is existent. While *Purva Mimamsa* says that there is no such Brahman. *vrittikara* differs from *Purva Mimamsa* and they assert that there is Brahman and it is revealed by the *Upanishad*. It means that *Brahmana sastra yonitvam* he accepts. Brahman cannot be known through any other *pramana* and it can be known only through *Vedanta pramana Upanishad pramana* alone. He also agrees *upakrama shad linga vichara* Brahman is revealed by the *Upanishad*. thus *Brahmanah sastra pramanatvam* he accepts. Up to now he is one with *Advaidins*. Later alone he changes and he says even though *Upanishad* reveals Brahman, he says that the mere *Brahma jnanam* cannot give *moksa*. All are possible but through *Brahma jnanam* one cannot get *moksa*. He goes along with *Purva Mimamsa* once again, he says *kevala jnanam* cannot give any *purusartha* including *Brahma jnanam*. He says after gaining *Brahma jnanam* one has to do *Brahma Upasanam*. *Brahma Upasanam* alone give *moksa* is his argument. Therefore *Vedanta* reveals Brahman and asks one to do *Brahma Upasanam*. This *Brahma Upasanam* is a type of *karma* and through this he will get extraordinary *punyam* and through this *punyam* alone *moksa* is possible. In support of that he again quotes *Purva Mimamsa sutra*. The whole *veda* ask you to do something or the other. Mere learning will not do and after leaning you have to do something. In *karma* and *Upasana kanda* you learn and do various *Upasanas* to get the benefits or *phalams*. But in *Vedanta* we say mere Brahman knowledge will give *moksa*, which they do not accept. So they say do *Brahma Upasana* instead of *devata Upasanas* etc. they feel that *Brahma jnanam* itself will not be of any use to us. In support of this he quotes *Upanishad mantra*. *Atma iti eva upasita vrittikara* says *Upanishad* very clearly uses the word *upasita*. In another place *Atma eva lokam upasita* here also there is a clear expression *upasita* and what we require *Brahma Upasanam* or *Paramatma Upasanam* to gain *moksa*. Then we ask him the question what about the statement of *atmavid soham barati Brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati* etc. *jnena moksa* we find in almost all the *Upanisads*. For that he says you should carefully understand the *mantra*. Every word of indicating *jnanam* has got the meaning of the *Upasanam* also. In 3.iii.7 of *Siksa valli Taittiriya Upanishad* we see *ya evameta mahasagmhita vyakhyata veda, sandhiyate prajaya pasubhih Brahma varcasenana nadyena suvargena lokena* the word *veda* means *upasita* that means word *veda* has got two meanings one meaning is *jnanam* and the other meaning is *Upasanam* and *Birgu valli* also in III.x.2 we see *ya evam veda ksema iti vaci yaga ksema iti*



*prana panayoh karmeti kastayah gatih iti padayoh vimuktir iti payau iti manusih samjnah atha daivih trptir iti vrstau balam iti vidyuti* here also veda refers to Upasanam. Brahma jnani does not become Brahman Brahma upaste Brahma bhavati. Brahma vid apnoti Param means Brahma upasaka apnoti Param only Atma upasaka gains moksa so says vrittikara. Wherever jnanam comes you have to read it as Upasanam says vrittikara. In short take all the quotations in all of them wherever jnanam comes you have to take it as Upasanam and it is Upasana dvara you gain moksa and not through mere knowledge. we ask the question why do you say that. The general rule is jnanena phalam nasti and there are exceptional cases where the problem is due to ignorance and we gave the example of rope snake example. Why do you jnanena prayojanam nasti we ask vrittikara. He says yes I also accept this. But Brahma jnanam does not come under that exception. Don't bring Brahma jnanam under the category of exception and it comes under the regular rule and therefore after gaining Brahma jnanam you should do Upasanam. In support of this he gives examples of many people who have studied Vedanta. Many people who have mastered Vedanta and even after thorough study of Vedanta they continue to be ordinary people and they have not turned to be a Brahma jnani. There are many who know Vedanta and they continue to be samsari. What is the use of Vedanta jnanam and Brahma jnanam? From all the personal experiences it is very clear that Brahma jnanam does not transform a person. People are full of raga dvesa and they don't turn out to be wise even after studying and mastering Vedanta. he says none of them will give any benefit and he will be Vedantic educated samsari. This is one argument to sympathise with vrittikara. We know we don't change even after studying Vedanta. we continue to be samsaris also those who have learnt Vedanta. so Brahma jnanena na moksa.

Then he gives one more argument in support of that. Upanishad clearly says Atma va arey drastavyah mandavyah srortavyaha nididyasidavyaha Atma should be understood through sravanam; also by mananam and nididyasanam; through sravanam and mananam one gets Brahma jnanam. if Brahma jnanam can give moksa srortavyah and mandavyah is sufficient. Why nididyasanam to gain moksa. Upanishad should stop with sravanam and mananam. Then Upanishad prescribes nididyasanam. It means repeated thinking of that. What is repeated thinking is otherwise called Upasanam. And this Upasanam is a clean action. It is compulsory action. Srortavyah mandavyah in Sanskrit tavyah is a suffic indicating compulsory action. The very word nididyasanatavyah indicates Upasana action gives prayojanam and not Atma jnanam. without Upasana action will be like learning yogasana. Yogasana jnanam includes karmangam. Brahma jnanam means Brahma Upasanam is also included. Our conclusion is Brahma jnanam followed by Upasanam alone will give the prayojanam. This is vrittikara matham.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya will refute this matham very elaborately. He defines moksa from different angle. He asks the question what is moksa and he after defining moksa and establishes such a moksa is not possible from Upasana. Gauda pada says every upasaka is an unfortunate one. here also we will criticize Upasana. This may even disturb some people. Upasakas are very much glorified and Vedanta is going to criticize Upasanas. We don't criticize Upasana and we only criticize Upasana as a means of moksa, which comes after Brahma jnanam. as a means of moksa it is heavily criticized. Before Brahma jnanam Upasana is glorified for mental refinement. It is a means for mental refinement Upasana is glorified and it is compulsory also. vrittikara's Upasana is criticized and his Upasana is to be done after Brahma jnanam. Kindly don't think that Vedanta is against Upasana. Jnana anantara Upasana we criticize and jnana purva Upasana we glorify. Here Adhi Sankaracharya will heavily criticize the Upasana as presented by vrittikara. Asariratahi moksa. Moksa is freedom from sarira sambandha. Naturally samsara is sarira tahi samsara sarira sambandha is

samsara. Asariratahi mokshah. Where does he find these two definitions? Are these two definitions are Adhi Sankaracharya's own making. As long as sarira sambanda Sukha and dukha cannot be avoided. Therefore priyam will come apriyam will go and this cannot be avoided. Even when priyam comes we will not be happy and we will be worried that this priyam will go away. As long as we are in relative samsara we are worried when priyam comes or apriyam comes. This problem cannot be avoided. Then what is moksha. Asariram va vatantam na priya priye sambanda for one who does not sarira sambandha priya apriya will not affect him. Now Adhi Sankaracharya comes back to Upasana. He says karma and Upasana are both action. Karma is an action; Upasana is also an action. One is kayikam karma and one is manasam karma. One is physical action and the other is mental action., Adhi Sankaracharya argues wherever action is there, there will be taratamyam or gradation. That means a person action for one hour and another for two hours and there will be quantity difference. Yagas are different kinds and hence quantitative gradations are there. in the same way in the Upasanam also there is qualitative difference. Tara tamyam is there in karma and hence karma phalam also there will be taratamyam. when there is punyam gradation what can that punyam do. It can only give varieties of bodies depending upon the gradation of punyas. The type of body depends upon the type of punyam. Even in animals certain animals are in the temples carrying the god and some are in circus getting the beating to perform action. A little bit more punyam you can be a human beings. Punyam can only give different types of body. It can improve asariratvam and it cannot make you asarirah. It can give you exalted sariratvam or inferior sariratvam. You may get Indra sariram, Prajapathi sariram etc. any amount of karma and Upasana will keep you in sariratvam only. Therefore samsara cannot be avoided. Karma punyam sasaratvam and samsara go together. As long as you are in this circle and with punya papa karma you will continue to be a samsari. If you define moksha also an Upasana phalam and moksha will include punyam and it means sasaratvam and if it is sasaratvam means you continue to be samsari. The phalams of karma and Upasana may result in going to some loka where god is residing. This also is temporary stay as it lasts only up to the exhaustion of the punya and papa. We do not accept this as moksha. As long as one retains individuality and even if you go to another loka you will have sariram and you are possessed by sasaratvam. In vaikunta also you have to struggle to see the Lord. Some will be near him and some will be behind the Lord. Then you cannot see the Lord directly. You can hear the conversation. As long sasaratvam is there we are in a paritucular place means there will be gradation and where there is gradation comparison will come and where there is comparison jealousy will come. we do not accept any moksha so long as there is sasaratvam for anyone or even to the god. As long as asariratvam, there will be gradation of even the happiness one gains as benefit of karma and Upasana. Upasana phalam comes under sasaratvam. Why cannot you say Brahma Upasana gives asariratvam. Adhi Sankaracharya says it cannot be. That we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 32

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4]**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [ Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

We see the significance of the word tu in the fourth sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya pointed out signifies the negation of all the objections. In his commentary he negates some of the purva pakas. First he negated Purva Mimamsa purva paksa.

Now he has taken up vrittikara matha. According to them Brahma Upasana gives moksa and not hrahma jnanam. Unlike this vrittikara accepts the existence of Brahman and Brahman is revealed by Vedanta sastra. He says you should not stop with Brahma jnanam and you should practise Upasana and as a result of punyam gained through Upasana you gained moksa. Adhi Sankaracharya very elaborately refutes this matham. We will go stage by stage and it will become clear.

One cannot gain moksa cannot through Brahma Upasana for that matter by any Upasanam. To establish this particular fact he has taken a definition and in support of this he gets Chandogya statement. Sarira sambandha abhavah moksa and the presence of sarira sambanda is samsara and its absence is moksa. Then he points out that this moksa can never be without Upasana. All karma and Upasana can get a gradation in sariram only and retain the status of sariratvam.

Karma and Upasana cannot change my sariratvam status. As a result of karma from manusya I become manusya Gandharva and deva Gandharva and even Brahmaji status is only better sariratvam alone whether it is karma or Upasana. Moksa is asariratvam only. For that vritti kara raises another question. I accept asariratvam is moksa temporarily. And why cannot you say that Brahma Upasana is very potent Upasana. It is specially powerful Upasana and it can give asariratvam itself. Brahma Upasana gives asariratvam. This is purva paksa.

Now we have to see the answer. The answer is asarirata cannot be the result of any karma or Upasana. He says because asariratvam is the very nature of Atma. Whatever is the nature of thing is always there. This is the definition of nature. It is something, which intrinsic to particular thing and it is nithya siddham. Heat is the nature of the fire and fire is eternally hot. Adhi Sankaracharya says asariratvam is the very nature of every jiva and it is siddha svarupam and it is ever established. Any karma or Upasana phalam is not available now and they are available later after the practice of karma and Upasana. Whether it is siddham or sadhyam? Sadhyam is something to be achieved in future. Asarirata is equal to nithya siddham because it sis svarupam. How can be sadhyam and siddham be equated? Therefore siddha asarirata moksa cannot be in the form of sadhya Upasana phalam. How can it be the very svarupam of everything? He refers to the Upanishad to show that Atma is asariram.

Refer to Mundaka Upanishad II.i.2 says *divyo hyamurtah purusah sabahya bhyantaro hyajah aprano hyamanah subhro hy aksarat paratah parah* Self respelendent, formless, un-

originated and pure that all pervading Being is both within and without anterior both to life and mind. He transcends even the transcendent, unmanifested causal, state of universe.

In Mundaka itself we see *yat tad adresyam agrahyam agotram avarnam acaksuh srotram tad apani padam nityam vihum sarvagatam susuksmam tad avyayam vyad bhuta yonim pari pasyanti dhirah* which means that which is invisible, ungraspable, unoriginated and attributeless, that which has neither eyes nor hands nor legs – that is Eternal full of manifestations. All pervading, subtlest of the subtle – that Imperishable Being is what the wise perceive as the Source of all creation.

Isa Upanishad says Mantra 8 *sa paryagac chakram, avranam, asnaviram, suddham, apapviddham, kavir maisi, paribhuh, svayambhuh, yathatathyato'rthan, vyadadhac chasvatibhyas samabhyah* he has filled all, He is radiant, bodiless, invulnerable, devoid of sinews, pure, untouched by evil. He the seer, thinker, all pervading, Self-existent has duly distributed through endless years the objects according to their natures. Asarirah is not a goal to be accomplished but a fact to be recognized and therefore it is not a phalam at all. Asariratva is nityah.

Then somebody comes in between and raises an aside objection. He says how do you define asariratva as moksa. In Advaita asarirah should be defined as moksa. If Advaitin defines Asariratvam as moksa, jivan mukti is not possible. You will get moksa only after death.

Adhi Sankaracharya says do you think that I have not thought about that. He says that jivan mukti is possible even when we say moksa is asariratvam. The other people think jivan Mukta is asarirah. Upanishad reveals asariratvam as it is our very nature. If asariratvam is Atma swarupam then when am I asarirah. The Upanishad points out that I am asarirah all the time. Atma nitya asarirah. Sarira sambanda varjitah.

Why Atma is asariram all the time? First reason is that it is the very nature of myself. Kaivalya Upanishad mantra 21 states *apanipado 'ham acintya saktih pasyamy acaksuh sa srnomy akarnah aham vijanami vivikta rupo na casti vetta mama cit sada ham* – the mantra says 'I am without hands and legs, of incomprehensible power. I see without eyes, hear without ears. Devoid of all forms, I am knowing [everything] and there is none that knows me I am ever pure knowledge. I am eternally asarira because it is my very nature.

Atma is *asangah.asangohi ayam purusah* it cannot have any relationship with anything just as Akasa. Akasa is along with everything but it is not connected with anything. Atma is related to anything. Therefore Atma nityam asarirah.

Sarira sambanda comes as a result of karma phalam. Karma phalam comes to a karta Atmanah nitya akakritvad Atma being ever karta where is the question karma where is the question of karma sariram and where is the question of sarira sambandha. Therefore Atmanah asariratvam nitya siddham.

If Atma is asariratvam is nitya siddham why say asariratvam is samsara. Why Asariratvam moksa? Adhi Sankaracharya says Atma cannot become asarirah but Atma can be mistaken as asariraka. It is mistaken as asarirah. What can go wrong can go wrong. What can happen successfully happen. Asariratvam has happened because of mistake. *Sasariratvam adhyasa siddham*. It is an error that has happened. If asariratvam is because of error how do you get asariratvam.

How do you reconvert snake into rope. It is intellectual conversion that there was, there is and there will be a snake. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says asariratvam is error. What is required is know the fact that aham Atma nithya sarira sambandha asmi. I am ever free from sarira sambanda. Even at the time of samsara I am asarirah. Ajnani is also asarirah but Ajnani thinks he is sasarirah.

Therefore what we require is a shift in the understanding. When the shift takes place he becomes a jivan Mukta. Thus jivan mukti is possible. Snake removes the skin and skin continues to be there near the snake and whatever happens to the skin the snake is unaffected. So also the jnani is unaffected by what happens to his body after he own up with Atma. The body has got its own course. A jnani never claims body's pleasure and pain as his. This is the first argument.

Moksa cannot be Upasana phalam. Here he gives another definition of moksa. Brahma bhavah hi mokсах. Every philosopher accepts moksa is nithyah. They are already tired of other phalam. No one wants anithya phalam. And from scriptures we come to know that there is only one nithya vastu that is Brahma. All other things are mithya. Everybody wants moksa to be nithya. One thing that is nithya is Brahman. Hence moksa is nithyah. Moksa prapti is Brahma praptih. Can moksa be Upasana phalam. Can Brahman be Upasana phalam.

Our analysis is can Brahman be Upasana phalam. For this purpose Adhi Sankaracharya says any karma and Upasana can produce four types of phalam. The karma upasana phalam is apatih reaching by doing action we can reach a place; utpattih you can produce something farmer can produce crops; factories produce various things.

Vikaraha or modification or conversion; you convert one thing into another. From cow dung etc., into gobar gas. Next is samskara purification there is so many factories do purification it is not modified and only impurities are removed. Gold ore iron ore etc. Remove the dirt and get pure gold. These are the four types of karma phalam. Can Brahman come under any of the four things? Can Brahman come under any of the four? Brahman reaching is out of question. Brahman is sarvagatvad. Brahman is all pervading and moksa is to reach Brahman.

All pervasiveness and travel are contradiction. Brahma cannot be reached need not be reached. The second is production. By karma and Upanishad you can produce many thing. There is no question of utpatti in the case of Brahman. When we will attain moksa. When will I attain moksa? This is wrong. Second karma phala is not possible; vikaraha can Brahman be the result of modification.

No Brahman is not the end product of any process because Brahmanah avikaratvad. Refer to Gita 2.25 *Avyaktoyam acintyoyam avikaryoyam ucyate tasmad evam viditvaina na nusocitum arhasi* - which reads as Atma is said to have a transcendental form and is incomprehensible and unchanging. Knowing this Atma as such you should not grieve.

Samskara why cannot we take that you go on purifying by karma upasana. You go on removing impurities and then Jivatma becomes Paramatma. Here gold example is also given. The gold becomes shining one after removal of impurities etc.

Adhi Sankaracharya says Brahmanah is nithya suddhitvad. In the sastra samskara is divided into two one is removal of impurities and another additional of virtue. It is like sarira samskaram. We take bath by using soap etc. This is dosa apanayana and after finishing

the bath we do lot of other things and it is called Guna Adhanam and scent. In the case of Brahman there is no dosa apanayanam bhavati and it is nir dustadvad nir gunatvad. Therefore Brahman is not apti visayah, samskara visayah etc. Brahman is different type of karma phalam. Moksa is different from all karma Upasana phalam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 33

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4]**

#### **Brahman the main purport of all Vedantic studies.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

Adhi Sankaracharya points out 'tu' signifies the negation of all darsanams. As a part of the commentary he negated Purva Mimamsa in the form of batta matha and praabakara madha nishedah. The main feature of vrittikara is Brahma jnanam cannot give moksa and Brahma jnanam he has tom practice Upasana and he will gain punya and through that punya he gains moksa. Adhi Sankaracharya negates this view. Moksa cannot be attained through Brahma Upasana. He gave two definition of moksa and through both definition he said that cannot be effect of Upasanas. We saw elaborately if moksam is asariratvam and it cannot be attained through Upasana because asariratvam is our real nature.

The second definition he gave was moksa is identical with Brahman if Brahmanis in the form Brahman it cannot be Upasana phalam. It is either in the form of reaching, modifying, purifying or producing. In the case of Brahman all the four are not possible which we had seen in the last class.

Brahman being moksa and moksa is not Upasana phalam. Moksa is Brahma Upasana phalam. This is the first argument.

We go to the second argument. It is based on assumption. Assuming something we will show purva paksa is wrong. Suppose we say moksa is Upasana phalam, and then what will be the nature of moksa. If it be, moksa will have a beginning because the result is accomplished by following a sadhana. Before Upasana, moksa is not there. You get moksa only after completing the moksa as a result of punyam gained through moksa. Whatever has beginning will certainly have an end. It is therefore anithya mokсах.

Goudapada says in his Mandukya Karika No iv.30 says *anade rantavat tvam ca samsarasya na sesyati, anantata ca 'dimato moksasya na bhavisyati* in the opinion of the disputants, That which is unborn, The very nature of That is to be ever unborn, it is never possible for a thing to be ever other than what it is. Eternity is not possible for moksa, which has beginning, and therefore moksa will become anithyam.

All philosophers have agreed that moksa is nityah. All suffering due to mortality, comes to moksa and if he faces yama there what for all the sufferings. Whatever acquired through karma is destroyed here and whatever acquired through punyam is exhausted in the outer world and he is back to be reborn. Upasana phalam is also anithyatvad. In fact the word phalam itself means that which becomes rotten and gets destroyed during course of time is phalam. Then it will be anithyah. This is the second argument.

The third argument is upasana cannot be the theme of Vedanta. It is not the theme of Vedanta. The first reason is that mimasa and samanvaya shows that Tatparyam is not

Upasana. For this we already have used shad lingani we saw. It is very clear that Vedanta talks about owning up moksa which is here and now. It does not talk of accomplishing something new in future.

The Mahavakyam which is central part of Vedanta shows tat tvam asi and it says that moksa is here and now if it is not here and now it can never be anywhere at anytime. You can be either nithya Muktah nor nithya bandah. Not only that in Brahadharaynaka upanisad it talks about karma phalam and Upasana phalam. By having a child who is Asthika who believes in karma and performs karma for father through putra father can get manusya janma once again.

Then karmana Pitru lokah; and Vidyaya Upasanen Brahma lokah. Having enumerated karma upasana phalam the Brahadharaynaka upanisad glorifies a sannyasi and he says that I don't want any of the three phalams and he seeks moksa. That indicates that moksa does not come under Upasana phalam. Therefore Vedanta does not deal with karma phalam and it does not deal with Upasana phalam and Vedanta deals neither karma nor Upasana and therefore Upasana is not the Tatparyam.

Then the technical reason Adhi Sankaracharya gives is this that entire Veda is divided into two portions one is Karma Upasana Kanda and jnana kanda is Veda antah. Veda Purva is analysed by Jaimini maharishi and it begins with athatho dharma jijnasa. Veda anta analysed by Vyasacharya starts from athatho Brahma jijnana. All karma upasana should be analysed in Veda Purva or Vedanta and Adhi Sankaracharya says all karma upasana should be analysed in Veda Purva since they produce dharma or punya. Everything connected with dharma should be analysed in Purva bagha.

The introductory sutra says athatho dharma jijnasa. If Vedanta deals with moksa and if moksa is Upasana phalam if Vedanta also deals with Upasana it should have come under Veda Purva alone athatho dharma jijnasa. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says if it dealt with Upasana and punya, it would have become a part of Purva Mimamsa portion of Jaimini.

That will produce punya and punya the moksa. Here in Purva mimamsa there is no mention of Vedanta and it is because Vedanta has nothing to do with dharma. Vedanta deals with an Atma, which is anyatra dharmad anyatra adharmad. Vedanta does not have dharma or Adharma and it talks about Atma, which is beyond both.

Refer Mundakopanisad III.i.3 *yada pasyath pasyate rukma varnam kartaram isam purusam Brahma yonim tada Vidvan punya pape vidhuya niranjanah paramam samyam uapiti* when the seer realizes the Self effulgent supreme being – ruler, maker and source of the creator even – then that wise one, shaking of all deeds if merits and demerits becomes stainless and attains the supreme state of equipoise Vedanta deals with a moksa of Vidvan who renounces punya and papa.

In Gita 18.66 Krishna says *Sarvadarman parityajya mam ekam saranam vraja aham tva sarvapapebhyo moksayisyami ma sucah* which reads as abandoning all duties come to Me alone for shelter. Be not grieved, for I shall release thee from all evils. Vedanta does not deal with dharma. Karma upasana produces punya and papam how can that Upasana be part of Brahma jijnasa. Dharma vilaksanatvad is not the Tatparyam of Vedanta.

Brahma Upasana itself is not possible. The very question whether Brahma Upasana gives moksa or not depends whether Brahma Upasana is available or not. Upanishad clearly says



'tat tvam asi' Brahman itself you are yourself is Brahman which means Brahman is not an object at all. It is upasaka's svarupam. How can the upasaka Brahman become upasya Brahman. Subject can never be an object and object can never be the subject; subject ever the eternal and object ever mortal. Nobody can do Upasana on Brahman including God.

Baghavan also can see everything except his own eyes. Therefore Brahman cannot be an object of Upasana. Your basic topic has collapsed. Even if you don't accept the intellect Upanishad clearly says that whatever you meditate upon is not Brahman whether it is extraordinary or ordinary. Meditated upon is not Brahma because mediator is Brahman. Brahmanah avisayatvad.

Then purva paksa asks a very legitimate question. It is an extension of the fourth topic. He says you are in trouble. If you say Brahman is not an object and then I would say Brahma jnanam is not possible because jnanam indicate Brahman to become an object of knowledge. The Upanishad clearly says Brahman is not an object. How can you say Brahma jnanena moksah.

This is the argument of vrittikara. He says then you cannot say that Vedanta cannot be pramanam for moksa. If you say sastram is not pramana the very sutra itself will be in trouble. Sastram is pramanam for Brahman. Your interpretation of fourth sutra is cancellation of third sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya says that Brahma jnanam is not possible and in fact Brahma jnanam is not required. We have repeatedly said that in the form of Consciousness Brahman is Self-evident and svayam Jyoti bhavati.

In support of our argument Gita says in 13.17 *jyotissam api taj jyotis tamasah param ucyate jnanam jneyam jnagamyam hrdis Sarvasya dhrsthitam* I which reads as He is the light of lights, said to be beyond darkness knowledge, the object of knowledge and the good of knowledge – he is seated in the hearts of all. Nothing need reveal Consciousness because Consciousness reveals everything. It reveals sastram.

Therefore Gita repeatedly Adhi Sankaracharya says that in life you need not work for gaining Brahma jnanam alone. Of Atma is Self-evident and jnanam is not required and why do you say sastram is pramanam, Brahma jnanam is not necessary etc. Adhi Sankaracharya excels and he says our problem does not know and our problem is misunderstanding of Atman, which requires correction. Self-evident 'I' is mistaken; that mistake has to be eliminated.

When I use the word I, the 'I' is evident and at the same time I the Consciousness is Self-evident; Body Mind Complex is evident because of the Consciousness. Two things shine intimately the property of the body I throw on Consciousness the mud of Body Mind Complex. Sastram is required not to reveal Brahman but remove superimposed limitations. This removal of limitation is in the form of vritti a mode in the mind and that vritti is called aham Brahma asmi. When I say aham Brahma asmi I know nothing new but I know the limitation of Body Mind Complex and dropping the limitation is intellectual process and this process is called Atma jnanam. Here also I don't experience anything new; I don't gain anything new I only remove something old. I drop something and I don't see experience anything new.

Therefore Atma jnanam is possible intellectual elimination of pramata prameya Nivrutti eva Atma Jnanam. Such an Atma Jnanam can come through sastram. Therefore sanstram is pramana. Adhyasa nivartaka Rupena sastra pramanam. Brahma Rupena na sastra pramana.

Therefore Atma Jnanam is possible. Sastram is pramanam. Such a pramanam is called nisheda rupa pramana. With this the fourth argument is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 34

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4]**

#### **Brahman the main purport of all Vedantic studies.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat – but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony*

We see the significance of the word tu in the fourth sutra and Adhi Sankaracharya points out that tu signifies the negation of all purva pakshas and he negated two types of Purva Mimamsa mathams and now he negates vrittikara matham. This vritti kara matham he negates elaborately. Firstly Adhi Sankaracharya said moksa couldn't be Upasana phalam. Then he pointed out if moksa is taken Upasana phalam then that moksa will be perishable and anithya.

Thirdly he pointed out Upasana cannot be central theme of the Vedanta. If Upasana is central theme it would have be independent sastra. Finally all sannyanis renounce all the Upasana phalam. Hence Upasana cannot be the central theme of Vedanta. Finally he said Brahman Upasana is not possible. Therefore Brahma Upasana is not possible.

Until now Adhi Sankaracharya had given his own arguments. Now he refutes some of his specific statements and specific questions. Brahma jnanam cannot give moksa because cannot give any benefit and jnanam has to be put into some kind of action similar to batta and praabakara matham. Science should be followed by application. He also said that Jaimini has clearly pointed out in his sutra.

Veda will be useful only when that instigates you to one action or the other. Therefore if there are any statements in Veda, which do not involve any action, are apramanam. Therefore its main contention, which does not involve any action, is useless knowledge. Therefore he said vidhi vakyani are pramanam and all commandments involve action. Avidhi vakyani non-commanding statements are apramanam because there is no action involved. They are called arthavadha vakyanam.

Adhi Sankaracharya negates him with wonderful argument. He asks do you accept nisheda vakyams in Veda like you should not harm anyone. You should not eat meat. You should not eat liquor. Are they pramana vakyam. They are as valid as vidhi vakyams. Now Adhi Sankaracharya you accept nisheda vakyams as pramanam and tell me what action is involved in nisheda vakyam.

After knowing that I should not drink water what I should do is that I should not drink. Is it an action? Avoidance of something is not an action and it is but absence of action therefore nisheda vakyam do not produce any action at all. Avoidance is but audasinyam. We use the word I do nothing and it is not a type of action. Nisheda vakyam retains actionlessness and do not produce any action. Nisheda vakyams are pramanam even though Kriya sambandam is not there. Vedanta vakyams are also pramanam eva saprayojantvad. Here jaimini strotram will not apply here.

Then they asked you say Brahma jnanam eva moksa and after Brahma jnanam Upasana is not required. Then they ask if it be so all students Vedanta gain knowledge by the study of Vedanta and all must be liberated people. I have interviewed several students of Vedanta. I asked them are you free or are you jivan Mukta.

Always they started with if and but etc. From this we know mere Vedanta jnanam is not enough and no one claims I am Mukta even after long time training. Who will be Viveka Mukta after maranam. No one answers straightaway sravanam will give moksa. This is vrittikara statement. Adhi Sankaracharya answers I never said that the student of Vedanta will be free.

A listener of Veda will not gain moksa. A knower of Vedanta is definitely free. I ask the question to a student will you get punar janma. He says I know I am Atma and I know Atma is birthless and I don't know whether I will have rebirth or not. He says I know Atma is birthless I am not sure whether I am Atma or not.

If I know I am Atma and I know Atma is birthless then I should ask where is the question of rebirth after knowing Atma. I am not bothered about the sarirams and I have nothing to do with sarirams and I am the sariri who is ajah nithyaha. As long as I doubt my freedom, my knowledge is doubtful; as long as knowledge is clear freedom cannot be doubted. Knowledge and banda cannot go together.

I should be very clear that I am Atma. Listeners are many and knower is few; knower will say I am free and it is Upanisadic information and it is an eternal fact. Where there is jnanam there is no question of samsara. Where there is samsara or doubt, you can never be free. Adhi Sankaracharya says listeners can be samsari and they cannot be knowers. Therefore jnanat kaivalyam and after jnanam no Upasana is required.

Then comes the next question. If you say Vedanta jnanam or aham Brahma asmi jnanam gives moksa why should Vedanta prescribe nididyanam after the study? Nididyanam means meditation. After practice I should practise meditation. You call that as nididyanam. Meditation must be there after the study. These are the arguments of vrittikara.

Adhi Sankaracharya says yes; Upanishad says and stipulates Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam. I say Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam all these three are meant for jnanam only. They are not practiced after jnanam and they are practiced for jnanam. How do you say that all these three are meant for jnanam. For that we say sravanam is main sadhana, which gives jnanam. Sravanam reveals my nature. It is called angi sadhana, which produces knowledge.

Scriptural study is most important sadhana. That alone produces jnanam. Even though jnanam takes place, obstructing jnanam to give moksa there are obstacles in giving moksa. Not that jnanam has any capacity but there are obstacles are there. One is doubt in the form of obstacles, which come from my own intellect or other darsanams. They say you be a part of Brahman. If you accept Dvaidam you cannot accept Advaidam. If you accept Advaidam you cannot accept Dvaidam.

If I am whole Brahman I cannot be part Brahman. If I accept one system presupposes negation of the other. I can be diplomatic externally. If someone asks whether you are Brahman, you cannot answer the question when you have lingering doubt. In Advaidam jivan

mukti is possible. In other system it is not possible. Therefore doubt should be there even an iota.

The second obstacle is habitual notion that Atma is something else and I am something else. I should be free and certain that I am Brahman. We always contradict our statement and on the other we complain at anatma level. We should not take Atma as third entity and it is called viparita Bhavana.

Sapratibanda jnanam is as good as ajnanam and it cannot give any benefit. Sravanam gives jnanam and mananam and nididyasanam removes the obstacles of doubt whether I am part of Brahman etc. Inside in the heart of hearts I can accept only one and I should reject improper things.

Mananam is aimed at to eliminate all the systems of philosophy. I should be doubt free doubt free knowledge means I should know what is right; I should know what is wrong. Right is right I should know and also I should know what is wrong and I should know why the wrong is wrong. Respecting a person is one thing and accepting a philosophy is another. Respecting is duty of a gentle man and accepting everything is sign of a confused man.

Mananam removes samsaya pratibanda. Finally comes nididyasanam and it removes that of looking Atma as third person. Start looking at Atma as first person. Atma as third person attitude should go. It is called reorientation of the ways of thinking. It is called nididyasanam and it does not give jnanam and it does not give moksa. It removes obstacles. It converts knowledge with obstacles into obstacles free knowledge. Then you gain moksa.

Imagine there is a bulb; there is a switch. Connection is Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi. Switching on is sravanam. Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi is wire connection. Bulb burns and it destroys ignorance. I switch on light yet it is dark. You check everything. All are ok. Why it is dark. Two thick black clothes cover the bulb.

Suppose someone asks can light remove darkness. Light can remove darkness. It is not affected. But between the light and removal of darkness, what you have to do is to remove the dark pieces of cloth, which are compared to the darkness. Did the light remove the darkness or removal of the cloth removed the darkness. Removal of dark is removal of obstacles and ultimately the light alone removed the darkness.

Unobstructed knowledge gives moksa. After jnanam nothing is to be done to attain moksa. Sravanam Mananam Nididyasanam gives unobstructed knowledge and unobstructed knowledge gives moksa. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 35

### **Sutra 4 Adhyaya 1.Pada 1 [Samanvayadhikaranam Topic 4]**

#### **Brahman the main purport of all Vedantic studies.**

*Tat tu Samanvayat* – but that [Brahman is known from sruti]; is the result of harmony

We see the significance of the word ‘tu’ which occurs in the fourth sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya points out the word tu signify the negation of all the purva pakshas. One purva paksha negated was Purva Mimamsa mathams and another he negates is vrittikara matham. Vrittikaras’ main argument is that one should do Upasana after gaining jnanam for moksa. He says that the Brahma Upasana is a type of karma.

This Brahma Upasana karma is capable of producing a special type of punyam, which cannot be obtained by doing any other karma. This special punya will give moksa. Adhi Sankaracharya refutes their claim and he asserts that Brahma Upasana cannot give moksa. We are liberated and we will ever be liberated and no Upasana needs produced moksa and if moksa is produced it will not be eternal. He said that Brahma Upasana is not possible because Brahma is not an object for Upasana.

Whatever you do by way of Upasana upon is not Brahman. Vrittikara claims that meditation after jnanam is prescribed the Upanishad. Only through sravanam and mananam only we gain knowledge. It is said after knowledge you have to do meditation to gain moksa. That meditation you call nididyasanam I call it Upasana. So Vedanta it is contended that there should be Brahma Upasana after jnanam.

For that our answer is nididyasanam is not Brahma Upasana after jnanam. Nididyasanam is not an Upasana after jnanam and nididyasanam is also part of the process of jnanam only. There is difference between vrittikara’s Upasanam and Vedanta’s nididyasanam. Nididyasanam is also for jnanam only and it is not to be done after gaining jnanam. Second difference is karma after jnanam whereas nididyasanam is not karma after jnanam. Nididyasanam is also a process of jnanam.

The third difference is in vrittikara madham Upasana produces punyam and nididyasanam being not karma it does not produce punyam and it only remove our habitual dehatma buddhi. The removal of dehatma buddhi is drista phalam. Upasana gives Adrista phalam only. In Upasana one gains moksa that you gain is an event in future.

In vrittikara madam one expects moksa. In nididyasanam knows of expectation of moksa. I am either free or I am never free anywhere any time. There is lot of difference between the meditation they talk about and the one in the form of nididyasanam we talk about. Sravanam Mananam Nididyasanam put together gives knowledge. Sravanam has positive role to produce knowledge; manam has got negative role of removing samsara habits. All the three play limited roles and ultimate result of the three is jnanam. After jnanam you need not do anything. Therefore Brahma Upasana is not prescribed in Vedanta.

Then comes last purva paksa. Adhi Sankaracharya has established there is no karma involved in Vedanta because karma belongs to Karma Kanda and jnana kanda there is no karma at all. While negating karma he negated Upasana also for Upasana also falls under karma only. Karma is kayika karma and Upasana falls under manasa karma. Neither of the two gives moksa and jnanam alone gives moksa.

Vrittikara puts the last purva paksa. You say there is no moksa by karma and Upasana. You say jnanam alone gives moksa. He asks is it not jnanam also karma. If you take mental activity as karma, why cannot we take jnanam also karma. Upasana and jnanam both have similarities and if Upasana is a mental activity and why not jnanam also a mental activity. He asks if you negate Upasana, I will negate your jnanam also. This is his argument. Jnanam also a form of karma and it is also a form of mental vritti. This is purva paksa of vrittikara.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives a technical and important answer. He says jnanam does not come under karma. Even though Upasana is also vritti jnanam is also vritti Upasana vritti comes under karma jnana vritti does not come under karma/ jnanam vritti nididyanam does not come under karma while Upasana vritti comes under karma.

Adhi Sankaracharya says that jnanam depends upon the object of knowledge vastu tantram whereas karma depends upon subject of action kartru tantram. Jnanam depends upon object karma depends upon the subject. You come to the class. You do two types of work. You use your ears, and you are hearer when you operate your ears. After hearing you want to make notes. The second function you do, is you function behind your karmendriyam you are a karta a writer.

The moment you are a hearer, what you hear is not under your control and it is under the control the object for I determine your hearing. Whatever I talk you have to hear. You have no choice and it depends upon the object of hearing. We say jnanam is prameya tandram not pramana tantram. What vritti should happen also not in your control?

The moment you become a writer functioning behind your hand, the operating depends upon not on object but depends upon the subject. Some take notes many do not take notes. You have choice. Even if you write, you have the choice what you should write. You may do anything, writing is under your control but the hearing depends upon the object alone.

Second difference is the same as first difference. Jnanam is dependent upon the type of pramanam you use and pramana tantram. Whereas karma especially Sastric karma is dependent sastra vidhi or codana and it is codana tantram karma. What type of world I should experience depends upon the pramana I operate, if I operate srortrendriam the object of knowledge depends upon the sabda Prapancha. When I use Caksu indriyam it is rupa Prapancha I experience.

As a pramata the knowledge I get depend upon the type of experience depends upon the pramanam I use. That is why I am in meditation, the ears are open and I don't have any choice regarding the hearing whether I like it or not I will experience it. Karma is codana tantram. It is sastra vidhi. Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example here. In Chandogya Upanishad there is pancagni vidya. It talks about a type of meditation in which various things are to be seen as agni.

In that final portion it says may you look upon the father as fire principle and finally it says you look upon mother as fire principle. This is an Upasana. Looking upon purusa and woman as fire and this type of meditation depends upon codana tantram as it is codana vidhi. Therefore that comes under codana tantram and ti is a type of karma or Upasana. Suppose one sees a aman as a man is ti because of sastra vidhi it is not codana tantram. But seeing a man as fire is codana tantram. Seeing a man as man is jnanam but seeing a man as fire is Upasana. Seeing stone as stone is jnanam but seeing a stone as god is Upasana. Seeing stone as stone we have no choice because it is a fact. But seeing it as God, you have your own choice. He may see it as something else.

Karma can produce four types of results aptih, utpattihi, samskarah and vikaraha reaching a place, producing, purifying and modifying a thing. One of the four results happens in karma. In jnanam it does not produce any one of the four results. It only reveals a thing as it but it does not produce. Imagine I know about Himalayas in a book. By this knowledge I don't reach anywhere.

Before knowledge I am seated here and after knowledge I am here only. Similarly by karma I can produce something and suppose I gain the knowledge of mango tree by gaining that knowledge I don't produce anything. Jnanam does not produce anything. It does not purify anything. After one-month vacation you get a dusty house. Knowledge reveals a impure thing as impure thing; knowledge reveals a pure thing as a pure thing. Knowledge cannot purify the thing and make an impure thing as pure thing.

If you want siddha suddhi you have to do karma and jnanam cannot purify anything. Karma alone purifies the mind. By gaining jnanam I don't purify the mind purify Atma and jnanam does not purify. Jnanam does not modify anything. I am fat and by knowing I cannot convert myself into a slim body.

Jnanam does not produce any of the four things. Karma produces one of the four results but jnanam does not produce any of the four results. So, jnanam and karma are different and not one and the same. Therefore Self-Knowledge is not a type of karma and Self-Knowledge does not produce anything. If it does not produce it does not give moksa also.

The fundamental is negated jnanena moksa. Yes who said jnanam produces moksa. Jnanam reveals the fact that I was I am and I ever will be Mukta purusah. Jnanam reveals a fact. It does not purify and it does not modify. Jnanam is not karma and after jnanam no karma is required.

Then you may doubt why should there be a Karma Kanda in Veda. I said jnanam is not karma and after jnanam no karma. Jnanam is not Upasana and after jnanam no Upasana. Karma Kanda is required before jnanam. Before jnanam Upasana is required. Karma Kanda is not useless and Upasana kanda is not useless. Jnana and Upasana kanda is useful before gaining jnanam. Thus Adhi Sankaracharya concludes vritti kara objection also. Tu pada vyakyanam is also over.

With this fourth sutra commentary is also over. With this fourth samanvaya Adhikaranam is also over. We have completed general and word-to-word analysis. Now we will conclude.

First I want to present the fourth Adhikaranam in technical format, which involves five factors. Every topic is to present in systematic manner. Vishaya the subject matter is Vedanta



sastram. Samsayah the doubt is whether it is karma param or Brahma param whether it deals with action or revealing Brahman. Does it merely teaches or does enjoin some action. Purva paksa says it is karma param.

Vedanta sastra enjoins action. The reason is the well known jaimini stostra. Karma alone can give you something mere knowledge cannot give you any benefit. Mere theory is not enough and it should be followed by implementation. Knowledge must be followed by karma. Some purva paksa says some should be in the form of physical karma and some say mental karma. People like do's and don't's. Siddhanta is Vedanta sastram is Brahma param and it want you to understand something. It is a matter of understanding only. There is no need of any action.

Once you come to Vedanta you have nothing to do. By this mere knowledge we get the benefit just as the rope knowledge you get the benefit of fear of serpent is gone. Finally sangathi and we will see the connection between previous Adhikaranam and the present Adhikaranam. It is akseba sangathih. It is the fourth Adhikaranam happens to be an answer to an objection raised on in the third Adhikaranam.

It was Vedanta deals with Brahman. Based on that an objection was given Brahman is not the subject matter of Vedanta and karma is subject matter of Vedanta. It is answered and it is concluded that karma is not the subject matter and it is Brahman is the subject matter of the Adhikaranam. More in the next class.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1			
Classes: 036 to 063 - Sutras: 1-1-5 to 1-1-31			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
36	115	1 . 1 . 5	5
37	118	1 . 1 . 5	5
38	121	1 . 1 . 5	5
39	124	1 . 1 . 5	5
40	128	1 . 1 . 5 to 1 . 1 . 7	5 to 7
41	131	1 . 1 . 7 and 1 . 1 . 8	7 and 8
42	135	1 . 1 . 9 to 1 . 1 . 11	9 to 11
43	140	1 . 1 . 11 and 1 . 1 . 12	11 and 12
44	143	1 . 1 . 12	12
45	146	1 . 1 . 12 to 1 . 1 . 14	12 to 14
46	149	1 . 1 . 14 and 1 . 1 . 15	14 and 15
47	152	1 . 1 . 16 to 1 . 1 . 18	16 to 18
48	156	1 . 1 . 18 and 1 . 1 . 19	18 and 19
49	160	1 . 1 . 19 and 1 . 1 . 20	19 and 20
50	163	1 . 1 . 20	20
51	166	1 . 1 . 20 and 1 . 1 . 21	20 and 21
52	170	1 . 1 . 21 and 1 . 1 . 22	21 and 22
53	174	1 . 1 . 22	22
54	177	1 . 1 . 22 and 1 . 1 . 23	22 and 23
55	180	1 . 1 . 23	23
56	183	1 . 1 . 24	24
57	187	1 . 1 . 24	24
58	190	1 . 1 . 24 and 1 . 1 . 25	24 and 25
59	195	1 . 1 . 25 to 1 . 1 . 27	25 to 27
60	199	1 . 1 . 27 and 1 . 1 . 28	27 and 28
61	202	1 . 1 . 28 and 1 . 1 . 29	28 and 29
62	205	1 . 1 . 29 and 1 . 1 . 30	29 and 30
63	208	1 . 1 . 30 and 1 . 1 . 31	30 and 31
	210		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 1

### Class 36

We have completed the first four sutras popularly known as chatur sutri. Four main topics have been discussed in the four sutras.

The first sutra happens to be first four topics also or four Adhikaranam. The first one is jijnasa Adhikaranam in which it was pointed out for moksa one has to gain Brahma jnanam through Vedantic enquiry. This is the essence of the first sutra. Then in the second Adhikaranam known janmadi Adhikaranam the idea give was that Brahman is nimitta upadana karanam of universe and that is both intelligent and material cause of the world. This we have to know through Vedantic study.

Third is sastrayoni Adhikaranam that jagat karanam Brahma is central theme of Vedanta sastra and all other topics are only convergent into this particular topic. In the fourth Adhikaranam known as Samanvaya Adhikaranam we saw that there is consistency of topic of Brahman. When we read this with Adhi Sankaracharya commentary the whole Vedanta is comprehensively discussed. He has brought out the essentials of Vedanta in the four sutras commentary.

The rest of the Brahma Sutra is elaboration of a magnification of the chatur sutri only. We will continue the study further. If you ask what you will get, we don't get any new knowledge but it is going to be clarity and conviction. In the following portion we will see several systems of philosophy and negating them. We will get thoroughness if we study the entire Brahma Sutra.

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.5 [5]**

#### ***Iksateh na sabdam***

because 'seeing' [is referred, the Pradhana] which is not founded on the Veda is not [cause]

We will do a general analysis of this sutra. Previous sutra is the key sutra of the entire chapter. That is why it is named samanvaya Adhikaranam based on the fourth sutra alone. From sutra 5 to 134 is only elaboration of the fourth sutra only. From fifth onwards we see Vyasacharya's commentary on samanvaya Adhikaranam. The whole thing is based on jagat karanam Brahman. This Brahma is Chetanam Brahman. That is why it is called Chetana karana vada.

It is idea that the material cause of the universe is a conscious principle and not matter. This is very important in all other philosophy material cause of the universe is inert matter. In Sankya inert prakrti cause in vaishesika inert atom is the material cause and all of them are called Achetana karya vada. They talk about Achetana upadana karana vada. Purva Mimamsa

say world is there eternally. They need not talk about creation at all. There is no endless or beginningless and world is always there. So we ignore the Purva Mimamsa.

Vedanta says creation is Chetana Brahma karana vada. Brahman is upadana karnam from vyavaharika standpoint alone from paramarthika Dristi Brahman is neither karanam nor karyam. Our efforts will be to negate Achetana jagat karana vada and the most powerful is Sankya philosophers. They say inert Prakriti is the material cause of the world. Here Vedantins will negate their view in the rest of the present chapter. We will establish that Chetana Brahman is the material cause of the world as against the purva paksa that Achetana Prakriti is the cause of the world. The negation had started from the last Adhikaranam when we commented the word 'tu'. When we negate Sankya it is as good as negating all other Achetana vadis including scientist and the big bang theory. This method is called prathama mallan Nyaya.

When you defeat current world champion in any sports indirectly you would be considered defeating the world existing champion. During Adhi Sankaracharya time the main contender is Sankya matham. In the first chapter Sankya was negated showing that they had no sruti support. In the second chapter the Sankya is negated that they do not have Yukti support. In the first chapter we showed that Sankya is Avaidhikam and from now onwards we show Sankya is ayuktam [illogical].

Let us know what is Sankya philosophy before we take to negating that philosophy. Second chapter of Gita is called Sankya yoga. We may get confused. Sankya mentioned in Gita is same as Vedanta and it has nothing to do with Sankya the purva paksa. Vedanta is called Sankya because samkaya is that sastra in which Atma Tattvam is revealed. Baghavata Kapila muni is Baghavan and the Sankya of Kapila muni is Vedanta only.

The Sankya, which we talk about, is propounded by another Kapila muni. The original Sankya sutras are not available. What is the main source of Sankya philosophy? It is Sankya karika a small book in verses. One Isvara Krishna authors it. Sankya talk about the main 25 'principle'. They are required for our future discussion. First we will discuss the creation talked by Sankya philosophers. Sankya people say before creation evolved, previously there were two principles, which are beginningless in nature. They are nithyam. One is called purusa, Chetana Tattvam and the other is called which also existed before creation the Prakriti, which we call as moola Prakriti or pradhanam or mukyam. Adhi Sankaracharya uses the word pradhanam. This Prakriti is constituted of three gunas sattva, rajas and tamas. Here guna is not property but substance themselves. It is like a thread with three strings. They are intertwined together and form the main substance called pradhanam. In Nyaya philosophy guna means property. In Sankya it is constituent of property.

Also they say pradhanam is inert in nature it is Achetanam. They also say the Achetanam pradhanam is material cause of the world. They talk about the steps as how world evolved. The second principle is Mahat tattvam. It is a matter evolved in the second case. Pradhanam is karanam and Mahat is karyam. Next stage is ahankarah.

They say evolution takes place because of the equilibrium of the three gunas inequilibrium of Prakriti Prapancha. Prakriti, Mahat and Ahankara. From the three emerge Manas Tattvam. Ahankara is karanam and manas are karyam. From manas nothing is created. Pradhana, Mahat, Prakriti, Ahankara and manas is the one stream of creation. From Ahankara ten sense

organs come. They are born out of Ahankara Tattvam. They are the second 'stream' of creation.

From Ahankara five subtle elements are also created. They are called panca tan matras. Suttle elements are not final product. From the elements gross elements are created. From them nothing new is born. There are three streasms. They are called evolutes. Pourusa, poraklriti, Ahankara five subtle elements sense organs ten and total twenty five principles are there. They are categorized into four groups. They are Prakriti, vihriti, Prakriti vihriti and aparahriti vihriti. In these entire context Prakriti means karanam and vihritis means karyam. Karanam, karyam, karana karyam and akarana karyam. Karanam means that which is cause and is never an effect. Karyam means that which is karyam an effect and it is never a cause.

Karana karyam is that which happens to be both are cause and effect from another angle and akarana karyam that which is neither cause nor an effect. Pourusa is aprahriti vihriti neither karanam nor karyam. Prakriti is the karanam of everything never karyam of anything and it is anadi. Mind Ahankara and suttle elements; Mahat is karyam with regard to Prakriti and karanam with regard to Ahankara. Ahankara is also Prakriti vihriti. Mind sense organs are product and from them new principles are created. They are products and therefore they are vihritis. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 37

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.5 [5]**

#### ***Iksateh na sabdam***

because ‘seeing’ [is referred, the Pradhana] which is not founded on the Veda is not [cause]

From the sixth sutra onwards Vyasacharya gives a commentary on sutra form upon the fourth sutra. Here Vyasacharya will establish that Chetanam Brahman alone is jagat karanam. He will take various sruti statements in support of his view. First chapter is sruti based while logic will be given more importance in the second chapter.

The second part is Achetana karana vada negation of the view that world is based on the matter principle. Most of the arthika systems are based on Achetana karana vadi alone. As a sample Vyasacharya takes up Sankya to negate Achetana karana vada. Once Sankya is negated all others will be treated as valid. We establish our matham upon sruti. I was explaining some of the main features of Sankya before taking up the question of negation.

Purusa is first principle and it is eternal and it does not originate. Second is pradhanam or Prakriti. It is Achetanam material in nature as opposed to Chetanam. It is supposed to have three gunas. They are constituent substance of pradhana. Pradhanam is also eternal and anadhi. It is also nithyam as purusa is.

Purusa is not born out of Prakriti and Prakriti is not born out of purusa. These three gunas will be in equilibrium at Pralaya kalam. At the time of creation pradhanam or equilibrium gets disturbed and this leads to evolution, which we call sristi. From the pradhanam, which is material in nature, come Mahat Tattvam and it is second stage of total matter.

This magat is also jadam and it has three gunas here also. The next stage of evolution is Ahankara. It has nothing to do with siddha manam Ahankara etc. Ahankara is total matter in the third stage. Still body is not born sense organs are not born manas is not born. From Ahankara we have three creation one is manas, next is ten sense organs; they don't enumerate panca pranas separately; the third stream is from Ahankara five subtle elements are born and also ponca sthoola bhutani. These 25 principles are divided into four padharthas. They are one is that which is cause that which is effect that which is both cause and effect and that which is not both.

One difference is instead of using karnam and karyam they have their own words. They use the word Prakriti for any material cause. Wood is prakriti of furniture. Ornaments they will call it vihriti. The word prakriti can be used for material cause. The meaning of the word Prakriti is that which is available for molding into various forms.

What is vihriti? That which is molded that which is shaped is called vihriti the final product of any modification.

Prakriti is karanam list and one will come under karanam list. Purusa is either a karanam or karyam. What is karyam? Sixteen items come under karyam list. Mind, ten sense organs, five gross elements final products. The Mahat is karyam with regard to Prakriti and it is karanam with regard to Ahankara. It comes under karya karana category. Ahankara is a product from the standpoint of Mahat and it is cause with regard to the elements. Five elements are an effect from the stand point of Ahankara and cause from the point of gross elements. They are 7 prakriti and vihritis are there. The gross elements are karyam with regard to subtle elements and gross elements come under only karyam and not karanam.

The main feature is that the whole creation is born out of pradhanam, which is Achetanam or jadam. But Vedantins say that the whole world is born out of Chetanam Brahman. For them Achetanam pradhanam is karanam for the whole creation.

Now I will deal with some of the differences between Vedanta and Sankya philosophies. We use the word Purusa, Mahat and Ahankara. Therefore, we may see why should we quarrel with Sankya. Purusa in Sankya and Vedanta is Chaitanyam there is no problem. Both are asangam. They say purusa is Akarta and we also say purusa is Akarta.

The main differences are the following. They say purusa is a bokta. In Vedanta purusa is also abokta. Major difference is karta and bokta are not identical and Vedanta karta and bokta are one and the same. Second difference is purusas are many in number in Sankya. In Vedanta purusah is ekah plurality in purusa is unreal and it is a mistake. As many individuals are there so many purusas are there. Sankya comes under Dvaidam and Vedanta comes under Advaidam. Since purusa is bokta every purusa is samsari jivah. But in Vedanta every purusa is a 'seeming samsari' but really not samsari. In Sankya every individual is a real samsari. Purusa is a jnata a knower also. A pramata but in Vedanta purusa is not a pramata. They say jnata is suffering because of ignorance and when gains knowledge he gets moksa and Prakriti will relieve him and he will get m,oksa. In moksa Prakriti will withdraw from purusa. These are differences at purusa level.

Then we will come for difference at pradhana or Prakriti level. They say pradhanam is jadam and we also say it is jadam. They say pradhanam is trigunatmikam. We also do the same. They say Prakriti evolves to become the universe. We also in several places say Prakriti evolves itself to become universe. The difference is that they say Prakriti is independently real entity. Prakriti alone becomes creation and purusa does not do anything. It is svatantram pradhanam. This indicates Sankya is Dvaida pradhanam.

Whereas in Vedanta Prakriti cannot exist independently. It is not separate substance it does not have 'satta' of its own. Purusa is like clay and Prakriti is like pot and pot cannot have existence of its own. The 'isness' belongs to clay alone. In Vedanta Prakriti is like a sakti of purusa as it does not exist separately.

Sakti cannot exist separate from sakta purusa that is me. Even though speaking power alone speaks, speaking power cannot exist separate from me and therefore I say I speak through speaking power which is dependent one me. Prakriti is only a creative power of purusa. Purusa alone creates into the world through the creative power called Prakriti. Therefore if Prakriti is independent entity you can call prakrti is creator. Also from another angle you can understand Prakriti is upadana karanam you should know that upadana karanam alone should end existence to the karyam.

If you have to say Prakriti is upadana karanam and prakirti lends existence to the world. Vedantins say Prakriti cannot lend existence to the world because Prakriti has borrowed existence from Brahman. Ultimately Brahman alone through Prakriti lends existence to the world. Therefore Brahman alone being lender of existence is upadana karanam.

Another difference is they say Prakriti say it is jadam and it si the material cause of the universe. For any creation material cause alone is not sufficient and you need nimitta karnam also. What is nimitata karanam. Nimitta karanam must be Chetana vastu because it is intelligent cause. For converting Prakriti into matter into the world we require a nimitta karanam the Sankya philosophy says they do not have nimitta karanam because they have no isvara and there is no intelligent principle to convert matter into universe. They have taken purusa as jiva who is a bokta samsari. Bokta samsari cannot be nimitta karanam of the world. Jivah is not omniscient.

There is Isvara and Isvara is not nimitta karanam and jivah is nimitta karanam and Prakriti comes into creation of its own. There is intelligent principle in Sankya. The mater becomes without the requirement of nimitta karanam world comes into existence. This we don't accept. Isvara is vyavaharika 'sat'hyam, which is different from Nirgunam Brahman. This Sankya does not postulate at all.

Pradhanam exist independently and pradhanam becomes the world independent of a creator. Because of these two reasons they say pradhanam is svatantram.

Third difference is in the order of sristi there is some difference. We will not bother. From Ahankara sense organs have come. In Vedanta mind and sense organs have come from five subtle elements alone. Baghavatam borrows the sristi principle of Sankya. Sankya from the point of view of Vedantins is Avidhikam. It is against Veda. Their teaching is against Veda pramanam it is that Sankya philosophy Vyasacharya will criticize in the following adhikaranams in this chapter. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 38

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.5 [5]**

#### ***Iksateh na sabdam***

because ‘seeing’ [is referred, the Pradhana] which is not founded on the Veda is not [cause]

We were seeing that in the following sutras Vyasacharya establishes Chetana karana vada the karanam primarily meaning upadana karanam which means Consciousness is the essential stuff of the entire creation. He will also refute Achetana karana vada who says matter is the material cause of the world. This is advocated many philosophers particularly Sankya philosophers. He will take sruti pramanam not resorting of logic. We will take those sruti vakyam to show that Chetanam Brahman is the upadana karanam and indirectly we will refute Sankya philosopher or we will prove Sankya does not follow Vedas.

Once we show Sankya is avaidhika then we can ignore them. When I say Chetanam Brahma is karanam it is not Nirgunam Brahman. It is karya karana vilaksanam. It is not Kevalam Brahman. It is Sagunam Brahman or isvarah. Brahma karana vada is but isvara karana vada. We should note isvara is none but Brahman clothed in maya. Clothed Brahman is isvara and unclothed Brahman is isvara.

Hereafter wards we will take those sruti statements that lend support to isvara karana vada. There is some statement that shows isvara is nimitta karanam of creation. Sankya does not accept nimitta karanam concept also. He accepts jiva and accepts Prakriti and according to him matter naturally evolve into as world. Vedantins believe gold cannot become goldsmith and Prakriti cannot become world without nimitta karana isvara. He does not accept upadana karana isvara also. We will establish Brahma is abinna nimitta karanam.

The srutis take for analysis are divided into two categories. One is called spasta Brahma linga vakyani and the second type of statements is aspasta Brahma linga vakyani. Spasta Brahma linga vakyani are statement where Brahman karanatvam is clearly indicated to show that Brahman is the karanam; the other is called aspasta Brahma linga vakyani that means they are the statements in which Brahman karanatvam is not clearly indicated to and we have to analyse and establish that Brahman is the karanam. First we will analyse spasta Brahma linga vakyani.

Now we will do the general analysis of the fifth sutra. This Adhikaranam is called iksati Adhikaranam.

This Adhikaranam has got seven sutras. Sutras are many and the topic is one only. We will analyse the sruti statement. This is well known vakyams of the Chandogya Upanishad the sixth chapter mantras 6.2.1 *sadeva somyedamagra asidekamevadvitiam; taddhaika ahurasadevedamagra asidekamev advitiam tasmadasatah;* somya, before this world was manifest there was only existence, one without a second. On this subject, some maintain that

before this world was manifest there was only nonexistence, one without a second, out of that nonexistence, existence emerged 6.2.2. *Kutastu khalu somyaivam syaditi hovaca kathamasatah sajjayeteti; 'sat'tveva somyedamagra asidekamevadvitiyam* the father said 'o somya what proof is there for this, that from nothing something has emerged; rather, before this world came into being, o somya, there was only existence, one without a second 6.2.3 *Tadaiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tattejoarjata tatteja aiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tadaposrjata tasmadyatra kvaca socati svedate va pursastejasa eva tadadhyapo jayante* this read as that existence decided "I shall be many. I shall be born" he then created fire. That fire also decided 'I shall be many I shall be born' then fire produced water. That is why whenever or wherever a person mourns or perspires, he produces water.

The Upanishad says before creation started 'sat' was alone there and it has not said that 'sat' was Chetanam etc. Samka saya that says 'sat' refers to his pradhanam and we say 'sat' refers to Chetanam Brahman. That 'sat' visualized or perceived or literally saw. 'sat' wanted to become many. Thereafter wards it created agni Tattvam. 'sat' karanam created jalam etc. By saying that 'sat' created everything we come to know 'sat' is jagat karanam.

Whether it is nimitta or upadana karanam. 'sat' thought 'let me become many'. Nimitta karanam does not become the product. Carpenter does not become furniture. Upadana karanam alone becomes a product. We will say that nimitta karanam created and when it is upadana we will say the gold became the ornaments. Here 'sat' karanam says 'let me become many'. Because of that we say 'sat' alone became many and it is upadana karanam of the creation. The controversy is that 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman or Chetanam Isvara. And therefore Chetanam Brahman or Chetanam isvara is correct. Sankya will say that 'sat' alone evolves to become Agni, jalam, etc.

Now we have to argue out the real position. Does the word indicate Vedantic Brahman or Sankya pradhanam? We will establish that Sankya is wrong and Vedanta is wrong. The first sutra will give two staged arguments. In the first stage Vyasacharya says Sankya pradhanam is talked about in this portion at all. It does not have Vedic sanction. It does not have sabda pramana. Sabda pramana here is Veda. The pradhanam of Sankya philosopher does not have Vedic sanction.

Sankya will say that it is included in sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad and he will say that the 'sat' is my pradhanam only. And therefore it is vaidhkam they will argue. We will say that word does not refer to pradhanam. It refers to Chetanam Brahman and not Achetana pradhanam. The word iksateh occurs in the mantra.

There are two words tad and iksateh. Tad refer to the noun occurred in the previous mantra. It is tad karanam iksateh. 'sat' karanam visualize or mentally saw and he says to Sankya if 'sat' is Achetanam karanam it cannot visualize anything and it is not the function of any inert object. Iksanam Chetana dharmah. Visualization can be done by Chetana vastu and 'sat' karanam refers to Brahman or Isvara alone.

From here we know that pradhanam is not the cause of the universe for it does not have any support. It is like anu or paramanu. The second pramanam is word 'sat' does not talk about pramanam be Upanishad says 'sat' karanam refers to the universe.

We cannot say so kamayatha isivad. It means *Sloka 2.6.3* of Taittiriya Upanishad reads as *So'kamayat,bahu syam prajayeyeti, 'sat'apo' tapyata, 'sat'apastapta, idagmsarvam-asrjata*

*yadidam kim catat-srstva tadeva-nupravisat,tadeva nupravisya sacca-tyacca-bhavat,niruktam cani-rukatamca, nilayanam canilayanamca, vijnanam cai-jnanam ca,satyam canrtam ca 'sat'yam-abhavat,yadidam kim ca,tatsatyam-itya caksate,tadapy-esa sloko bhavati.[iti sastho 'nuvakah]* because the Upanishad says the 'sat' visualized the universe; so kamayatta isivad there the word is used and the desire is also the Chetana karanam so Upanishad uses the word visualization, desire, tapah etc., all these indicate that Chetana vastu is karanam. This is approach to the first sutra.

It consists of three words *iksateh na* a sabdah. The first word is *iksateh*. It refers to the function of the verbal action of visualization. By using the word because of the function of the verbal use of visualization there must be some conclusion. The conclusion is not said in the sutra at all. Adhi Sankaracharya supplies because of visualization tad karanam na pradhanam it means the word 'sat' cannot refer to the inert Prakriti because of the visualization is mentioned there and inert Prakriti cannot visualize and therefore pradhanam is not mentioned there. This is the first inference.

Adhi Sankaracharya goes on giving some arguments given by Sankya. Sankya says why do you say pradhanam cannot visualize. I know pradhanam has got three gunas. They are sattva rajas and tamas. We have seen in Gita itself refer to sloka 14.5 *sattvam rajas tama iti gunah prakrti sambhavah nibadhnanti mahabaho dehe dehinam avyayam* that reads as sattva or goodness, Rajas or activity, and tamas or inertia – these three gunas [states] of mind [or prakrti] bind the eternal embodies one [jivatma] to the body, O Arjuna.

We have clearly seen sattva represents knowledge. Whoever is sattva guna pradhana he will have knowledge. When sattva guna increases jnanam increases. Pradhanam has got jnanam and all Chetana dharmas are possible for pradhanam. If you say jagat karanam is sarvajnam I will say samasti sattvagunatvad pradhanam is sattva guna. Therefore even though the word *iksateh* comes I can take pradhanam is sarvajnam etc. This is the argument of Sankya.

For this Adhi Sankaracharya says however much sattva guna is there in pradhanam it can never know anything and it can never visualize anything because it is inert according to you. sattva guna is also Achetanam rajo guna is also Achetanam and tamo guna is also Achetanam and therefore pradhanam cannot visualize therefore I cannot accept pradhanam is Chetanam.

Adhi Sankaracharya concludes Chetanam Brahman alone is referred to here. Sankya says I accept pradhanam itself does not visualize because I know it is Chetanam. But because of purusa sambanda vasad because of sambanda the association with purusa, pradhanam gets the capacity to visualize and therefore sattva pradhanam alone visualized and become the creation. This is the statement of Sankya philosopher.

For this Adhi Sankaracharya says no. The first answer is you cannot say that because of the relationship with purusa you cannot say because you have said that your purusa is relationless and that it is asangah and there is second answer, which we will see, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 39

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.5 [5]**

#### ***Iksateh na sabdam***

because ‘seeing’ [is referred, the Pradhana] which is not founded on the Veda is not [cause]

We analyse the word analysis of the fifth sutram Iksateh na sabdam. This is based on Upanisadic expression of Chandogya Upanishad manta 6.2. The Upanishad says the world was visualized before creation. Based on this Vyasacharya argues that visualization is possible by Chetanam Brahman alone and not by Achetana pradhanam as claimed by Sankya philosophers. It occurs in Aitereya Upanishad also chapter I section 1 mantra 1 *Atma va idameka evagra asit*, nanyat kincana misat that reads as in the beginning verily Atman [Self] alone was this [universe] nothing else active whatsoever.

In Prasnopanisad chapter VI.3 *sa iksamcakre, kasmin nahan utakranta utkranto bhavisyami kasmin va pratisthite pratisthasyamiti* that reads as He [Purusa] reflected; ‘what is it by whose departure I shall depart and bny whose stay I shall stay? From this it is clear that Chetanam Brahman alone visualized the world creation.

In Taittiriya Upanishad II.vi.3 reads as *so kamayat, bahu syam prajayeyetti, sa tapo tayata* that sasy ‘He desired ‘I shall become many and be born. He performed tapas. Having performed tapas He created whatever we perceive.’ This desire is possible for Chetana karanam only and not by Achetana pradhanam.

In Mundakopanisad II.ii.7 *yah sarvajnah sarvavid vasyaisa Mahima bhuvi, divye Brahma-pure hyesa vyomny Atma pratisthitah* there it is said jagat karanam is sarvajnam a\omniscience and omniscience is possible for Isvara alone the Chetana vastu alone and not for Achetana vastu.

Based on that Adhi Sankaracharya gives some more argument. Sankya philosophers countered that pradhanam also can be sarvajnam because pradhanam is full of sarvajnam as it is said in Gita. For this Adhi Sankaracharya counters that pradhanam cannot be Chaitanyam at all even it has sattva guna because sattva guna itself is Achetanam. Achetana sattvam Achetana rajas Achetana tamas all being Achetanam how can the combination of the three become Chetanam and become Chetana pradhanam to visualize the creation.

For this Sankya philosopher says that by itself pradhanam is not Chetanam but it becomes Chetanam in association with purusa. For that we answer no you cannot say that Vedanta alone can say that in your philosophy purusa is asanga swarupah and it cannot help Prakriti because purusah asangah and the fact Prakriti is svatantra and independently capable of functioning and that means it cannot be independent. Therefore that argument also will not hold water.

For that Sankya philosopher asks another question that in Adhidaiva philosophy also purusa is asangah as seen in various Upanisads. Gita sloka 9.10 reads as *maya dhyaksena prakritih suyate sacaracaram betund nena kaunteya jagad viparivartate* which means under My guidance, nature [prakriti] gives birth to all things moving and unmoving and by this means, O son of Kunti the world revolves. In the presence of purusa, Prakriti functions. It blesses Prakriti you say it functions but you claim asangah. In Vedanta it can be asangah and it is sasangah it blesses Prakriti we don't have any problem. It is contradiction in your system but it is not so in our system. In your system purusa and Prakriti have the same order of reality being in the same order of reality.

But in Vedanta especially in Advaitam Prakriti is of a lesser order of reality and Prakriti is vyavaharikam the association is also mithya and its relationship is of lower order of reality but its asangatvam is paramatikam. Since they belong to two orders of reality it is possible. Normally light and darkness cannot coexist but it can coexist, subject to one condition and suppose I go to bed in dark room, and they see a dream and in dream they see sunlight and he dreams in dark room. Light is there and darkness is also there.

Light belongs to dream and darkness belongs to jagrat being both belonging to two orders of reality. Therefore you cannot say Prakriti is sarvajnam because Prakriti is Achetanam as per your own statement and being independent it cannot associate with purusa and get the sarvajnam status. Let us assume by the blessings of purusa pradhanam becomes sarvajnam and Chetanam and because of purusa sambanda pradhanam becomes Chetanam. It it gets Chetanam because of associationship of purusa the credit of visualization goes to purusa alone.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example. A person says ayodahati it means the iron ball burns my hand. We know iron has no burning capacity. It means iron has become hot and it is because iron ball is pervaded by the fire hence the iron ball gets the burning power and it burns. The credit goes to the fire alone. Even if Prakriti visualizes, the credit goes to purusa and not Prakriti. Pen is writing means pen writes means I am writing through the pen. Chetanam gets importance but not the Achetana Prakriti. Visualization originally belongs to Chetanam alone and hence Chetanam is jagat karanam. Sankya says ok I accept. Pradhanam being Achetanam cannot visualize I agree. It cannot desire anything I agree.

Then he says even your Brahman cannot do iksanam Brahma cannot have sarvajnatvam. If my pradhanam cannot have the quality your Brahman also cannot have sarvajnatvam. Sarvajnam means knower of all; to become sarvajnatvam Brahman must be a knower and Brahman can never be a knower because of three reasons. First it is Nirvikaratvad knowing is a process involving mental activity. To be a knower you have to go through a process. But Brahman is avyaktoyam. It cannot be a knower.

Second reason is any action including knowledge requires instruments. Physical action requires karmandriyan, mind is required sense organs are required it is free from all karanam. You talk about Brahman before sristi when instruments are not born. Mind will come later after birth only. Therefore you cannot say Brahman is sarvajnan

Third reason is you say Brahma is sarvajnam knower of all before sristi there is nothing to be known when there is no object to know where is the question of all knowing. How can Brahman enjoy sarvajnatvam where there was nothing to know before creation. There are two types of answers.

Adhi Sankaracharya says when you say Brahman is all knower or all knowing that knowledge of Brahman is not a process we talk about but it is jnana swarupam, if we talk about knowing action mind and in the case of mind the knowing is not the nature of mind but it is an action. Refer to 1.4.10 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad. Knowledge in the form of activity and knowledge in the form of swarupam we have discussed there. In the case of Brahman it is the nature of Brahman. Therefore Nirvikaratvad will apply for mind and not to Brahman.

Second objection is karana Abhavad that Brahman has no instrument. Only when jnanam is a process it requires instruments. Whereas jnanam is swarupam it does not require an instrument because it is its very nature. It is very well said in Kaivalya Upanishad 1.1.21 *apani pado ham acintya saktih pasyamy acaksuh sa srnomy akarnah, aham vijanami vivikta rupo na casti vetta mama cit sada* 'hum this reads as I am without hands and legs, of incomprehensible power, I see without eyes, hear without ears. Devoid of all forms, I 'am knowing' [everything] and there is none that knows me. I am ever Pure knowledge.

Atma sees without the eyes hears without the ears knows without the mind means that Atma does not requires any instruments to know anything being it knows itself. Atma is jnana swarupah. Therefore karana Abhavad defect you cannot say.

Next is visaya Abhavad. There is nothing to know before sritsti. Adhi Sankaracharya says you cannot say objects are absent are absent before creation and then from nonexistence creation has to come and before sristi objects were there in potential form. Therefore had object that is avyakta jagat. Therefore Brahma Sarvasya avyaktasya Brahma sarvajnam Brahma is knower of everything in avyakta form.

I accept Brahman sarvajnam. Jnanam is not a process and it is swarupam you say. The question is if it is not a process, you cannot use any verb because to use a verb it indicates action and action indicates a process. If Brahman is not a process you should not use any verb and you cannot use the verb iksetah. Even sarvajnam a verb cannot be used. How do you say Brahman is sarvajnam.

For that Adhi Sankaracharya says even when a process is involved sometimes we use the verb in figurative sense. The example is Suryah prakasate agnihi dahati sun is lighting up fire is burning. Lighting is a verb you use. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question is the lighting up is an action or is light a nature of agni. So also the agni whether it burns it is an action or it is its nature. If it is an action it will be temporary.

That is why my speaking is an action and I don't speak eternally. The rule *yad Kriya rupam tad anityam yad svarupam tad nithyam* lighting up is the very nature of the sun and it is not the job it does. Similarly agni does not burn and it is heat itself. Even though it is its nature we say agni burns. It is figurative expression and it is not an action. When you say Brahma janadi it is figuratively said and it is its swarupam. This is one way of arguing to establish Brahmanah sarvajnatvam.

There is another argument also. Even though Brahman by itself nirvikaram Brahman by itself cannot know anything but with the help of maya Brahman can become sarvajnah. Isvarah can become a knower. Brahman in the form of Isvara can be sarvajnah and maya is instrument and Brahman can become sarvajnah. Sagunam Brahmanah need not be figurative. I want you to take Chetanam Brahman that is having sarvajnatvam and not pradhanam.

Then we will go to the next word 'na'. It is connected to both iksateh and also to the second letter asabdam. Na refers to na pradhanam because of visualization.

Third word is asabdam. Asabdam is asabdatvad. It is clue for second reasoning. The word asabdam means Avidhikam. It does not have support of Veda pramanam. It is Sankya pradhanam. Now we have shown 'sat' does not have your pramanam and so you don't have support of Veda and 'sat' referred to by you.

Since it is avidhikam it does not have support of Vedas and it cannot be jagat karanam just as paramanu of Naiyayika philosophers. Pradhanam also is not supported by Veda. Pradhanam is not jagat karanam being not having the support of the Vedas. The conclusion is that Vedanta talks about Chetanam Brahman alone are jagat karanam and the subject matter of Vedanta is jagat karanam Brahman.

Vedanta does not deal with your pradhanam or anything. Another objection is there for which answer will be given in sixth sutra which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 40

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.5 [5]**

##### ***Iksateh na sabdam***

because ‘seeing’ [is referred, the Pradhana] which is not founded on the Veda is not [cause]

We are seeing the fifth sutra iksateh na sabdam which happens to be fifth Adhikaranam also. This consists of seven sutras i.e., five to eleven. In all the sutras the subject is one and it is what is the emaning of ‘sat’ in Chandogya Upanishad. Whatever is ‘sat’ is jagat upadana karanam. Sankya refers to it as pradhanam. We say that it refers to Chetanam Brahman alone. The first reason is because of perception because of visualization and iksanam. Now I will wind up the teaching of this sutra. Pradanam is Achetanam hence it cannot be the jagat karanam. How can Nirvikara Brahman be perceiver for which we said Brahman can be taken as Nirgunam Brahman or Sagunam Brahman. Both are Chetanam and both can be jagat karanam if we take Nirgunam Brahman it is perception without change and if we take Sagunam Brahman it is savikaran drastru. I will give you a reference we had elaborately discussed this topic 1.4.10 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad. It was concluded that Achetanam pradhanam can’t be the jagat karanam. With this fifth sutram is over. Now we will take up sixth sutram.

### **Topic 5 – Sutra 5-11 [Ikshatyadyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.6 [6]**

##### ***Gaunah cet na Atmasabdat***

*On account of the word ‘Atman’ [being applied to the cause] the meaning [of the word ‘being] is not figurative.*

In the previous sutra we said jagat karanam is Brahman alone because of visualisation that established Brahman is Chetanam. Sankya philosopher came with an objection saying that it can be connected to the Achetanam pradhanam or Prakriti also. He said pradhanam is jagat karanam. How can be insentient object be the cause of creation? He said every word can have two meaning one is Mukya meaning and the other is gouna meaning or figurative meaning. An example is given and it is that boy is a lion. We have got lion of Punjab. We say he is an iron man. When we say boy is a lion and the primary meaning of lion cannot be taken to mean a boy. There are so many differences between lion and boy. But still we say boy is a lion. We see there are some common features between lion and boy like majesty, like strength, like leadership etc. Lion is leader of animal and the boy is a leader. Because of common feature he is the lion. Similarly he is the pillar of the association. Pillar supports the building so the organization will collapse without him. It is figurative.



Similarly Sankya says iksanam is possible for pradhanam iksanam is figurative perception. Here he should give common features between primary and special or figurative features. Sankya says that any Chetana vastu sentient being uses visualization mental picturisation before systematic planned action. Someone visualizes how an action should take place. You have to visualize before picturisation. Unless I visualize I cannot systematically produce. Pradhanam also systematically visualizes everything. All the 23 items come in a systematic manner. If pradhanam makes it systematic it is 'as though' visualized the creation before because creation is orderly.

Pradhanam is jagat karanam 'satt' is pradhanam. Because it has got gouna iksanam. He gives further support also for this interpretation. Refer to 6.3.2 of Chandogya Upanishad *seyam devattaiksata hantahamimastisro devata anena jivan Atman anupravisya namarupe vyakara vaniti*. That god [existence] decided 'entering into these three deities [fire, water, and earth] as the individual Self, I shall manifest myself in many names and forms] First element created as per the Upanishad is tejah agnih.

Therefore Upanishad says 'sat' karanam visualized and it created agni Tattvam. 'sat' Brahman created agni and from agni he created jalam and Upanishad does not say Brahman created jalam but says agni created jalam. What does the Upanishad do? Before creating jalam what did agni do? Agni visualized water before creating jalam. It created jalam after visualizing jalam. Agni is Achetana bhutam. Upanishad says Achetana agni visualized before creating jalam. Can Achetana agni visualize?

Sankya says that the Upanishad says Achetana agni visualized and only way of justification is that visualization is figurative and not actually visualized. The agni visualized as though. Agni produced water and water produced earth. Fire produced water and water produced earth. Here also sruti does the same mischief. Water visualized the earth and after visualization created earth. Can water visualize because water is Achetanam. The iksanam is figurative and cannot be mukyam. We have got figurative iksanam here. The majority is gouna iksanam only. Thus Achetana pradhanam has got iksana sabdah gounah. That visualization is occurring near the visualization of agni. Because of the contact and proximity the iksanam is also gounam. This is the purva paksa of Sankya. Therefore pradhanam is cause of jagat karanam. They say Vedanta philosophy is wrong. So they say Sankya view is not Avidhikam.

Vyasacharya answers. Atma sabdad. He says that the word 'sat' is replaced by the word Atma. In two places the replacement comes. Here we have an Anupravesa sruti. After creating the world I the karanam will enter the world as Jivatma. This is one place. In another place there is another famous mantra wherein the teacher says jagat karanam 'sat' alone is Atma and that 'sat' Atma alone is you are. The argument is the word Jivatma can refer to only Chetana vastu.

Even in Sankya philosophy the word is connected to purusa alone and not to Achetana pradhanam again he says 'sat' which is Chetana Atma is nothing but you. Normally you will address Chetana vastu only. You will not talk to Achetana vastu. Atma is Chetanam and therefore 'sat' karanam also must be Chetanam only. In the case of visualization of agni I accept as gounam figurative. In the case of water also it is figurative. In the case of Atma it is Mukya iksanam. This is the essence of the sutra.

The first anumana vakyam is purva paksa and the other is siddhanta's anumanam. Iksadi sabda gouna sabda is the figurative visualization of fire and water. Vedanta says iksadi sabdah na gounah and it is mukyam eva. It is primary visualization of hetu. It is not visualization as said by Sankya pradhanam. The word Atma refers invariably to Chetana vastu unlike the visualization of water and fire. The word Atma refers to Chetana vastu alone and Achetana vastu can never be used for Atma. The word Atma is used to establish the visualization is not figurative but it is primary. Now we will go for word analysis.

Gouna is a word used by Sankya philosopher. Gouna means figurative. He is like a lion. All these expressions come under this category. Gouna means iksadi sabdah. The visualization expression is figurative. The full anumanam is represented by gounah one word. The next word is cet. If purva paksa argues like this the following is our answer. The third word is na Atma sabdad. Na means not. Na gouna the word should be supplied. Isadi sabdah na gounah visualization is not figurative because there is usage of Atma with regard to visualiser. You say Atma is Chetanam and if visualiser is Chetanam visualization is Mukyah. With this sixth sutra is over. The sixth cannot be taken independent sutra and it only strengthens the fifth sutra by showing that the visualization mentioned in fifth sutra is primary.

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.7 [7]**

#### ***Tannisthasya moksopadesat***

*because the instruction is that one who is devoted to Him, gets final release [the word Atman cannot be used with reference to pradhana]*

In the previous sutras we established 'sat' refers to Brahman alone and not pradhanam on account of primary visualization. Here we give another reasoning. Here also 'sat' refers to Chetana Brahman alone. The reasoning is different. The sutra presents the reason. This is based on the latter expression of the sixth chapter of Chandogya Upanishad.

That Atma is you it is declared. Whoever is established on that karana Atma will get liberated. The statement is whoever knows that 'sat' jagat karanam myself, he will enjoy until Praraptam is over and after Praraptam he will enjoy jivan mukti. Suppose the 'sat' refers to pradhanam, tat tvam asi Achetana pramanam you are inert pradhanam. Jagat karanam is pradhanam and you are inert.

You are pradhanam and you are foolish it is said. When you declare that you are inert pradhanam I will enjoy jivan mukti and get established in inert matter. Who will become inert by the study of sastram. I would prefer to be a jivah. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 41

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.7 [7]**

#### ***Tannisthasya moksopadesat***

*because the instruction is that one who is devoted to Him, gets final release [the word Atman cannot be used with reference to pradhana]*

We are seeing the third sutra of Iksateh Adhikaranam. A statement occurring in Chandogya Upanishad is being discussed. 'sat' has been stated to be cause of to the jagat karanam. While Sankya philosophers claim that Achetana pradhanam is the cause, Vyasacharya himself in these sutras asserts that Achetana pradhanam cannot be the basis for the creation and the 'sat' referred to in the Upanishad is nothing but Chetanam Brahman for which Vyasacharya gives six reasons.

The benefits of more reasons in that process our scriptural understanding get better understanding. Every conclusion is ultimately connected to aham Brahma asmi the liberating wisdom. When you gather more and more reasons for important conclusion the Self-knowledge become clearer and clearer. Clarity in scriptural knowledge is the clarity in Self-Knowledge. It like wiping the mirror and more and more the mirror is clean, better and better you get the image or your face. When the face is not clear you don't rub your face, you rub the mirror alone.

Similarly we rub the scriptural knowledge mirror to get better understand. It will also eliminate the present doubts but also remove the future possibilities of doubts. Not only the possibility of doubts in my own mind but also the challenges from other people. We get knowledge and also the conviction and you have enough reasons to answer any doubt not only of mine but also others. We always look for more than one reason. 'sat' means existence is not inert entity but Consciousness. 'sat' the existence is the substratum of the whole creation and one Christian father studies under me. But he tells all the philosophers have accepted the existence is substratum but others are not able to accept that substratum is 'we ourselves'.

The basic reason is 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman. It is Mukya iksitatvam and visulisation is proof for that. In the second sutram we get the second reason that 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives two interpretations. I will give the easier second interpretation. The Upanishad introduces 'sat' as jagat karanam. The sixth chapter of Chandogya has sixteen chapter elaborately discuss the creation. Thereafter it concludes that jagat karanam is 'you'. From eight section to sixteenth section the last mantra is '*sa yatha tatra nadahyetaidatmyamidam Sarvam tatsatyam sa Atma tattvamasi evetaketo*' that says that [self] is the Self of all this. It is the Truth. It is the Self that thou art, O Svedaketu. The jagat karanam Brahma is you are and you mean Chetanam Brahman or purusah. And he says Svetaketu you are and that you refers to purusah and that purusah is the listener student.

Having acquired the knowledge jagat karanam purusah one should get established with the knowledge and Chandogya upanishad says in the section 6.14.2 that the one who is established in this Self-knowledge gains moksa. He has to wait for that much time until the Prarapta is exhausted and after wards he get videha mukti and get liberated. The essence of this mantra is that the one gets established is jagat karanam will get liberated.

Now Vyasacharya asks the question what can be the Sankya philosophers. According to them jagat karanam 'sat' is Achetana pradhanam. When sruti says you are that. You are Achetana vastu and further it said that if you are established in Achetana nature you will get liberated means aham Achetanam pradanam jagat karanam asmi and according to that mantra the conclusion is that when you are established pradhanam you will get liberation. Thus you will end up in absurdity.

Even according to their philosophy itself it is a contradiction. They say in moksa the Prakriti should go away and according to him moksa is a state when Prakriti should go away. They themselves say that one should get established in purusa to get liberated but in this context they say you get established in pradhanam the Chetana vastu thus contradicting their own conviction. How can be Prakriti is pradhana nista.

Thus we establish 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman alone and not Achetana pradhanam. Here *tannisthasya* means whoever is identified with 'sat' will get moksa the liberation. Your aim always should to establish with 'sat' karanam. Next word is moksopadesat is the promise to get established with 'sat'. Atha sambatye occurs in 6.14.2 of Chandogya Upanishad the moksa is promised. If you take 'sat' as the pradhanam, that will not tally with what is said in the above sruti and therefore pradhanam nisthasya moksopadesat should not be taken is our conclusion. 'sat' is Chetanam because of visualization. 'sat' is Brahman and establishment of 'sat' is moksa karanam.

## **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

### **Sutra 1.1.8 [8]**

#### ***Heyatva avacanat ca***

there being no statement that it is to be discarded [the pradhana is not mentioned by the word 'sat'; and.

If you take the Upanishad it wants to reveal Atma, which is jagat karanam and Chetana vastu. It does not reveal directly being a suble entity. The listener has gross mind being engaged in gross Vyavahara. Hence the Upanishad takes one to the gross entity first and then subtler then subtler and the journey goes from grosser to subtler and this teaching is called arunthathi darsana nyayah. The couple has to see arunthathi star. Arunthathi is a smallest star. The priest cannot show it directly and he takes to the grossest entity, the moon and slowing smaller and smaller and each time the seer thinks it is arunthathi and slowly reaches the right star.

Similarly there is pancakosa Viveka and first it is Annamaya the Achetana vastu and later comes to prana maya and reveals prana maya as Atma and slowing come to the real Atma at the end. Upanishad first reveals the Achetanam and finally reveal the Chetanam at the end. This procedure is standard one used in Upanishad. 'sat' karanam is Achetanam pradhanam

alone and Upanishad is revealing Achetanam 'sat' pradhanam as jagat karanam and there is nothing wrong in this as arunthathi darsanam is followed. It is the first stage of teaching. The aim of the Upanishad is to reveal 'sat' and ultimately go to purusa through pradhanam. They say 'sat' is only an intermediary state and finally you have to reach the purusa as is the case of arunthathi Nyaya. This is the argument of Sankya philosopher.

Vyasacharya gives the answer in this sutra. Anna maya, prana maya and mano maya etc., are the intermediary stages that is followed to realize the Chetanam Brahman at the end. Finally ananda is revealed as Atma. Intermediary step is that which is negated later. Anna maya, mano maya etc., are negated and ultimately ananda Atma is not negated and hence it is final. To establish that is intermediary you should look for negation and negation is called heyatvam or nisheyatvam. All the kosas are negated. But ananda Atma is not negated.

According to Sankya philosopher sat is pradhanam only and it is taken as intermediary step and if the sat is taken as the intermediary step and if it is negated, that step cannot be the final Atma as per the sruti. Upanishad should continue teaching and since Upanishad has stopped the teaching the 'sat' as jagat karanam, Svetaketu understood 'sat' karanam. And after wards the teaching is over. 'sat' karanam is ultimate step and since it is final step it has to be Chetana purusah alone. Surti does not negate 'sat' karanam and therefore it is Chetanam alone. This is the argument and now we will take the word analysis. The false notion of the pradhana as the 'sat' has not been introduced first and discarded later so that it should be an aid to the understanding of Svetaketu that Atman alone is the 'sat' or the real being.

The sixth adhyaya of the Chandogya Upanishad deals with the direct statement of the Atman to the real being. If the word 'sat' were to denote pradhana then the knowledge of the pradhana as the cause would have given us the knowledge of the individual souls. But this does not happen because the souls, which are sentient, cannot be the effects of the non-sentient pradhana. Therefore the word 'sat' does not mean pradhana.

In this sutra tad sabda vakyam is not pradhanam heyatva avacanat. There is one 'ca'. Every word is important in the sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya takes the seventh reason that tad sabdham is not pradhanam from 'ca' sabda. In sixth chapter the father asks the question whether you raised the question from the teacher. Did you ask the particular question? Chandogya 6.1.,2 and3 what is that knowing which everything is known.

This comes in Mundakopanisad. *Karana vijnanenansarvam karyam vijnatham bhavati*. By knowing the cause all the effects are known. Karyam is nothing but the karanam with names and form. Ornaments is nothing but the gold with the names and forms. There are no ornaments separate from the gold. Jagat karana vijnanena jagat karyam vijnanam bhavati. 23 tattvams are born out of karanam.

Suppose a person gets pradhana jnanam, he knows all and can a person know purusa by knowing all. Purusa has to be known only if purusa is a product of the purusa. Pradhanam jnanam does not give purusa jnanam. This person will know all inert things in life and Chetana jivah he will not know. Therefore pradhanam cannot be jagat karanam if it is so Sarva jnanam naiva bhavati. In Vedanta Brahma vijnanam enables to know Sarva jivah and Achetana vijnanam. Because all jivas are none other than Brahman. All jivas are non different from Brahmas.

All Achetana Prapancha is also known through Brahma jnanam for entdrie Achetana Prapancha is then product of Brahma. Therefore in Vedanta alone eka vijnanena Sarva vijnanam possible. Ca kara indicates eka vijnanena Sarva vijnanam pratijna satvad. Further reason are given which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 42

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.8 [8]**

##### ***Heyatva avacanat ca***

there being no statement that it is to be discarded [the pradhana is not mentioned by the word 'sat'; and.

We have just completed the 8<sup>th</sup> sutram of Iksateh Adhikaranam. The subject matter of the Adhikaranam is sruti vakyam of Chandogya Upanishad 'sat' *tveva somyedamagra asi* Sankya philosopher says 'sat' is Achetanam pradhanam and Vedanta says 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya has given seven reasons in support of their negation of pradhanam and we have competed four of them.

The word 'sat' does not refer to pradhanam because there is no statement of negation. If it refers to pradhanam it would have negated and taken to Purusa and since 'sat' is highest state not negated and hence 'sat' refers to Chetanam Brahman only. Because of ca in the sutram and ca refers to eka vijnanena Sarva vijnanam. Knowledge of 'sat' will lead to knowledge of everything and hence 'sat' sabda refers to Brahma jnanam and Brahman alone and not to pradhanam. Pradhna jnanam will not lead to Sarva jnanam. This we have seen in the last class. By knowing pradhanam can lead to latter knowledge and not purusa jnanam. Whatever is product of pradhanam can be known and through pradhan jnanam we have know the knowledge of purusa. Purusa is not the product of pradhanam. This is indicated by cakara in the 8<sup>th</sup> sutra.

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.9 [9]**

##### ***Sva apyayat***

on account of [the individual soul] entering into the Atman [the word 'Sat' does not refer to Pradhana]

In this sutra Vyasacharya refers to another discussion occurring in 6.8.1 of Chandogya Upanishad. The mantra read as *uddalako harunih svetaketum putramuvaca svapnantam me somya vijanihiti yatraitatpurusah svapiti nama sata somya tada sampanno bhavati svamapito bhavati tasmadenam svapitityacaksate svam hyapito bhavati* this means then Uddalaka aaruni said to his son, Svetaketu, Learn from me, my dear, the true nature of sleep. When a person here sleeps, as it is called then, my dear, he has reached pure being. He has gone to his own. Therefore they say he sleeps for he has gone to his own.

Upanishad points out during sleep state, a special name is given to sleeper and that name is svapiti. Upanishad raises the question why should a sleeper be named svapiti. The answer is that during sleep jiva resolves into its original nature. Apyayah means layah. Svapyayah means svarupa layah. In deep sleep a sleeper is called that jiva is in his real nature. During Sushupti jiva resolves into 'sat' karanam. We now get the idea that jiva resolves into its nature and jiva enters into 'sat' karanam and we come to the conclusion that the original nature of jiva is 'sat'. First it says jiva resolves into 'sat' and then says jiva resolves into its original nature. By analyzing the Sushupti state of nature, we come to know jiva resolves into nature, which is 'sat'. If we accept Sankya interpretation during Sushupti jiva resolves into nature 'sat' karanam. According to Sankya jiva resolves into Achetana pradhanam. Because its nature is Achetana pradhanam. According to Vedanta during Sushupti, jiva resolves into its nature, which is Chetanam. According to Sankya Achetanam will be the nature of jiva and according to Vedanta Chetanam is the nature of jiva. Are you Chetanam or Achetanam? Even if you are to say I am Achetanam, you should be Chetanam. Achetanam can never be the nature of jiva says Adhi Sankaracharya. Chetanam Brahman alone can be the true nature of jiva. Chetanam cannot be the nature of Achetanam and Achetanam cannot be the nature of Chetanam. Both are independent entity. Therefore svapyayah. 'sat' sabda cannot be pradhanam for 'sat' is jiva's real nature in Sushupti. This is the general analysis. We will go to word meaning.

Svapyaya is compound word one is svam and another is apyayah. Sva means svarupam in Sushupti jiva is said to be in svarupam. It is not the case of jiva alone. Anything resolves into its nature. If all the waves resolve it will resolve in the ocean. That nature is referred to as svam. Next word is apyayah. Apyayah word is used in Gita for resolving into the original nature in sloka 11.2 *bhavapyayau he bhutanam srutau vistaraso maya tvattah kamalapattraksa mahatmyam api ca 'vyayam* the origin and destruction of beings verily, have been heard by me in detail from thee says Arjuna to Krishna. Apyayah means desolution. Svapyayah means svarupa layah. Both in Sushupti and Pralaya jiva gets into svarupa layah. Svarupa layah is 'sat' layah and svarupa is 'sat' and therefore 'sat' should be Chetanam. With this fifth reason is over. We will enter the next sutra to see the sixth reason.

## **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

### **Sutra 1.1.10 [10]**

#### ***Gati samanyat***

on account of the consensus of opinion [expressed in different Upanisads, Brahman is the cause, and not pradhana

The Upanishad introduces 'sat' as jagat karanam without saying whether saatt is Chaitanyam or Achetanam because the Upanishad is vague we have the doubt. Now we have a general rule whenever a statement is vague in an Upanishad the vagueness can be clarified from parallel idea given in another Upanishad and solve the problem. We will take similar sristi statement in another Upanishad and then see the karanam taken is Chetanam or Achetanam based on that the vague statement could be clarified.

The famous one is from Taittiriya Upanishad 2.1.1 reads as *Om Brahma-vid apnoti param, tadesa'bhykta satyam jnanam anantam Brahma, yo Veda nihitam guhayam parame vyoman so-'snute sarvan Kaman saha Brahmana vipasciteti tasmad-va etasmad-atmana akasah*



*sabbhuta* the meaning of the mantra is Om, the knower of Brahman attains the Supreme. With reference to that there is following hymn recited; Brahman is the Truth, knowledge, Infinity. He who knows it as existing in the cave of the heart in the transcendent Akasa, realizes all his desires along with Omniscient Brahman.

From that [which is] this Atman is space born; further it reads satyam jnanam anantam Brahman and it is introduced as jnana svarupam and Chetana svarupam and there is no vagueness with regard to Brahman. Having introduced Chetanam Brahman it says that from that Chetanam Brahman Akasa was born. Further it is indicated Brahman is the upadana karanam for the entire creation.

In another place in *Sloka 2.6.3* of Taittiriya Upanishad reads as *So 'kamayat, bahu syam prajayeyeti, 'sat'apo' tapyata, 'sat'apastapta, idagmsarvam-asrjata yadidam kim catat-srstva tadeva-nupravisat, tadeva nupravisya sacca-tyacca-bhavat, niruktam cani-rukata mca, nilayanam canilayanamca, vijnanam cai-jnanam ca, satyam canrtam ca 'sat'yam-abhavat, yadidam kim ca, tatsatyam-itya caksate, tadapy-esa sloko bhavati. [iti sasthanu 'nuvakah]* that Brahman alone desired and became creation. Here also Brahman is introduced as upadana karanam.

In the same Upanishad mantra III.i.2 reads as *tam havaca yato va imani bhutani jayante yen jatani jivanti, yat-prayantya-bhisamvisanti, tad-vijijnasasya, tad brahmeti sa tapo – 'tapyata, sa tapas taptva* the meaning is to him [Bhrgu] he [Varuna] again said 'crave to know well that from which these beings are born, that by which, having been born, these beings live and continue to exist; and that into which, when departing they all enter. That is Brahman' Here, once again the Upanishad has categorically stated that Brahman is sristi sthithi karanam of the entire creation leaving no doubt that Brahman eva upadana karanam. Omniscient one is Brahman here and such Brahman is Chetanam what to talk of Sarva vid sarvajnam Brahman.

The same idea is seen in Mundakopanisad Mantra 2.1.3 that reads as *etasmaj-jayate prano manah sarvendriyani ca kham vayur-jyotir-apah prthivi visvasya dharini* the meaning is from Him are born the Prana [life], the mind, all the organs, the sky [Akasa], the wind [Vayu], the fire [Jyoti], the water [Apah], and the earth [Prithvi] which supports all. Here also we find explicitly that Chetanam Brahman is the upadana karanam of the whole creation starting from jiva to Prithvi.

Aitareya Upanishad declares in mantra 1.1 *aum Atma va idam eka evagra asti, nanyat kin can amisat; sa aiksata lakan nu srja iti* that reads as Aum Atma alone was verily the one that existed here in the beginning. Nothing rival whatsoever existed to blink, it thought; 'let me now create the worlds'. The word Atma represents Chetanam alone.

Prasnopanisad mantra III. 3 says *Atmana esa prano jayate yathaisa puruse chayai-tasminnetad-atatam mano-krten-ayaty-asmin-sarire*, which means this prana is born of the Atman, the Self. As shadow is born of the man, so is the Prana spread out on the Atman. By the actions of the mind, it enters into this body. It is very important and it says prana is born as shadow is born out of Brahman. The unreal creation is born out of Brahman the real.

The Brihadharaynaka upanisad contains several quotations to indicate that Chetanam is karanam for the jagat karanam Brahman.

Now we will see the word meaning. This contains two words as *Gati* and *samnyat*. In this context gati means jnanam, jnanam indicates Chetana karana jnanam. The jnanam belongs to Vedantin's Chetana Brahma jnanam. Other Upanishad does not support Achetana jnanam of Sankya whereas all the Upanisads as above support Chetana karana jnanam.

Samanyat means concurrence. The Chetana karana jnanam has got concurrence with other various Upanisads whereas Sankya's view is not supported by other Upanisads. Hence Sankya's view is negated in this regard that Achetanam pradhanam is jagat karanam. This is the sixth reason to establish that 'sat' is Chetanam Brahman not Achetanam pradhanam.

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.11 [11]**

##### ***Srutatvat ca***

*and because it is mentioned in Sruti [that the all knowing Brahman is the cause],*

Here Vyasacharya has in mind the statement occurring in 6.9 of Svetasvara Upanishad, reads as *na Tasya kascit patir asti loke, na cesita naiva ca Tasya lingam, na karanam karanadhipadhipo na casya kascij janita na cadhipah* this reads as of Him there is no master in the world, no ruler, nor is there any mark of Him, He is the cause, the lord of the lords of the sense organs; of Him there is neither progenitor nor lord.

The important portion is saha karanam, which means that is the cause of the universe. Upanishad says that does not seem to solve the problem. What is that is the question. All the previous mantras talk about Chaitanyam Brahman and having talked about Chaitanyam Brahman the Upanishad says that karanam Brahman is the cause of the universe. Here alone directly it is said that Brahman is the cause of the universe.

Since the universe says Brahman is karanam Sankya cannot contradict and if does so he becomes an avaidhika and his philosophy is more on Tarka less on sastra. He cannot contradict the Upanishad statement. This is the general analysis. The anumanam is 'sat' sabda vakyam refers to Chetanam Brahman is the cause of the world creation.

There are two words srutatvat and ca. Srutatvat means because it is heard and we should note because it is mentioned in the sruti. In those days Veda is never read because Veda was never a written text. They always heard Vedas and never read. That is why it is called sruti. There is a word 'ca' and this indicates the conclusion of the reasons given in the sutras. All seven reasons indicate 'sat' is Chetana karanam Brahman. Fifth Adhikaranam is over.

Now I will give you the Upasamhara of the Adhikaranam. The subject matter of the sutra is 'sat' occurring in the Chandogya Upanishad. The doubt here is whether the word 'sat' refers to achetana jagat karanam pradhanam or Chetana jagat karanam Brahman.

Here the Upanishad has not clearly mentioned that 'sat' refers to Brahman and hence the doubt has risen. Purva paksha here is Sankya. He says Achetanam pradhanam eva jagat karanam. Many reasons are given. First is material cause has to be material and it is Achetanam. Pot is Achetanam matter. All materials are inert and hence the cause also should

be material and inert. Pradhanam and world similarity is there. Cause and effect should have similarity and here world and pradhanam have similarity. Siddhanta says 'sat' is Chetana karanam Brahmaiva that we have seen in all the earlier mantras. In the fourth Adhikaranam Sankya raised an objection that Brahman is not jagat karanam, we have convinced them in the present adhikaranam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 43

### **Topic 5, Sutras 5-11 [Ikshatyadhikaranam]**

Brahman the [intelligent principle] is the first cause

#### **Sutra 1.1.11 [11]**

##### *Srutattvat ca*

and because it is mentioned in Sruti [that the all knowing Brahman is the cause],

**With the sutra 11 Iksateh Adhikaranam is over. This occurs in Chandogya Upanishad. Why should it occur in Brahma Sutra? Brahma Sutra analyses Vedanta vakyani. Therefore Iksateh Adhikaranam should come in Uttara mimamsa only. Then we should ask why the Iksateh Adhikaranam should occur in the first chapter. It is samanvaya adhyaya and it is meant to show consistency or harmony.**

This is to show there is consistently without contradiction reveals Brahman is the idea here. In this Adhikaranam it is shown that all vakyas reveal Brahman. This is called adhyaya sangathih and it is to show that the chapters occur in this chapter legitimately. Why this Adhikaranam occurs in the first pada of the first section. The reason is that the first pada analyses those statement in which there are clear clues that reveal Brahman.

We took the word ‘satt’ was taken as to whether it denotes pradhanam or Brahman. The clue is Iksatihi. In the second section we will analyse those statements, which are not clear. This academic exercise is called pada sangathih. Sangathih is the fifth Adhikaranam answers the objection raised in the fourth Adhikaranam. Sankya philosopher raises this objection.

With this Iksateh Adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.12 [12]**

##### *anandamaya*

[means the Brahma] because [the word ananda as denoting Brahman] is repeated

**Here we enter the sixth Adhikaranam Anandamayadhi Adhikaranam. This has got eight sutras dealing with one topic ananda maya. This occurs in second half of 2.5.2 of Taittiriya Upanishad that reads as *tasyaisa eva sarira Atma yah purvasya tasmad va etamsad vijnana mayat anyo’ntara Atma ‘nandamayah, tenaisa purnah sa va esa Purusa-vidha eva, Tasya Purusa-vidhatam, anvayam Purusa-vidhah, Tasya priyameva sirah, modo daksinah paksah, puccham pratistha, tadapy-esa sloho bhavati.***

**That reads as of that, of the Former, this one verily is the embodied self, Different from this self-made up of intellect [Vijnanamaya] is another self within, formed of Bliss [Anandamaya]. By this, that is filled [by that is filled [by Anandamaya the Vijnanamaya**

**is full]. It also has the shape of man. According to the human form of That is the human form of this. Of it, joy [Priya] is the right side, Rejoicing [Moda] is the left side and Bliss [promoda] is the trunk. Brahman is the tail support.**

This is Anandamaya Adhikaranam. Adhi Sankaracharya writes the commentary in a particular pattern. He has established Anandamaya is one of the five kosas and the study of Anandamaya is a part of panca kosa visayah. The Upanishad has not direct intention to reveal panca kosa for knowing *pancakosa* jnana will not give you moksa. If it does not give moksa why should the Upanishad introduce that. The same Upanishad Manta 2.1 reads as *Brahmavid apnoti param tadesa 'bhyukta, satyam jnanam anandam Brahma yo Veda nihitam guhayam parame vyoman, so-'snute sarvan Kaman saha brahana vipasciteti* I the meaning is the knower of Brahman attains the Supreme. With reference to that there is following hymn recited; Brahman is Truth, knowledge, infinity. He who knows It as existing in the cave of the heart in the transcendent Akasa realizes all his desires along with Omniscient Brahman.

There the Upanishad has said Brahma jnanam will give liberation. Naturally a seeker will be interested in Brahma jnanam. Upanishad says that it cannot reveal Brahman directly. It reveals a flight of steps to climb up and realize Brahman. The steps are panca kosas. They are not Brahman but steps from grosser to subtler level. Annamaya is first step; prana maya second step; mano maya third step; vijñana maya is the fourth step; ananda maya is the fifth step and then you get Brahman.

As even you get further kosas becomes subtler and the mind also becomes subtler and subtler. The grossest 'I' becomes sookshma and sookshma and if you understand up to ananda maya you can come to Brahman and once you realize Brahman you attain moksa. This is commentary of Adhi Sankaracharya.

There are some commentators who say Anandamaya is not a kosa and it is itself Brahman. They have commented Brahma Sutra also. Keeping this in view, they point out Anandamaya is Brahman. According to them Brahma Sutra proves Anandamaya proves Brahman. This is vrittikara madham. In samanvaya Adhikaranam also we saw vrittikara madham.

Adhi Sankaracharya joints this vrittikara madham and along with vrittikara Adhi Sankaracharya also comments upon every sutra and establishes that Anandamaya is Brahman. The greatest mischief he does while joining vrittikara he does say that he supports vrittikara but comments as though it is his view.

But in the commentary of Taittiriya Upanishad Adhi Sankaracharya comments Anandamaya is not Brahman. He concludes that the whole statement that Anandamaya is Paramatma in the sutra 19. Having said that thereafter he says that the following note is to be added. He says all I said till now is wrong and he says Anandamaya cannot be Brahman and Anandamaya is only kosa.

Having refuted the vrittikara madham, how do you interpret the sutra. If vrittikara is wrong how should you interpret the sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya says that the sutra has to be reinterpreted as follows and he gives the reinterpretation of the sutra, which alone is Advaidic interpretation. Under every sutra it is vrittikara interpretation. After the completion of the last sutra 19, Adhi Sankaracharya refutes vrittikara madham and defines Advaida interpretation.

I will not elaborately deal with vrittikara commentary. I will give the essence of the vrittikara arguments and then I will refute them and give our commentary. Vrittikara says Anandamaya Atma eva. Aya is not a kosa. He tries to give various arguments. There are two main arguments in support of his conclusion.

Previously Upanishad talked about kosa not directly. Initially it introduced the kosa as Atma only and thus Anandamaya is introduced as Atma. At the end of that Upanishad says anyontara Atma prana maya. It introduces prana maya and anna maya is reduced to kosa. Later prana maya is reduced to kosa when it introduces mano maya.

Manomaya becomes a kosa when it introduces vijnana maya; and vijnana maya becomes a kosa when it introduces Anandamaya kosa. If Anandamaya should be reduced to kosa there should be another statement anyontara Atma another interior Atma. Only when another interior is introduced the previous one is kosa and it is eliminated because of anyontara Atma. Vrittikara argues to prove Anandamaya as kosa we should get anyontara Atma, but such a statement is not there. So we find Anandamaya is innermost Atma and hence it is Brahman. The previous four are kosas. Anandamaya is Sarvantara Atma. This is the argument one of vrittikara.

The second argument is that after every kosa the Upanishad quotes a rg mantra which gives more description of anna maya, so also after introducing prana maya; vijnana maya rg mantra clearly states the meaning of the kosa. That rg mantra talks about Brahman. From this it becomes clear Anandamaya is Brahman. Therefore because of rg mantra quotation that we come to the conclusion that Anandamaya is Brahman. This is the argument of vrittikara madham.

Adhi Sankaracharya refutes the vrittikara maya by giving five arguments and negates their views. He gives his views in sutra 10 only. What are those arguments? His is vrittikara madha condemnation.

They say after Anandamaya there is no anyontara Atma statement. Nothing interior is revealed. For Adhi Sankaracharya says that no dobut anyontara statement is not there. Even though it is not there something interior to the Upanishad within the Anandamaya statement itself reveals Anandamaya. See the Upanishad quotation given above.

Ananda maya is Priya moda and pramoda is ananda maya and there is non-experiential pleasure wherein ananda means ananta which is ananda Atma which is interior to Anandamaya. It is 'Self' the core. Atma is the heart of Anandamaya kosa and thus Anandamaya becomes a kosa. This is the first argument.

Rg mantra talks about Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says that rg mantra does not refer to Atma. Rg mantra does not talk about Anandamaya but it talks about the tail of Brahman. In all previous portions it talked about anna maya etc. How is that here in the case of Anandamaya rg mantra does not talk about Brahman? For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives two arguments, which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 44

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.12 [12]**

#### ***anandamaya***

[means the Brahma] because [the word ananda as denoting Brahman] is repeated

**We see the sixth topic known as Anandamaya Adhikaranam where Taittiriya valli mantra is taken up for discussion. Adhi Sankaracharya writes his commentary in a particular pattern and I will do accordingly. First portion Adhi Sankaracharya commentary on all sutras based on vrittikara madham. The second part is negation and third part is reinterpretation of all sutras based on Advaidam. According to them Anandamaya should be taken as Brahman. We say it is Anandamaya kosa. The reasons given by vrittikara we have discussed in the last class. At the end of Anandamaya rg mantra talks about Brahman and therefore Anandamaya is only a kosa. All other sutras also will conclude in the same manner as is given here in this sutra.**

The second part is Adhi Sankaracharya's vrittikara madham. He establishes Anandamaya is kosa alone and it is the fifth kosa. He gives five arguments in support of his argument. One more argument is given in Taittiriya Upanishad. Then the arguments become six.

Vrittikara says Anandamaya is Brahman since nothing is introduced later. After Anandamaya kosa ananda Atma, which indicates Anandamaya is kosa and ananda without kosa, is Atma. The difference between them is kosa ananda and Atma ananda? The kosa ananda is experiential pleasure, which is Pratibimba ananda. It is fluctuating pleasure. The experience of ananda Atma is not subject to any fluctuation. It is non experiential and it is purnatvam and it is Bimba ananda and since Bimba ananda is introduced as antharatma and Anandamaya should be taken as kosa only. This is the first argument.

Virttikara says Anandamaya is kosa because rg mantra at the end of Anandamaya talks about Brahman. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives this argument. Not doubt it talks about Brahman. It does not refer to Anandamaya the kosa but it refers to ananda Atma Brahma puccham pradhista. Therefore it does not refer to Anandamaya and Anandamaya has to be kosa alone. This is the second argument to establish that Anandamaya is a kosa.

Adhi Sankaracharya says that the very word Anandamaya indicates that it is a kosa and not Brahman. Word Anandamaya consists of two parts one is ananda and another is maya.

Suffix maya is added to the word ananda. The very suffix maya indicates that it cannot refer to Brahman. The first meaning of maya is modification and the second meaning is abundance or saturation etc. When you add suffix to any word, it indicates modification that object you talk of. Whatever the object is indicated with suffix maya is Savikaram only. It reveals a changing object and not changeless object. If it is savikarm it cannot be Brahman is the conclusion of Adhi Sankaracharya.

Physical body the modification of annam is Annamaya. Annam is karanam and Annamaya is karyam. All the four kosas are karya maya Atma only including Anandamaya. Being karyam or being Savikaram it cannot be Brahman. That is why we say no experiential pleasure can be Brahman. Experiential happiness is subject to fluctuation. Now we will come to the second meaning of maya that is abundance.

Even if we take ananda in abundance and even if we take that meaning Anandamaya cannot be Brahman because when you say ananda is predominant it means that there is some dukham in it. It is not purna ananda. You cannot dukha lesam when you talk of ananda. Brahma by definition is ananda embodiment and not even a dash of dukham. Then what is Brahman? Brahman is without the suffix 'mayat' since Anandamaya has got a suffix maya, it is kosa as is the case with Annamaya or prana maya or vijnana maya. This is the third argument.

Anandamaya is not Brahman. It gives the description of Atma. It means it has got parts. Anandamaya has got parts or avayava like Annamaya has got various parts are there. All the mayas have got various parts or limbs and similarly Anandamaya has got parts. Whatever has got parts is called savayavam. If it is savayavam or part it has to be a product. Not only it is a product, it has got the limitations. *Yad savayavam tad paricchinam savayavatvad gatavad.* It is subject to modification also. Anandamaya is also a limited product only. Brahman Niravayavam and it is free from parts. Therefore Brahman is parichinnam how can Savikara savayava parichinna be identical with niravayava, Nirvikara, aparichinna Brahman. Therefore Anandamaya is not Brahman. This is the fourth argument.

Anandamaya is not Brahman. While describing Anandamaya Brahman has been separately mentioned as puccham, which means adharam. It is the very support of Anandamaya and when Brahman is support how can Brahman itself is Anandamaya. Supporter and supported cannot be identical and they both are different. This is the fifth argument. Brahman is separately enumerated.

In Taittiriya Upanishad Adhi Sankaracharya gives one more argument. In the Upanishad Brahmananda valli at the end the Upanishad mantra III.x.5 talks of jnana phalam. *Sa yas-cayam puruse yas casav aditye sa ekah sa ya evamvit, asmal lokat retya etam annam ayam Atmanam upasam kramya, etam pranam ayam Atmanam upasam kramya, etam manomayam Atmanam upasam kramya etam vijnana mayam Atmanam upasam kramya, etam ananda mayam Atmanam upasam kramya, etam annam ayam Atmanam upasam kramya emam llokan kamanni kamarupy anusam caran, etat sama gayann aste* now the benefit of the knowledge the Upanishad says Jnani crosses over all the kosas which means dis-identifying with anna maya I no more look upon as Annamaya as myself and Annamaya is like a dress.

So each maya is a dress and jnanam transcends all of them and suppose Anandamaya is Brahman should be not disassociate with Anandamaya and it will become he is disassociated with Brahman and he will become sunyavadi. It is not crossing ananda maya. Anandamayah kosah upasankarana visayatvad annamayavad. It is an object of crossing like Annamaya and prana maya. So vrittikara madham is defective.

Now we enter the third part of all the sutras based on Advaidam. Adhi Sankaracharya does it very briefly. The reinterpretation he does briefly. This we will do it elaborately. Now we will take up general analysis.



The topic under discussion in this sutra is Anandamaya is not Brahman. The Upanishad talks about various parts of Anandamaya like Annamaya and Pranamaya etc. Puccham means tail and it is like a tail that supports. For bird the tail is important for support. Tail is part of something it is a limb and any part is always subsidiary to the whole. It is amukyam and not only amukyam it is also paratantram and the part depends upon the whole for survival. The states are under the control of the central. States depends upon the central. Part is ever dependent this we know. Brahman has been introduced in the Anandamaya context as Brahma puccham pratista. It is introduced as the tail of Anandamaya.

If Brahman is tail of Anandamaya it becomes an avayava of Anandamaya a part of Anandamaya and Anandamaya becomes the whole and Brahman the part and if Brahman is avayava it will have two qualification. It will become paratantram and it will be dependent on Anandamaya. Here analysis whether Brahman is secondary or paratantram or dependant on ananda maya. Through this section we establish that Brahman is not secondary to Anandamaya even though it is presented as the tail of Anandamaya.

Similarly, Brahman is not dependent of Anandamaya and Brahman is independent only even though it is presented as the tail of Anandamaya. Brahman is primary and not secondary. All the eight sutras establish Brahman is independent, the Brahman mentioned as the tail of Anandamaya. Anandamaya abyasad is the sutram and we should interpret Anandamaya maya puccha rupam Brahman is svatantram abyasad. This is the first reason establish that Brahman is svatantram. Details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 45

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.12 [12]**

#### ***anandamaya abhyasat***

[means the Brahma] because [the word ananda as denoting Brahman] is repeated

The commentary of this mantra is over in the last class. Adhi Sankaracharya established Anandamaya is only and kosa and it is not Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya has negated the view of vrittikara that Anandamaya is Brahman with sruti support.

Analysis is not the nature of Anandamaya. What is Anandamaya is not our discussion. In Anandamaya discussion the word Brahman occurs as Taittiriya Upanishad *Tasya Purusa-vidhatam, anvayam Purusa-vidhah, Tasya priyameva sirah, modo daksinah paksah, puccham pratistha, tadapy-esa sloho bhavati [ibid]*. Here the word occurs and the controversy is about Brahman and not about Anandamaya. Why should there be a discussion about Brahman? There is no controversy at all. Vichara presupposes controversy.

It is this that Upanishad introduces Brahman as the puccham of Anandamaya. Puccham means a tail. We all know like the tail of the monkey or bird the tail must refer to an avayava or part alone. Thuccha sabda indicates the avayava only. Brahman is introduced, as thuccham of Anandamaya and Brahman becomes an avayava. Let Brahman become an avayava then what is wrong. Once we accept it as avayava, Brahman becomes avayavi the whole. Any part depends upon the whole, as the tail cannot be independent of the whole. Then Brahman becomes paratantram. This purva paksa's argument.

Superficially looking Brahman appears to be paratantram as it is presented as the tail. We establish that Brahman is svatantram alone. Here Brahman means what is said in the Anandamaya prakatanatvam. It is svatantram alone. The reasons are many but the conclusions are many.

The first reason given in sutra 12 is abyasat. We find in Taittiriya Upanishad at the end of every kosa we find a rg Veda mantra. That mantra is called nigamana slokah. We have five nigamana sloka. When we find the content we see something interesting. After every maya, it gives importance to the five mayas. Anandamaya nigamana should give importance to that Anandamaya but it talks about ananda. Here Anandamaya is not given importance. It talks about the Brahman, which is the puccham of Anandamaya. Since nigamana sloka gives importance to Brahman, it is evident that Brahman is pradhanam and it is not the tail of Anandamaya. Therefore it is not tail it is 'as though' tail. Nigamana sloka repeats the word Brahman giving importance to Brahman and not to Anandamaya. This repetition is termed as abyaas in the sutra. All the latter portions give importance only to Brahman and not Anandamaya. Therefore it is clear Brahman is importance and not Anandamaya.

It consists of two words Anandamayah and abyaasa. We should get the laksyartham of Anandamaya. It is Anandamayasta puccha Brahman. We take such a meaning because that is the context. We are not interested in Brahman and not Anandamaya. We supply a new word, which is not in the sutra which is pradhanam or svatantram. Anandamayasta is svatantram. Abyasaad means in the nigamana sloka stresses the importance of Brahman alone.

## Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### Sutra 1.1.13 [13]

#### *Vikarasabdat na cet na pracuryat*

if it be said [that Anandamaya] does not [denote the highest Atman] because it is a word denoting modification, [then it is] not so, [the meaning of the affix ‘maya’] being abundance.

Now a purva paksa comes and raises an objection. Brahman is pradhanam and the word Brahman is repeated and predominantly discussed in the later portions. He says that these are indirect reasons and I have direct support that Brahma puccham pradhista. It is sruti words. The word puccham means tail and the tail is a portion and the portion always depends upon the whole. Once it moves from the body or the whole the avayava loses its importance. Here Brahman is said to be puccham and it cannot be independent. If such a purva paksa is raised the sutra gives the answer also.

The sutra has got two portions one of purva paksa and the later portion siddhanta. Vedanta says puccham is used and it is not used in literal sense at all and it has got an implied meaning. The implied meaning is adhara Artha laksanaya. Adhara means support. Brahma puccham means Brahman supports. Just as the tail of the bird supports the bird, so the Brahman supports the whole world and reveals adhara. The word puccham is followed by pradhista the adhistanam. Why should Upanishad confuse us? Upanishad could have used the word adhara. Why it is not done so? It has not done because in the previous kosas the word puccham has been used for the sake of Upasanartham.

In each of the kosa there is head, right, left etc., and the Upanishad wants to keep the trend in Anandamaya also. It is done for continuity and to go on majority. In order to reveal Brahman, the puccham word has been used after mentioning Anandamaya. In order to reveal Brahman the word puccham is used. The literal word of puccham should not be taken and the lakshyartha the meaning as support should be taken.

Vikarasabdat is the word. Vikaraha means avayavah sabdah means sabda. It is there in the Upanishad. It is Brahma puccham. There afterward we have introduce a word. After the word na we should supply the word Brahma and svatantra. Purva paksa says Brahma na svatantram. Brahman is not independent being tail of the whole.

Siddhanta says if the purva paksa argues like that our answer is na paratantram. Brahman cannot be taken as paratantram prajuryad. It means predominance. The word puccha is used not to indicate avayava but to agree predominance used in the previous stotram. To fall in line for the agreement in other stotra the puccha sabda is used here.

The word puccha is taken by purva paksa as avayava. It means Brahman is dependent. Whether the word limb is Vachyartha or lakshyartha we should see. The meaning avayava is lakshartham or Vachyartham. Tail does not mean limb. Tail means tail. It is a particular part hanging behind the animal. Suppose the word tail and limb are synonymous, some one asks me do you have tail. Tail as limb should be only lakshyartha and therefore if purva paksa takes it as limb he takes it as Vachyartha.

When I take it as lakshyartha, both of us do not take the direct meaning. Between Vachyartha and lakshyartha direct meaning is powerful. You take implied meaning and I take implied meaning and my implied meaning suits the context more than yours. Therefore word puccham is used not because it is limb but puccha sabda abundance and to agree with majority that is all. Anandamaya maya na pradhanam vikara sabdat. This anumanam number one. Anandamayastam Brahma na apradhanam or na palatantram why praturyad. This is the second reason. Now we will go to the third one.

## Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### Sutra 1.1.14 [14]

#### *Tat hetu vyapadesat*

because [Brahman] is mentioned as the cause of [the bliss, the affix ‘maya’ means abundance].

Here we give another reason to establish Brahman is svatantram. Brahman has been introduced after Anandamaya. When we look at the later portion the focus is not Anandamaya but the tail of Anandamaya, which is Brahman. Then comes sristi prakaranam once again. Because in Taittiriya Upanishad sristi has been talked already. Brahman is introduced and the creation comes afterwards. Now Brahman has been reintroduced as the puccham of Anandamaya kosa and after wards sristi is reintroduced again.

Taittiriya Upanishad 2.6.3 *so kamayat bahu svam prajayeyeti sa tapo tapyata sa tapas taptva idagm Sarvam asrjata yadidam kimca tat srstva tadeva nupravisat tadeva nupravisya sacca tyacca bhavat niruktam cani rukatam ca, nilayanam cani layanam ca, vijnanam cani jnanam ca, sathyam, jnanam anandam abhavat, yadidam kim ca, tat satyam itya caksate, tadapy-esa sloka bhavati.* This reads as he desired ‘I shall become many and be born, He performed tapas, having performed Tapas, he created this whatever we perceive. Having created it, he entered into it. Having entered it He became the manifest and the Unmanifest; the defined and the undefined; the housed and the houseless; knowledge and ignorance; truth and falsehood; and all this whatsoever that exists. Therefore it is called existence. In this sense, there is the following vedic verse.

Saha akamayata idagm Sarvam asrjata does this saha refers to Anandamaya or Brahman. If it refers to Anandamaya then Anandamaya will become jagat karanam but we know it cannot become jagat karanam. How can the limited savayava Anandamaya become the jagat karanam and if you take Brahman it fits perfectly and therefore Brahman is svatantram because it is the cause of the whole creation. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 46

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.14 [14]**

##### ***Tat hetu vyapadesat***

because [Brahman] is mentioned as the cause of [the bliss, the affix ‘maya’ means abundance].

We see the third sutra of ananda maya karanam. We see the interpretation of Adhi Sankaracharya made at the end of the Adhikaranam. The topic is puccham in the sutra is svapradnam Brahman or apradhanam Brahman. It is conclusion that it is svatantram Brahman.

What he says is Brahman, which is elaborated later, is revealed as jagat karanam even though it is presented as Anandamaya puccham. That puccham Brahman is elaborated later. Brahman is presented as jagat karanam. Not only it is jagat karanam but also karanam of panca kosa and Anandamaya also. It is Sarva karanam Brahman. Also we have another supporting reason that Anandamaya is savayavam and it has limbs. According to logic yad savayavam tad karyam. Brahman is introduced later as karanam.

Vyasacharya asks karanam is dependent upon karyam or karyam dependent upon karanam. Karanam is ever independent. You cannot say Brahman depends upon Anandamaya but you should say Anandamaya is dependent upon Brahman. Upanishad also adds a word pradhista and the word puccham does not mean tail but the very adhistanam of the entire world including Anandamaya. Brahman is the hetu of the entire creation.

We say Brahman is presented as jagat karanam. It is presented in Taittiriya vakyam. Saha akamaya means he desired to create the world and he created the world is the Upanishad vakyam. Pronoun saha refers to what is our question. Here pronoun is given but not said Brahman created the world. Brahman presented as Anandamaya alone presented as sokamayama later to indicate that Brahman created the world. The pronoun should agree with the gender and also number etc., according to grammar. It need not agree in case. Brahman neuter gender and saha is masculine gender. How can the masculine pronoun can go with neuter gender Brahman? And he says Anandamaya alone is svapradhanam and it is jagat karanam and not Brahman. This is the suggestion of a purva paksha.

We say pronoun cannot refer to Anandamaya and it refers to Brahman only. Pronoun should refer to immediately present noun only and not farther noun. Therefore, saha should refer to Brahman, alone which is closer, and not Anandamaya. After introducing several sentences Brahman is introduced so Brahman is closer. It may be closer and what about the gender is not in agreement. For which siddhanti says gender does not agree because the Upanishad does not want to make any difference between Brahman and Atma.

The word Atma is in Sanskrit is masculine in gender. Here Upanishad want to show that Brahman and Atman are identical and it becomes very clear if we study the beginning portion

of Brahmanandavalli. There the Upanishad defines Brahman Taittiriya II.i.1 as *satyam jnanam anantam Brahma. Yo Veda nihitam guhayam parame vyoman, so'snute sarvan Kaman saha Brahmana vipasciteti* here Brahman is categorically defined as satyam jnanam anantam that is truth, knowledge and infinity is Brahman. And then the Upanishad continues in the next mantra *tasmad-va etasmad-atmana akasah sambhutih* and then Upanishad introduces Atma.

Tasmad va etasmad Atmanah tasmadva represents Brahman and again it says that Brahman is none other than the Atma and from this it is clear that Upanishad does not want to differentiate between Atma and Brahma. Ananda Atma eva Brahma puccham.

Again in Bhrgu valli it is said III.vi.1 *anando prahmeti vyajanat, anandad-dhyeva khalvimani bhutani jayante, anandena jatani jivanti anandam prayanty-abhisam visantiti, saisa bhargavi varuni vidya, parame vyoman pratisthita, so ya evam Veda pratistithati annavan annado bhavati, mahan bhavati prajaya pasubhir Brahma varcasena, mahan kirtya.* Ananda here is said to be Atma. Atma and Brahman are identical is confirmed in the above two statements. Thus it is concluded that Brahman alone is jagat karanam.

There are two words tat hetu and vya-padesat. Brahma puccha Brahma is svatantram. Because it is presented as jagat karanam Brahman is jagat karanam in the statement sokamayam. Tad means Brahman hetu means jagat karanam mentioned in Upanishad, this is the meaning of the compound word. This the reason for establishing Brahman is svatantram, the next word is ca. The significance is that purva paksha says Brahman has to be paratantram because it is presented as tail. Because it is a tail it should be part.

Why do you raise it in Anandamaya prakaranam. Why you are attached to the word tail. Look at vijñana maya prakaranam and there it is Hiranyagarbha in vijñana maya prakaranam.

The Upanishad mantra II.iv.2 reads as *tasmad va etasman manomayat, anyo'ntara Atma vijñanamayah tenaisa purnah, sa va esa Purusa-vidha eva, Tasya Purusa-vidhatam, anvayam Purusa vidhah, Tasya sraddhaiva sirah rtam daksinah paksah, satyam uttarah paksah, yoga Atma mahah puccam pratistha, tad apy esa sloko bhavati* it is said face is the head of vijñanamayah Sastri knowledge is on the right side of vijñanamaya concentration is central part of vijñana maya puccham is samasti sookshma sariram or Hiranyagarbhah. In vijñanamaya Hiranyagarbha is presented as vijñana maya kosa. How can you accept Hiranyagarbha as tail? It is vyasti and macrocosm. How can macro vyasti maya become tail of microcosm? You should say Hiranyagarbha is the tail means Hiranyagarbha is the adharah, the supporter.

If here, the tail can be taken as adhara why cannot you take puccham as adharam in anandamaya also. Pritivi is shown as puccham in prana maya. In mano maya puccha is avayava. In some context puccha is avayava and in some other context it is adharam. This is to be taken keeping the context in mind. According to context the meaning of the word differs. In the context of Anandamaya adhara meaning should be taken. With this third sutra is over.

## **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### **Sutra 1.1.15 [15]**

### *Mantravarnikam eva ca giyate*

[Anandamaya is Brahma because] the same [Brahman which has been mentioned in the mantra is mentioned [in the Brahmana.

We will do the general analysis. Vyasacharya says you look at Brahmandanda valli and you will have no problem at all. This deals with Brahman in detail. The very word indicates that Brahman is pradhanam. Brahman is svatantram. Anything mukyam is pradhanam. Subordinate will be dependent. It starts with bramavid apnoti param. It starts with the saying that one who knows Brahman will become Brahman. Brahman is defined through a rg mantra. It is mantra varnah. It quotes rg mantra because the Upanishad is not rg Veda Upanishad. Brahmanam is commentary on mantra portion of the mantra bagha of the Veda.

Mantra and Brahmana is equal to Veda. Mantra is crisp and Veda is elaborate. Therefore it quotes a rg mantra. Brahman is define das infinte Brahman satyam jnanam and anantam. Brahman is independently existent; Brahman is thus svatantram. The very word anantam shows Brahman is the tail of anything. Upanishad wants to reveal Brahman through arunthathi Nyaya. Brahman is introduced as jagat karanam and Brahman is introduced as kosa karnam also. Up to Annamaya gosa everything is karyam. Going backward Pranamaya to Manomaya to vijnana maya.

Then at the end of Anandamaya it is shown as the same as the rg mantra. Brahman of rg mantra is commented upon later and shown as ananda maya. Therefore Anandamaya prakatatva Brahma is mantra varnikam Brahman. Puccham Brahma is given a new title mantra varnikam Brahma; it is that Brahman that independent and infinite Brahman mantra vane yuktam mantra varnikam. Mantra varnikam Brahman is svatantram and puccham Brahman is nothing but mantra varnikam Brahman is also svatantram. This is the general meaning of the stostra.

Puccham Brahman svatantram maantravarnikatvad. If you want Atmavad. Vyatirakaena gatavad. There are four words are there in the sutra. Mantravarnikam is that Brahman which has been already mentioned in rg mantra satyam jnanam anantam Brahman. That alone is talked about and not new Brahman. That mantra varnikam Brahman is supposed to give moksa ultimately. If this puccham Brahman is different by knowing this we will not any moksa.

Therefore there should not be different mantra varnikam Brahman alone is mentioned as puccham Brahman. Because of this reason also [four reasons] Brahman is pradhanam or svatantran and it is not paratantram. In the next sutra the topic is slightly different. Until now we said Brahman is svatantram. In the next sutra Anandamaya is not svatantram but paratantram. Because there will be doubt that if you study the Upanishad superficially.

Brahman is presented as part of Anandamaya and Brahman is part and Anandamaya is the whole in which case it is svatantra and Brahman is paratantra because it is a tail of Anandamaya. Now we say Anandamaya is para tantra and Brahman is svatantra. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 47

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.15 [15]**

#### ***Mantravarnikam eva ca giyate***

[Anandamaya is Brahma because] the same [Brahman which has been mentioned in the mantra is mentioned [in the Brahmana.

We see Anandamaya Adhikaranam and we have seen the first four sutras and Vyasacharya has established puccham Brahman is svatantram. In Taittiriya Upanishad Brahman is shown as puccham, Anandamaya is pradhanam and Brahman is apradhanam. Through this Brahma Sutra Vyasacharya has established that Brahman though seen as apradhanam, Brahman svatantram and Vyasacharya has show four reasons in the last four sutras.

The next two sutras we will discuss Anandamaya is not pradhanam and it is apradhanam. This word apradhanam can be said as paratantram. Apradhanam means dependent.

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.16 [16]**

#### ***Na itara anupapatteh***

[Anandamaya] is not the other [viz.the Jivatman] because [thing] do not follow

Here Vyasacharya says Anandamaya cannot be pradhanam in the main topic of Brahmavalli. It is svapradhanam. It cannot be svatantram at all. It is because by seeing the Brahmananda valli Upanishad introduces that Brahma jnanam will give liberation. From this it is clear that Brahman is important for mumukshu and it is important for Brahmananda valli and later that Brahma is introduced satyam jnanam and anantam truth, knowledge and infinity. Anantam means it is not limited at all.

That Brahman is presented as jagat karanam also. It is satyam it is anantam and it is Sarva karnam also. It is repeated three times Brahman is jagat karanam showing its importance. In the last portion also Upanishad concludes emphasizing Brahman. Brahma is the beginning and it is end and it is jagat karanam also.

Vyasacharya says ananda maya is not satyam for it is experiential pleasure, which is subject to change. Anandamaya consist Priya moda etc., and it cannto be satyam. It cannot be infinite also it has got Priya moda avayavam. It is endowed with parts and it has boundary. It has boundary means it not sathyam and it is not anantam.

Whatever has got avayavam comes under karyam only and it will not come under karanam. In seed you cannot branch fruits etc., which is karanam and in tree the karyam you can see everything. Anandamaya is karyam and it has parts it is not ananta, sathyam, it is having parts



and so it is not the main topic of Brahmananda valli. It not pradhanam for it does not fit into it. This is the general analysis.

This sutra consists of three words na itarah anupapatteh. You supply a word svatantrah. Itarah na svatantrah anupapatteh it is. Itarah means the other one, which means Anandamayah. The next word is 'na' svatantrah or na pradhanah. Anandamaya is not the pradhanam or not the central theme of the Brahma valli.

The next word is anupapatteh, which means because it is not fitting, it is not proper it is not logical etc. For Anandamaya it is not fitting or be proper to be the central these of Brahmananda valli. Why it does not deserve to be Brahman. It is not jagat karanam and hence it is moksa hetuh also.

## **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### **Sutra 1.1.17 [17**

**]**

### ***Bheda vyapedesat ca***

and because the difference is pointed out [the Anandamaya is not the Jivatman]

Here Vyasacharya says that we come to know that Brahman is the central these when you make a thorough study. Brahman alone is focused elsewhere also and Brahman pucham Pradista all them you see Brahman alone is given special status. Brahman is also presented as ananda swarupah refer to 2.7.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad *asad va idam agra asit tato vai sad ajayata, tad atmanagm svayam akuruta tasmad tat sukrtam ucyata iti* it is said that in the beginning was verily that Non-existence from that the existent was born. That created itself for itself. Therefore it is called the self-made or the will made. The mantra continues in the second mantra *yad vai tat sukrtam raso vai sah*. That which is self made that is taste or joy. Upanishad as ananda translates the word rasah. It is this portion we will concentrate here. The meaning of the two sentences raso vai saha means Brahman is of the nature of ananda. The next sentence in the same mantra is *rasagm hyvayam lasdhava 'anandi bhavati* having obtained the taste man, because blessed for who can breathe out or breathe in if this joy were not there in the cavity of the heart and this Brahman himself brings us joy.

Ayam anandi bhavati this Anandamaya kosa becomes happy through Priya vritti of moda vritti or pramoda vritti. Anandamaya kosa becomes happy by getting Brahmananda. He gets the ananda vritti by getting Brahman. From this Vyasacharya says that Anandamaya kosa is receiver of Brahma ananda Vyasacharya

Anandamaya kosa and Brahmananda should be different because the receiver is different from the received. Subject and object can never be same. Brahman and Anandamaya are different as the subject and object cannot be the same.

Here Brahman is proved as pradhanam because it is source of moksa. Brahman and Anandamaya are different. Brahman is pradhanam and naturally Anandamaya is apradhanam. Anandamaya is apramadham secondary and subservient because it is different from pradhanam Brahman. Rasam is received and Anandamaya is receiver. Anandamaya is apradhanah. Anandamaya is apradhana for sruti says it is different from pradhanam Brahman. Two words are there. Beda vyapedesat and the other word is ca. Different of ananda maya from pradhanam Brahma binnatvam the difference of Anandamaya from pradhanam Brahman and Anandamaya become sapramadhanam.

Next word is vyapesat, which means sruti vakyad. Suppose Vyasacharya says Anandamaya is not Brahman none would accept. Bed vyapedesat such a sruti statement is there. Adhi Sankaracharya reinterprets all slokas I said. Vrittikara's madham he approved in all eight

sutras and Advaita's interpretation he has done in three sutras and says the rest you do the homework. This job sub commentators have given the comments for the three sutras.

Therefore Anandamaya na pradhanah. Sruti says that is different from Brahman. The next word is ca to connect his with the previous sutra. Both have the same topic that Anandamaya is apradhanam. With this sixth sutra is over.

## **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### **Sutra 1.1.18 [18]**

#### ***Kamat ca na anumapeksa***

and on account of desire [being expressed by anandamaya] no necessity of interring [the pradhana]

The topic here in the next two sutras is Anandamaya is apradhanam. If Anandamaya and Brahman are identical and Anandamaya will become pradhanam if both are one and the same, Vyasacharya says both are different and Anandamaya will become pradhanam. Hence it is said Anandamaya is not Brahman or pradhana.

Here one of purva paksha wants to establish that Anandamaya is Brahman elevating it to the vip status. For that he uses a peculiar logic. Whenever something is controversial at two places and parallels topic if discussed it will become clear. Clear statement occurring elsewhere removes the doubt in another place. If Brahman is Chetanam satt is also Chetanam. If the meaning is vague in one Upanishad, take some other chapter or Upanishad for have clear meaning.

Purva paksha says it is Brahman. Since the definition is not clear, he is ready to take to Brigu vallu. Here kosa Viveka is done there also. After vijñana maya it is said that ananda is introduced as jagat karanam Brahman.

In the sixth valli of Taittiriya III.vi.1 it is said *anando brahmeti vyajanat, anandad dhyeva khalvimani bhutani jayante, anandena jatani jivantie anandena jatani jivanti, anandam prayanti abhisam visantiti* he see another beauty the student take annam as Brahman and then he mistakes prana maya as Brahman, he mistakes anantam as Brahman and he comes back not he does not come back to the teacher.

That is why purva paksha says the student does not come and hence anandam is Brahman. After knowing anandam as Brahman and student does not come back. In Brigu valli the fifth one named ananda clearly reveals Brahman. Here also ananda maya is fifth one.in brigu Valli fifth one represents Brahman. To prove Anandamaya as Brahman he takes an example of the sutram. Now purva paksha says Ananda maya occurring here is Brahman.ananda maya Brahman and it is the fifth item. He qualifies Brahmananda valli through brigu valli. Vyasacharya says that there is other anumanams.

Vyasacharya say that your example is wrong but Brahmananda valli word used is anandamaya and both can never be equated though the words used is coming both. One is endowed with suffix maya. Therefore Anandamaya refers to Nirvikara padarth. How can

Nirvikara ananda is quoted as an example to Savikara ananda maya. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 48

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.18 [18]**

#### ***Kamat ca na anumapeksa***

and on account of desire [being expressed by anandamaya] no necessity of interring [the pradhana]

We see Anandamaya Adhikaranam and the Adhikaranam has got eight sutras and we see the seventh one. The sruti portion taken for discussion is Taittiriya Upasana where Brahman is compared to puccham and the confusion how puccham the tail, a part can become the whole. The word puccham should be taken, as adhistanam of Anandamaya is the argument of siddhanta. It is said pancakosa adhistanam is Brahman it is argued by Vedantins. It is the central these of the Upanishad argued.

Vyasacharya establishes Brahman is svatantram and independent in the first four sutras of Anandamaya. Anandamaya is para tantram and apradhanam is established in the fifth and sixth sutras. In the last two sutras it is established that Anandamaya is not Brahman. The subsidiary Anandamaya and Brahman cannot be equal at any time.

While doing the general analysis we discussed the arguments of purva paksa who said Anandamaya is Brahman. He argued that Brahmananda valli with brigu valli the third chapter of Taittiriya Upanishad. In both chapters Pancakosa Viveka is done. Therefore we have an advantage if there is vagueness in one chapter the vagueness can be rectified by a clear statement elsewhere.

When we take Brahmananda valli the fifth one is Anandamaya. Whether the fifth one Anandamaya is Brahman or not we are not able to decide and purva paksa suggests to go to Birgu valli to decide whether it is Brahman or not.

There is no room for doubt because Anandah Brahman comes after vijnana maya. Purva paksa in Brahmananda valli argues that Anandamaya mentioned in in Brahmananda valli should be necessarily be Brahman only. This is the purva paksa argument and Vyasacharya gives answer in the present sutra.

Here in the sutra he says such an inference should not be done. Vyasacharya says such an anumanam there is no scope and no room for purva paksa's argument that brigu valli ananda be taken as an example to prove that Anandamaya is Brahman Vyasacharya does not say that purva paksa should not do such inference being that is wrong. Vyasacharya does not say why such inference is wrong nor does he give any reason. It is our homework

Fours are there kamata, ca, na and anumana apeksa is the fourth word. Anumana apeksat consists of two words. Anumana means the inference made by purva paksa, which

Vyasacharya quotes. The anumanam is Anandamaya is Brahman mentioned in Birgu valli. Apeksha means scope the possibility to take such an anumanam.

For doing such anumanam is indicated in the first word kamatah, which means anandah. That which is desired by all is kamatah and it otherwise means Birgu valli ca anandah. This ananda is used as an example and word kamatah means Birgu valli ca ananda Dristanta.

The next word is na which means should not be done. Or it is nonexistent or not there. The final meaning kanad na anumana apeksha there is no possibility of purva paksha inference by taking Birgu valli ananda as an example. For our understanding we can say that purva paksha anumanam is wrong. Purva paksha anumanam is Anandamaya is Brahman. There is another word ca, which I will discuss later.

Vyasacharya does not say the purva paksha inference is wrong. Ananda of Birgu valli and Brahmananda valli represent fifth kosa of panca kosa. That both come after vijnana maya we do not question. Because it comes after vijnana maya is sufficient reason to equate the both Anandamaya of Brahmananda valli and Anandamaya of Birgu valli and the example is wrong example. The reason why they cannot be equated is said in one place it is said ananda and in other place it is said Anandamaya. The very words are different.

The siddhanti tells that they are different from the very name when the one is with suffix and the other without suffix. This suffix shows the difference. When maya comes it indicates sa vikaram. Maya sabdah vikaraha. It is Anandamaya is Savikara padartha. We know happiness never remains the same either it increases or decreases. Therefore the word Anandamaya indicates it is Savikara padartha and ananda in birgu valli is Nirvikara Chaitanyam.

Ananda is Nirvikara padartha. Here ananda refers to Consciousness and not experiential pleasure whether it is ordinary or mystic pleasure. Mystical pleasures experienced by persons in Samadhi. It is available only when in Samadhi state and not at all times. Consciousness is universally present and if ananda is Consciousness and how can we use the word ananda to show the Consciousness.

Ananda is state of mind and how can Consciousness be ananda is their argument. Consciousness is not subject to arrival and departure. For that Swamiji gives an answer. The word ananda whenever it is equated to atma or Brahman should be translated differently. The normal translation is joy, happiness pleasure ecstasy, bliss etc.

In this context never translate ananda like that for it is anantam. In English it is wholeness, fullness or infinitude. It is so because when ananda is equated to Brahman, it refers to non-fluctuating entity. When you use the word ecstasy it is fluctuating one and no one is eternally bliss. Sachidananda is wrongly translated as existence, awareness, and bliss.

While existence and awareness are non-fluctuating principle, the bliss is fluctuating one and it is not eternal. Not only we make that mistake and we try to go to Samadhi and experience Brahman in the form of bliss. Once it is bliss, you have to work for it but when you take it as infinite you need not work for it because infinite is here and now. Ananda as bliss is sadhyam and ananda as bliss is siddham. In Brahma valli Anandamaya is happiness and birgu valli anandam is wholeness or purna vastu. One is Savikaram and another is nirvikaram. Two we give a counter anumanam. Anandamaya na Brahma savikaratvad like annamayavad or prana mayavad or manovayavad or vijnana mayavad.

Now we go to cakara. This sutra is interpreted differently also to convey totally different idea. For this we go back to the previous iksati Adhikaranam remembering the subject matter also. In iksati Adhikaranam it was discussed satt was Achetanam or Chetanam Brahma. Upanishad took satt vastu is jagat karanam. The controversy was whether satt was Achetanam pradhanam or Chetanam Brahman. We concluded that satt vastu is Brahman alone not Achetanam pradhanam.

Pradhanam is technical word to equate with Prakriti, which is a matter principle. Satt is matter according to Samkya and satt is the Consciousness is the cause of the universe. Satt is Chetanam Brahman we gave the reason iksateh. Upanishad talks about visualization before creation. Our argument visualization is possible for Chetana vastu and not possible for Achetana vastu.

Satt sabda vastu is not inert pradhanam and visualization is possible by Chetana vastu and not Achetanam Brahman. This sutra is to be connected to the previous Adhikaranam in the previous Adhikaranam. Satt vastu is not pradhanam for various given. This present sutra should be taken as eighth reason for this. Desiring or kamanaca is the reason., the satt vastu creates the world for visualization. He says that satt vastu is taken after creating the world. It is found in Taittiriya upanisad *so kamanamaya* portion of the Upanishad.

Without universe punya papa of jiva cannot be cleared without universe and in order to reduce the burden Isvara wanted to create the world and so we say satt vastu desired. Desiring is possible for Chetana Brahman and not by Achetana pradhanam. This is the meaning of this sutra.

Kama is here interpreted as desire. Because of the presence of desire, jagat karanam is taken as the jagat vastu. Pradhanam is called anumanam. Anumanam in certain context means pradhanam or matter in Samkya philosophy.

Samkya philosophers establish pradhanam only through inference. I will elaborate this latter. Anumana apeksa means there is no possibility. Satt sabda vakyam na anumanam or na pradhanam because it has got desire. The ca adds this aspect to Iksateh Adhikaranam for the sake of conjunction to the previous Adhikaranam. Therefore Anandamaya is not Brahman. Now we will take the last sutra.

## **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

### **Sutra 1.1.19 [19]**

#### ***Asmin asya ca tadyogah sast***

besides, within this [Anandamaya, the union of this [individual soul] is taught.

It also talks about the same that Anandamaya is not Brahman. I will give a general analysis. Anandamaya is also resolved into Brahman by knowledge. It is so because the aim of Upanishad that it wants to reveal Brahman and it as Advaita Brahman. The reason is that as long as Dvaidam there is fear there is limitation there is mortality and there is samsara and in Advaidm alone there is moksa and it reveals Brahman and after revealing Brahman it resolves the whole creation into Brahman.

Once you resolve everything into Brahman there is only Brahman into everything. Ultimately Anandamaya is also resolved into Brahman and if it is resolved into Brahman indicates that Anandamaya is resolved and Brahma is resolved and how can both be one and the same and be identical. Hence it is different from Brahman. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 49

### **Topic 6 – Sutras 12-19 [Anandamayadhikaranam]**

Anandamaya is Para Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.19 [19]**

#### ***Asmin asya ca tadyogah sast***

besides, within this [Anandamaya, the union of this [individual soul] is taught.

We see the last sutra of Anandamaya Adhikaranam. Here it is established that Anandamaya is not Brahman. It is savikarm because of the suffix of maya to ananda which is nirvikaram Brahman. I will continue the general analysis of this sutra, which I commenced in my last class.

Taittiriya Upanishad mantra II.vii.3 reads as *yada byevaisa etasminn-adrsye-‘natmye anirukte-‘nilayane-‘bhayam pratistham vindate atha so-‘bhayam gato bhavati* that says when atman attains the fearless oneness with Brahman who is invisible, incorporeal, inexplicable, and unsupported, and then he becomes free from fear. The jnani resolves the whole universe in Brahman and Advaidam Nirgunam Brahman alone remains. The resolution of world we don't talk about physical resolution, which we cannot do it but it only by understands.

By knowing the clay, which is the essence of the pot, I know that there is no substance called pot and pot is only a namarupa and it has only nominal or verbal existence and it does not have substantial existence.

This negation of substantial existence of pot is called dissolution of the pot, we come to know there is no pot but it is clay. In the same, the resolution of the world is nothing but the understanding that there is no substantiality in the world and it is nothing but Brahman, which is its adhistanam. World has got only verbal existence, if this whole world is resolved, the reminder Brahman will be formless, property-less support-less, invisible, incorporeal, inexplicable, unsupported Brahma alone will be left out. He will gain nirbhayatvam because there is not second thing to frighten him.

On the other hand if a person accept even the slightest difference in the form of port whole difference, it will the cause for bhayam or fear. There should be no world difference from me and even the god difference from me. I, between the world and god there is no difference and the feeling of oneness alone will help one to gain liberation.

Upanishad talks about panca kosa dissolution and in that context Upanishad talks about Anandamaya dissolution also which is relevant for us. Anandamaya also dissolved into Brahman. The idea is Anandamaya is dissolved into Brahman means Anandamaya is dissolved and Brahma is dissolver and therefore dissolved has to be different from locus of dissolution. Anandamaya is different from Brahman in which Anandamaya is it is dissolved. So Anandamaya is not Brahman because it is dissolved into Brahman and this is the essence of this sutra.

In this sutra five words are there such as asmin, asya, ca, tadyogom, sasti. Asmin means asmin prakarane. Asmin is equal to what is said in Brahmananda valli. Anandamaya, which we discuss, is Brahmananda valli is the meaning of asmin. Asya means of Anandamaya. Ca means also that not only anna maya prana maya Anandamaya also; tadyogam means Brahma layah or atma layah or dissolution.



Yogam means layah or dissolution. Sasti means teaches here we have to take that the Upanishad teaches. In this chapter itself Upanishad teaches the dissolution of Brahman. The dissolution of Anandamaya in Brahman is taught in this sutra. The idea to be arrived is since Anandamaya dissolution in Brahman, Anandamaya and Brahman are different. Anandamaya is like sugar and another is coffee. Sugar dissolved into coffee to make it sweet. Brahman is pradhanam and Anandamaya is apramanam. Brahman is primary and Anandamaya is secondary. Primary Brahman is different from from Anandamaya.

In this Adhikaranam the topic is Brahman, which started in the first sutra. Brahma is to be known; Brahman is jagat karanam; Brahman known only through sastra; Brahman is the central theme of the Upanishad. In the fifth Adhikaranam Upanishad did not use the word Brahman and used the name satt and we have to clarify that satt is nothing but Brahman. In the sixth Adhikaranam the Upanishad uses the word Brahman but it says Brahman is the tail of Anandamaya and there is room for confusion. Then it is said that tail is unimportant and therefore Brahman seems to be secondary being puccham and it was confirmed primary even though the word puccham is used.

The word puccham does not have the meaning of tail. Puccham means support of visvadharam. The tail of the bird is very important to support it to fly. So also Brahman supports all the living creatures it is argued. Don't extend the example too much and don't ask Brahman has a tail etc. Brahman is tail and tail supports and Brahman supports are the Tatparyam of the sutra. Finally I will put the whole Adhikaranam in technical format.

Puccham Brahman occurring in Tatitriya Upanishad is the subject matter of this Adhikaranam; the doubt is whether puccham Brahman is svatantram primary or paratantram or apradhanam secondary. Next purva paksa the view of the opponent whoever does not accept Vedanta is discussed. It can be anyone who opposes Vedanta is called purva paksa. His view is ever wrong. He says puccham Brahma is paratantram and it is secondary. This is the third factor. The conclusion of Vedantins is that puccham Brahman is svatantram.

Sarva adharatvad vyatirekena annamayavad unlike Annamaya puccham is Sarva adharam. In four statements we crystallize our thinking. To be precise puccham Brahman is the topic and our view it is primary. Purva paksa says it is secondary. We take the view because Brahman is pradhanam. Why this occurs in Brahma Sutra and why it is in first sutram and why it is occurs in the first pada and why it occurs after iksatet Adhikaranam. With this Anandamaya Adhikaranam is over. Now we will enter the seventh Adhikaranam.

## **Topic 7 – Sutras 20-21 [Antaradhikaranam]**

The being or person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.1.20 [20]**

#### ***Antah taddharma upadesad***

the being within [sun and the eye] is Brahman because His attributes are taught therein

This is a small Adhikaranam consisting of two sutras. Since the first sutra begins with antah, it is called antar Adhikaranam. The sruti vakyam, which is analysed in the Adhikaranam, or the visaya vakyam is Chandogya Upanishad 1.6.6. The subject matter here is Sagunam Brahma Upasanam. We can also say Isvara Upasanam. This Sagunam Brahma or Isvara is meditated upon two different locuses. One is called Adhideivata Upasana wherein locus is external and the other is adhyatma where locus is internal. Since we talk about Sagunam Brahman wherein Brahman is endowed with attributes and it is Nirgunam Brahman. Seven important attributes of Isvara are talk about about. Isvara is not having negative attributes but

Isvara has all seven positive attributes. Seven attributes in adhidevata and adhyatma Upasana each we will discuss here.

Seven attributes of adhidevatma Upasana is Adhitya Purusatvam Isvara as located in the sun's orb or solar disc. Upon the Adhitya Mandalam we have to imagine Isvara located in the sun.

Second is Hiranmayatvam and he is golden coloured. His skin shines like gold. Bhagavan has got eternally golden skin.

Third is pundarikaksatvam or kamala nayanatvam that is lotus eyed Lord. The peal of the fully flowered lotus flower and Isvara has got the eyes like the lotus flower.

Fourth feature we will see in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**  
Class 50

**Topic 7 – Sutras 20-21 [Antarathikaranam]**

The being or person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

**Sutra 1.1.20 [20]**

***Antah taddharma upadesad***

the being within [sun and the eye] is Brahman because His attributes are taught therein

Seven attributes of Adhidevatma Upasana are Adhitya Purusatvam as below.

First is Isvara as located in the sun's orb or solar disc. Upon the Adhitya Mandalam we have to imagine Isvara located in the sun.

Second is Hiranmayatvam and he is golden coloured. His skin shines like gold. Even the hair is supposed to be the golden coloured. Bhagavan has got eternally golden skin.

Third is Pundarikaksatvam or kamala nayanatvam that is lotus eyed Lord. The peal of the fully flowered lotus flower and Isvara has got the eyes like the lotus flower.

The fourth guna of Isvara is oordhatvatvam. Isvara is the lord of higher lokas and the objects therein. Not only he rules the higher lokas the lord can give those pleasures. That is why he is called kamesvarah. He can give pleasures by Sankalpa matrena.

The fifth virtue is Sarva papa Rahitatvam. He is free from all the papas. Chandogya gives a special name for that and that is 'udh' which means 'beyond' and he is beyond all the papams.

The sixth virtue is sarvagatmam and the lord alone is in the form of everything. He is visva rupah and virad rupah etc. The Vedas are the limbs of the Lord and the whole creation the sabda, Artha, vak Prapancha are the limbs of the Lord.

The seventh and final virtue mentioned here Sarva vibhudhimatvam that all the glories of the creation belong to the Lord only. Wherever glory is there that belongs to the Lord only. In Gita 7.21 and 7.22 it is said *yo-yo yam-yam tanum bhakiah sraddaya rcitum icehati Tasya-tasya 'calam sraddham tam eva vidadhamy aham sa taya sraddhaya yaktas Tasya 'radhanam ihate labhate ca tatah Kaman mayai 'va vihitan hi tan* whichever deity you worship only one lord alone you actually pray one Isvara only. All the glories go to the Isvara lone.

Similarly we have seven glories on adhyatma level also

First is aksi Purusatvam that means the Lord is not seen outside but is seen or imagined to be present in our own eyes.

Second virtue is hiranmayatvam seen as before is golden coloured.

The third one pundarikatsatvam is same as before

The fourth virtue is adholoka kama Isvaratvam. One who is the lord of lower lokas as well as the sense pleasures there? Here percentage of pain will be more and the percentage of pleasure will become less and less.

The fifth, sixth and seventh are the same as before.

We will do an analysis of the above now. We come to know that Brahma Sutra is not confined to Nirgunam Brahma alone and it analyses Sagunam Brahma as well. We should be careful to assess which Brahman is talked about in the context in which the name of Brahman is indicated. Neyam Brahma is Nirgunam Brahman and upasyam Brahma is Sagunam Brahman is discussed.

Why should we discuss the topic and we should know why this debate is taken up. The controversy is because that Upanishad does not say Sagunam or Nirgunam Brahma is not used and the Upanishad uses the word Purusa only. In adhyatma Upasana akshi antha Purusah is used. In adhideiva upasana the word used is adhithya antha Purusah. If the word Brahman is used there would have been no controversy. The word Purusah can also refer to jivah also. The word Purusah can be used for Brahman or Isvarah also.

Therefore the controversy is whether Purusah refers to Isvara or Jiva. Our conclusion is Purusa sabdah refers to only lord and Lord alone is the object of meditation or object of worship. Therefore the topic is antha Purusah whether it is Isvara or Jivah and our conclusion is Isvara only. Akshi antha as well as adhi antha Purusa refer to Isvara only. All the virtues mentioned in this section belong to Isvara only. Jiva does not have any of the glories mentioned here. Anthah Purusah Isvarah. Isvara guna gathanad eva. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

This sutra consists of two words first one is antah and the other is *taddharmaupadesad*. *Antah* means *adhithya aksi anta Purusah*. Literally the word *antah* means inside one; in other wards it means antar adhithya Purusah. The two Purusas are referred to *anthah*. Before that we supply one word that is Isvara or Sagunam Brahman and it is na jivah. It is not jiva. The next word is *tad dharmopesad*.

Tad means Isvarah and dharmah means virtues and it means the divine virtues are mentioned in the Upanishad. Now what are the divine attributes applicable to Isvara and what to Jiva. Sarva papa Rahitvatvam freedom from all sins is attributable to Isvara only. Jivah is in fact is embodiment of all papams.

Adhitya Purusah aksi Purusah both refer to Isvara. Aksipurusah may refer to ordinary jivah and exalted jivah may be Adhitya Purusah the status gained by extraordinary punya karma. All the devatas are jivah only belonging to higher category.

A purva paksa asks why not take Adhitya Purusa as exalted jivah a person who has gained that status due to exalted punyams. Our answer is that you see the Upanishad once again and Upanishad says sarvepyah papyayah udayah and it is Sarva papa Rahitvatvam that means here we talk about Purusa who is absolutely free from all papas.

Adithya Purusa may be exalted devata and he may have better punyam and even that devata has got a mixture of punya and papa and he has got dukha and sukha and papa. Even

Hiranyagarbha has got one percent papam and if he is fully free of papa he would have been a liberated soul and he is also subject to birth and death.

Adithya devata is only an exalted jivah and Isvara is free from all the papams. Isvara is sarvatmahah and he is free of the whole creation and Isvara is jagat karanam and jagat karana rupa is Sarva jagat Rupena Isvarah eva varthate and no Isvara can claim sarvatmakatvam. The very fact the pujas are different and vahanas are different shows they are equal to Isvara.

Third virtue is Sarva vibhudiattvam. No devata can claim all the vibdhuti. But no jivah and devata have got all the mahimas or glories as Isvara has. It is a symbol or clue to show that my very living depends on his grace and Isvara alone make me live and me enjoy life. It is Isvara Mahima only. This is the meaning of the sutra.

One purva paksha raises an objection and he says he cannot accept adithya and aksi Purusa as Isvara and it has got to be a devata only and not Isvara. When you talk of virtue you take only the last three virtues, which are convenient to you. You don't talk about other four virtues, which they cannot belong to Isvara.

First one is adithya Purusatvam and aksi Purusatvam. Upanishad clearly gives a location. Adithya va aksi va. Purva paksha says location is limitation. When you say location it means that he does not stay elsewhere. It is not sarvagathah.

If Purusah refers to Isvara and Isvara also become limited one and located one applies to jivah alone and not to Isvara. Location suits only jivah. Second virtue is hiranmayatvam. Upanishad clearly talks about body, and hiranmayatvam etc. It clearly indicates sariram and finitude. Isvara is all pervading and he is to be all pervading.

In this regard refer to Gita sloka 7.4 that reads as *maya tatam idam Sarvam jagad avyaktamurtina matsthani sarvabhutani na ca ham tesv avasthitah* that read as by me all the universe is pervaded through my unmanifested form. All beings abide in me but I do not abide in them.

Isvarah is all pervading and the one having organs is to be limited; to have colour is to be limited; to have complexion supports me; and the other one adho loka kama two distinct Purusas have been talked about and each one has got limited area in power.

Adithya Purusa is lord of higher slokas and aksi Purusa is lord of lower lokas. But Isvara is Sarva loka kama and is omnipotent and he cannot refer to Isvara. Therefore limited power indicates jivah or devata. Now siddhanti will give an answer, which we will see in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**  
**Class 51**

**Topic 7 – Sutras 20-21 [Antarathikaranam]**

The being or person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

**Sutra 1.1.20 [20]**

***Antah taddharma upaadesad***

the being within [sun and the eye] is Brahman because His attributes are taught therein

We are in the 20<sup>th</sup> sutra, which happens to be in the antar Adhikaranam regarding the word occurring in Chandogya Upanishad in adhideiva Upasana, and adhyatma aksi Purusa. Our enquiry is whether it refers to Sagunam Brahma or Isvara. In this Adhikaranam nirgunam Brahman is not taken for discussion. Brahma Sutra discusses both nirgunam Brahman and sagunam Brahman. Our controversy is due to the fact Purusa refers in some cases jivah also. Antah and we have to supply the word Sagunam Brahman. That of all the virtues three of them belongs to Isvara. The purva paksha here raises an objection. He says when we talk about virtues we talk only about the three and always talk of the last three virtues. If the first four virtues are taken, they indicate limitations only. The first one relates to adharavatvam and it refers to location indirectly indicating the limitation. To be located in one place is to be absent in other places; the very sutra the word anthah is used and locate within is negate the locus outside.

The second virtue is that Purusa has got hiranmayatvam. This gives colour to Isvara and giving the colour etc. Also denies other attributes to Purusa. Then next is pundarikatsam and this is rupavatvam of Isvara. Isvara has got form and Purusa with form must be limited. The next is adhideiva Purusa is ruler of lower and higher worlds. His sovereignty has got limitation and it is aisvarya maryadha. There is limitation to his power. Adithya Purusa and aksi Purusa with limited powers have been here indicated and argued they cannot be Isvara but only jivah. Such Isvara is limited one and when Purusa is not Isvara, he should be manusya rupa jivah or devata rupa jivah and manusya as also devata has got limitation.

For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer. He says it is true. Isvara cannot have and does not have any limitation. He does not have a location, form limited power also true. But at the same time he can have all the three for the sake of Upasana of the upasaka. This is called upasanartham. The limited cannot be conceived by individual upasaka and for the same of Upasana sastra can prescribe varieties of colours, locations and forms for the sake of Upasanartham. They are not factual and are prescribed for Upasana only.

**Even though Isvara does not have particular location etc., because of maya Isvara can assume particular form and particular colour, which is known as avataram. It is imagination of devotee and he can imagine and in addition to that for the sake of devotee he can assume the form. If with the help of maya Isvara can create the whole world and what is the difficulty for him to become or take form for the purpose of his devotee with all the forms, colours etc.**

I this regard Gita sloka 4.6 reads as *ajo'pi san avyayatma bhutanam isvaro'pisan prakrtim svam adhisthaya sambhavamy atmayaya* the meaning of this sloka is though [I am] unborn, and My self [is] imperishable though [I am] the lord of all creatures, yet establishing Myself in My own nature, I came into [empiric] being through my power of [Maya] but on the other hand the embodiments of human beings are not voluntary. Driven by prakrti through ignorance they are born again and again.

Some appearances are for samasti for the society and some are for the individual devotee and He gives darsanam to grace and bless them. All the seven virtues are possible for Isvara. If you take jiva you can explain only first four virtues and if you take Isvara you can explain all the virtues taking into account that Isvara takes the various forms and colours to bless His devotees which Isvara can do always with maya.

When Isvara can create the entire universe with his maya powers why cannot he appear in various forms to bless those whom he Himself has created. This is the argument of Adhi Sankaracharya to negate the views of the purva paksa. The last three virtues are innate virtues while the first four are acquired virtues of Isvara to bless and grace jivas.

### **Topic 7 – Sutras 20-21 [Antarathikaranam]**

The being or person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.21 [21]**

#### ***Beda vypadesat ca anyah***

on account of the distinction being mentioned [the person who appears on the sun is another [from the individual should residing in the body of the sun]

**Before going to sutra in detail I will give some general observation. This we should remember throughout the study of Brahma Sutra as also the Vedanta. The observation is regarding is our approach to Isvara and how does Advaidins approach Isvara. Their approach appears contradictory and it is necessary we should know the reality. Our approach is one from paramarthika the absolute standpoint is than Nirgunam Brahman everything else is mithya. Jiva mithya jagat mithya and even Isvara is mithya. Mithya karana boothah. Advaidins negate Isvara also along with jiva and jagrat. From paramarthika Dristi, even Isvara is mithya.**

In Advaida Maharanta one author rightly says *upasanta-jagat-jiva-sisya-acharyesvara-bramam svatah siddham-anadyantam paripurnam-aham-mahah*, the author of this sloka declares that effulgent Consciousness am I, which is self established, all full without beginning and end and in which the illusory ideas of the worlds, the individual, the disciple, the teacher and Isvara are all extinct. There are five confusions. They are jagat, jiva, sishya, Acharya, jiva all the five are bramams [confusions or delusions] and he establishes that from paramarthika svarupam from the standpoint of paramarthika Dristi the real nature of jivah as also Isvara are one and the same and therefore jiva Isvara aikyam is established. When Advaidins comes to vyavaharika Dristi he is particular to establish Isvara. And that means there is jiva vyavaharika dristy there is jagat from vyavaharika drisy and Isvara also is there from vyavaharika drishya. Isvara is karana Tattvam and jiva and jagat are karya Tattvam. He also establishes that each one is different from the other. Jiva` is different jagat and jiva is different Isvara. Isvara is different from jiva and Isvara is different from jagat. Advaidins very clearly establish the different between jivah, Isvara and jagat. The existence as also his

difference from Isvara is underlined by Advaidins. In Brahma Sutra we get both of them in equal numbers. Both vyavaharika as also paramarthika Dristi are discussed. We should be careful to note what is exactly meant in each place.

Here Purusa is the topic is discussed. We want to find whether Purusa refers to jiva or jiva refers to Isvara. When jiva and Isvara are identical we will not find any difference and the controversy will not be there. You see difference only when you note that jiva and Isvara are identical from the vyavaharika level. Several such occasions we come across in Brahma Sutra. Of the purva paksha happens to be sankya who is a person negating Isvara. If sankya negates from paramarthika dristya we will appreciate because we also negate from paramarthika Dristi. The problem is that sankya negate Isvara jagat karana bootha from vyavaharika drist also.

Vedantins says from vyavaharika Dristi Isvara is there and they in turn negate vyavaharika Isvara. When we negate sankya philosophy we are in vyavaharika level. Isvara is existent and Isvara is different from jiva that is the view of Advaidin. Isvara is Sarva papa rahitaha and jiva is Sarva papa sahitah. This particular sutra [21] says Isvara is different from jiva, our sruti pramanam to establish that jiva is different from jiva. From this we get a corollary that our attitude to Isvara should not be casual which may happen to Vedantic student.

Consistently we negate Isvara from Paramarthika angle. We call it mithya. Mithya is divided into Prathibasika and vyavaharika mithya. Prathibasika is imaginary or mental projection. At the same time vyavaharika mithya has gone some reality from empirical angle and it is not like imaginary projection. So also Isvara is also one like vyavaharika mithya and it is like Prathibasika mithya or it is not a mental projection like swapna. Isvara is as much real as world. You take any object of the world which is dearest to you a thing, a being or a situation and mentally imagine you lose that thing and then look at it as real one and important to me and you attach that thing to Isvara and attach so much important to that object and you should give the same important to Isvara.

As I cannot brush aside my relations etc., so also you will not be ready to lose Isvara also. If I ask you whether you are ready to lose your knowledge, you will say I am ready to lose anything except the knowledge. But from Brahma Dristi, knowledge is also mithya because it is enjoyed by the mind and when the mind is mithya how can the knowledge be real. As you respect mithya jnanam so much respect you should already be ready to give to Isvara also. If that mithya knowledge is to come from Isvara, you should have mithya grace of mithya Isvara to gain and retain the mithya knowledge. For attending the classes of the mithya knowledge and to gain mithya knowledge from the mithya classes, you require mithya grace from mithya Isvara to gain knowledge also.

If the grace of mithya Isvara is not there to gain mithya knowledge, Isvara may give you ever so many obstacles to gain the knowledge. That is why, it is better to surrender to Isvara and don't take Isvara as casual and it is therefore in Advaidam, Isvara is very important for gaining jnanam, jnana ishta from pratibanda Dristi. As this Isvara is negated by sankya, even Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya both canvass for Isvara who is distinct from Jiva and who bless jiva to gain jnanam and this vyavaharika Isvara helps us to study and gain the knowledge of that Paramarthika Brahman. When many people read Brahma Sutra and Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam on this sutra, people get confused as why and how Adhi Sankaracharya himself is confused and he advocates beda between Isvara and jiva.



Here we should remember Adhi Sankaracharya is not at all confused but he is very clear about the concept of Isvara and he favours beda in some classes and advocates abeda in some other places based on the context. When purva paksa is yoga, Nyaya, vishistadvaida or Dvaida, he establishes abeda and when purva paksa is carvaka, bouddha etc, he will advocate beda and establish Isvara from the Vyavaharika angle.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**  
**Class 52**

**Topic 7 – Sutras 20-21 [Antaradhikaranam]**

The being or person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

**Sutra 1.1.21 [21]**

***Beda vypadesat ca anyah***

on account of the distinction being mentioned [the person who appears on the sun is another [from the individual should residing in the body of the sun]

We see the 21<sup>st</sup> sutra the second sutra of antaradhikaranam where Isvara or Sagunam Brahman is being enquired. The sruti vakyam adhithya and aksi anta prusah is being analysed and we come to the conclusion that both refer to Isvara only. When we deal with Isvara we are at vyavaharika level and we don't discuss Paramarthika Nirgunam Brahman. Through this Adhikaranam Vedanta establish that there is Vyavaharika Isvara in addition to vyavaharika jagat and vyavaharika jivah. It is accepted because Samkya and other philosophers don't accept Isvara at all.

Therefore it is necessary for Vyasacharya to establish vyavaharika Isvara that this adhikaranam shows that vyavaharika Isvara is different from vyavaharika jivah. Vyavaharika jiva and vyavaharika Isvara is equated then there will not be the third entity. It for this reason the distinction is made and therefore we establish jiva, Isvara beda through sruti pramanam. When we establish this difference, one should not feel that we are against jiva Isvara abeda. Nor do we contradict ourselves.

Whenever we establish beda the context is Upasana and whenever we talk of abeda it is from Paramarthika Dristi and the context is jnanam. Vyavaharika dristya jiva Isvara bedah and in the context of Paramarthika jiva Isvara abedah. There is not contradiction and we establish that wave and ocean are one and the same and at the same we also establish wave is karyam and ocean is karanam while at the same time we vehemently establish that wave and ocean are one. The essential identity of wave and ocean from the standpoint of water we know very well.

We are sane when we say both the statements. When we talk of beda, it is vyavaharika Dristi and the context is Upasana. But from Paramarthika Dristi we talk of jnanam and we talk of jivah Isvara abedah. There is not contradiction. This Adhikaranam is from vyavaharika angle and we advocate Sagunam Brahman. Adhitya devah refers to jivah and purusah refers to Sarvagatha jivah who is located in Adhitya also. Jivah is in Adhitya and Isvara is also in the Adhitya.

The sruti statement occurs in Brihadaranyaka upanisad 3.7.9 that reads as *ya aditye tisthann adityad antarah, yam adityo na veda, yasyadityah sariram, ya aditayam antaro yamayati, esa ta atmantryamy amrtah* which means 'He who dwells in the sun, yet is within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body the sun is, who controls the sun from within, he is your self, the inner controller, the immortal. This Brahmanam is well known Antaryami

Brahmanam. Here Isvara is introduced or presented as Antaryami and the Antaryami who is the inner controller present everywhere.

In this entire Brahmana, the Antaryami Isvara is present everywhere and one of the places mentioned that Antaryami Isvara is present in Surya Mandalam also. Antaryami remains in Surya Mandala. 'Yam Adhitya na beda' is the relevant portion we should note. Here means Adhitya or the sun does not know Antaryami. Here when Upanishad says Adhitya does not know Antaryami what is meaning of the word Adhitya. It does not refer to inert solar disc because it does not know anything and there is no meaning.

Only if we can know something, then only we can say we know or we do not know something. Only Chetana vastu can know something of not know something. Here sun does not know Antaryami means it refers to Adithya Devata, who is Chetanam. Here, Adithya devata not knowing Antaryami means that what we derive is that Antaryami is different from Adhitya devata. Therefore in the Adhitya itself there are two things, one Adhitya devata and the Antaryami Isvara both are there.

Therefore Adhitya has got two Chetana Tattvams one is jivah and the other is Antaryami, which called Isvarah. Upanishad says that Adhitya devata does not know Isvara indicating that Adhitya devata is different from Isvara. Since two are there the word can either refer to Purusa or Adithya devata. Word purusa here refers to Antaryami alone an Antaryami, which is different from devata, which devata does not know and that Antaryami alone is referred to by the word purusah.

The three extraordinary glories mentioned belong to Antaryami Isvara only and not to the jivah. Adhitya purusa mentioned in 1.6.6 of Chandogya is different from Adhitya devata mentioned in Brahadharaynaka upanisad 3.5.7. The difference is mentioned in this Upanishad because of the statement of difference between adithya devata and Antaryami purusah. The anumana vakyam is adithya aksi purusah is the paksa mentioned in Chandogya 1.6.6. And 1.6.5 is Isvarah the Sagunam Brahman or upasyam Brahma. This refers to the difference mentioned in 3.7.9 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad. In fact the word anyah is given and we have to supply the word adithya devatah anyah Isvarah. It is not referring to devata but to Isvara different to devata. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we will take the word-to-word meaning. Beda means difference; the difference between adithya devatga and Antaryami. Word vyapadesat means because of the statement. Because of the statement of difference mentioned between adithya devata and adithya Antaryami and we supply the statement occurring in Brahadharaynaka upanisad 3.7.9 of Antaryami Brahmanam.

The next word is ca is the conjunction, which joins this sutra with the previous sutra. Previous sutra gives the reason tad dharmopesad we give an additional reason also. The third word is anyah which means different. Different means what is different from what; adithya Antaryami Isvara the Isvara residing in adithya is different from adithya devata.

This is the meaning of the sutra. The final meaning is that Isvara who is located in the solar disc is different from the adithya devata because the sruti differentiate this Isvara from adithya devata. When we worship the deity the sun are we worshipping devata or maya sahitam Brahman, this is question. A doubt may arise. Siddhanta says that we don't worship

the sun the presiding deity of the sun but Isvara who is the controller of all the presiding deities.

Why we don't worship the adithya devata to have good eyesight. Our answer when we worship adithya devata it will protect only the eyes and when you worship Antaryami Isvara since he is lord of all presiding deities that will take care of all our sense organs. In the same way when you worship Saraswathi, you get the blessing so the controller of all deities and not only Saraswathi. In fact all our worship and all our pujas are directed to one Antaryami Isvara alone. With this antaradhikaranam is over.

We will now sum up the sutra in the formal format. The subject matter of this Adhikaranam is adithya aksi purusha mentioned in 1.6.6. Of Chandogya Upanishad. In adithya aksi purusha the controversy is whether it is jivah, jiva or devata. Devata comes under exalted jiva category. Purva paksha claims that adithya purusha is jiva or devata only. The reason is it has got limitation. It means because it is located in the sun and eye and it has got colour and it has got organs like pundarikaksah etc, and it has limited lower of ruling lower or higher loka. Siddantah conclusion is purusha refers to Sagunam Brahman alone.

It is different from jiva; jagat and devata the reason being the virtues of total purity and absolute glory etc. Can belong to Isvara alone not to any other one. All the limitations mentioned are for the sake of Upasana or they should be taken as the limited manifestation of the Limitless Lord to bless the limited jivas. Either I imagine a limited god for my benefit and it for my benefit or lord comes to me to bless me and both are possible and the lord has got assuming maya sakti and we have also have got imaginary power. Our conclusion is purusha Isvarah only.

Either I imagine for my benefit and it is my projection or Isvara comes to me to bless me. Both are possible. We have imaginary power while god has got assuming power of maya sakti. By this we directly address Samkya philosopher that we should accept jivah and jagat for vyavaharika Dristi. This is the seventh Adhikaranam and it has come after six and before eight and the establishing the appropriate job is the job of the commentators.

## **Topic 8 [Akasadhikaranam]**

The word Akasa must be understood as Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.1.22 [22]**

#### ***Akasah; tat – lingat***

on account of signs on account of the characteristic marks [of Brahman being mentioned] the Akasa [in Brahman]

Akasastalligat – the word Akasa i.e., ether here is Brahman on account of the characteristic marks [of that i.e., Brahman being mentioned] tad; his, of Brahman ligat; because of characteristic mark; the Akasa referred to here is of Akasa mentioned in mantra 1.9.1 of Chandogya upanisad. *Asta kijasya ka gatih ity Akasa iti hovaca, Sarvani ha vaimani bhutany akasad eva samutpadyante akasam pratyastam yanty akaso hy evaibhyo jyayan akasah parayanam* which means what is the goal of this world? He replied 'space for all these creatures are produced from space' they return back into the space; for space is greater than these' space is the final goal.

This is the 22<sup>nd</sup> sutra and it is the eight Adhikaranam or topic and it is a small Adhikaranam consisting of only one sutra. It is called akasadhikaranam because it starts with the word akasah. I will give you the context of discussion. For this we take two sections together the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. Here the Upanishad gives another Upasana that is Isvara Upasana only.

Isvara that is endowed with a special virtue parovariyatvam, which means the greatest one or the most, exalted one. In this Adhikaranam also Sagunam Brahman is discussed. This Isvara is to be invoked in Omkara occurring in Sama veda is known as Udgita. Udgita means that which is chanted in highest pitch. It is invocation of Isvara in Udgita.

The Upasanam prescribed is parovariyatva guna Vishista Isvara Rupena Upasana the meditation on Omkara seeing it as the greatest Lord. This is the topic in 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. It is in the form of discussion among three people called Salavatya a Brahmin as to what is the support of these worlds may be; the king Pravahana Jaivali replied that it is Akasa.

The third one is Dalbyah. Of these two are Brahmana and raja is ksatriya. The topic they discuss is something nobler. Jaivali knows more than the other two. In spite of his learning he is humble and he gives respect to the Brahmana. He wants to hear from them and the discussion is on what is greater than what. In the first dialogue salavatya gives a series of great things each one better than the previous one.

First they talk with sama mantra; greater than that is svarah; pranah is number three ; annam is four and apah is five and svargah is number six. The superiority goes upto svarga loka and when questioned which is better than svarga loka. Then he is countered that there is something better than the svaraga loka. Sikah says if anyone svarga is best, he will lose his head. Dalbyah teaches the first six stages. Silaka introduces the seventh one that Buloka is superior to svarga.

Manusyas sustain all the devatas and Pitrus. When these two people come up to seventh stage Jaivali interferes and in the 9<sup>th</sup> section he comes and he says Buloka is not the ultimate and if anyone says Buloka is ultimate his head will break. Then Jaivali says that you are Brahmanas and you do not know and he teaches this Upasana or Udgitha sama or Omkara sama.

While introducing the eight one which superior to Buloka and introduces Isvara by using the word akasah. Since the word Akasa is used here there is confusion. The confusion is whether Akasa refers to local Akasa or Isvarah. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 53

### **Topic 8 [Akasadhikaranam]**

The word Akasa must be understood as Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.22 [22]**

#### ***Akasah; tat – lingat***

on account of signs on account of the characteristic marks [of Brahman being mentioned] the Akasa [in Brahman]

We see the 22<sup>nd</sup> sutra which happens to be the 8<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam of Brahma Sutra.

Akasastalligat – the word Akasa i.e., ether here is Brahma on account of the characteristic marks [of that i.e, Brahman being mentioned] tad; his, of Brahman ligat; because of characteristic mark; the Akasa referred to here is of Akasa mentioned in mantra 1.9.1 of Chandogya upanisad. *Asta kijasya ka gatir ity Akasa iti hovaca, Sarvani ha vaimani bhutany akasad eva samutpadyante akasam pratyastam yanty akaso hy evaibhyo jyayan akasah parayanam* which means what is the goal of this world? He replied ‘space for all these creatures are produced from space’ they return back into the space; for space is greater than these’ space is the final goal.

I was discussing the context in which the above sruti statement occurs in Chandogya upanisad. Two Brahmanas and one king discuss as to what is the highest thing in the world. This Isvara utkristan guna Vishista Isvara is invoked and it is Omkara occurring in sama veda and it is called Omkara or Utkrista Isvara. Omkara is alambanam and Isvara is upadyam. A series of superior things are discussed sama, svara, prana. Anna, apah swarga and finally Akasa and in the discussions they reached that Akasa is the highest thing in the world. Each is considered being superior to the previous one. Akasa occupies the topmost position. Jaivali reveals that Akasa is the highest thing in the world. We have taken Isvara is the greatest source. There contradictory is due to the fact jaivali has used thw word Akasa to indicate Sagunam Brahman. Akasa is one the five elements and we take not as Akasa but we take it as Isvara. We have to justify such an interpretation. Vyasacharya gives his support to this view in this sutra.

The general meaning of the sutra is that the word Akasa occurring in this mantra refers to Isvara only. Sagunam Brahman or upasyam Brahman replaces the word Isvara. Why not use the word Isvara. Brahma Sutra should deal with Brahman only and how come you use the word Isvara which is not different from Brahman.it is so because dressed Brahman is Isvara. He wears the dress called maya and when he removes the dress called maya, maya sahitam Brahman is Isvara and Isvara minus maya is Brahman. The word Brahman is very loosely placed as well as suguna Isvara.

Adhi Sankaracharya does not commit the mistake out of sonfusion but ti is used for us to know that Brahman and Isvara are not different. For Vishistadvaidins Brahman is Sagunam

Brahman and there is no Nirgunam Brahman for them. When Advaidins use the word Brahman it can refer to both Sagunam Brahman or Nirgunam Brahman. But when it comes both and it is a job to select the meaning that suits. There is a rule vyavaharika Brahma is sagunam Brahman. Inanna prakarane neyam Brahman is Nirgunam Brahman. Here we use Akasa word to indicate that it refers to Nirgunam Brahman. And it does not refer to Akasa element. There are sufficient to show that it is Brahman. The anumana vakyam is akasah Brahma [Sagunam Brahman or Isvarah] Brahma word is to be supplied by us.

Now we will take up word for word analysis and the first word is akasah occurring in 1.9. Of Chandogya upanisad is the meaning of the word Akasa. Then comes the word Akasa. Tan linga consists of two words tan llingat. Tad refers to Brahman or Isvara. Linga means clues or marks or indications of Brahman are there in the Upanisads.

The indications to show akasah is Brahman are indicated by Adhi Sankaracharya. Jaivali says all beings in the world are born of this Akasa only which is the first indication. All these people resolve into Akasa only. Akasa is Sarva butha sristi karanam; akasah is cause for sthithi or emerging of the world. Akasah allows the people to do this Upasanam. Akasah is superior to all other things. Sritikjaranatvam, laya karanatvam, laya karanatvam and Sarva concludes this and in the next mantra Upanishad uses the word ananda, the infinite. All six indicators are there and Akasa should not be taken as butha Akasa and it is said that akasah is the indicator. This is the essence of this sutram.

Purva paksa ekadesi some one raises an objection to our conclusion. He says that Akasa should not be taken as Isvara and it should be taken as element alone. He gives the reason for doing so. Any word can have several meanings. One rule is that every word has got one primary and powerful meaning, which is taken by all people in general. The word can have several secondary meanings also. Anything that moves in the sky can be called kathah.

The sun, which moves in the sky, is kathah. Bird is the primary meaning and all others are secondary meaning. Derived meaning should be taken only in certain cases and the primary meaning is taken by one and all, on all occasions. Here general meaning is called vachyarthah and when you take it for a particular thing it is called yoga arthah or derived meaning.

According to language study sastras have come to the conclusion that the primary meaning is more powerful than derived meaning. Primary meaning is primary and all the people understand it. Only the one who has that knowledge of the things knows derived meaning. Primary meaning is prasiddharthah and yogad means secondary meaning. We have got the word akasah and the primary meaning as understood by all the people that space is ruhi arthah of the word akasah. What we do here. We don't take the prasiddha Artha but take the secondary meaning Isvara. We have to justify such an interpretation.

One justification is Isvara is all pervading like Akasa and therefore Akasa is Isvara. Chaitanyam is akasah because Chaitanyam is all pervading like akasah. Akasa is Isvara because Isvara is as much pervading as Akasa. Akasa is derived from the root prakasate, the shining one, and effulgent one. Akasah means sarvatra Prakasah. Brahma is evident everywhere in the form of sat, chit and ananda Rupena. Akasa is like Isvara it is said. It is all pervading like space and is effulgent as Akasa. Whatever be the reasons akasah is secondary meaning for Isvara.

The primary meaning of the word Akasa is the space only. Between primary and secondary always the former is superior to all secondary meaning and purva paksa says Akasa is space and it should not be taken as Isvara the secondary meaning. Akasa is space is more powerful than the secondary meaning. Akasa is taking as the sristi sthithi laya karanam.

Taittiriya Upanishad says that space element is sristi karanam because from Akasa alone all other things came to existence. Without space we cannot exist because without space we cannot live. So also space is laya karanam also and it is superior to all other elements. It can be applied to elemental space also and it is the primary meaning. Purva paksa says that Akasa is space element, mahan, sristi sthithi laya karanam. You have to invoke Akasa upon Omkara.

Siddhanti has to establish a no and convince Akasa is Brahman alone. Adhi Sankaracharya says no doubt we can take the primary meaning that Akasa is an element. Upanishad says akasad Sarvani bhutani jayante everything is born out of Akasa and should we take as Brahman or element is our question. When you say everything it includes Akasa the elements also. Here it is taken everything except Akasa is element. If you say Akasa as Brahman everything has got unrestricted meaning.

When I say everything is born out of space, we mean everything except space is born out of akasah. Then everything is limited. If you take Akasa is Brahman everything is born out of Brahma. In your interpretation everything has got restricted meaning and when I say everything is born out of Brahman everything including is born out of Brahman. Sarva sristi, Sarva sthithi and Sarva laya etc., all fit more with Brahman then by taking Akasa as the element.

Akasa is abeksita laya karanam and Brahman is adhyatmika laya karanm. Akasa resolves into Brahma and therefore Brahman alone Sarva sristi sthithi laya karanam. When you take space element as Akasa you sacrifice the primary meaning in many cases. You have to take secondary meaning. But I take the secondary meaning only at one place that is by sacrificing the primary meaning. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 54

### **Topic 8 [Akasadhikaranam]**

The word Akasa must be understood as Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.22 [22]**

#### ***Akasah; tat – lingat***

on account of signs on account of the characteristic marks [of Brahman being mentioned] the Akasa [in Brahman]

We see the 22<sup>nd</sup> sutra, which happens to be the 8<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam of Brahma Sutra. We have seen that Akasa is sristi sthithi laya karanam. The question is whether we should take it as space element or Sagunam Brahman. Purva paksa says that the primary meaning is Akasa and when it is taken as such all the adjectives attached to it that Akasa is Sarva siddhi karana do not apply. On the other hand when we take it as Sagunam Brahman, we sacrifice the primary meaning of the word Akasa the element of space. When we take it as Sristi sthithi laya, we compromise with the secondary meaning while sacrificing the primary meaning of the element. Thus our conclusion is that Akasa means all pervading Isvara. In this we have become weaker a bit as we compromise with the secondary meaning but Adhi Sankaracharya says we are able to have all other Sarva sristi karanam which includes the space also. This we saw in the last class

Adhi Sankaracharya adds one more point. We have accepted Akasa as Isvara is secondary meaning although it makes us weaker. The weakness is compensated by all other meanings that it is sristi sthithi laya karanam. Even taking Akasa is not secondary meaning is the argument posed by Adhi Sankaracharya. Really speaking Akasa as Isvara is not secondary but primary meaning only. It is so because Akasa is well known as Isvara in the scriptures. It is not loka *prasiddhi* but it is primary meaning in the Sastric circle. It is often used in the name of Sagunam Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya gives three mantras as example.

Mantra 8.14.1 of Chandogya upanishad *Akaso vai mama namarupayorniravahita* having used the word Akasa, the Upanishad says *tat Brahma* and which means word Akasa is nothing but Akasa clearly indicating that Akasa is Brahman the sristi sthithi laya karanam of the entire creation. The entire substratum of the creation is nothing but Akasa which in other words means Brahman.

Also refer 4.10.5 of Chandogya upanishad that reads as *so hovaca vijnamyaham yat prano Brahma kam ca tu kham ca na vijanamiti te hocuryadvava kam tadeva kham yadeva kham kamiti pranam ca hasmai tadakasam couch. Iti dasamah khandah*. This meaning of the mantra reads as ‘I know that prana is Brahman but that ka and kha are Brahman I do not know. The fire replied. ‘that which is ka is also kha, and that which is kha is also ka’. Then the fires taught him that Brahman was both prana and Akasa [space]. here kham means Akasa and kam means anandah. Here it is said Akasa Brahman and anandam Brahman. Here Brahman means Sagunam Brahman. *Rujo aksare parama yomen* is rg veda mantra. Here also it is said all emanate from supreme Aksaram Brahman which is sristi sthithi laya karanam and which is yoman that means akasah. Aksara and yoman are used to indicate Akasa.

Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya conclusion even with regard to Akasa as Isvara we do not take the secondary meaning and it is primary meaning when viewed from scriptures but not from the view of the world common usage is concerned. With this Akasa Adhikaranam is over.

The vishaya is the Akasa occurring in the Chandogya upanisad. Samsaya is whether it refers to space element or whether it refers to Sagunam Brahman or Isvara. Purva paksha says Akasa is the element or space. He argues that Akasa the element is the primary meaning of the word Akasa that is most powerful meaning. Fourth factor is siddhantah the word Akasa means Brahman only for which Adhi Sankaracharya has give various Sastric pramanams even though the primary meaning of the word is Akasa the element. All the six description of Sagunam Brahman tallies with the word Akasa to Brahman is proved by siddhantins. The fifth factor is sangathih. The position of this topic is in the appropriate position that it should occur in Brahma Sutra. Here we don't go into the detail. With this eighth Adhikaranam is over.

## Topic 9 Pranadhikaranam

Then word 'prana' must be understood as Brahman

### Sutra 1.1.23 [23]

#### *Ata eva pranah*

for the same reason the breath also refers to Brahman. – atma eva for the same reason; pranah the breath [also refersto Brahman] as prana is described as the cause of the world, such a description can apply to Brahman alone.

'Which then is that deity? 'Prana' he said Chandogya upanisad mantra 1.11.5 *prana iti hocaca Sarvani ha va imani bhutani pranamevabhisamvisanti pranamabhyujjihate saisa devata prastavamanvayatta tam cedavidvanprastosya murdha te vyapatisyattathoktasya mayeti*. It is the prana [the vital force'. In prana all things that we see around us [moving or unmoving], disappear [at the same time of their destruction. And at the time of their appearance,] they appear from prana. Prana is that deity to whom the prastava is addressed if you had sung the hymn not knowing the deity to whom it is addressed, in spite of being warned by me, your head would surely have fallen.

This Adhikaranam also happens to be a smallest Adhikaranam with only one sutra. This is known as prana Adhikaranam and prana is the first word and hence it is called pranadhikaranam. For this Adhikaranam the visaya vakyam is from Chandogya upanisad 1.11.5.

Here a king is doing a very big yaga. The yaga is to be started and all the priests are seated around the yaga kunda. There are several priests associated with each veda. Each veda has got four priests each totaling 16 priests. When the yaga is about to be started one famous Brahmana sastrayana Rishi enters the yagasala who is very poor. Before yaga there was a cyclone in his village and all suffer including the Brahmana. He wants money. He comes to know that local king is going to perform the yaga and he hoped get good daksina. He goes to the group of four sama veda priests sitting there. One is Udgata. Second is prastota, third is patiartha and the fourth is subramanya. The Brahmana asks three questions to them to the first three priests. The question is related to sama mantra chanting. Every sama mantra is divided into five or seven divisions. Each division is called a Bhakti. It means a division of

sama mantra. We will take five divisions of sama mantra. One is himkarah and second is prastava and third is udgata, fourth pratihara and five is nithanam. Four priests and five baktis and each Bakti has got adhistana devata. Sakrayana approached the priest and asked three questions about adhistana devatas.

First he goes to prastota priest and having approached him, he asked about the adhistana devata about prastava Bakti devata. Second question the Udgata priest is asked about Udgata Bakti devata, pratikarta priest is asked about pratihara Bakti devata. The answer he gets that all people do not know about the devatas although they know and they are expert of sama mantra. Sakrayana tells that if you chant without knowing the meaning of mantra, your heads will burst. He gives a warning.

The priests did not chant anything and there was utter silence. King was worried why the yaga did not begin. He asked sakrayana who he was. He is a learned person and a scholar. Sakrayana was asked to perform the yaga and he became the supervisor for the yaga and demanded good Dakshina. The yagna is about to commence. Three priests asked sakrayana about the devatas before meditating the devatas on whom the mantra is changed. He gives the answer and he says prana is the Bakti devata; adithya devata is udgita Bakti devata and pratihara Bakti devata is Annam. We will now focus on the prana devata, which is prasthana Bakti devata.

It is discussed 1.11.5 of Chandogya upanisad the extract given at the beginning of the lecture. In his commentary Adhi Sankaracharya points out that the word prana here is Sagunam Brahman or Isvara and Isvara is the Bakti devata. That further described in this mantra. Isvara is described as Sarva sristi sthithi laya karanam.

All things arise from prana, which is nothing but Sagunam Brahman or Isvara. If the Upanishad had used the word Isvara there would not have been any problem. But the Upanishad instead of using the word Isvara uses the word prana to indicate the Isvara. Prana is part of Sookshma Sariram. But here prana is taken as Sagunam Brahman.

Here it is seen prana refers to Sagunam Brahman only and not only the vayu vikara. Indications are there for prana to be Sagunam Brahman, which is sristi sthithi laya karanam etc. Prana is Isvarah. Therefore this Adhikaranam is simple. Prana is because of Isvara's description. Prana has got two descriptions, which is sristi and laya karanam,

The sutra consists of three words. Ata eva pranah. Atah means because of this reason; asmad karanad; based on this tal lingas because of Isvara's description being given Sristi sthithi laya karanam and eva means there is no other reason given that is the reasons given earlier to Akasa applies to this also. Athi desah means extension of one argument to another context, the argument in the earlier and present Adhikaranam is same. Then comes the word prana, which means the prana occurring in Chandogya upanisad mantra 1.11.5. Here word prana refers to Isvara. The fourth word you have to supply is Brahma.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 55

### **Topic 9 Pranadhikaranam**

Then word 'prana' must be understood as Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.1.23 [23]**

#### ***Ata eva pranah***

for the same reason the breath also refers to Brahman. – atma eva for the same reason; pranah the breath [also refersto Brahman] as prana is described as the cause of the world, such a description can apply to Brahman alone.

We have seen in the last class that the word prana represents Sagunam Brahman as it has the qualities of Isvara as was decided in the Akasa in the previous Adhikaranam. Thus whether you take it as panca prana or vayu in either of the meaning it cannot be laya or sristi karanam and hence we say prana here means Sagunam Brahman or Isvara.

Now purva paksa comes with another sruti quotation to negate our view. It is taken from satapata Brahmanam of shukla Yajur veda. Here it is said when one is asleep the vayu indria, manah and in short all organ resolve into prana. During sleep prana does not get resolved and it very much functions at the time of sleep and this Unmanifest condition is called prana that is avyakrita avasta or Sushupti avastha is called prana.

The very fact the sleeping person is alive and he again wakes up shows that prana is alive. On waking up all organs wake up with prana. So it is called Sarva laya as also Sarva sristi karanam. Purva paksa says that prana itself is able to be the cause of sristi sthithi laya karanam and why it should be given the meaning that it indicates Isvara or Sagunam Brahman. This is the argument of purva paksa. Adhi Sankaracharya says you read the scriptures clearly. In Chandogya upanisad prana is presented as samasti Prapancha sristi sthithi laya karanam that includes our organs also.

In satapata Brahmanam it talks of only the vyasti karana sristi laya karanam only. Prana in vachyartha is the vyasti karana sthithi laya karanam. Therefore your quotation is uncalled for quotation. Purva paksa gives another sruti quotation in which it talks about everything resolves into prana. There also we talk of Sushupti. In this mantra also Sushupti is talked about and it is said all the organs resolve into prana and it uses an extra expression that it says not only vak indriyam resolves but also the objects of vak indriyams also resolves. That means Caksur and Caksur visayah also resolves. It will include all things in creation. Sarvani bhutani pranam apyete it is said. Prana is not karana sristi laya karanam but it is samasti karana sristi karanam.

Prana is Brahman it is concluded in Kaushitaki Upanishad mantra 2.2 *prano brahmeti ha smaha paingyas Tasya va etasya Pranasya Brahmano vak prastac Caksur arundhate, caksuh prastacchrotraam arundhate Srortram parastat mana arundhate .tasmai va etasmai pranaya Brahmana etah Sarva devata ayacamanaya balim haranti evam haivasmad Sarvani bhutani ayacamanayaiva balim haranti ya evam veda tasyopanisan na yaced iti tad yatha gramam bhiksitva labdhvopavisen naham ato dattam aniyam iti ta evainam upamantrayante ye*

*prustat pratyacaksiran esa dharmoyacato bhavati annadas tv evainam upamantrayante dadama ta iti.* The breathing spirit is Brahma thus indeed paingya used to say and the mantra continues asserting that the breathing spirit as Brahma behind the speech the eye is enclosed behind the eye the ear is enclosed; behind the ear the mind is enclosed; behind the mind the breathing spirit is enclosed. To this same breathing spirit as Brahma, all these divinities bring offering though he does not beg for it even so to this same breathing spirit all beings bring offering even though he does not beg for it, and so the mantra goes.

There is another Brahadharaynaka upanisad mantra also there it is presented as karana sristi karanam prana is prana but when it is presented as karana of samasti Prapancha sristi sthithi laya karanam panca prana cannot be sristi sthithi laya karanam and when it is karyam, and how can it be resolving ground of another karyam and how can be chain can be resolving ground of gold and prana itself being karyam it cannot be resolving ground karyam and therefore it is taken as Brahman. Always in sastra is weaker than primary meaning. For this we give the same argument given in the case of Akasa. You sacrifice one primary meaning for the sake of justifying many indicators like Sarva sristi karanam and Sarva laya kranam etc. The word prana is taken as breath by the lay people. Prana is Brahman in the sastra it is prasiddham.

We find in the sastra at many places, prana is used in the sense of Brahman. Refer to mantra 1.2 of Kenopanisad that reads as *srotasya srotram manaso yad vaco ha vacam sa u Pranasya pranah caksusas saksur atimucya dhirah, pretty asmal locat amrta bhavati* which means that because it is the which is the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, the speech of the speech, indeed of the speech the breath of the breath, the eye of the eye, wise giving up [wrong notions their self sufficiency] and departing from this world become immortal. Pranasya pranah Brahma it is said. There are two pranas. Second prana indicates Brahman. From this it is clear word prana is used in the sense of Brahman.

Further in mantra III.i.4 of Mundakopanisad it is said *prano hyesa yah Sarva-bhutair-vibhati vijanan Vidvan bhavati nativadi, atma krida atam ratih kriyava- nesa Brahma vidam varisthah I* which means knowing him the prana reveling in all beings,, the wise man stops all his blabberings. Sporting in Self, delighted in Self and doing acts [enjoined], this man is the best of those who know the Brahman. Prana alone appears in the form of total creation.

The same Upanishad in mantra II.i.1 states *tad edat satyam yatha sudiptat pavakad vispphulingah sahasrasah prabhavante sarupah tatha ksarad vividhah somya bhavah prajayante tatra caivapi yanit* that reads as this the truth as from the flaming fire thousands of sparks, similar to its form [nature] issue forth; so from the Immortal [Brahman] O my beloved youth, diverse [manifold] beings [jivas originate and they find their way back into it.

In the second chapter it is said Brahman alone is in the form of creation and in the later state it is said prana is Brahman. From this it is clear Mundakopanisad prana is used in the name of Brahman alone. In 1.4.7 of Brahadharaynaka upanisad it reads as *Taddhedam tarhyavyakrtamasit, tannamarupabhyameva vyakriyate, asaunamayamidamrupa iti; tadidamapyetarhi Namarupabhyameva vyakriyate, asaunamayam idamrupa iti; sa esa lha pravistah, a nakhagrebhyah, yatha ksuradhane' vahitah syat, visvambharo va visvambharakulaye; tam na pasyanti. Akrtsno hi sah, Prananneva prano Nama bhavati. Vadan vak, pasyamascakshuh, srnvan srotram, manvano manah; tanyasyaitani Karmanamanyeva, sa yo't ekaikamupasate na sa Veda, akrtsno hyeso't ekaikena bhavati; atmetryevopasit, atra hyete sarva Ekam bhavanti. Tadetat Pathaniyamasya sarvasya*

*yadayamatma, anena hyetat sarvam Veda. Yatha ha vai padenanvindedevam; kirtim slokam vindate ya evam Veda.*

It is very clearly said Brahman entered everybody who is breathing and when one breathes atma itself gets the name prana. Thus in various Upanisads the prana is used in the sense of primary meaning and therefore it enjoys the status of primary meaning and the word prana is Brahman. There is one more argument that purva paksa makes here. Prana is introduced as prastava Bakti devata, udgita Bakti devata and pratihara Bakti devata. Here Bakti means a portion of Sama mantra. What is the devatas of the three is the question posed by Sakrayana. First one is prana, the second is adithya and the third one is annam.

For this purva paksa says the second and the third are not primary devatas and how they can be compared to Brahman. They are parichinna devatas only. Two are parichinna devatas and because of the proximity of parichinna devatas prana devata also refer to parichinna devata only. This is the proximity argument. If we talk about something if there is vagueness based on the meaning of the other word you connect to the nearest you decide the correct meaning. Sanithya argument is weakened if the indicator words are stronger. The linga argument here is powerful then the sanithyam because of the proximity if you take prana as small devata, the problem is as to how the small devata will be sristi sthithi laya karanam. In front of powerful indicator the proximity argument is set aside. Hence prana is Brahman is concluded effectively.

The subject is prana sabdah in 1.11.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Samsaya is whether it refers to vayu vikara prana or whether it is Brahman or Sagunam Brahman or maya sahitam Brahma. The third factor is purva paksa who says prana is vayu vikara eva. He gives the reason is that it is the primary meaning. That alone is powerful than the secondary meaning of Brahman. Prana is the sristi sthithi laya karanam of our body also. Therefore prana is vayu vikaraha. Then siddhanta and it is always the sutra and pranah Brahma.

The indications are there being Sarva bhuta sristi laya karanatvam is possible only when you take prana is Brahman. Prana is sristi laya karanam of individual organs in Sushupti and prana is not sristi laya karanam of samasti Prapancha. Because of this reason pranah Sagunam Brahman. Sagunam Brahman is established in Brahma Sutra. Isvara as material cause is the unique aspect of Vedanta which is not there in Samkya Nyaya etc. In the other philosophies Isvara is taken as nimitta karanam. They take matter as the material cause. Conscious being the material cause of the world is unique feature in Advaidam. Here Isvara is upadana karanam is repeated. Establishing Nirgunam Brahman is not going to negate the sankya system. For Brahma Sutra primary purva paksa is Isvara is Kevala nimitta karanam or upadana karanam also. Pranadhikaranam establishes Brahman as upadana karanam and when we say sristi sthithi laya karanam means it is upadana karanam. Therefore sankya philosophy gets negated in all the Adhikaranam. Now we enter the next Adhikaranam which we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 56

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The Light is Brahman,

#### **Sutra 1.1.24 [24]**

#### ***Jyotisharanabhidhanat***

Jyotih the light charanam feet; abhidhanat because of the mention

The light is Brahman on account of the mention of feet in a passage, which is connected, with the passage about the light referring to mantra III.13.7 of Chandogya upanisad.

We will take up general analysis of the whole Adhikaranam and thereafter we will take the general analysis of this sutra. We take up for discussion the mantra III.3.7 of Chandogya upanisad. First we will see the context of this discussion. This refers to 12,13 and 14th section of Chandogya upanisad. The subject matter discussed here is Sagunam Brahman Upasana is the subject matter and this Brahma Upasana is prescribed in three different ways.

In the 12<sup>th</sup> section Brahma Upasana is presented in the form of Gayatri. Gayatri is the metre one of the vedic metres in which mantras are composed. This meter is used for one particular mantra. Mantra is also called Gayatri. In vedas there are several metrea are there. Them we see in sandhyavandanam. Metre is a method in which a mantra is composed. Gayatri metre is most respected metre and it is taken as the mother of all the metres. In the name of Gayatri chandas a Brahma Upasana is suggested.

In 13<sup>th</sup> section we get two topics. We get an Upasanam called Brahma purusa Upasanam. All ideas I give are relevant ideas for our discussion. Brahma used in Gayatri is presented as abiding in the hridayam, which is abode of Gayatri rupam Brahma that is discussed in 12<sup>th</sup> section Chandogya upanisad.

This hridayam is like a city and huge palace and Brahman is the king and there are four ways to this palace. Each of the door way is taken care of by a security and we have five security in the form of devatas each door manned by one one devata and this devata is called Brahma purusa. The master who is none but Brahman engages it. This Brahma purusa is to be done and it is prescribed as anga Upasana for the previous main Upasana, which is Gayatri rupa Brahma Upasanam. Gayatri Upasana is primary Upasana and others are secondary Upasanam. Anga should be done with angi Upasanam and they complementary Upasanam.

The Brahma purusa Upasanas are discussed in 13<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. There we also get second part where another type of Brahma Upasana is prescribed. This is in the form of Jyoti Rupena Brahma Upasanam. Tejo Rupena Brahma Upasana. This is the second part of 13<sup>th</sup> section. Then we have the next section 14<sup>th</sup> of Chandogya upanisad. Here also Brahma Upasana is talked about and that is Sarva Rupena Brahma Upasana.

That is meditation is sarvatmaga Brahma Upasana. It is called chandilya vidya and it comes in the 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter 13<sup>th</sup> section 7<sup>th</sup> mantra. Now we are going to analyse this particular mantra. I will give you the meaning of this mantra.

Mantra 7 of 13<sup>th</sup> section of 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad reads as *atha yadatah parro divo jyotirdipyate visvatah prsthesu sarvatah prsthesvanuttamesuttamesu lokesvidam vava tadyadidamasminnantah* Jyotih the meaning the mantra is then higher than this heaven, above the world, higher than everything in the highest world, higher than which nothing exists the light that shines there is the same light that is in a human being. Brahma is said to be above everything else. It is the highest and the best. It shines in the highest world and ti also shines in the heart of a human being.

This mantra says Brahma Jyotih is all pervading which is in the higher lokas up above and also within the individual body sarira Jyoti. While talking about higher lokas are which is beyond all the lower pranis and all Buvar loka suvar loka and it is Brahma Jyoti. Not only it is above all lokas and it is also within the body and because of this Jyoti alone the body is live body. Without Chaitanyam this body will be dead body and it will not have life at all.

The light is the magnification of Brahman and for meditating higher Jyoti and it is available in body. You meditate on Brahma Jyoti on physical body itself. The presence of Brahma Jyoti is recognized that you touch your body you can feel the warmth of life; even when outside temperature is lower this physical body is warm and in that dead body that warmth is not there. Thus, ausniya Rupena Brahma Jyotih.

The second thing is the very same Jyoti is there is in the stomach in the form of digestive fire and this is ablaze all the time. You have to fuel this fire to glow for you to be alive. When the fire burns you can hear the sound of the burning fire. That Jyoti you can hear when you turn your attention inwards and you can hear the voice of the one that of sound of the fire. In the form of sound and heat, the Brahma Jyoti is available in the body. This is the actual mantra. In addition to that you hear the samanya sabda heard always from the inner body.

This mantra talks about Jyoti Rupa Brahma Upasana in the body. This is our interpretation of this mantra. In this mantra Brahman does not occur at all. Jyotih alone is used. It talks about Jyotir Upasana and it does not say Brahma Upasana. How do you interpret Jyoti as Brahman? Why cannot the Jyoti be taken as well known light like Surya Prakasa or Agni Prakasa or anything else? Therefore the word Jyoti means light that is effulgent and why do take this primary meaning and take it as Brahman. Jyoti is Achetana Prakasa.

All other Prakasa are karya or Achetana Jyotih. Our discussion is Jyoti mentioned in the mantra is Achetana Jyoti or Chetana Brahma Jyoti and it is established that Jyotih Brahmaiva. We have sufficient reasons to prove our viewpoint. This is general analysis of the whole Adhikaranam. All talk about the same subject but now we will take up the first sutra of this Adhikaranam.

We have a problem, which we did not face earlier. We could prove prana and Akasa is Brahman because we had the special qualities was mentioned in the same section. We could easily establish based on the qualities mentioned. We don't find any quality mentioned in the 13<sup>th</sup> section when we talk of Jyoti. Therefore we have to prove this by an indirect method.



Vyasacharya drops 13<sup>th</sup> section for the time being. We should go back to 12<sup>th</sup> section and we have to show that Brahma Upasana is talked about we have to establish. That itself we have to establish because in the previous section Gayatri Upasana is talked about and there also Upanishad does not Gayatri is Brahman. Then we have to go to 12<sup>th</sup> section and establish that Gayatri Upasana is Brahma Upasana. In the 12<sup>th</sup> section several qualities are mentioned and therefore we have sufficient clues to establish that Gayatri is Brahman.

Having established that we say 13<sup>th</sup> section talks about the same Upasnam as in the 12<sup>th</sup> Upasnam. First we will have to establish by giving sufficient clues. 12 upasyam is the same 13<sup>th</sup> upasyam and once we establish 13<sup>th</sup> is same and go back to say 12 upasyam is Brahman and then come to prove the Jyoti is Brahman. Now we will go to the 12<sup>th</sup> section

Here in 12<sup>th</sup> section it is said Gayatri alone is everything. 3.13.1 of Chandogya upanisad says *Gayatri va idam Sarvam bhutam yadidam kinca vagvai Gayatri vagva idam Sarvam bhutam gati ca trayate ca* that mean all that exists in this world, whatever there is is Gayatri. It is the word that is Gayatri for the word gives names to all things and it also tells them not to fear. The Upanishad talks about the glory of Gayatri.

The glory of Gayatri is presented that Gayatri has got four quarters and the first quarter consists of entire cosmos or universe; this means all middle upper and lower lokas and the other three quarters are beyond the universe and time and space which is Nirguna svarupam. Samasti Prapancha is one fourth of Gayatri and that which is beyond this is the other three fourth. This is to show that the so-called vast universe occupies only one quarter of Gayatri and how infinite Gayatri should be. It is similar to vibhuti yoga and there while talking about the glory of Krishna he says that I am so vast and in fact the entire universe is but a minutest part of me.

The whole universe is occupying a small portion of me and similarly Gayatri is infinite and three quarters are not occupied by anything and the whole universe occupies only one fourth. The other three are beyond desa and kala. Gayatri is sarvatmika and Gayatri is chatuspad. All these are in the 12<sup>th</sup> section.

The Upanishad has said Gayatri is everything. Can this Gayatri be taken as one of the vedic metres or Gayatri be taken as Brahman itself. We should take Vachyartha or something else. If it is vedic metres, how can a vedic metre be everything and in fact Gayatri metre cannot be another metre and how can you say that is in the form of the whole universe and how can you justify if it is taken as limited metre. Gayatri is all and it is having four quarters of which only one quarter occupies the universe but the rest are beyond time and space.

Therefore Gayatri is Brahman. Sarvagatma rupa chatuspad rupa linga. It has the characteristics of Brahman in the form of sarvagatmatvam and chatuspadatvam.

The next is based on anga Upasana that comes later. This comes in 13<sup>th</sup> section first portion is that Gayatri Brahman is abiding in hridyam with five four ways and the security guards are Brahma purusa. Security staff is called Brahma purusa is significant if Gayatri is not Brahman why should the supporting devatas in the anga Upasana be called Brahma purusas. Instead of using the word Gayatri purusas it has used the word Brahma purusas.

Connecting the anga and anga Gayatri has to be Brahman. If Gayatri is taken as Brahman and anga Upasana is Brahma Upasnam and anga Upasana is Brahma purusa Upasnam and it

will perfectly fix and therefore Gayatri has got to be Brahman. Brahma Upasana and Brahma purusa Upasana and thus we have established Gayatri is Brahman. In 13<sup>th</sup> chapter Gayatri is talked about and here jyoti must be Brahman. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 57

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The Light is Brahman,

#### **Sutra 1.1.24 [24]**

#### ***Jyotisharanabhidhanat***

Jyotih the light charanam feet; abhidhanat because of the mention

The light is Brahman on account of the mention of feet in a passage, which is connected, with the passage about the light referring to mantra III.13.7 of Chandogya upanishad.

We see the 24<sup>th</sup> sutra and that is the tenth Adhikaranam known as jyotisharanagabhikaranam. This refers to 3.13.7 of Chandogya upanishad. Here the enquiry is about the Jyoti occurring in the Upanishad. In this Adhikaranam we establish that Jyotih is Brahman and it is Sagunam Brahman or Isvara only since the context is Upasana. In the last class I did the general analysis of the entire Adhikaranam as also the first sutra.

In the previous two Adhikaranam we had special clues in that section itself to show that Akasa is Brahman or prana Brahman etc. Here we don't find Brahma lingam and are forced to use indirect method. Hence we go to the previous section of Chandogya upanishad. This mantra belongs to 13<sup>th</sup> section known as Jyotir vidya. 12<sup>th</sup> section deals with Gayatri vidya. We have to establish that Gayatri is Brahman and we are able to establish because we have sufficient clues to establish that Gayatri is Brahman. The very same Brahman previously seen as Gayatri is talked referred to in the 13<sup>th</sup> section also. Then we can apply the equation. We establish Gayatri is Brahman and then we prove Gayatri is Jyotih and then we conclude that Jyoti is Brahman. Upanishad talks of four padas of the Gayatri to prove that Gayatri is infinite. The entire universe is Gayatri. The three are beyond universe.

The mantric Gayatri cannot become infinite and therefore Gayatri should be understood as Brahman only because of the four quarters. Not only Gayatri has four quarters consisting the whole universe it is also seen that Gayatri is Sarvatmagam. If it is a metre then it is a finite entity and it cannot become everything. Then that Gayatri must be Brahman only. This is the first part of the argument.

Gayatri abhinna Jyotih. If Gayatri is nothing but Brahman in the 12<sup>th</sup> section the topic of 12<sup>th</sup> section and topic of 13<sup>th</sup> section are the same it is to be established. Adhi Sankaracharya gives three reasons for Gayatri is discussed as Jyoti Brahman. First is grammatical reason.

Adhi Sankaracharya says you look into that mantra, which begins with atha, indicates beginning of new Upasana and afterwards it uses the pronoun yathu which means a pronoun can be used only to remind you of the noun talked before. If the Upanishad suddenly says that principle means that Upanishad assumes that reader knows of something that is talked about. If Upanishad talks of fresh thing it will talk of light and then use the pronoun. Pronoun of yad reminds of the upasyam Brahma the Gayatri rupam Brahma here. This is the first reason.

While talking about Gayatri vidya Upanishad gives a mantra. There Brahman associated with swarga loka is indicated in the 13<sup>th</sup> section by using the word divi. Brahman of 13<sup>th</sup> section has got swarga loka sambanda. When the Upanishad introduces Brahman, it uses the words atah, parah, divah higher than the heaven; yat Jyotih dipyate the light which shines visvatah prsthesu above the word etc. The association of all pervading Brahman is indicated by the word divah. Thus swarga loka sambandha of Brahma or Gayatri is indicated in 12<sup>th</sup> mantra and Brahman and Jyoti is indicated in the 13<sup>th</sup> mantra and thus we can link that Jyoti is Brahman. This is the second argument.

Then one more argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives. In 12<sup>th</sup> section Gayatri vidya is Brahma Upasanam and we have already proved. Then our doubt is regarding 13<sup>th</sup> section Jyotir vidya. Then Adhi Sankaracharya says go to 14<sup>th</sup> section, which is candilya vidya. When you go to 14<sup>th</sup> chapter we clearly prove that candilya vidya of 14<sup>th</sup> section is also Brahma Upasanam. Controversy is only about the middle. Previous one is Brahma Upasana and the later one is Brahma Upasana and suddenly in the middle nothing new can come like a jerk. This argument is generally used in mimamsa sastra and this argument is called sandamsah nyayah. The tong is called sandamsah.

Jyotir vidya is caught between Gayatri and candilya vidya and hence the middle Jyotir Upasana must belong to Brahma Upasana only. Symbolized is one while the symbols are different. Alambanam, vary but the upasyam is one and the same Brahman. Therefore whatever argument is given for prove Gayatri is Brahman can be applied to show that Jyotih is also Brahman. The Jyoti is non-different from Gayatri refer to Brahman alone because of the mention of four padas of the previous section the universe being one padam and the rest being the three padas.

Now we will go for word for word analysis. The first word is Jyotih and second word is charanabhitnad. The light, which is mentioned in 3.13.7 of Chandogya upanisad and which is non-different of the Gayatri of previous section. The conclusion is that Jyoti is Brahman and it is Sagunam Brahman or Isvara. Here context is Upasana prakaranam and it is maya sahitam Brahman and it is otherwise called Isvara. Charanam and abhidhanad the word charanam means padah or quarter. In this context it refers to the four quarters. Abhidhanad means because` of the statement of indication of four quarters. Now the question will where is the mention of four quarters. We see the mention of four quarters in the previous Gayatri Upasana and borrow the lingam and apply it to our Jyoti Brahmanam to prove it is Brahman.

Now a purva paksa comes and he say I cannot accept your conclusion. He says the word cannot refer to Brahma Jyoti or Chetana Jyoti. It should refer to Achetana Jyoti alone. The most famous light is the sunlight. He says Jyoti should be taken adithya Jyoti not as Brahma Jyotih. Surya Jyoti is karya Jyoti and Chetana Jyotih. He gives six arguments in support of their views.

Prasddatvad whenever we use light we get the idea of some sunlight or moon light or tube light etc. Hence Jyoti is taken as Consciousness but taken as some sort of light only. The second argument is it uses the word diptyate means shining. No one thinks of shining Consciousness. No one experiences the shining Consciousness.

The third argument is maryadha vacanad, which means boundary. Purva paksa says you read mantra once again. The mantra reads as *parah mantrah dipyate* it is beyond the heaven in the higher lokas. The word parah means beyond. Beyond means this side he is not.

The fourth argument is adhara sravanad. The Upanishad talks of location for the Jyotih and it is all about the location and it means the light is in the higher lokas. That is not possible for Brahman and Brahman is not located anywhere.

The fifth argument is here the Upanishad talks about the Jyotir Upasana. It is in higher lokas and that Jyoti may be meditated upon in the body in the form of the very warmth of life and tejah or agni. It can also be felt within.

Now purva paksa says the warmth of body the agni Tattvam is taken as symbol and Jyoti also must be taken as a similar Tattvam in the higher loka or the heaven. Some similarity should be there between alambanam and deity. alambanam is ferocious when you do kali Upasana. Alambanam and upasyam should have some similarity. In the sme way the fire in stomach must have some Jyotih. Alambana samanyad.

The sixth and final argument is this. The Upanishad talks of the phalam of this Upasana. it are warmth experienced in the body and also the sound heard from within the body. The phalam of the Upasana is that he will become a presentable or handsome person. Not only that his name will be famous but also will be known everywhere. The beauty and fame are the Upasana phalam. This phalam is what? They are only finite result. We know generally that parichinna devata will give parichinna phalam. Meditators of final devatas get final moksa phalam only. Isvara Upasana will give paricchinna phalam. Therefore Jyoti karya Jyoti is Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya takes all arguments and therefore Jyotih means Brahman alone. More in the next class

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 58

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The Light is Brahman,

#### **Sutra 1.1.24 [24]**

#### ***Jyotisharanabhidhanat***

Jyotih the light charanam feet; abhidhanat because of the mention

The light is Brahman on account of the mention of feet in a passage, which is connected, with the passage about the light referring to mantra III.13.7 of Chandogya upanisad.

We see the 10<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam with four sutras of which we see the first sutra. We have seen the word analysis of the sutra. If Jyoti the light mentioned in 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter refers to Brahman alone which we have talked about in 12<sup>th</sup> chapter in the name of Gayatri. Now a purva paksa has come and has given six reasons saying adhithya Jyoti is a light and it talks about Surya Prakasa alone and not Brahma Prakasa Upasanas.

First is he says Jyoti is Achetana Jyoti and it is not Chetana karana Jyoti. The Upanishad uses the word shining and it is only external shining and the Consciousness does not shine at all. If it be so, in the dark room wherever we go light should be there. Thirdly there is boundary and the light is beyond heaven and by saying beyond heaven it talks about limit and therefore it must refer to any limited Jyoti say the Surya Prakasa.

Fourthly adhara vacanad and Upanishad uses the word that the light is in the heaven or higher lokas and location indicates it is not Brahman and it is unlocated and the Jyoti being located it is not Brahma Jyoti; fifthly that this Jyoti is similar to Jyoti in the body which is felt in the form of warmth and it has some similarity and therefore upasyam also should be karya and not karna Jyoti.

Sixth and final reason is that it is parchinna and the Upasana phalam is beautiful body to the upasaka which can be seen and not only he will be seen and when a person goes through Brahman he will get unlimited reasons and limitless Isvara should give limitless results and therefore limited phalam proves that the light mention here is not Brahma Jyoti but any other Chetana and limited Jyoti like adithya Prakasa. Now Adhi Sankaracharya give his arguments negating the views posed by the purva paksa.

The word light is well known external light alone and how can we sacrifice primary meaning. We say primary meaning can be sacrificed if other factors are favourable if all other factors are favouring secondary meaning. Here we have shown that secondary meaning alone is supported for Upanishad talks about a Jyoti, which pervades the whole universe, and beyond universe. And this is possible for karna Jyoti Brahman and not karya Jyoti.

The second answer is that the word Jyoti has got the meaning of Consciousness in the primary sense and the only reason that the meaning is to loka prasiddham and this meaning is sastra prasiddham. In the Upanishad the expression Jyoti is common to indicate the

Consciousness. Refer to II.ii.9 of Mundakopanisad that reads as *Hiranmaye pare kose virajam Brahma niskalam tac-chubhram jyotisam Jyotih tad yadatma vido viduh* and the meaning of this mantra is the stainless indivisible Brahman, the pure, the light of all lights, is in the innermost sheath of the golden hue- the highest. That is what the knowers of the Atman know.

Again the same Upanishad mantra II.2.1 reads as *vaih sannihitam guhacaram nama Mahat padam atraitat samarpitam ejat prajan nimisac-ca yadetaj-janatha sad-asad varenyam param vijnanad yad varishthanam Prajnanam* the meaning of the mantra is Bright existing very close moving in the cavity of the heart; great and the support of al; In Him is all the universe centered round; what moves, breathes and winks. Know it, which is both with form and without form the most adorable, the highest of beings, the one beyond the understanding of creatures.

The expression light is very much used for Consciousness and there is nothing wrong for light is that in whose presence things become evident and the ultimate light is Consciousness because in the presence alone we know anything and everything.

The Upanisad uses the meaning shining for the Consciousness also in several places. It is sastra prasiddha Artham. We see in mantra I.i.16 and 1.1.17 of Kaivalya Upanishad that reads as *yatparam Brahma sarvatma visvasya yatanam Mahat sukmat sukmataram nithyam tat tvameva tvameva tat jagrat svapna Sushuptyadi prapancam yat prakasate tad Brahmaham iti jnatva Sarva bandhath pramucyate* the meaning of this is that which is the Supreme Brahman the self of all the ample support of the universe, subtler than the subtle and eternal... that alone thou art thou alone art that and that which illumines the world of relative experiences lived in the waking, dream and deep sleep conditions, that Brahma am I and realizing thus one is liberated from all shackles. Therefore there is nothing wrong in such a meaning.

In Gita sloka 18.7 it is said *jyotisam api taj ryotis tamasah param ucyate jnanam jneyam jnanagamyam brdi Sarvasya dhisthitam* that reads as He is the Light of lights as aid to be beyond darkness knowledge, the object of knowledge and the goal of knowledge – he is seated in the hearts of all. Therefore Jyoti as Consciousness is the primary meaning of Consciousness. The second objection is sound

Third objection is that boundary has been placed and how can Brahma has boundary. Adhi Sankaracharya says that this section is Sagunam Brahman Upasana section and Isvara Upasana section and we can talk about limitation of Isvara for the convenience of upasana. We confine Isvara to an idol and we go to a temple and worship the idol and keep the all-pervading Isvara in a temple. Therefore maryada vacanad is not an ocean and the limitation is consciously imposed for the purpose of Upasana.

The fourth objection is adhara vacanad. How can you locate Brahma or Isvara in one place. For this the same answer is given as before. All this is done for the purpose of puja or for the purpose of Upasana.

Fifth objection is that Isvara is visualized in sarira Jyotih. If the alambanam is karya Jyoti the upasyam also should also be karya only. If one is jadam the other also will be jadam. We say that there is no rule like that. If the jada alampanam is for jada vastu only we cannot do any Upasana or puja. It is because upasyam is invisible and we need visible alampanam. The alampanams are always jada vastu of the universe for meditating upon the invisible devata. In

fact we cannot do any Upasana without having an alampanam and alampanam being jada vastu cannot be displaced. The upasyam also must be jadam is not there. In fact Krishna asks us to meditate upon him on various objects only. Ganga, Himalayas, agni etc., are jadam yet we use them as alampanam to invoke the Lord Isvara.

Then comes sixth and final argument that the phalam is parichinnan and therefore devata also will be paricchinnam only. Purva paksa argument is that limited devata can give only limited power. This Adhi Sankaracharya negates asking the purva paksa as who gave such a rule. A limited devata cannot give limitless result that we accept. A fellow having ten rupees can give only charity of ten rupees only. But hundred-rupeed person can give more danam. Parichinna deva can give only parichinna phalam but Isvara can give both limited as also limitless phalam. Refer to Gita sloka 7.21 that reads as *yo yo yam yam taum bhaktah sraddaya'rcitum icchait Tasya Tasya 'calam sraddham tam eva vidadhamy aham* the meaning of this sloka runs as whatever form any devotee with faith wishes to worship, I make that faith of his steady. here he say I can give dharma Artha as also moksa. You can go to Isvara and seek material benefits as also beauty. There is nothing wrong if phalam is beauty. Gayatri abhinnam Jyotih Brahma. With this 24<sup>th</sup> sutra is over.

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The light is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.25 [25]**

#### ***Chandobhidhananneti chet na tatha cheto'rpananigadat tatha hi darsanam***

if it be said tha Brahma is not denoted on account of the metre Gayatir being denoted, we replay not so, because thus i.e., by means of the metre the application of the mind on Brahman is declared' because thus it is seen –in other passages also]

While defining sutra we talked about the pithy short statement. Even though this condition is followed there are occasions when the sutra becomes longer. This sutra is an exceptional sutra.

Now we will go to general analysis of this sutra. The topic is the same of the light of Brahman. In the previous sutra we established that Jyoti in this sutram is Brahman. Our main argument was the Brahma upasana is talked about and from that we come to this section. Purva paksa does not accept this argument. He says just because in previous section we talked about Brahma Upasanam and hence this sutra also talks about Brahman. Purva paksa argument is that even taking the previous sutra Jyoti Brahman is itself wrong.

Our answer to that is Gayatri is Brahman. And therefore Gayatri Upasana is equal to Brahma Upasana and that is continued here. Purva paksa asks who said Gayatri is Brahman for it is primarily known as vedic metre. You misinterpret it as Brahman. Well-known meaning of the word is chandah. He says in the previous section Gayatri chandah was talked about and not Brahman. Our argument that Gayatri has got a primary meaning that it is vedic metre. We say the word Gayatri has got laksyartha and it is implied and the secondary meaning is Brahman. Metre is primary meaning and Brahman is the secondary meaning. For which he argues when primary meaning and secondary meanings are there which is powerful.



Primary means primary and secondary means secondary. How can you leaving the primary meaning you take to secondary meaning. He asks when primary meaning is powerful why taking secondary meaning. Our argument is that again primary meaning can be given up if it contradicts logic and it unfitting. If primary meaning does not fit in this context we can take to secondary meaning. In this context the primary meaning does not fit in and therefore we are forced to take to the secondary meaning.

Upanishad says in 12<sup>th</sup> section Gayatri is everything Gayatri va idam Sarvam. Gayatri is cause of the whole universe. Gayatri pervades everything. Now take to the primary meaning of Gayatri. This Gayatri does not occupy even one page and this finite limited metre is the primary meaning. But this 24 letters of Gayatri is pervading the entire universe. We find that primary meaning does not fit in and we have to go for the secondary meaning.

Adhi Sankaracharya says in mantra 47 of vakya vritti that if the direct world meaning throws up in inconsistency with what is pointed out by other proofs or evidences, the sense consistent with its word meaning that is intelligently suggested by the terms, is to be accepted – and this is its suggestive meaning or [laksahan]. Primary meaning should be given primary place. You should not take secondary meaning first. If it does not fit only the secondary meaning should be taken here we are forced to take the secondary meaning.

Any presiding deity presides over one aspect of creation and no devata can be taken for everything. Here therefore you are forced to take karnam Brahman or maya sahitam Brahman. Therefore Gayatri pada Vachyartha is chandah and Gayatri pada lakshyarthah Brahman. Then comes the final question from purva paksa. When you take a secondary meaning you have to apply a rule and the secondary meaning should be closely connected to the primary meaning. Lakshyarthah should be connected with Vachyartha. The connection between Gayatri and Brahman is Brahman is connected with everything in creation.

Brahman is the cause of everything and everything is the karyam of Brahman. Gayatri is karyam of Brahman and Brahman is the cause of everything. You can invoke Brahman on invoke on anything. Karya Gayatri dvara karanam Brahman upasyate. Karya ganga dvara karana ganga upasyate. We don't have infinite gods but we have infinite forms symbolizing one god. Purva paksa says it is talking about Gayatri only but siddhanti says it talks about Brahman through Gayatri.

In the final part of the sutra is the example where Vyasacharya says we have many examples like this invoking Brahman through vedic mantras. It is very common.

In Siksavalli of Taittiriya Upanishad chapter v there are several vyahriti mantras through which Brahman is invoked for example 1.iv.2 *bhutiti va ayam lokah, bhuva iti antariksam suvar-ity-lokah, maha iti, adityyah, adityena vava sarve loka mahiyante*. It is Gayatri alampanah Brahma Upasana it is. We worship Brahman through Gayatri. Ganga puja is Brahma puja through ganga. Hindus are not idol worshipper and it idol alampanaka Isvara puja.

We will go to word for word analysis. *Chandobhidanad na* relate to purva paksa portion *iti chet* means suppose; *na tatha chetorpana* thus application of the mind; *nigadat* means because of the teaching *tatha hi* like that darsanam it is seen [in other texts]. Because of the mention of the vedic metre mention in the previous section the conclusion is. Purva prakaranam upasyam and another word we have to supply is Brahma.

The final sentence is because of the mention of the vedic metre Gayatri the object of meditation in pervious section is not Brahman. The idea is that the purva paksa questions why take Gayatri for meditating upon Brahman when it is nothing but a Gayatri metre. Suppose such an argument is given, then comes siddhanta and his answer we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 59

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The light is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.25 [25]**

#### ***Chandobhidhananneti chet na tatha cheto'rpananigadat tatha hi darsanam***

if it be said tha Brahma is not denoted on account of the metre Gayatir being denoted, we replay not so, because thus i.e., by means of the metre the application of the mind on Brahman is declared' because thus it is seen –in other passages also]

We see the word for word analysis of the sutra. We saw the inferential statement assumed by him is the object of meditatioin in 12<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad is not Brahman. If you prove that what is said there, then alone we can say 13 section deals with Brahman. 12<sup>th</sup> section deals with Gayatri chanda. Because of the mention of vedic metre and it is an Upasana on vedic metre and not Brahman. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Second part of the sutra deals with the answer to the purva paksa. The second na is the negation by us the Siddhantis. The previous section dealt with Gayatri chandah is not correct is our reply to purva paksa. We supply purvaprakarana upasyam na change the object of meditation is not on vedic metre as you claim.

Tatha means through Gayatri symbol. It is through the symbol we meditate and Gayatri is not an object but it is a symbol for some other object. Siddhanti says Gayatri is only alampanam and the upasyam is Brahman. Gayatri chanda alampanena chetorpananigadat chetorpanam means Upasanam and it means Brahma Upasanam. Cheta means mind; arpanam means fixing. Fixing mind means Upasanam.

The word Brahma we have to supply. Nagatad means because of the mention. The final meaning is because of the mention of the Brahma Upasanam. Because of Brahma Upasanam through Gayatri alampanam Gayatri should not be taken as Upasanam but as alampanam. Gayatri chanda alampanena Brahma Upasana vidhanam. Brahma Upasanam is prescribed through the symbol of vedic metre.

Now we will take the word tatha that means such meditation. Such meditation means veda mantra dvara Brahma Upasanani. The word he means widely popularly etc. We see the word darsanam means, such Upasanam are seen by us in the Upanisads. In siksa valli vyahriti mantras are taken as alampanam for Brahma Upasanas. I some cases even letters are taken as symbols for Brahma Upasana. Vedic letter, vedic words, vedic metres, vedic sentences are taken as alampanams for doing vedic Upasanas.

In the olden days people did veda adhyayenam and student's mind was soaked in vedic mantra and it was possible to take such mantras or vedic letters as alamapanam for doing vedic Upasanas. Rg veda people meditate on Isvara on rg mantra. Rg mantra can serve as alampanam for any Upasana. Gayatri is common to all vedas and hence Gayatri is taken as symbol for Brahma Upasana. Now we will go to 26<sup>th</sup> sutra.

## **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The light is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.1.26 [26]**

#### ***Bhutadipadavyapadesopapattescheivam***

And thus also [we must conclude viz., that Brahma is the subject or topic of the previous passage, where Gayatri occurs] because [thus only] the declaration as to the beigns etc. Being the feet is possible.

The main discussion here is 13<sup>th</sup> section of the 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad and we establish that the Jyoti mentioned there refers Brahma and not Gayatri. Here he gives one more reason in support of the above conclusion that Purva prakaranam upasyam na Gayatri chadah. The object of meditation is not vedic metre. In the previous section Upanishad makes a statement 3.12.5 of Chandogya upanisad that Gayatri has got four padas. Adhi Sankaracharya argues this itself indicates Gayatri does not refer to vedic metre and if it refers to vedic metre it should refer to three padas and not one pada. Gayatri has got three padas whereas in the Upanishad says chathus padas.

Once you say Gayatri has got four padas the question comes what are the four padas of Gayatri. In the same Upanishad four padas of Gayatri is mentioned and they are bhutani[all living beings of the creation] second pada is Prithvi [the whole earth] third is sariram [physical body] and the fourth is hridayam [the heart]. From this it is clear Gayatri refers to Brahma or sarvatmakam Brahma. Since four quarters encompass the whole universe all human being consisting of individual body and individual sariram the macrocosm and microcosm the whole thing put together it is said Gayatri. If it is metre how the whole world be talk about here. Therefore Gayatri refers not to the vedic metre but to Brahma alone.

You should make a note that 12<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad states Gayatri has got four padas as above. This is one explanation given by Chandogya upanisad. The very same Chandogya upanisad gives another explanation by quoting a rig mantra. The other three pada are beyond the creation, one is based on sama veda and the other is rg veda based. Entire world creation is the basis for one explanation and the other one is the basis for rg veda based. Final conclusion is Gayatri refers to Brahma alone. Here Vyasacharya takes sama veda based explanation. Because four padas are mentioned as living being earth and sariram.

Now we will enter the word for word analysis. The sutra contains three words. Bhutadi; the elements etc., i.e. The elements, the earth, the body and the heart; pada; [of] foot, part ; vyapadesa; [of]mention [of]declaration or expression; upapatteh; because of the possibility or proof, reasonableness, as it is rightly deduced from the above reasons; cha also; evam thus so.

## **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The light is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.1.27 [27]**

#### ***Upadesabhedanneti chet na ubbayasminnapyavirodhat.*** ..

If it be said [that Brahman of the Gayatri passage cannot be recognized in the passage treating of 'light'] on account of the difference of designation or the specification [we reply] no because in either [designation] there is nothing contrary [to the recognition].

Now we get into a grammatical discussion in this sutra. Going back to our past discussion.

First we analysed and established that Gayatri is Brahman. Then we came to the 13<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad that Jyoti talks of Gayatri only. Therefore we said Jyoti deals with Brahman in roundabout method. In the 12<sup>th</sup> section Gayatri is Brahman. How do you say that 13<sup>th</sup> section also deals with Brahman. For this we gave several reasons. Among various reasons one particular reason we should take up for discussion. Swarga loka or 'div' is repeated in both the sections. In the 12<sup>th</sup> section [3.12.6] of Chandogya upanisad the mantra reads *asmtavanasya Mahima tato jyayamsca purusah padosya Sarva bhutani tripadasyamrtam divi*. The mantra contains the word divi which means swarga loka in the heavens.

Now we come to the mantra 3.13.7 of the same Upanishad which reads as *atha yadatah paro divo yotirdipyate visvatah prsthesu sarvatah prsthesvanuttamesuttamesu lokesvidam vava tadya didamsminnanantah puruse Jyotih* here also we see the word 'divo' to indicate the swarga loka.

Our argument of common word connection, because of the common word occurring in both the sections the object of meditation must be the same and the topic is swarga loka is common to both the section. In both the places we are reminded of the Brahma Upasanam. Based on this argument, the purva paksa is raising an objection. The objection is he says you cannot say that the same word is repeated in both the sections. If the 12<sup>th</sup> section the word mentioned is 'divi' whereas in 13<sup>th</sup> section the word is 'divo'.

Grammatically speaking 12<sup>th</sup> section is using the 7<sup>th</sup> case whereas the 13<sup>th</sup> section is using panchami vibakti the 5<sup>th</sup> case. Even though words are identical the cases are different. Since the cases are different, the topic also must be different. Then the siddhanti says even though cases are different the topic is the same. In one place it is said 'in the heaven' and in the other place it is said 'beyond the heaven' and how can the topic be the same is their argument. Thus we find the propositions are different as we see in one place it is 'in' and in the other it is 'beyond' before the noun heaven. How can both be the same is the argument of the purva paksa.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya answer that in certain times different cases have different meanings but certain other context the different cases or different propositions endings give the same meaning. Jnanad moksa jnanena moksa. The fifth as also the third case both convey the same meaning that knowledge gives moksa. In English also certain propositions convey the meaning of another proposition also. The hotel is on the river. The capital of the country is on the river. Here 'on' means of the river or beyond the river or near the river. The proposition is 'on' but the meaning is 'near' or 'beyond'. Here the word divi does not convey location and it conveys beyond the heaven. There is not a problem. 'In' the heaven means 'beyond' the heaven in this context. We have a proposition 'over'. When I say the clock is over the table means it is located on the table. Suppose I say the boy jumped over the table means he jumped beyond the table. Here divi and divah should not disturb too much as.

Now we will see the second argument. When we talk about the repetition of the same word we only talk about the repetition of the word and not the cases. Behind the proposition we should see the word is repeated or is the same should be seen by us. Repetition of word is enough whether the topic is the same. Prakriti is common but Pratyaya there is no difference. I will give you the example in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 60

### **Topic 10 – Sutras 24-27 [Jyoticharanadhikaranam]**

The light is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.27 [27]**

*Upadesabhedanneti chet na ubbayasminnapyavirodhat.*

If it be said [that Brahman of the Gayatri passage cannot be recognized in the passage treating of 'light'] on account of the difference of designation or the specification [we reply] no because in either [designation] there is nothing contrary [to the recognition].

This sutra consists of two parts the first of purva paksa and the second one is that of Siddhantis. The word divi in the 12<sup>th</sup> section and divah in 13<sup>th</sup> section of fist chapter of Chandogya upanisad refers to heaven in both the places. This gives us the pratya vijnanam the recognition that the object of meditation is the same in both the places.

Purva paksa's argument was that you couldn't take as confirmation that both are the same because of the different in the cases from grammar point of view. This we have discussed in detail in the last class. For that we gave two answers that even though the propositions are different we say that the two different propositions convey almost the same idea only. We say that in both the cases it means divah only and there I no difference between divi and divo from the standpoint of grammar even though two case endings are there, the meaning is the same.

Secondly our conclusion is not based on proposition but on the word near the proposition. We don't talk about the repetition or recognition of the proposition but we see the repetition of the word heaven and therefore the topic in both the places are the same. Suppose we have two books and in the first place it is written volume I and in the second book it is not written what book but volume is written as II.

In such cases I read the characters or the name occurring in the second volume and if I see the names are repeated I conclude that this volume is continuation of Ramayanam only. For this confirmation I read the names and not the volume. The propositions may be different and I am not particular in case ending but I am interested in names. I am not interested in the words and not the propositions.

Again even though propositions are different the meanings are the same in both the places. Though the grammatical cases used in the scriptural passage are not identical, the object of the reference is clearly recognized as being identified. So ends the general analysis of this sutra.

Now I will come to the word for word analysis. Upadesa; of teaching of grammatical construction or cases; bhedat; because of the difference; na; not; iti chet: of it be said; na; no; ubhayasmin; in both [whether in the ablative case or in the locative case] api even; avirodhat because there is no contradiction.

Of these first two words relate to purva paksa. Here we have to supply two words to complete purva paksa. They are Purva prakaranam upasyam the objection of meditation said in the 12<sup>th</sup> section of chapter 1 of Chandogya upanisad. Then we have to supply then the word Brahma. The object of meditation in the pervious section is not Brahma because` of the Upadesa bedad the words are different in both the cases. The words kept in mind are divi and divo occurring in 12<sup>th</sup> andnm13th section respectively. They are different is their argument. When they talk about not the difference in words but on the basis of the propositions.

Then comes if such an argument is given by purva paksa, then comes siddhanta answer na ubayasmin api abhirodad. Here also we supply three words. Purva prarita upasyam na Brahma na iti na. That means it is Brahman. Purva paksa is not true is easier expression. Here there is no contradiction in the ideas.

All the things and beings are one quarter of Brahman and the other three relate to heaven. Here the word all means that not only the things and beings of Buloka as also the higher and lower lokas also or the entire Saguna Prapancha that will include the swarga loka also. Suppose the word divi is taken in the heaven and there will be problem of repetition because it is included in the word 'all'. Therefore the word divi should not be taken as being in the heaven but it should be taken as beyond heaven. It is beyond Sagunam Brahman and it is but Nirgunam Brahman. This is beyond ika loka and para loka. This is our argument. Thus there is no contradiction. The tenth Adhikaranam is over with the 27<sup>th</sup> sutra.

I will give you the final summary of the entire Adhikaranam. This is unique because we give a set of reasons and we make two conclusions. Two conclusions are one is with regard to 3.1.12 and the other one of 3.1.13 Chandogya upanisad. The first one talks of Gayatri Brahma. The word gayatri used in 12<sup>th</sup> section does not refer to gayatri metre or gayatri mantra but refer to Brahman. We come to another conclusion based on 13<sup>th</sup> section Jyotih Brahman that means that Jyoti occurring in 13<sup>th</sup> section is Brahman. For both conclusions the reasons are the same.

Three reasons are given. We see one each in three sutras. We have to read three sutras twice because we come to the two conclusions. First time gayatri Brahma charanabhidanad; the bhutadipadavayapadesopapptechaivam and conclusion is gayatri Brahma. Then we have to read the same second time. Gayatri abinnam Jyotih Brahma; charanabhidanad; then you repeat the mantra. The conclusion is some with set of two reacons.

Her we take reasons from the 12<sup>th</sup> section [ibid] and we apply the reason for the conclusion in the 13<sup>th</sup> section [ibid]. This is the uniqueness of this Adhikaranam. It is because in the 13<sup>th</sup> section we don't have the direct supporting reasons and therefore we borrow this from 12<sup>th</sup> section. Therefore, it appears to be a confusing Adhikaranam. Now I come to the technical format.

The subject matter in this Adhikaranam is the word Jyotih occurring in 3.13.7 of Chandogya upanisad. The samsaya is we have to tell the doubt. Without doubt the topic will not be included in Brahma Sutra. If it is not a confusing topic it will not find a place in Brahma Sutra. The doubt here is Jyoti is whether it is Chetana or Achetana whether it refers to worldly light or it refers to Chetana Jyoti the Consciousness principle. Because we find both the meanings are there.



In fact because of this confusion alone people wait for Jyoti to come. We should not take the Jyoti as karya Jyoti but take it as Brahma Jyoti. Purva paksa takes it as Achetana Jyoti or adithya Jyoti. He takes that meaning because that is the primary meaning and that is the known meaning. Then comes siddhanta and he says Jyotih Brahman. We talk about Sagunam Brahman only. Samkya does not believe in Isvara and therefore we have to establish Isvara. Because of the three reasons we conclude that Jyotih Brahman. Because of the same reason the word gayatri is Brahma which is an incidental conclusion. It comes in the appropriate position only.

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.28 [28]**

#### ***Pranastathanugamat***

prana is Brahman, that being so understood from a connected consideration [of the passage referring to prana]

This is the first sutra of the pratardanadhikaranam. Normally the Adhikaranam is named based on the prominent word of the first sutra. Here it is prana and it should be named pranadhikaranam because 9<sup>th</sup> is named as pranadhikarnam and therefore this Adhikaranam is named as pratardanadhikaranam. Generally in vidvat sadat, they discuss Brahma Sutra. Each scholar takes up one Adhikaranam each. Then other people attack and so the vidvat discusses the topics.

To avoid the communication gap it has been named as pratardanadhikaranam to avoid repetition with 9<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam. In this Adhikaranam the Upanishad taken is Kaushitaki Upanishad. This Upanisad belongs to rg veda consisting of four chapters. One particular point to be noted is very big mantra. Third chapter second mantra is taken up for discussion. *Sahovaca pranosmi pajnatma tanman ayur iti upasva.* More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 61

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.28 [28]**

#### ***Pranastathanugamat***

prana is Brahman, that being so understood from a connected consideration [of the passage referring to prana]

We see the 28th sutra, which is the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam of the first pada of the first chapter. This Adhikaranam deals with a mantra in Kaushitaki Upanishad belonging to rg veda. A particular portion of the big chapter 2<sup>nd</sup> mantra of 3<sup>rd</sup> of Kaushitaki Upanishad is taken for analysis, which reads as *Sahovaca pranosmi pajnatma tanman ayur iti upasva*. Here the teaching is given in the form of Indra the teacher and the disciple is the king known as Pratardano. He was powerful and valourous king. Indra liked the king.

Pratardano is on earth and Indra is in the heaven. It is like Naciketusa visiting Yama. Pratardano meets Indra and says I am very much pleased with you and he gives a boon to the king. Pratardano leaves the boon to Indra and asks for the best that is useful for entire humanity. He says I don't want to choose and he left the choice to Indra. Indra knows there are four purusarthas dharma, Artha, kama and moksa. There is only one that is best and that is moksa. Moksa is not a substance. Moksa is the very nature of every person and it is given in terms of jnanam. It is already ours for claiming. Getting moksa Purusartha is claiming Purusartha. Claiming moksa is possible only gaining the knowledge.

Indra chooses to bless Pratardano with Brahma jnanam. This is one of the dialogues in the Upanishad. There is another dialogue Gargya ajatasatru dialogue from Brahadharaynaka upanishad is repeated here. Since Pratardano is the student, it is called Pratardanadhikaranam. Indra begins his teachings. Instead he calls the king and say that you should know me. It is like Krishna asking Arjuna to surrender to him. Now the question comes who are you. Indra begins to describe himself. He talks about himself in different vein and therefore there is lot of confusion.

In Gita also we have confusion about the role of Krishna. He calls himself as friend of Arjuna when he addresses himself as an ordinary human being. At the same time when he says that I have taken many avatars to save the humanity, Krishna poses himself as Sarvatmaka Brahman. There is need for us to clearly understand the meaning of the words used by Baghavan to realize what he actually means when he says I am the karanam of everything.

Sometimes Krishna is Mr. Krishna and in other places he is Sagunam Brahman and in other places he is Nirgunam Brahman. One I is to be interpreted differently at different places keeping the context in mind. Here also Indra uses the word aham in different meaning. In one place he says ajaraha asmi and I am immortal etc. And in some places he says I am Brahman.

In other places he says I am prana and I am prajnatma asmi, Chetana rupa asmi or Chaitanya swarupa asmi.

Therefore there is some confusion. We have taken one particular statement for analysis. He says aham pranah asmi. I am pranah. I am prajnatma asmi Chetana swarupah asmi Chaitanya rupah asmi. May you know me as the immortal one. I am the very life of everyone. We analyse prana as to whether prana refers to Indra himself or whether prana refers to jiva or whether it refers to vayu or whether it refers to Brahman. In this Adhikaranam we establish prana is Brahman. This is the general analysis of the entire Adhikaranam.

The first sutram is the main sutram that lead to the argument to establish that prana is Brahman only. Tathaanugamat because of the consistency it is accepted as Brahman. There is confusion different topics are discussed. Shadlinga vicara is samanvayah finding the consistency or harmony. This we have done elaborately in samanvaya Adhikaranam. Now we have to find out what are the indication is Brahman is consistently discussed and not prana or jiva or vayu or Indra.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives four main indications to how that Brahman is discussed here. First clue is that he says pratardana has asked for the best Purusartha in mantra 3.1 of the Upanishad ibid. We know Brahma jnanam alone is the best Purusartha and therefore prana must refer to Brahma alone. Knowing prana as prana will not give Brahma jnanam and getting prana jnanam he will get higher loka and not liberation. This is first indication.

Second indication is that he says that because of this knowledge a person is freed from all the karmas. It is again 3.1 of the Upanishad ibid. Once one knows this, he does not have to worry about anything. This state can be attained only through Brahma jnanam. Sarva karma nasa phalam.

Third clue is Adhi Sankaracharya points out that esha prana eva prajnatma ajarah anandah amrtia swarupah and it is neither increasable nor decreasable and there is one neither thing that will neither decrease nor increase and that purnatvam belongs to only Brahman. The regular prana cannot be said to be ananda. How can regular panca prana be ananda, amritam and ajara. Therefore we should not take the vachyartham of prana but take the lakshyartham of prana, which is nothing but Brahman. This is the third reason.

Fourth and final meaning is pranosmi prajnatma is there that means Chaitanyam swarupam and Chaitanya swarupam belongs to Brahma alone. Regular prana is born out of the samasti rajo guna of five elements and since elements are inert in nature but prana is Chetana prana and therefore it should refer to aboudhika chaitanyam eva. This is indicated by the word anugamat. This is the meaning of the first sutra

We come to word for word analysis. Pranah; the breath or life energy the word occurring in 3.2 of Kaushitaki Upanishad; them we supply the word Brahma; tatha, thus so likewise like that stated before; life that stated in the sruti quoted in connection therewith; angamat because of being understood [from the texts]. The final meaning is that prana is Brahman. This is the main theme of the sutra.

First objection is that prana should be taken as vayu Tattvam. Samasti vayu is available in individual level as prana. This vayu is glorified in the Upanisads. Upanishad says vayu is infinite vayu is Brahma and vayu is eternal also. Vayu is anasthamita devata. Therefore prana

is vayu. Prana is primary meaning of the word vayu. It is the Vachyartha and it is primary meaning than all secondary meaning.

Adhi Sankaracharya says no. Because primary meaning can be given up if all the other statements support our conclusions. In support of many favourable factors we can give up the primary meaning. When Vachyartha goes against logic etc., we can give up the primary meaning and take to lakshyartha meaning. The second reason is Sarva karma nasa phalam. Again eternity of vayu said in the pictures is not literal eternity. That eternity is not primary. Compared to jalam, vayu and agni prana has got better life. Even after the resolution of three elements vayu continues in Akasa. Therefore vayu is not anantam, anandam ajaram etc., will not be possible. Thus it is concluded you take the Vachyartha meaning.

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.29 [29]**

#### ***Ma vakturatmopadesaditi chet adhyatmasambandhabhuma hyasmin***

If it be said that [Brahman is] not [denoted or referred in these passages on account of] the speaker's instruction about himself we reply not so because there is abundance of reference to the inner self in this [chapter of the Upanishad]

As I said before these three sutras are only answering the various points. We know prana is vayu is negated. Here and the next sutra gives some other objection. This is against Indra's statement made to Pratardana. First person singular refers to the speaker. Here the speaker is Indra. Therefore purva paksa claims the word prana refer to devata only because of the sentence sa ho vaca..... This is the Purva paksa. First part is purva paksa view and the second part is the teaching.

Entire teachings refer to individual only. It has nothing to do with adhideivam. adhyatmam deals with individual adhi butham deals with cosmos creation adhi Deivam controlling the creation. Indra comes under adhi Deivam classification. Vyasacharya says if you look to the teachings in Brahman, it deals adhyatmam only. The word prana itself in the context of various states of experience, you cannot suddenly go to devata. You may go anywhere. Predominant reference in this chapter is adhyatmama.

We will see the word for word analysis. Na; not; vaktuh; of the speaker [indra; Atma of the Self; upadesat on account of instruction; iti thus chet; if adhyatma sambandha bhuma; abundance of reference to the Inner Self; Hi because asmin; in this chapter or Upanishad. Prana cannot be Brahman is the purva paksa argument. Because prana is taught as Atma the very self. Here prana is revealed as the very self of the speaker. Here speaker happens to be Indra and therefore we should take it as prana and not Brahman

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 62

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.29 [29]**

#### ***Ma vakturatmopadesaditi chet adhyatmasambandhabhuma hyasmin***

If it be said that [Brahman is] not [denoted or referred in these passages on account of] the speaker's instruction about himself we reply not so because there is abundance of reference to the inner self in this [chapter of the Upanishad]

The present sutra is the second sutra of pratardhanadhikaranam. The topic of discussion is the word prana that occurs in Kaushitaki Upanishad. In the first sutra of this Adhikaranam we have establish the main conclusion that prana is Brahman. The supporting reason is that the following portion because of the law of consistency. There are two reasons for consistency.

The Upanishad says that prana jnanam is the greatest goal of life and we know if prana jnanam to be greatest goal prana cannot be ordinary prana but Brahman. Sarva karma nasa is possible through Brahma jnanam only and hence prana must be Brahman only. The usage of ananda, ajarah. Amritah etc., also reveals that prana is Brahman and we have already concluded the main meaning in the first sutra. From this sutra Vyasacharya refutes the interpretations of other philosophers. We have already refuted the purva paksa argument that prana represents vayu in the first sutra.

According to this purva paksa the word prana should mean Indra devata alone. The reason he gives is that the speaker happens to be Indra. While talking about prana he uses the words in apposition with prana. In one place he says you should know prana and in another place he says that you should know me thus it is made clear that prana is Indra.

Prana knowledge is equivalent of knowing me. We know that a reflective pronoun can refer to only the speaker. The first person singular always refers to the speaker and here the speaker is Indra devata and hence prana refers to Indra devata alone. The first portion of the sutra is the purva paksa argument. Our answer is that we don't question the subjective reference of Indra.

When you see the third chapter in the entire chapter we find there is no scope for devata description at all, the topic is adhyatma topic and not adhideivam topic. The whole chapter discusses the prana and the Brahman. The contextual references support Adhyatmam and not Adhideivam meaning.

In Isavasya Upanishad it says in mantra 4 that *nainad deva apnuvan Purva marsat* it describes Atma is not available for any type of knowledge or objectification and it says devas cannot objectify Atma. The topic of discussion is available for any means of knowledge only. Suddenly Indra or Varuna cannot come. We talk about sense organs prana Avasthatriyam etc., all are centred on Adhyatmam and you cannot give Adhideivam meaning to prana. This is the general analysis.

Pranah na Brahma it is said by purva paksa devata vadi; he says prana occurring in Kaushitaki 3.2 is not Brahman. When he says it is not Brahma he has in mind that prana is Indra devata. Prana refers to Indra devata according to him. Vaktu Atmani upadesat; here the speaker is Indra. Word Atma means himself. Here it does not mean sachidananda Atma. Upadesat means revelation. It means because of the speakers revelation of prana as himself; if such an argument is given by anyone or purva paksa the answer is Adhyatma sambanda bhuma; bhuma means predominance; sambandha means related to; predominant discussion is related to Adhyatmam related to individual.

Here the emphasis is on the word Adhyatmam. Here Vyasacharya negates Adhideivam by emphasizing Adhideivam. Here Indra is negated here. Indra comes under Adhideivam group. The next word hyasmin; he should be joined to Adhyatmam sambanda bhuma and he means because; because predominant discussion is related to the individual and not devatas the celestials, why do you talk of devatas here. Asmin means here in this section. In this Upanishad there is no need for bringing in devata when it discusses only individual. Therefore pranah na Indra h. This is our argument. With this 29<sup>th</sup> sutra is over.

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.30 [30]**

#### ***Sastradrishtya tupadeso vamadevavat***

the declaration [made by Indra about himself viz., that he is and with Brahma] is possible through intuition as attested by sruti, as in the case of Vamadeva.

In the previous sutra devata vadi was negated. Circumstantial evidences do not support Indra and he cannot be drawn. Purva paksa is not satisfied with our answer. Therefore he raises another question. He is not satisfied because he says I gave a reason to establish that prana is Indra but you have not directly answered my question. But you have not refuted my reason that usage of pronoun which first person singular refers to Indra himself. You have not replied this point. I have got direct evidence that Indra uses the word I and me which has not been answered at all.

Indra says in mantra 3.1 of Kaushitaki Upanishad *mam eva vijanithy etad evaham manusyaya hitatamam manne yan mam vijaniyan trisirsanam tvastram ahanam* that Indra begins his teaching that you should know me to the highest of Purusartha. For that answer is given in this sutra. The word I or me has got two meanings. One is called Vachyartha, the primary meaning used in common language and the other is implied meaning known as lakshyartha, which is predominantly used in Upanisads and scriptures. It is a meaning given in scriptural standpoint. I the primary meaning refer to anatma the karya karana sthoola sookshma sariram. Vyavaharika Dristi is Vachyartha; scripture teaches another meaning.

Another 'I', sastra wants to teach which is other than Sookshma Sariram Sthoola Sariram and the other meaning is the Consciousness in the body. The scripture aims to reveal the Consciousness and point out that you the body is mortal and you the Consciousness is ever immortal. You should know when loukika Dristi Artha should be taken and where satriya Dristi Artha should be taken. Suppose Krishna says you are my friend and then it refers to Krishna not only as a friend and there first person refers to anatma.

But when Krishna says 9.4 of Gita says *maya tatam idam Sarvam jagad avyaktamurlina matshani sarvabhutani na ca ham tesu avasthitah* that means by Me all this universe is pervaded through My unmanifested form. All beings abide in Me but I do not abide in them. Here Krishna refers himself to Brahman. His absolute reality is for above the appearance of things in space and time. Can Krishna the person pervade the whole creation? No. Krishna as person cannot say he pervades the whole creation. When Krishna says I pervade how can you take it as Brahman.

So here the mang refers to lakshyartha and paraprakriti is Consciousness alone. Always you see whether it is sastriya or loukika Dristi? Indra used first person singular and it is sastriya dristya upadesah. It is lakshyartha Dristi. But Vyasacharya gives an example from Brahadharaynaka upanisad. This occurs in Taittiriya Upanishad also. Here Vamadeva Rishi is given. Refer to 1.4.10 *Brahma va idam agra asit, tad Atmanam evavet, aham Brahmasmiti tasmad tat Sarvam abhavat tad yo yo Devanam pratyabudhyota, so eva tad abhavat, tatha rstuam tatha manusyanam*, that reads as Brahman, indeed was this in the beginning. I know myself only as 'I am Brahman'. Therefore it became all.

Whoever among the gods became awakened to this be indeed became that. Whoever knows I am Brahman he can say I am everything sarvatma bhava it is called. Upanishad quotes vamadeva Rishi and that Rishi declared that I am Manuh and aham Surya and extend further I am stars moon and *ayam eva idam Sarvam*, in Taittiriya we have got 3.x.6 *aham annam aham annam aham annam aham annado3'ham annado3'ham annadah ahagm sloka-krda-ahagnm sloka-krda-hagm sloka-krt, aham-asmi prathamaja rta3 bhayi, yo ma dadati so edeva ma3 vah aham annam annam dantama3-;dmi, aham visvam bhvanam-abhya-bhava3m, suvarna Jyotih, ya evam veda, ity upanisat* there a jnani says I am all. The Rishi is talking about his sariram but he talks of Brahman only. In all such cases aham means sastra drisya Brahman alone. Vamadeva Rishi got knowledge even during the conception alone. Now we will go to word analysis.

There are four words in this sutra *sastradrishtya*; through insight based on scripture or as attested by sruti it is not loka drishtya, it is from lakshyartha drishtya; *tu* unlike loka drishtya ; but; *upadesah*; instruction, the teaching from Indra in front of Pratardana; *vamadevavat*; like that of *vamadeva* although there are so many examples are there in the Upanishad. If vamadeva refers to body he cannot say that I pervade everywhere.

Devatavadi is still not satisfied. He raises another question, which Adhi Sankaracharya gives, in his commentary. In the third mantra itself Indra said that you know me and in the same mantra another line comes. Purva paksa quotes some more description of Indra . The description is the mantra says *trisirsanam tvastram ahanam* where he says that I have killed an asura called Tvastran an asura with three-headed monster. He says *arunmukan yatin salavrkebhayah prayacchan* that means there were some fake sannyasis who had Vedanta in their mouth all the time who talked spirituality all the time but there were some who don't talk of spirituality but who talked loukika words; they are non-vedantic sannyasis and they mislead the world and I gave all the sannyasis the wild dogs to kill them. In fact he asked the dogs to kill the fake sannyasis. These are all from Indra drishti for Brahman cannot kill anyone. Here Indra is using the word clearly for devata. Because of reference to tvastra vada the first person singular should be taken as Indra devata only and therefore I cannot accept prana as Brahman. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 63

### **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.1.30 [30]**

#### ***Sastradrishtya tupadeso vamadevavat***

the declaration [made by Indra about himself viz., that he is and with Brahma] is possible through intuition as attested by sruti, as in the case of Vamadeva.

.Here there is a dialogue between Pratardana and Indra. The discussion is on Prana occurring in Kaushitaki Upanishad mantra 2. Purva paksa object prana is not Brahma but Vyasacharya negates the objections. First contention that prana is vayu is negated and the second contention is indra devata itself is being negated in the current sutra. It is because indra uses the word aham when he referred prana. We elaborately discussed in the last class. First we negated on plea that the discussion is centred round Adhyatmam and we should not bring in devata discussion and the purva paksa objection is negated. The second part is given in the present sutra.

Now their point is when you say the chapter predominantly discusses means you have no direct support in the absence of direct support. Now purva paksa gives the direct support of reflective pronoun 'mang' and he asks how do you answer this scripture support. In scripture aham is used in two ways one is lokaika prayogah the common meaning and another is sastriya drishtya and Krishna says I am sarvatma and here one should take sastriya drishti. Here also indra can use the word both in personal name and lakshyartha drishtya when it will mean Brahman. Mama ayuh amritam upasva may you meditate upon me and you will become immortal.

In some other places also he says you remember me you will be immortal; by knowing indra as devata none will get moksa and if one sees from sastriya drishtya the one gains liberation. The details of Vamadeva is given in the next class. One more question is raised by purva paksa, which I raised in the last class. He said when indra uses aham it is not sastriya drishti and it refers to devata also. He only give details of his exploits in Brahadharaynaka upanisad in killing of asuras and fake sannyasis. All these exploits belonged to Indra devata and not to Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says that you are only studying those statement talks about the exploits of indra. There is another sentence follows the killing of asuras and sannyasis.

It says *Tasya me tatra na loma canamiyate, sa yo mam veda na ha vai Tasya hena cana karmana loko miyate* the essence of the sloka is even though I have killed all sannyasis and it is papa karma and either I should papa or punya phalam and I am free from all the phalas. I am not afflicted by those karmas. When indra says I am not affected by karma phalam, it is very clear that he refers to Atma alone. Exploits are mentioned not to talk of devata Atma and it only shows even the extreme karmas will not affect me. Krishna says in Gita all the karmas are mentioned there only to show that all of them will not affect asanga Atma swarupam.



Therefore the Upadesa is satriya drishti eva. Even the papams will not touch my hair is the expression used by indra. Then where is the question of touching me the Atma.

## **Topic 11 – Sutras 28-31 [Pratardanadhikaranam]**

The prana is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.1.31 [31]**

#### ***Jiva Mukhya prana linganneti chet na uapsatraividhyat asritatvadiha tadyogat***

it is to be said that [Brahman is] not [meant] on account of characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital air [being mentioned], we say no, because [such an interpretation] would enjoin threefold meditation [Upasana] because Prana has been accepted [elsewhere in the Sruti in the sense of Brahman] and because here also [words denoting Brahman] are mentioned with reference to Prana.

Purva paksa says that we have got enough clues to take prana as jiva itself. This is called jiva lingam. Lingam means clue or indication. Prana also may refer to mukhya prana. Our regular prana is called mukhya pranah. In certain context prana is used in the sense of sense organs.

In 2.1.8 of Mundaka Upanishad it is said *sapta pranah prabhavanti tasmad saptaricisah samidhah sapta homah. Sapta ime loka yesu caranti prana guhasaya nihitah sapta sapta* that means from Him are born seven pranas the seven flames, seven fold fuel, the seven fold oblations, as also the seven worlds where the pranas move in the cave of living creatures, seven and seven. Here prana means sense organs. Very breathing itself is called prana.

So add the adjective Mukhya then it is regular prana. Purva paksa says that there is one statement occurring in 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter 8<sup>th</sup> mantra of Kaushitaki Upanishad says don't concentrate on the instruments or organs and they are not the real you and you should know one who is using the karanam and you should know the smeller, speaker and in short you should know one behind the organ, if Indra negates the karanam and you should know the karta means the statement refers to jiva alone.

Then comes the fourth meaning for the word prana and he says prana means life breath alone. He gives another reference 3.3 of Kaushitaki Upanishad says prana is the life of the person. Prana alone holds the very body together and not only it holds the body together but also it supports such a weak plant is supported by a stick that holds the body together. That is why when the prana goes the body disintegrates. That prana is panca prana that holds the prana. From that it is clear that prana refers to Mukhya prana alone.

Siddhanti gives three reasons to negate the purva paksa. One chapter will have three different themes, which is against mimamsa sastra. It says one prakaranam should have one main theme. All other topics should be secondary topics. All secondary topics will center on the main topic. The achievement of the goal of liberation is not possible without gaining Brahma jnanam. Therefore our conclusion is that partaram also should be interpreted as Brahman. Prana supports the body and here also the prana refers to Brahman alone. Vyasacharya says that this is not the unique thing we do and we have done this in many places. All indriams are backed by Consciousness alone; prana is prana is because of Chaitanyam alone. Everybody

lives not because of local prana but because of the original Consciousness that enlivens the body.

In Kathopanisad mantra 2.5.5 says *na pranena na apanena martyo jivati kascana, itarena tu jivanti, yasminn etav upasritau* that reads as not by Prana; Not by apana does any mortal live; but it is by some other, on which these two depend, that men live. Prana itself is jadam in nature and behind the prana there is Chaitanyam that is called Pranasya prana. The glory of prana is prana borrows Chaitanyam from atma this prana out of borrowed Consciousness prana lends Consciousness to the Sthoola Sariram and the real glory belongs not to prana but to the atma.

That is why it called Pranasya prana and it is called atma. The real supporter is Brahman only. In this Kaushitaki Upanishad also the situation is the same and the word should not be taken literally and be taken as atma. We have to see the context and understand rightly.

Now we will see the word meaning. Jivamukhyapranalingat; on account of the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital air; Na; not; iti; thus chet; if; na; not Upasana; worship meditation; traivdhyat; because of the three ways; asritatvat; on account of prana being accepted [elsewhere in sruti in the sense of Brahma]; iha; in the Kaushitaki Upanishad passage; tadyagoat; because of its appropriateness; as they have been applied; because words denoting Brahma are mention with reference to prana.

Since there is jiva and prana, it is concluded that prana refers to Brahman. supporter is prana but ultimate supporter is Brahman. in 9<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam we have interpreted prana as Brahman why cannot we do it here. Although there may be many indications, the powerful one will take the lead. Because of these reasons pranah is Brahman.

I will sum up the entire Adhikaranam. the visayah is the word prana occurring in 3.2 of Kaushitaki Upanishad is the subject matter. the doubt is whether it refers to Brahman or anything else of Brahman. the doubt is due to the clues indicating so many things. Purva paksas says vayuh, devata, jivah,, and then Mukya prana can be taken as prana. they don't want it to be Brahman. siddantis says prana is Brahman. the sangathi is the Adhikaranam is in appropriate place only. In 9<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam also we proved prana is Brahman and why should we have two Adhikaranam. it is because in 9<sup>th</sup> Adhikaranam brahma lingam was there and there was no problem. it was not obstructed by any other lingam. But it is not the case with this Adhikaranam. with this first pada is over.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 2			
Classes: 064 to 087 - Sutras: 1-2-1 to 1-2-32			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
64	212	1 . 2 . 1	32
65	215	1 . 2 . 1 and 1 . 2 . 2	32 and 33
66	219	1 . 2 . 2 to 1 . 2 . 5	33 to 36
67	223	1 . 2 . 5 to 1 . 2 . 7	36 to 38
68	227	1 . 2 . 7 and 1 . 2 . 8	38 and 39
69	231	1 . 2 . 8 and 1 . 2 . 9	39 and 40
70	235	1 . 2 . 9	40
71	239	1 . 2 . 9 and 1 . 2 . 10	40 and 41
72	243	1 . 2 . 11	42
73	246	1 . 2 . 11 and 1 . 2 . 12	42 and 43
74	250	1 . 2 . 12 and 1 . 2 . 13	43 and 44
75	254	1 . 2 . 13 and 1 . 2 . 14	44 and 45
76	258	1 . 2 . 15 to 1 . 2 . 17	46 to 48
77	262	1 . 2 . 17 and 1 . 2 . 18	48 and 49
78	266	1 . 2 . 18 and 1 . 2 . 19	49 and 50
79	269	1 . 2 . 19 and 1 . 2 . 20	50 and 51
80	272	1 . 2 . 20 and 1 . 2 . 21	51 and 52
81	276	1 . 2 . 21	52
82	279	1 . 2 . 21 to 1 . 2 . 23	52 to 54
83	283	1 . 2 . 24	55
84	286	1 . 2 . 24 to 1 . 2 . 26	55 to 57
85	290	1 . 2 . 26 to 1 . 2 . 28	57 to 59
86	295	1 . 2 . 28 and 1 . 2 . 29	59 and 60
87	298	1 . 2 . 29 to 1 . 2 . 32	60 to 63
	301		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 2

Class: 64

### **Pada 2 - Introduction**

You may remember that Brahman sutra has got four adhyayas first is samanvaya adhyaya, second is aviroda adhyaya, third is sadhana adhyaya and the fourth is phala adhyaya. In the first adhyaya vyasacharya shows the consistency and harmony and he shows Brahman known as upasyam Brahman and neyam Brahman. Upasyam Brahman is called isvara. This samanvaya adhyaya consist of four sections and each one is called pada or quarter. It consisted of 11 topics and 31 sutras. In these 11 topics the first is introduction and all the later ten topics dealt with Brahman alone. Of these 10 topics we find 2<sup>nd</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam totally 6 adhikaranams deals with neyam Brahman vedantic topics as means of liberation. From 7<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam deals with upasyam Brahman or isvara.

Whether it is neyam Brahman or upasyam Brahman it deals with Brahman alone. Spasta Brahman linga samanvaya vadah it means in this pada whatever upanisadic statements are taken they are supported by clear references to Brahman. Brahman linga vakyams they are. It reveals sarva adhistanam clues revealing Brahman. These clues are divided into two spasta Brahman lingam clearly indicating Brahman and aspasta Brahman lingam which are not directly revealing Brahman. They are to be analysed and show that all deal with Brahman alone. In the first pada the statements taken are all belong to spasta linga vakya Brahman samanvaya pada.

Now we enter second pada. And this is known as aspasta Brahman linga vakya samanvaya pada. Here we will takes the clues, which are unclear and establish that Brahman alone is the subject matter. Whether it is spasta or aspasta the aim is all of them reveal Brahman alone. Central theme of all upanishad is Brahman only. All uniformly deal with Brahman. It is called mimamsa. Because of this only Brahman sutra got the name utara mimamsa sutrani. We have seven topics and thirty-two sutras. With this background we will take up first adhikaranam of the second pada.

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.1 [32]**

#### ***Sarvatra prasiddhopadesat***

[that which consists of the mind 'manomaya is Brahman] because there is taught [in this text] [that Brahman which is] well-known [as the cause of the world] in the upanisads.

Now i will enter into general analysis of the entire adhikaranam. This adhikaranam consists of 8 sutras. This adhikaranam analyses the mantras 1 to 4 occurring in the 14 chapter of 3<sup>rd</sup> section. This section in chandogya upanishad is called sandilya vidya. This section consists of four mantras beginning with *sarvam khalvidam Brahman tajjalaniti santa upasita*; it has got four mantra. We take up the second mantra for analysis. [3.14.2] sandilya is asking the

devotee to do an upasanam. The object of meditation is the controversy, which we will resolve. It is described as mano maya that which has got manas as upadhi; prana sarirah the one who has got prana as his body; and barupah chaitanya swarupah.

These are the gunas or virtues of the upasya. Therefore in chandogya upanishad 3.14.2 we have an upasya vastu, which if of the nature of mano mayadi visistah characterized by mano maya, prana maya and barupah. Here we have controversy that whether the mano mayadi visista upasyam is jiva or Brahman. It is because the upanishad is mischievous in this section. The condition for analysis is only when there is doubt seen in the upanishad. The first qualification for entering the Brahman sutra is doubt and that it should be beneficial to the seeker. It should not be a useless pursuit. It is called kaka dantha pariksa nyayah.

There are fourteen sections where there are problems. Upanishad gives many descriptions of Brahman as also upasya vastu and equal number of description of jiva also and if only Brahman lingams are there there is no controversy and only jiva lingams are there, there is no controversy. When there is a mixture of Brahman lingam or jiva lingam there is controversy. This is the general analysis of the entire adhikaranam. We will establish mano mayadi visistam Brahmaniva. Purva paksha will argue it is jivaiva.

Now we will analyse of the first sutra. Here vyaacharya analyse mano mayadi alone is Brahman. It begins with Brahman. It comes under 3.14.2 of chandogya upanishad. First we will take 3.14.1 of chandogya upanishad that reads as *sarvam khalvidam Brahman tajjalaniti santa upasita; atha khalu kratumayah puruso yathakraturasmimlloke puruso bhavati tathetah pretya bhavati sa kratum kurvita* [all this is Brahman. Everything comes from Brahman; everything goes back to Brahman, and everything is sustained by Brahman. One should therefore quietly meditate on Brahman. Each person has a mind of his own. What a person wills in his present life, he become when he leaves this world. One should bear this in mind and meditate accordingly.]

I will summarise the mantra briefly and it is the most important mantra. Idam sarvam Brahman kalu the whole creation is Brahmaniva. The upanishad gives the logic tajjalan is the description of the world and the world is given a beautiful title; first description is tajjam means that which is born out of Brahman; tallam means the world is that which resolves into Brahman; tadanam means 'ann' means breath; breathing means existence; Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam of the world is established. Hence the world is given the title tajjalan.

Since everything is Brahman karyam sarvam Brahmaniva. Ornament is gold because it is gold karyam. *Yad yad karyam tad tadatmakam. Brahman karyam jagat Brahman rupam. Jagat Brahman rupam Brahman karyatvam mrd rupa gatavad.* Therefore, since everything is Brahman why do get annoyed. May you do upasana of Brahman, which is sarvatmakam. Thereafter ward upanishad says a person is made up of what he repeatedly meditates. As a man thinks so becomes not only mentally but also physically. Purusa is said to be dhyana mayah. He is a product of his own meditation.

Meditation does not mean you sit and meditate. Meditation means whatever be the constant preoccupation of the mind. Krishna says in 8.5 of gita *yam yam va 'pi smaran bhavam tyajati ante kalevaram tam tam evai'ti kounteya sada tadbha abhavitah* that means thinking of whatever state [of having] he at the end gives up his body, to that being does he attain o son of kunti, being ever absorbed in the thought thereof. Not only he becomes the object of

meditation in this life but also he becomes one of the thought in the next life also. As a person thinks so that he becomes after death.

Then the upanishad advises may a person monitor the mental life. Generally we don't monitor our mental biography because the world and society does not know it. People bother about the shirt they wear. But they don't bother about banian. So you do dhyanam. In the first sutra vyasacharya argues that Brahman is the upasya vastu and therefore mano mayadi visista upasyam Brahmaniva na tu jivah. Here again i have to make an incidental point. We do discuss Brahman or isvara in the sastra. We should see the context of discussion.

Sometimes Brahman is discussed as upasyam Brahman or sometimes as neyam Brahman. When we discuss upasyam Brahman it is vyavaharika dristi and when we discuss neyam Brahman it is paramarthika dristi. Many people are confused about advaida because they are not able to understand this beda between upasyam Brahman and neyam Brahman the vyavaharika and paramarthika dristi. When vyavaharika dristi comes advaidin argue Brahman is jivah. When upasyam Brahman is discussed we call upasyam Brahman is isvara and we strongly argue this is talking about isvara only. We clearly accept jiva isvara beda. We say jiva is different isvara is different. The same advaidin argue vehemently they are nondifferent and they are one and the same and only by that knowledge you get liberation.

Advaidin talks of beda as also abeda. Our answer when we talk of upasana we will talk of beda and when we talk of jnanam we talk of abeda. The question comes why should beda be talked about in the Brahman sutra. Why upasya prakaranam and establish beda? Our answer is that Brahman sutra not only wants to give liberation but also refute all other systems of philosophies. If you don't bother about other philosophies then Brahman sutra is not required and if you are interested in refuting other systems of philosophies you should study Brahman sutra.

One of the challenging philosophies is sankya philosophy and he did not accept vyavaharika isvara and he was an atheist and nirisvara vadi. Since sankya was primary opponent of Brahman sutra we discuss the second pada. Through Brahman sutra vyasacharya equally want to establish vyavaharika isvara is different from vyavaharika jivah and vyavaharika jagat. Paramarthika dristya jiva is isvara jagat nasti. Adhi sankaracharya says jiva is confusion; jagat is confusion and isvara is a divine confusion. Here vyasacharya wants to establish vyavaharika upasyam Brahman is different from upasaka jivah. This mano maya prana sarira deals with that upasyam Brahman alone. This is the general analysis of this sutra. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 65

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.1. [32] contd.**

#### *Sarvatra prasiddhopadesat*

[that which consists of the mind 'manomaya is Brahman] because there is taught [in this text] [that Brahman which is] well-known [as the cause of the world] in the upanisads.

We now see the first sutra of the second pada of the first chapter and the adhikaranam is sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam. Here we now take a statement from chandogya upanishad and the mantra comes in 3.14.2. Here an isvara vidya names as sandilya vidya prakaranam is taught. There are four mantras and now we take up the second mantra.

Here there is an expression many mayah prana sarirah and bharupah. An upasya devata is prescribed here and upasyam is mano mayadhi visista upasyam. From this it is clear that we deal with sagunam Brahman or isvara only and this has nothing to do with jnanam. Here controversy is whether mano mayadi is jiva or isvara. We indirectly imply jiva and isvara are different.

In this adhikaranam consisting of 8 sutras we will establish that mano mayadi visista is isvara and not jiva. Advaidin is going to establish that jiva is not the object of meditation and it does not mean that he accept isvara alone as object of meditation and not jivah and it does not mean both are different. We answer to this that jiva and isvara are different. We do jiva isvara aikyam also. We do teach jiva isvara beda. Yes both beda and abeda. Are you not ashamed of the double standard? For this we say we are not doing anything wrong.

Satta beda vyavaharika dristya there is jiva isvara beda is there and from paramarthika dristya there is no beda and jiva isvara aikyam is seen. Jiva and isvara are identical. For example carbon and diamond are different from common man's point of view because people wear diamond ornaments but none even touch the carbon. They both are different.

At the same time carbon and diamond are one and the same from the point of view of the scientist and they call diamond is nothing but carbon with slight variation. So also with isvara and jiva. They are two from vyavaharika angle and they both are one and the same thing from paramarthika angle. Upasana prakaranam is vyavaharika dristi only. Jnana prakarane abedah; purva baghe beda and vedanta baghe abedah. Sandilya vidya is upasana prakaranam and we accept jiva isvara beda and mano mayatvad visistah.

The sutra is based on the first mantra of 3.14.1 of chandogya upanishad. Upanishad clearly says Brahman is everything and Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam. This jagat karanam Brahman is sarvatra prasiddham. It means in all the upanisads in all puranas that Brahman is well known. In gita krishna defines himself as sristi sthithi laya karanam and in baghavata

puranam also this fact is establish. Lord is the one who creates, sustains and dissolves is Brahman alone and that Brahman is introduced in 3.14.1 of chandogya upanishad. This is the general analysis of the first sutra.

Now we go to word for word analysis. This consists of two words sarvatra everywhere, in every vedantic passage; i.e., in all the upanisads; prasiddha; the well known; upadesat because of the teaching. You have to supply two words manomayatvad visista upasyam Brahman. Object of meditation is endowed with property of manomaya etc., mentioned in chandogya upanishad is the controversial topic. The topic is sagunam Brahman or isvara.

Here it is taught that isvara and Brahman are non-different and dressed Brahman is isvara and undressed isvara is Brahman. Smriti grandha also states Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam. Prasiddha means well known; sarvatra means well known by all. It means jagat karanam Brahman.3.14.1 talks about Brahman and 3.14.2 cannot talk anything other than Brahman is the statement of vyasacharya. The upasya vastu in 3.14.1 is Brahman alone.

## **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.2 [33]**

#### ***Vivakshitagunopapattescha***

Moreover the qualities desired to be expressed are possible [in Brahman; therefore the passage refers to Brahman]

Now in the bashyam adhi sankaracharya raises a question, which can be asked by purva paksi. He answers the question. We have to go back to the first mantra 3.14.1 *sarvam khalvidam Brahman tajjalaniti santa upasita; atha khalu kratumayah puruso yathakraturasmimlloke puruso bhavati tathetah pretya bhavati sa kratum kurvita* . He says in the first mantra it is said that the whole world is born out of Brahman, sustained by Brahman and go back to Brahman we don't question. Thereafter wards the sruti talks about the important of the upasana. Therefore one should do meditation. Now the purva paksi says the definition of Brahman is given only to be connected with the word santah and should not be connected to upasita. Santah means quietly. Then upasita.

Everything in Brahman is connected to the santa padam and not with upasita padam. The benefit of doing it is since everything is Brahman why do you have raga and dvesha. Adhi sankaracharya in his bhaja govindam [sloka 24] writes *tvayi mayi chaanyatraiko vishnuh vyartham kupyasi mayyasahishnuh bhava samachittah sarvatra tvam vaanchhasyachiraadyadi vishnutvam* the meanin of the sloka reads as 'in you, in me and in [all] other places too ther is but one all pervading reality [vishnu]. Being impatient, you are unnecessarily getting angry with me.

If you want to attain soon the vishnu status, be equal minded in all circumstances. Vishnu is everywhere. Why do you get angry with me? Why don't you accept me. You are vishnu and i am vishnu and may you become santah. If you want to attain vishnu padam this condition you have to follow. The passport for vishnu padam is that you should not have raga and



dvesa, upanishad says if you want to practice upasana you should not have raga dvesa. Even if the lord's form comes then also you will think of artha and kama or raga or dvesha.

If you remember everything is Brahman then you can become quiet or shantah chandogya upanishad 3.14.1. Is not meant for suggesting upasana but only an advice to be tranquil in mind thinking that all are Brahman. Then the upanishad says may you practise meditation. Brahman is not suggested as an object of meditation. The object of meditation is mano maya. Don't take that Brahman here and introduce Brahman as object of meditation. This is the argument of purva paksi.

Adhi sankaracharya says no doubt that first mantra introduces first mantra shanti and sama siddatvam. Second mantra talks about some object of meditation. Now we have a problem what should i meditate upon? In the first mantra Brahman is introduced for something. In the first mantra jivah is not talked about. How can you talk about jiva about which no mention has been made? Since Brahman is mentioned, we have to take it as an object of meditation in the absence of mention of anything else.

Here why do we have to controversy and it is because the object of meditation is presented as mano maya, prana maya and barupah the self-effulgent chaitanya rupah and we already know that all the three of them are chaitanya rupah. The confusion worsnes when mano and prana maya are included. Maya and prana maya predominantly is jivah and barupah is both jiva and isvara. When such controversy is there, we read the very same prakaranam further and if some more descriptions are there. In sandilya vidya itself whether there are any noncontroversial descriptions on the object of meditation. Confusing statements are clarified with the help of other noncontroversial statement.

In some other places jiva is used in the sense of isvara. Purvapara paramarsah. Look at the previous and later mantra and settle the controversial mantra. In the next word it says sathya sankalpah one who programmes is never obstructed. The object of meditation is described as sathya sankalpah. We know that if we plan hundred things a few alone happens and majority does not happen. Sathya sankalpam is possible only in the case of atma alone. One whose body is all pervading like akasa is atma. Sarva kamah sarva rasah all are Brahman's.

All belong to him alone and this is said in the second mantra. This object of meditation is bigger than the earth and bigger than akasa, [refer to chandogya upanishad 3.14.3] *esa ma atmantarhrdaye'niyanvriherva yavadva sarsapadva syamakadva syamakatanduladvaisa ma atmantarhrdaye jyayanprthivya jyayanantariksajjyayandivo jyayanebhyo lokebhyah* it is said my self within my heart is smaller than a grain of rice; smaller than a grain of barley, smaller than a mustard seed, smaller than a grain of millet; smaller even than the kernal of grain of millet then the sruti adds the self in my heart is larger than the earth, larger than the mid-region, larger then the heaven; and larger even than all these worlds; the underlying idea in the verse is that the self is everything and everywhere.

It is therefore smaller than the smallest and bigger than the biggest. In the fourth mantra again the upanishad says *etad Brahmanitamitah pretyabhisambhavitasmiti yasya syadaddha na vicikitasastiiti ha smaha sandilyah sandilyah iti caturdasah khandah* [mantra 3.14.4 of chandogya upanisad] the gunas further gunas mentioned in the second and third and fourth mantras belong to Brahman alone isvara alone and never to jiva. The fitness of later virtues is there with isvara and not jiva. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to word for word analysis.

This contains three words vivakshita; desired to be expressed; guna qualities; upapatteh; because of the reasonableness; for the justification cha and moreover. Vivakshita gunopapatteh is a compound word of three words. Vivikshitam means revealed in the upanishad in the same sandilya vidya 3.14.1 to 3 and the next word is guna which means virtues, qualities that are mentioned are sathya sankalpah akasa atma, sarva karma and etad Brahman etc.

You can go on adding other virtues as well. Then the next word is upapatteh means fixed into. It is proper because of the fitness etc. Since virtues mention in three mantras will fit into isvara alone and not jiva and therefore mano mayadvadi refers to isvara alone. Ca indicates because of this reason also. Because already one reason is given in the previous sutra and the present sutra adds one more reason.

Purva paksi comes with another objection. He says all these virtues i can fit into jivatma also. He says wherever sarva karma etc., comes i would say jiva has got all the karmas because he has taken many janmas and therefore cumulatively he has got all the karmas similarly cumulatively he has got rasas gandhas etc., and suppose we ask what about akasa atma. You cannot say any argument. How will you explain sathya sankalpa and akasa atma. This i will tell you in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 66

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.2 [33]**

#### ***Vivakshitagunopapattescha***

Moreover the qualities desired to be expressed are possible [in Brahman; therefore the passage refers to Brahman]

We see the second sutra of sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam in which sandilya vidya of chandogya upanisad 3.14.1 to 4 are discussed. The mano maya prana sarirah refer to jiva or Brahman is the topic for discussion. While purva pakshi says it pertains to jiva, siddhanti argues the same belongs to Brahman. Here prana sarira refers to sookshma sariram and mano maya refers to jivatma only. Siddhanti through these 8 sutras establishes this belongs to Brahman alone.

First mantra talked about Brahman and therefore vyasacharya argued that it relates to Brahman alone. The second sutra which we have completed that other qualification mentioned here clearly revealed isvara alone and qualifications mentioned in the second mantra is sathya kamaha akasa etc. And in the third mantra it was pointed out akasatmatvam and in the fourth mantra Brahmantvam etc. Cannot fit into Brahman and it cannot fit into jiva is established. We have seen the word meaning also.

The final meaning the possibilities of the revealed gunas can possibly can fit into Brahman only and not jiva. Adhi sankaracharya introduces a purva paksha here. All the revealed gunas can fit into jiva also purva pakshi says. Even though jiva does karma in one janma but he must be doing all karmas cumulatively and therefore sarva kamah then what about sathya sankalpah etc., we know that in no particuar janma all our sankalpah will be implemented and jiva can never have sathya sankalpa in one janma and what about akasa.

None can be as big as akasa or Prithvi. Purva paksha agree and he says it can fit in with isvara only. But he says jiva one can become akasatma and sathya sankalpa etc, one day. He can merge with isvara and he can be and 'would be' jiva. Siddhanti says this too much stretched fitting. Where is the need for jiva mixing with isvara and then say jiva becomes big and be compared to akasa etc. Why somehow fix into jiva.

Somehow you fit into jiva and you say jiva is manomaya sathya samratva etc., and future oneness with Brahman etc and say jiva and what is the use of meditate upon jiva and what is the benefit of meditating upon jiva. You cannot say the meditated jiva will fulfill the wishes. He is going to become sathya sankalpa only afterwards. Therefore the conclusion is mano maya refers to Brahman only and not jiva and now we will go to third sutra.

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.3 [34]**

***Anupapattestu na saarirah***

On the other hand as [those qualities] are not possible [in it] the embodied [should is] not [denoted by manomaya etc]

In fact this sutra is the reverse side of previous of the previous sutra. In the previous sutra vyasacharya said that the qualification could fit into isvara also. But here he says that these qualification cannot fit into jivah. When i says these qualification means sarva kamatvam, Brahmantvam, sathya sankalpam and since none of them fit into jivah and therefore jivah is not the object of meditation. Such qualities cannot apply to the individual should. The argument in support of the sutra is continued.

The preceding sutras have stated that the qualities mentioned are possible in Brahman. The present sutra declares that they are not possible in the jiva or the embodied should. Brahman only is endowed with the qualities of 'consisting of mind or manomaya and so on' but not the embodied self. The qualities such as 'he whose purposes are true, whose self is the ether, who is speechless, who is not disturbed; who is greater than the earth' cannot be ascribed to the individual should. The term 'saarira' or 'embodied' means 'dwelling in a body'.

If the opponent says 'the lord who dwells in the body' we reply; true. He does abide in the body, built not in the body alone; because sruti declares 'the lord is greater than the earth, greater than the heaven, omnipresent like the ether, eternal' on the contrary the individual should resides in the body only. The jivah is like a glowworm before the effulgence of the Brahman who is like a sun when compared with it.

The superior qualities described in the text are not certainly possible in jiva. The all pervading is not the embodied self or the individual soul as it is quite impossible to predicate omnipresence of him. It is impossible and against fact and reason also that one and the same individual could be in all the bodies at the same time. This is the general analysis.

Here there are four words. Anupapattah; since they cannot be fit into; supply viviksita guna anupapattah since the revealed property not being justifiable, because of the impossibility, because of the unreasonableness, because they are not appropriate; tu; definitely also but on the other hand; na; not; saarirah; the embodied, the jiva or the individual soul. We have to supply one word mano mayatvadi visistah upadyam. The object of meditation prescribed as mano maya etc., is not applicable.

All these qualification mentioned in sandilya vidya are fit in for isvara only. Purva paksi argues that there are certain other qualifications mentioned in sandilya vidya you avoid because they cannot fit in for isvara. The third mantra you quoted '*jyayan prthivya, jyayan antariksath jyayan divah jyayan ebhyah lokebhyah*' that the self within the heart is larger than the earth, heaven, mid-region and all these worlds etc. They fit into isvara only. But read the third mantra again and you find '*vriheh aniyam vrihehva*' means the smallest one; upasya devata is smaller than even grain of barley or rice; this you have conveniently forgotten and not quoted when talking about isvara qualification. This particular qualification of smallness can you ever fit in to isvara. As i cannot apply certain qualification of isvara to jivah, you

cannot also apply the qualification of smallness in size` etc., to isvara which is applicable to jiva. These qualifications will fit into jiva only in figurative sense that is the jivatma obtaining in the body. In some other upanishad the size of jiva is described. You take a piece of hair or the tip of the hair and cut the hair into hundred portion and take the one hundredth of the cut portion and then subdivide into hundred, or on ten thousandth tip of hair is the size of jivatma it is said. Aniyam vrihehva fit in with jiva only and since these qualifications do not fit in for isvara, my argument is that upasya devata should be jiva and not isvara on the basis of the above argument.

Adhi sankaracharya says for us no problem at all because you should remember that when we say isvara is totality all the individuals are included in isvara and isvara couldn't be included in jiva and jiva can be included in isvara. Isvara's body cannot be included in jiva and jiva's body can be included in isvara. Therefore the aniyatvam or smallness also is the property of isvara. Manomayatvam is not only the property of jiva and it is the property of isvara also.

Mind is the property of jiva as also isvara. Vyasti attributes can belong to samasti and samasti attribute cannot be applied to vyasti. In taittiriya upanishad we see '*sa ya eso-ntar-hrdaya akasah, tasminn-ayam puruso manomayah, amrto hiranmayah, antarena taluke, ya esa stana ivava-lambate, sendrayanah, yatrasau kesanto vivartate, vyapohya sirsa-kapale* which means here in this space within the heart resides the intelligent, imperishable, effulgent 'purusa' or 'entity'. Between the palates, that which hangs nipple like [uvula] – that is the birthplace of Indra, where the root of hair is made to part opening the skull in the center. [1.vi.1siksavalli] here hiranyagarbha upasana is prescribed and hiranyagarbha's qualification is mentioned and it says 'manomaya' is used for samasti hiranyagarbha alone.

From this it is clear that word manomaya can be used for isvara also, so also prana maya can be used for isvara also but sathya sankalpa etc., can be applied to only isvara and not jiva. Now we will go to fourth sutra.

## **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.4 [35]**

#### ***Karmakartrivypadesaccha***

Because of the declaration for the attainer and the object attained. He who consists of the mind [manomaya] refers to Brahman and not the individual soul.

We will do the general analysis. In this sandilya vidya there are four mantras and in the fourth mantra the phalam of sandilya vidya is given. Refer to 3.14.4 of chandogya upanishad that reads [a portion of the mantra] *etat Brahman itah pretya etam abhisambhavitasmī iti* the upasaka will reach the upasaka devata after death he will be isvara and krama mukti is prescribed. If you put this phalam in appropriate way it is upasaka jiva will reach upasya devata is the statement, upasaka jiva is the traveler and upasya devata is reached object.

Now vyasacharya argues here the reacher karta is jiva, the subject of reaching and upasya devata the karma the object; here what is our debate the upasya devata the object of reaching is our controversy. It is whether jivatma or isvara. The controversy is whether the object reached jiva or isvara. Suppose the object reached also is jiva the traveler is jiva and upasaka devata is also jiva and therefore it amounts to jiva after death reaches jivah.

How can karta and karma be one and the same? This is illogical and it cannot happen the one entity being both subject and object. Thus upasya jiva is jiva it is illogical. According to mano maya is isvara and jiva is doing upasana and he will reach isvara through shukla gathi reach isvara and then he will get liberated. This is not possible if the upasya devata is jivatma. Hence mano maya refers to isvara and not jiva.

This sutra contains two words; kartri; subject; karma; object; vyapadesa because of the declaration or mention; cha and – because of the clear statement of object of reaching as the upasya devata the upasaka jivah. Upasya devata is jivah and upasaka is jivah means the jiva will reach jivah after upasana is impossibility. Subject and object cannot be one and the same. If the object were isvara, then the upasaka jiva can reach isvara after upasana is possible. Because of the distinct mention of upasya devata and subject is devata [3.14.4 chandogya upanishad] jiva will reach upasya devata means it has to be isvara alone and you cannot say jiva will reach jivah. Two words are to supplied are mano mayatvadi visista Brahman karma kartu vyapdesacha. Cha means the next reason also. With this fourth sutra is over.

## **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.5 [36]**

#### ***Sabdaviseshat***

The argument in favour of sutra 1 is continued. That which possesses the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and so on cannot be the individual soul, because there is a difference of words.

This is one word sutra. We will do general analysis. There is a general rule that when a vague statement occurring in one place may be understood with a clear statement occurring in another place of the upanishad. In another portion of veda in satapata Brahmanam isvara upasana is talked about and there also isvara is described as mano mayah prana sarirah barupah. Our problem is whether the three refer to jivah or isvara. In satapata Brahmana another qualification is given which makes the upasya devata very clear. There it is said antaratman purusah, which means isvara who is obtaining within jiva. Now it is clear upasyam cannot be jiva and one who is within jiva cannot be jiva itself and therefore it must be other than the jiva. The content is different from container is the law. The manomaya purusa is presented as content and jiva is presented, as container the content upasyam must be different from upasaka jivah. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 67

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.5 [36]**

#### ***Sabdavisheshat***

The argument in favour of sutra 1 is continued. That which possesses the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and so on cannot be the individual soul, because there is a difference of words.

We see the fifth sutra of sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam with reference to sandilya vidya mantra occurring in 14 chapter of chandogya upanisad. The object of meditation prescribed manomadvadi visistah. Upasyah is talked about and we find whether it refers to jivatma or paramatma. Vyasacharya establishes it refers to paramatma only. First we referred to first mantra in which mantra itself referred Brahman and next we said all the attributes given there referred to paramatma only and not to jivatma.

Then we referred the same in negative angle also. Thereafter we gave another logic in the fourth mantra based on the phalasthuthi. We said that upasaka jiva this upasya vastu after death and if upasya vastu will reach upasya jiva which means jiva will reach jiva and it is not phalam at all. Therefore upasyam should be taken as isvara and jiva after death will reach isvara. The first four sutras are based on sandilya vidya based on mantra 3.14.1 to 3.14.4 of chandogya upanishad.

Now vyasacharya takes the same idea from *satapata Brahmana* expressed in similar words 'as is a grain of rice or gram of barley or a canary see or the kerna of canary seed, so is that golden person in the self [x 6.3.2 satapata Brahmana]. This portion deals with isvara upasana only here one word i.e., the locative 'in the self' denotes the individual soul or that embodies self and a different word viz., the nominative 'person' denotes the self distinguished by the attributes of the consisting of mind etc. The upasya devata in sandilya vidya and upasya devata in satapata Brahmana are one and the same and if we prove there it is different from jivah the we can prove the upasya deva is different from jiva in this sutra also. The portion from satapata Brahmana we have chosen if we understand sandilya vidya. Refer to 3.14.3. Of chandogya upanisad. Here also upasya devata is mention, which means the deity of meditation. In satapata Brahmana also upasya devata description is given. The description in both is very, very same. The description of atma given in satapata Brahmana is also very subtle. From this common description we conclusion the upasya devata in satapata Brahmana and upasya devata in sandilya devata are one and the same. Now we will see the upasya devata given in satapata Brahmana is different from jiva or not. It is different from jivah. In satapata Brahmana two words are used. What is used is antaratman purusah. Purusah here is upasya devata, in sandilya vidya upasya devata is called hiranmayah and in satapata Brahmana also it is called self effulgent. Antaratma means jivatma and antaratman means according to vedic grammar means jivatmani it means within jivatma. Within jivatma present

is purusah and it is nominative case and upasya jivah purusa is in locative case it means upasya purusa is within jivatma who is in locative. Content is different from container. Antaratman is in locative case and it refers to container. Satapata Brahmana says upasya devata is within jiva and it is not jiva is proved here. Then we can say sandilya vidya upasya devata is also paramatma. This is the general analysis.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. There is only one word. Sabda word viseshat because of difference. Words occurring in satapata Brahmanam and the words meant here is antaratman and purusah; these two words refer to upasya devata and jivatma are described. Between these two words viseshat because of their difference being vibakti beda; jivatma pratipathaka paramatma pratipathaka sabda yogo vipakti beda. Jivatma is put in seventh case and paramatma is put in first case. Sabda bedad artha bedah. Sabda viseshad the conclusion is upasya devata is different from jivatma it is something obtaining in jivatma but different from jivatma. Two words are supplied to compete the sentence manonmayatvadi vishistah jivah.

## **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.6 [37]**

#### ***Smritescha***

From the smriti also [we know the embodied self or the individual soul is different from the one referred to in the text under discussion]

In the previous sutra we took a clue from satapata Brahmana. In this sutra vyasacharya takes an outside clue. It is not from sandilya vidya. Here we take a clue from bhagavad gita. In sandilya vidya while discussing upasya devata there is a particular description in the third mantra. If mantras are in our mind it will be convenient for discussion. Refer to 3.14.3 of chandogya upanisad *eshama atma antar hridaye* is an expression we find in this mantra means the upasya devata is within the heart.

In gita there is a sloka reads as *isvarah sarvabhutanam hrddese 'rjuna tisthati bhramayan sarvabhutani yantrarudhani mayaya* [18.61] that means as the lord in the hearts of all beings o arjuna causing them to turn round by his power as if they were mounted on a machine.

Here also isvara is taken upasya devata. In sandilya vidya also upasya devata is stated to be in hridayam. If the upasya vastu in gita is isvara, the upasya vastu in sandilya vidya also should be isvara only. There is commeness in both. Here isvara is clearly said and in sandilya vidya it is not clear and because of the gita vakyam we can take it as isvara.

Smritech from the smriti here any scripture other than the veda is called smriti. Ramayanam, bhagavatam, panini, yogasutra etc., are called smriti. There are countless smritis are there. Even puranas are also called smriti. Without adhi sankaracharya's bashyam the word smriti will not convey anything to us. Here upasya devata is in hridaya and in sandilya vidya also upasya devata is in the heart and therefore isvara is revealed as upasya devata. Ca means because of this reason also. We supply two words manomayatvadi vishistah jivah.



## Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]

The mano maya is Brahman

### Sutra 1.2.7 [38]

#### *Arbhahaukastvattadvyapadesaccha neti na nichayyatvadevam vyomavaccha*

If it be said that [the passage does] not [refer to Brahman] on account of the smallness of the abode [mentioned i.e., the heart] and also on account of the denotation of that [i.e., of minuteness] we say, no; because [brahman] has thus to be meditated and because the case is similar to that of ether.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. First it is an objection from purva paksi. Up to na is the objection and thereafter it is our answer. He says that i cannot accept that the upasya devata is isvara. He says you quoted from gita and sandilya vidya that upasya devata is in the heart. You also said that isvara is in the heart of every one's heart. The very fact that the upasya devata is within the heart indicates that it is not isvara. Logic is the content must be smaller than container. A bigger content cannot be enshrined in a smaller container. The hridayam is not even as big as body. It is of the size of our fist. It is of very small size.

The first clue we get upasya devata is residing in a small container. That means upasya devata is smaller than the heart.. 3.14.3 of chandogya upanishad further describes the size of the upasya devata upanishad takes the comparison to rice, barley etc. From the size of the container and from the description of the dimension of the upasya devata, we find them to be small but isvara is sarvagathah and is very big. Upasya devata must be small like barley rice etc., and it cannot be the infinite isvara. This is the purva paksi argument.

For this vyasacharya gives is yes accepted. Upasya devata is big is also accepted. Big isvara cannot be contained in small heart also is accepted. Still upanishad talks about the location and size for the sake of meditation and they are not factual. Both of them are imaginary for the purpose of upasana. A small spadika lingam is of smallest size and but represents the big isvara. Lingam is only an alampnam and imaginary symbol of the real isvara. It is only superimposition that is location and size. He gives an example of akasa. We all know that akasa is all pervading and there is no container to accommodate akasa and it is never a content but still we talk about akasa inside a pot. That is gatakasah. We say inside a pot or inside a room. Inside the space is small we say. We all know that there is no small or no big space. Limitation never belongs to the space. Space is all pervading. The limitation of the container is falsely transferred to limitless akasa. Space is all pervading and the limitation of container we falsely attribute to the space. Space within the house is limited although all pervading space is limitless. For that we say the very expression that space is within the pot. Space is not within the pot but really speaking space is without and in fact the pot is within the space. All these things are imaginary and it is only the imagination that god is within the heart but on the other hand all the hearts are within the god. This is the general analysis.

We will see the word analysis. Arbha kaukastvat; because of the smallness of the abode this contains two words arbha means small okah means residence upasya devata has got a small space when sutrakara says upasya devata has got small abode in the form of hridayam; tatvyapadesat; because of the description or denotation as such i.e., minuteness upasya devata

is of barley size; cha; and also na not; iti not so; chet; if na thus so vyomavat like the ether;  
cha and. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 68

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.7 [38] contd.**

#### ***Arbhahaukastvattadvyapadesaccha neti na nichayyatvadevam vyomavaccha***

This is the seventh sutra of sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam. The subject matter of debate is manonmayatvam whether it is jiva or isvara is the question. Siddhanta says that Brahman alone is upasya devata. This is contined in the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra is also. The first part is purva paksi and the second portion is siddhanta. Upasya devata is jiva is established by the siddhantis. The upasya devata has got alpa asrayam a small abode a small dwelling space. The dwelling space is small it is pointed out that it is in antar hridaye.

We know that heart is a small space and if the devata is indwelling in the heart means indweller is smaller than the dwelling space. Purva paksi says that upasya devata is jiva alone and it cannot be isvara. The second word is tad vyapadesad is the another reasoning given by the purva paksi. It consists of two word tad and vyapadesad means smallness; vyapadesat because of the direct statement or mention of the smallness of the upasya devata.

The direct mention of smallness is given in 3.14.2 of chandogya upanisad as already discussed in the previous class. Previous reason was not directly mentioned the smallness that the container is small and the content devata also must be small; but now the upasya devata is small directly aniya vriherva from the two reason the upasya devata is small like paddy and therefore upasya devata is jivatma and not paramatma. The two words supplied is manonmayatvad vishistah and the second word added is paramatma to be read with the word na in the sutram.

Siddhanta says iti chet if such argument is given by the purva paksi or suppose the purva paksi gives such an argument we give the answer 'na'. We say purva paksi madham na their opinion is not correct. The upasya devata is paramatma only and not jivatma. Siddhanti has to refute the two reasonings given by the purva paksi. The upasya devata is within the heart and it is small. We say when sastra says isvara is in the heart you should not understand in the normal way. When someone says shri raman is in the office, we understand that shri raman is in the office he is not elsewhere, he is not at home and he is not on the road. We understand that shri raman is in the office only. And authomatically we assume that he cannot be found anywhere. Adhi sankaracharya says when sastra says isvara is in the heart you should not conclude isvara is in the heart only. Then you will think he is in the heart and he is not outside. If you think that isvara is in the heart only, isvara is taken as limited. Adhi sankaracharya says when sastra says that isvara in the heart, you should note that isvara is in the heart also. Once you understand that isvara also must be outside also. There is no question of limitation. The next question is if you say that upasya devata is in the heart also the question comes if upasya devata is everywhere and why should the upanishad take the heart only. If you accept upasya devata is everywhere for that answer given is because the upasya

devata is an object of meditation. Since it is an object of meditation for the convenience of meditation it requires a locus for meditation purpose even though upasya devata is everywhere. It is not a factual locus because isvara is everywhere. Everything including time and space are located in isvara. Sastra talks of assumed locus for the purpose of meditation. For the sake of meditation hridaya akasa is because it is an object of meditation. It has been said as located in the heart. Don't take it that seriously. This is the answer to first reasoning of the purva paksi. If it is all pervading why should it be described as paddy, barley etc. In another place it is said lord is of the size of the thumb. For this also we have the same answer. Upasya devata is object of meditation and limitations are superimposed for the convenience of meditation. The next word is vyomavat. Here vyaacharya gives an example it is like akasa. Manomayatvad visishta upasya devata is all pervading like akasa. All pervading paramatma is in the heart also like all pervading akasa is within a room also. Here also extend the example i gave before. When raman is in the office means he is in the office only. Suppose a person says there is space in the room, the understanding is space is all pervading when we say the space is in the room also. In the case of upasya devata also you meditate on upasya devata who is in the hridayam also. Then comes the next sutra.

The opponent says if Brahman has his abode in the heart, which heart abode is different in each body, it would follow that he is attended by all the imperfections which attach to beings having different abodes such as parrots shut up in different cases viz., want of unity being made up of parts, non-permanency etc., he would be subject to experiences originating from connections with bodies. To this the author gives a suitable reply in the following mantra.

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.8 [39]**

#### ***Sambhogapraptiriti chet na vaiseshyat***

If it be said that [being connected with the hearts of all individual souls to] its [brahman's] omnipresence, it would also have experience [pleasure and pain] [we say] not so, on account of the difference in the nature [of the two] another objection is raised and refuted here.

This is also divided into two portions first is purva paksi and the second is ours. Purva paksi said that all pervading atma is within the heart. We all know that jivatma is within the heart as a samsari and experiencer of samboga. Upasaka jivatma is in the heart and upasya paramatma is also in the heart. Purva paksi says both of them are in the heart and the difference is jivatma is in the heart only and paramatma is in the heart also. Only jivatma and also paramatma both are in the heart. Both of them are chetanas also. Now purva paksi says both of them are sentient and both are in the heart. Jiva experiences sukha and dukha anubhava is there for jivatma.

Now purva paksi argues jivatma who is sentient experiences sukha and dukha and you say paramatma is in the heart and paramatma is chetana and paramatma also necessarily suffer sukha and dukha boghavan. Paramatma also must be experiencer of sukha and dukha and paramatma is sentient one residing in the heart like jivatma. We also know that when

someone is suffering in the hospital and if you go there and see the suffering and because of the presence don't you undergo the trouble. Therefore paramatmanah samboha prapti and paramatma also is a samsari.

Siddhanti says no, because paramatma the upasya devata isvara is different from upasaka and upasaka is samsari and upasya isvara is asamsari. Upasaka is having punnyam and papam and upasya devata is free from punya and papa. Therefore even though isvara is in the heart he does not suffer samsara. Because isvara is present in a suffering in the problematic adhikaranam samithyam does not mean suffering. Lotus is in water and it does not get water. One is like a cloth it does get wet and another is like a lotus leaf it does not get wet. Upasaka has sukha dukha anubhava but upasya devata like lotus leaf does not suffer samsara.

An advaidin who talks of jivatma paramatma aikyam talks of beda. Advaidins talk about both beda and abeda because of contextual difference. Advaidin talks of difference whenever the topic is upasana and it is from vyavaharika level. In sandilya vidya you have to apply beda and upasaka is samsari and upasya devata is samsari. At the sametime advaidins talk of abeda when in the context of discussion on paramarthika level when jivatma and paramatma are one and the same.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Sambhogaprapti that it has experience of pleasure and pain iti thus for paramatma also when you say paramatma is also in the heart. paramatma out of sympathetic vibration will also cry when jivatma cries.; chet if; na is the statement of siddhanti. There is no sukha and dukha anubhava for paramatma.; not; vaisheshyat; because of the difference in nature that is between jivatma and paramatma the difference being jivatma is like a cloth getting wet and paramatma is like lotus leaf asangah punya papa vilaksanah nithya, mukta purusah;. vitiriktatvad upasya devata is to be supplied.

Now adhi sankaracharya raises a purva pakshi and answers. Now purva pakshi asks you cannot say jivatma and paramatma are different. Have you forgotten your real teaching. According to sastra jivatma and paramatma are one and the same. Therefore sastric teaching is that paramatma alone is in the form of jivatma. Not also in the hridayam and paramatma alone is in the hridayam in the form of jivatma. Don't say both are in the heart and you should never say paramatma also in the heart. He says paramatma alone is there in the form jivatma and jivatma suffer sukha and dukha when paramatma is in the form of jivatma and therefore paramatma alone must be suffering according to advaida madham. Paramatma is suffering in the form of jivatma since aikyam is the philosophy of advaidin. Adhi sankaracharya in this context is either angry or amused.

Now he asks the question to this poor prahaspathi. He says what is significance of the maha vakyam. Maha vakyam says jivatma is equal to paramatma. To interpret you should know that all philosophers agree that jivatma is samsari and all the philosophers uniformly agree paramatma is asamsari. Now we have an equation jivatma is equal to paramatma; you can interpret it in two different ways. Jivatma is a samsari and that jivatma is equal to paramatma; therefore paramatma is also samsari. Samsari is equal to jivatma and jivatma is equal to paramatma therefore paramatma is samsari. There is another interpretation. Paramatma is asamsari and paramatma is equal to jivatma asamsari is equal to paramatma and paramatma is equal to jivatma therefore jivatma is equal to paramatma.

According to one interpretation paramatma is samsari and according to another interpretation jivatma is asamsari paramatma. After long study do you want to conclude do you want to

arrive at jivatma is samsari or do you want to conclude paramatma is jivatma. In this way it should not be interpreted. This we will discuss in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 69

### **Topic 1. Sarvatra prasiddhyadhikaranam [sutra 1-8]**

The mano maya is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.8 [39] contd.**

#### ***Sambhogapraprtiriti chet na vaiseshyat***

If it be said that [being connected with the hearts of all individual souls to] its [brahman's] omnipresence,, it would also have experience [pleasure and pain] [we say] not so, on account of the difference in the nature [of the two] another objection is raised and refuted here.

We have just completed the word analysis of this eighth sutra. Adhi sankaracharya has raised an extra purva paksi and he answers that. Here purva paksi happens to be half cooked advaidin and he has some knowledge of advaidam and has not fully grasped advaidam. He applies advaidam partially. He asks according to advaidin paramatma is everywhere he happens to be in adhikaranam also and he also knows jivatma is experiencer of sukha and dukha and he also knows paramatma is jivatma according to the maha vakyams. Paramatma alone is in the form of jivatma and jivatma is a samsari and one concludes paramatma is a samsari. This is the words of the purva paksi argument. Therefore according to advaidam paramatma will become a samsari.

For this adhi sankaracharya gives his answer. No doubt jivatma paramatma equation through every maha vakyam. When sruti talks about this one should know what is the intention behind this. There are two ways of equation. We have an idea of jivatma and paramatma before arriving at the conclusion. We know paramatma is asamsari and sarva kalyana gunah. We have to base our opinions from the sruti. Before coming to the equation of jivatma and paramatma, we know jivatma is samsari, a maha samsari and we know paramatma is asamsari. Now we learn the teaching. We come to two different conclusion. One starts from jivatma. Jivatma is samsari. Upanishad points out jivatma is equal to paramatma and therefore jivatma is samsari upanishad say jivatma is paramatma and therefore paramatma also must be samsari. Now i come to know paramatma is samsari after studying sastra. Paramatma is in our own court only. This is one type of interpretation.

The second possibility is we start from paramatma; paramatma is asamsari. Upanishad points out that paramatma is jivatma; and paramatma is asamsari and i knew jivatma is samsari and now the correction is from samsarivam to asamsarivam. First interpretation brings paramatma down to samsarivam and according to second interpretation jivatma status is upgraded from samsarivam to asamsarivam. If you say because of maha vakyam paramatma is samsari you bring down paramatma status. That is not the object of sastric study. What benefit i get by studying the sastra. What benefit i will get by knowing that paramatma is samsari. In second interpretation i make a big correction that until now i thaout i am a samsari and i gain knowledge and i get corrected and i become asamsari and become one with paramatma. Difference is jivatma is samsari during ajnana kalam and jivatma is asamsari at

the time of jnanam. Paramatma is both at the time jnana and ajnana kale is paramatma. Paramatma will have samsara before and after advaida jnanam is not correct. The eighth sutra is over and the first adhikaranam is also over. We will sum up the adhikaranam.

First one is visayah. The subject matter is the object of meditation mentioned in sandilya vidya of chandogya upanisad and that too the three expression mano mayah prana sarirah etc., that too specifically mano maya vishistah is the subject matter. The samsaya the doubt resolved here is because of the contention. The samsaya is that upasya devata is jivatma or paramatma. It is resolved that paramatma is the upasya devata. Purva paksa says upasya devata has to be jivatma only. He has got his own reasons. He says mind, prana etc., can belong to jivatma alone and paramatma is beyond all these things. Further jivatma is located in the heart and it means limitation. Description indicates the finite thing and upasya devata is jivatma is the purva paksa contention.

Vedantins say that it is paramatma only and he gives several reasons and eight sutras are eight reasons. Most of the attributes given there fit in with paramatma alone and the few attributes generally connected with jivatma fits in with paramatma. Paramatma includes jivatma and jivatma attributes can form in paramatma but paramatma attributes cannot fit in with jivatma. Because of the above reasons we have concluded that the upasya devata of this upasana is paramatma alone.

Before concluding i want to make two more points. In our advaidic literature in some places we vehemently establish jivatma paramatma beda or jiva isvara beda. There are certain occasions we equally vehemently establish abeda or aikyam. This has created lot of confusion to those who study sankara bashyam. Both are right depending on the conduct of discussion. Whenever we talk of upasana the context is vyavaharika dristy that is empirical standpoint. Advaidin accept vyavaharika dristy jiva isvara bedah asti. There is jagat different from isvara and jiva; there is jiva who is different from isvara and jagat' there is isvara that is different from jiva and jagat. Jiva isvara beda we will emphasise when sankya does not accept vyavaharika isvara. For them jiva is purusa and jagat is prakrti and he does not accept vyavaharika isvara.

This vyavaharika dristi is entertained at the time of upasana. Therefore i should say there is isvara who sristi sthithi laya karta. I am deenah samsari and alpha. These are all vyavaharika dristi jiva isvara beda. This is established in this adhikaranam. When we talk about liberating jnanam and from paramarthika dristi there is no beda between jiva and paramatma. There is no plurality at all. One who says jivatma is different and paramatma is different is devanam pasuh. Eighth sutra says jivatma and paramatma are different and this statement is from vyavaharika angle for the purpose of upasana.

The second point i want to discuss is this. Because this particular adhikaranam deals with meditation and it is known as upasya Brahman. In certain adhikaranam wehre the same Brahman is discussed not for upasana but for moksa and that Brahman is called neyam Brahman. If you remember the first pada i told you which adhikaranam deals with upasana Brahman and which one deals with neyam Brahman. What is difference between upasyam Brahman and neyam Brahman.

You will find when upanishad talks about upasyam Brahman and neyam Brahman the description appears to be very similar. That you will not know which is upasyam and which is neyam Brahman. Tajjalan means sristi sthithi laya karanam Brahman is introduced by



sandilya vidya. Our conclusion is that whether sandilya vidya deals with upasyam Brahman or neyam Brahman.

Sandilya vidya upasyam Brahman is introduced as karanam. In taittiriya upanishad Brahman is introduced as karanam Brahman *tasmad-va etasmad-atmana akasah sanbhutah, akasad-vayuh, vayor-agnih, agner-apah, adbhyah prthivi, prthivya osadhayah, osadhayah-'nnam, annat-purusah* [ii.i.2 of taittiriya upanishad] in brigu valli [iii.i.2 of the same upanishad] it is said *tam hovaca, yato va imani bhutani jayante, yen jatani jivanti, yat-prayantya-bhisamvisanti, tad-vijijnasasva, tad brahmeti, so tapo-tapyata, sa tapas-taptva i* here also karanam Brahman is introduced.

But we say sandilya vidya karanam Brahman is upasyam Brahman and Brahmananda valli and brigu valli of taittiriya upanishad relate to karanam Brahman but it is neyam Brahman. Karanam Brahman is maya sahitam Brahman; it is not suddham Brahman and it is karana karya rahitam. In sandilya vidya also we get karanam Brahman; in taittriyam we take Brahman as neyam Brahman. The difference is this that when it introduces sagunam Brahman alone.

The main teaching on Brahman is central theme of upasana prakaranam. At that time whether the karanatvam, sagunatvam is retained or not. This is the question. Adhi sankaracharya says in upasana one has to retain sagunatvam staus and meditate on sagunam Brahman and karanatvam is retained. This is the technically communicated by a special word. That is karatva visistam Brahman. Here karanatvam is introduced and its status is retained throughout the upasana. Upasyam Brahman is equal to karanatvam vishistam Brahman.

In the jnana prakaranam karanam Brahman is introduced and Brahman is given the status at the time of introduction and later when tat tvam asi is taken or paramatma jivatma aikyam is said the student do so only by doing the important job of from Brahman one has to remove the maya and karanatvam status is removed and sagunatvam is also removed and similarly from jivatma his upadhi is also removed and karyam status from jivatma will go and therefore jivatma is not an effect and paramatma is not the cause and you find the ekam chaitanyam.

Karanatvam status is lost at the time of teaching a jivatma paramatma aikyam. Now we say karanatvam upalaksitam or upahitam Brahman. This is introduced in jnana prakaranam. In vishistam Brahman the karanatvam is retained. In upahitam Brahman the karanatvam is left off. Introduce karanatvam launch the teaching and drop the karanatvam and this teaching is called adhyaropa. Both introduce sagunam Brahman. And then drop it at the time jnanam. We say certain adhikaranams are upasya Brahman adhikaranam and some are neyam Brahman adhikaranam and both will introduce karanam Brahman and the difference is one is vishistam and the other is upahitam. With this first adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 2. Attradhikaranam; [sutras 9-10]**

The eater is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.9 [40]**

*Atta characharagrahanat*

The eater [is Brahman], because both the movable and immovable [i.e., the whole world is taken [as his food]

I will give you general analysis of the entire adhikaranam. This adhikaranam consists of two sutras only and it is known as attradhikarnam. This adhikaranam deals with a mantra occurring in kathopanisad 1.2.25. This is neya Brahman adhikaranam. The essence of this mantra Brahman jagatah laya karanam. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 70

### **Topic 2. Attradhikaranam; [sutras 9-10]**

The eater is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.9 [40]**

#### ***Atta characharagrahanat***

The eater [is Brahman], because both the movable and immovable [i.e., the whole world is taken [as his food]

We see the 9<sup>th</sup> sutra of the second section, which happens to be attradhikaranam consisting two sutras. Here we analyse a mantra from kathopanisad yasya Brahman ca ksatram ca, ubhe bhavati *adanah, mrtyur-yasyo-pasecanam ka, ittha veda yatra sah, iti kathakopanaisadi prathamadhyaye dvitiya valli* [1.ii.25]. The meaning of the mantra is to whom the Brahmana and the ksatriya classes are [as it were] but cooked rice and death itself is a condiment [curry or pickle], how can one thus know where that atma is? Thus ends the second valli of the first chapter.

We will see the meaning of the mantra paramatma is the cause of the resolution of the world. Normally paramatma is sristi or sthithi karanam but here it is shown as laya karanam. Here it is shown at the time of pralaya eats up the whole universe and therefore paramatma is the eater of the universe. Eater is called atta in sanskrit and here paramatma is the eater of the universe and the whole universe becomes the fool of paramatma. Odhanah means the food in sanskrit.

The word Brahman in this mantra means the Brahmana jathi all the Brahmanas. Ksatram means all the ksatriyas. By using the two words the mantra means the whole chara achara prapancha. Why choose Brahmana and ksatra as the representative of the world and it is because they are the ones who maintain the creation. They are considered to be the vips of the universe.

Brahmana protects dharma by providing vedic education. Ksatriyas protect dharma through their legal and legal laws and courts and they protect dharma through legal system. They are supposed to maintain dharma and by maintaining dharma they sustain the world. By mention the prominent ones they mean the whole world. For that paramatma the entire world becomes the food. When we eat solid food, it is difficult to swallow and liquid is mixed with solid food and make it easy to swallow. Any liquid dish you mix with solid food is called upasesanam.

If you don't add any liquid and straightaway you cannot swallow the food and to make the eating easy bhagavan has provided upasesanam in the form of salaiva in the mouth and disintegrate the food with the help of the teeth. This we all know. In the same way paramatma is the eater and the whole world is the solid stuff and he cannot swallow without upasesanam. The upasesanam here is the hammering stuff is every sukha and dukha anubhava or experience of ours.

Each experience is like hammers and it disintegrates the personality and it is further helped by the time principle. When young the body is a solid stuff and adding upasesanam kala look at the person at the time of ninety what happens the body does not move. The mind is shattered and the person he wants to live and he wants to leave. That means this person has come to swallow-able condition. Physically also with kala upasesanam the body has become easy to swallow. With the help of kala the world is the food for the bhagavan. Mrithyur yasya upasesanam.

Here another important principle is told and that time is paramatma and paramatma is not in 'time'. Paramatma is not in time but the time is born in paramatma, exists in paramatma and dissolves in paramatma and paramatma is beyond paramatma. In our experience we find not only the world resolves and along with that time also resolves. World and time are inseparable ones and you cannot think of time without world and you cannot think of world without thinking of time. Who can know paramatma in this manner as a swallower of world and time? What is more important is the swallower of time. This is not a question and only a few can comprehend what is beyond time.

Then the upanishad makes another statement as to who can know where the paramatma is located. This is also significance statement. We say paramatma swallows the world with the help of time. Here paramatma takes kala as side dish and kala is also swallowed. The universe includes akasa also. Akasa is the first product to have been produced. Now imagine a condition when paramatma swallows the space where is the paramatma is located.

To locate paramatma it requires space. Paramatma has swallowed space and some one asks where is paramatma. Intellect cannot answer the question and paramatma is location-less. That means paramatma has neither time location nor it has space location; it creates time and space it sustains time and space and it resolves time and space. Who can understand paramatma as swallower of time and space? Hence paramatma is seen as eater of time and space.

Here what is the controversy here for this mantra to be included in Brahman sutra? We said paramatma is eater of the world along with time and space. Here upanishad does not use the word paramatma and upanishad uses a pronoun. Here word 'yasya' means for that or for him is used to denote paramatma. Here we get full of pronouns to denote Brahman. How do you know the pronoun represents Brahman or paramatma alone and no other noun?

The controversy is compounded here. If the upanishad talks about one noun then we can say it talks about that particular noun. But kathopanisad talks about different subject and we should the pronoun talks with particular topic. Three main topics are there that can be represented by pronoun. One is Agni devata; second is jivatma and the third topic discussed is paramatma. Since different nouns are there, the pronouns can represent either Agni or jivatma or paramatma.

When naciketetus approaches yama he asks for three boons. To perform the naciketetus fire, one has to chant a specific mantra; is known as nachiketetusagni. Kathopanisad talks about naciketetusagni. Through that ritual one gains swarga loka..yama teaches this yaga and with the help of this Agni one can perform a ritual and with the help of this yagna he can gain moksa. Then nachiketetus asks what happens to jiva after death.

*Yeyam prete vicikitsa manusye asti-tyeke nayam astiti caike, etad vidyam anusistas tvaya 'ham varanam esa varas trtiyah* [i.i.20 of kathopanisad] which means there is that doubt, 'when a man is dead' some say 'he exists' and some again say 'he does not' this i should like to know being taught by thee this is the third boon, that i ask. He cannot ask what happens to paramatma after death. Yama answers the question later.

Then yama dharma raja says '*yonim anye prapadyante sariratvaya dehinah, sthanam anye 'nusamyanti yatha karma yatha srutam*' that means some souls enter the womb to have a body, others to to the plants, just according to their work and according to their knowledge. Then naciketetus asks yama to talk about paramatma which beyond birth and death beyond punya papam etc. Jivatma travels and goes to another body depending upon the punya papa karma. It travel and it talks of birth death cycle.

The third topic is paramatma and about that also naciketetus asks the question. *Anyatra dharmad-anyatra dharmat anyantra smat krta krtat, anyatra bhutac-ca bhavyac-ca yat tat pasyasi tad vada* [kathopanisad i.ii.14] that is naciketetus asks about 'that which thou seest as other than virtue and vice – as right and 'unright', as other than cause and effect, as other than the past and future - tell me all that. Then, yama talks about paramatma.

Then yama dharma raja says '*na nayate mriyate va vipascit nayam kutascin-na babhuva kascit, ajo nityah sasvato'yam purano na hanyate hanyamane sarire* [i.ii.17 of kathopanisad] that means the intelligent atman is not born, nor does he die, he did not spring from anything, and nothing sprang from him. This unborn, eternal, everlasting, ancient, is not slain even when the body is destroyed. Agni devata is talked about; paramatma is talked about; jivatma is talked about. Now three pronouns are talked about and in 1.ii.25 of kathopanisad three pronouns are used and asked who is the eater whether it is paramatma or jiva or Agni. It is the doubt.. We should say that the eater referred to by the three pronouns is paramatma. The eater is paramatma. Now i will come to the general analysis of the first sutra.

The first sutra says that the eater is only paramatma. It is because the food mentioned is not the ordinary food. The food mentioned is the entire cosmos consisting of both movable and immovable animate and the inanimate things of the world. It is not jiva he cannot eat anything; similarly Agni devata also cannot eat anything except that offered in the yaga etc, Agni can swallow Prithvi and jala devata. Agni is itself is consumed by vayu. Agni cannot consume vayu and on the other hand it is consumed. Here we talk of that which consumes everything the sarachara prapancha. This is the general analysis of the first sutra.

Now we will see word for word analysis. It has got two words' *atta* means the eater; eater mentioned in 1.ii.25 of kathopanisad] now one may ask the question the word eater is not mentioned in the mantra. We say the eater is not mentioned directly but it is mentioned the food and the eater mentioned is implied here. By implication the eater is mentioned in the mantra and that eater is called *atta*. Then we have to supply paramatma bhavati. This eater mentioned in the above mantra is paramatma alone. *Bogta* is paramatma. This is the conclusion.

What is the logic here? The reason is given as characharagrahanat because the movable and the immovable [i.e., the whole universe] is taken [as his food]. How do you say chara chara prapancha is mentioned? Such a word is not at all there. The mantra talks about Brahmanas and ksatriya. For that our answer is that Brahmanas and ksatriyas are representatives of chara chara prapancha. They are the indicators of the whole universe. Brahmanas and ksatriyas

represent the whole universe. There is some norm where one should take implied meaning and the direct meaning.

Here Brahmanas and ksatriyas are taken as upalaksanam to represent the whole world. Kala is taken to consume all which means vasyas, sudras etc., are also taken into account. Time is the helper for swallowing the entire prapancha. This is the word meaning of the first sutra.

Now adhi sankaracharya raises certain further questions. One purva paksi raises the question and says that it is paramatma is the eater but jivatma should be taken as the eater. In sastra we often discuss who is akarta abokta karta bogta. Invariably in sastra paramatma is asamsari; jivatma is samsari. Paramatma is abokta and therefore asamsari. Jivatma is resented as karta and bokta and therefore he is samsari.

Therefore atta should be taken, as jivatma and paramatma is abokta. I will give you upanishad support and paramatma is not eater and jivatma alone is eater. In mundaka upanishad it says there is a tree and two birds bound to each other in close friendship, perch on the self-same tree. One of them eats the fruits of the tree with relish, while the other [just] looks on, without eating.

*Dvau sparna sayuja sakhaya samanam vrksam parisvasjate, tayor anyah pippalam svady-atty-anasan anyo abhicakasiti* [ref iii.i.1 of mundaka upanishad] of those two birds jivatma bird eats the karma phalam and from atti take the word atta which means eater whereas the other bird which is paramatma remains as saksi and jivatma is atta and paramatma is not and therefore your interpretation is wrong is the argument of purva paksi. Now what will the answer of siddhantin and adhi sankaracharya gives the answer, which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 71

### **Topic 2. Attradhikaranam; [sutras 9-10]**

The eater is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.9 [40] contd.**

#### ***Atta characharagrahanat***

The eater [is Brahman], because both the movable and immovable [i.e., the whole world is taken [as his food]

We see the ninth sutra of second pada which happens to be the second adhikaranam known attradhikaranam. Here we have seen the meaning of the first sutra and we see certain purva paksas and the questions and answers given in the sankara bashyam.

We see the kathopanisad mantra 1.2.25. The upanishad does not directly say that Brahman is eater but it says indirectly saying that the whole world is the annam and if it is annam there must be one who eats and the eater cannot be other than Brahman. Further side dish for the food is stated to be the kala, the time. The implied eater is called atta and eater is not mentioned. We have concluded that eater is paramatma alone and none else. The food is not ordinary food but the entire cosmos both animate and inanimate things. Here bashyakara introduces a purva paksi. Atta means eat. Atta and bogta both means the same thing.

Purva paksi says from vedanta sastra we know bogta is a samsari because he described as karta and bogta but paramatma is termed as akarta and abokta. Since bokta is samsari and he is jiva therefore 1.2.25 of kathopanisad talks of jivatma alone. If it were paramatma the upanishad cannot use the word atta and it must have used the word anatta. In support, he gives upanisad mantra *dvau sparna sayuja sakhaya samanam vrksam parisavajate, tayor anyah pippalam svady-atty-anasan anyo abhicakasiti* [ref iii.i.1 of mundaka upanisad]. Jivatma and paramatma are compared to two birds and they are perched on the individual body and upon the tree jivatma and paramatma are seated and one is atta and another is anatta one is eater and another is noneater or abokta. Now our doubt is which is atta and which is anatta.

Upanishad says jivatma is atta and paramatma does not eat anything. Another one without eating only witnesses. From mundaka upanishad it is clear jivatma is atta and paramatma is anatta. From this it is clear jivatma is atta. This is purva paksi's answer. Now adhi sankaracharya gives his answer.

Adhi sankaracharya says in the sastras the word atta and bogta can refer to either jivatma or paramatma depending upon the context. Therefore never jump into a conclusion without referring to the context. Context is determined by the object, which is eaten. After finding out what is the object of eating then conclude jivatma or paramatma. There are two objects of eating found in sastra. One is sukha dukha anubhava or karma phalam. Eating means experiencing. One experience is karma phalam. This is not the whole creation and it is only a

particular experience of sukha and dukha. Karma phala bogta is one possibility or karma phala atta.

Second object of eating the whole universe is presented as object of eating it is not sukha dukha anubhava and it is seen in the entire universe. Prapancha atta means eating or it is but laya karta. One meaning of atta is eating and another meaning is dissolving. Karma phala means experiencing karma by jivatma and it is samsari status. Jivatma enjoys karma phala attritvam status makes him a samsari and it means sukha dukha anubhava, when you talk about prapancha atta it refers to laya karta one who is eating the whole universe at the time of pralayam and it refers to paramatma alone and paramatma alone is laya karta and he is asamsari and paramatma is mukta.

When you say karma phala samsari jivatma and when you say prapancha atta it is asamsari paramatma. In kathopanisad we talk of the whole universe assisted by kala it refers to paramatma alone whereas when you talk of the birds one of them is said to be the eater and the eater is jivatma and the witness bird is paramatma. Kathopanisad mantra talks of the eater of the world the asamsari paramatma and mundakopanisad mantra talks of the eater of the karma phala samsari jivatma. The word pippalam means karma phalam.

In mundaka phalam jivatma is talked about. In kathopanisad the prapancha atta paramatma is talked about and therefore don't mix up the two mantras. An aside point also can be noted here. The word karta is also like that. Suppose i ask the word karta refers to jivatma or paramatma. Karta literally means doer. The word karta can either refer to paramatma or jivatma according to the context. You ask the question doer of what. After getting the answer alone you conclude. If i say punya papa karta means it refers to samsari jiva.

Suppose i say sristi sthithi laya karta the doer of the sristi sthithi laya of the whole universe then refers to asamsari paramatma. When it is macrocosmic karta bokta it is paramatma and microcosmic karta bokta is samsari jivatma. Here atta refers to paramatma alone. One more purva paksi who argues that atta can be Agni devata also. We know Agni is consumer of things both in the worldly sense and also from the scripture sense of the terms also. Agni receives all the offerings and Agni is in the stomach in the form of vaishvanara Agni. Agni alone si there in stomach in the form of samana prana. Purva paksi says Agni can also be called as atta.

The second fire naciketusa fire also is Agni and not only that in veda mantra Agni is seen as annadah. In taittiriya upanishad [brigu valli iii.viii.8] it is said *annam na paricaksit, tad vratam, apo va annam, jyotir annadam, apsu jyotih pratisthitam jyotisy-apa pratisthitah, tad etad annam anne pratisthitam sa ya etad annam anne pratisthitam veda pratisthithati annavan annadeo bhavati mahan bhavati prajaya pasubhir Brahman varcasena, mahan kirtya* which means do not reject food. That is a duty. Water is food. Fire is the food eater; fire is fixed in water, water is fixed in fire. So food is fixed in food. He, who knows that food is fixed in food, stands forever, established well. He becomes the possessor of food and an eater of food. He becomes great in prajeny in cattle and in his spiritual lusture. He becomes great in fame. Here Agni is said to be the eater. The same idea is repeated in brihadharaynaka upanishad also ref mantra [1.4.6 brihadharanyaka upanishad] reads as *atheity abhyamanthat, sa ,mukhac ca yoner hastabhyam cagnim asrjata, tasmad etad ubhayam atomaham antaratah, alomaka hi yonir antaratah tad yad idam ahur amum yaja, amum yajety ekaikam devam, etasyaiva sa visrstih, esa u hy eva sarve devah, atha yat kim cedam ardrum, tad retasao asrjata, tad u somah, etavad va idam sarvam annam caivannadas ca, soma evannam Agnir annadah, saisa*



*rahmanotistrstih, yac chreyaso devan asrjata; atha yan martyah sann amrtan asrjata, tasmad atrisrstih, atisrstyam hasyaitasyam bhavati ya evam veda.* Here it is said that this whole world is just food and eater of food soma is food and fire is the eater of food this is the highest creation of Brahman namely that he created the gods who are superior to him. He although mortal himself created the immortals. Therefore it is the highest creation. Adhi sankaracharya does not answer the question. Agni devata can consume only limited things. Vaisvanara Agni can eat only eatable. Even in pralaya kala Agni can consume jala and Prithvi tattvam and it cannot other akasa, vayu etc. Agni is atta and it is sarva atta. Therefore it has to be paramatma alone and not Agni.

## Topic 2. Attradhikaranam; [sutras 9-10]

The eater is Brahman

### Sutra 1.2.10 [41]

#### *Prakaranaccha*

And on account of the context also the [eater is Brahman]

First I will give you general analysis. Vyasacharya says the context reveals paramatma is the eater of the whole prapancha. If you see the place of the mantra 1.2.25 the context is not jivatma context. Jivatma is talked about later in the upanishad. There is a special area where jivatma is talked about. Jivatma context is separately given. Even Agni devata is not there. Agni devata talk is over with the second boon. This mantra comes with this mantra of the third boon.

Since the second boon is over Agni is not talked about. Jiva is also not there. This sloka comes immediately comes after naciketusa asks a question. This question is asked in 1.2.14.kathopanisad that reads as *anyatra dharmad anyatrsa dharmat anyatra smat krta krtat, anyatra bhutac-ca bhavyac-ca yat-tat pasyasi tad vada.* This question is quoted more often than the answer itself. The question is beyond dharma and adharma. This is quoted to negate the idea given by vishistadvaidam. If god is nirguna only in the sense god is free from bad guna. Akalyana guna is negated by nirguna, but advaidins say god is free from good and bad gunas. This is crucial difference between vishistadvaidam and advaidam. Brahman is beyond dharma and adharma kalyana and akalyana good and bad. All the cause and effect is beyond we talk about that one. The question is about jivatma or paramatma and it is certainly about paramatma only and not about jivatma. Dharma adharma aditah means paramatma only. Jivatma has got dharma and adharma. In fact jivatma is jivatma because he is in the grip of dharma and adharma. Answer should be paramatma alone. Yama's answer begins from no 1.ii.18 and 19 of kathopanisad reads as *na jayate mriyate va vipascit nayam kutascin-na babhuva kascit, ajo nityah sasvato 'yam purano na hanyate hanyamane sarire hanta cen manyate nantum, hatas-cen-manyate hatam; ubhau tau na vijanito, nayam, hanti na hanyate* all these mantras if you study they all talk about paramatma alone. Whereas we know jivatma is subject to birth death cycle. While dealing with paramatma we get in that prakaranam which begins with 18. The question is about paramatma and the answer is also about paramatma and therefore the concluding mantra also should talk about paramatma and therefore eater talked about is not jivatma and it is paramatma because of the context which determined by question and the answer.

The word for word analysis is that it contains two words prakaranat; from the context or because of the context the paramatma is the context cha; also and. Why also is added because in the previous sutra one reason is given and it is the second reason so it is said second reason also.

Vyasacharya gives two reasons. Adhi sankaracharya gives the third reason also. Again go back to the [antra 1.ii.25] *kathopanisad yatra Brahman ca ksatram ca ubhe bhavati odanah, mrtyur yasyo-pasecanam ka ittha veda yatra sah*. The eater is talked about. Whether it is jivatma or paramatma is the question. Who can know the eater and the second question that can know where the eater is? Here even though upanishad asks the question, actually it is not a question and here who can know means majority cannot know but a very, very few know the eater and eater is incomprehensible matter is talked about. The eater does not have any location because eater is not in space and space itself is the eater.

Adhi sankaracharya argues if the eater is jivatma such a question will not come at all jivatma is never an incomprehensible one and we know jivatma as samsari etc. If the eater is jivatma, it can be easily known to anyone, if it is easily known, upanishad would not have said who can understand the eater. It talks about incomprehensible paramatma the eater.

Similarly the location also regarding jivatma's location there is no doubt about it. Jivatma location is not a mystery. The smriti talks of the mystery and hence it talks about incomprehensible eater not a well-known eater and incomprehensible eater can be paramatma alone and not jivatma. In all the discussion we talk about jivatma and paramatma all the time differentiating jivatma and paramatma and you may have doubt whether you have any difference about jivatma and paramatma. Avoiding confusion is not clear knowledge. If Brahman sutra can create confusion raise the confusion and remove the confusion. Therefore here we do talk about jivatma paramatma beda and what we say is ajnana kale we talk of beda from vyavaharika angle and when we gain jnanam we talk of abeda from paramarthika angle. Therefore when we talk about we talk of vyavaharika ajnana avastha. With this attheadhikaranam is also over.

The subject matter of this adhikaranam is the eater mentioned in 1.ii.25 in kathopanisad is paramatma. Second point is what is our doubt. The doubt is whether what is mentioned here is the eater jivatma or paramatma. Doubt is because the upanishad does not use the word jivatma or paramatma. What is view of the purva paksa. He says atta is jivatma. The reason is atta means bokta and bokta is samsari and samsari is jivatma and mundaka mantra supports this fact. Jivatma is atta the upanishad says. Jivatma birds eats and paramatma bird does not eat. Our answer is atta paramatma. The reason is we talk about the eater of karma phalam and if it is the eater of karma phalam we talk of the eater of sristi sthithi laya karta and it is paramatma only and because of this eating paramatma does not become samsari. Eater of karma phalam becomes a samsari and eater of sristi sthithi laya karta is asamsari. This adhikaranam is occurring in the right place only.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 72

### **Topic 3. Guhapravishtadhikaranam; [sutras 11-12]**

The dweller on the cave of the heart is the individual soul and Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.11 [42]**

#### ***Guham pravistavatmanau hi taddarsanat***

We have completed the 10<sup>th</sup> sutra of the second pada. Now we will go to the next sutra, which happens to be the third adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam consisting two sutras and it is known as guhapravishtadhikaranam. First we will do the general analysis of the entire adhikaranam and then we will do the general analysis of the first sutra.

This adhikaranam analyses a mantra in kathopanisad and the mantra is *tram pibantau sukrtasyo loke guham pravistau parame parardhe; chaya-tapau Brahman-vido vadanti, pancagnayo ye ca trina-ciketah* [1. Iii.i of kathopanisad] the meaning of the mantra is the two who enjoy the fruits of their good works being seated in the cavity of the heart, the seat of the supreme, the knowers of Brahman call them shadow and light; as also the performer of the fivefold fire and those who have propitiated three times the naciketush fire.

In the previous adhikaranam we analysed a kathopanisad 1.2.25 mantra. The next mantra of kathopanisad is the present adhikaranam. First I will give you the general meaning of the mantra in detail as this is very important mantra. This mantra talks about jivatma and paramatma as residing in the heart of all beings. Guham pravistau parame parardhe jivatma and paramatma have entered the hridayam the heart and they reside in the heart. They are located in the sacred place within the heart. The whole physical body is compared to the temple and heart is called sanctum sanctorum and it is said in the first line that they enjoy the karma phalam which is in the form sukha and dukha rupam. The world loke means sarire in the physical body. This jivatma and paramatma experiencing the karma phala. In our language jivatma can be understood as pratibimbananda chaitanyam and paramatma can be called bimba chaitanyam and pramata and saksi experience the karma phalam. The nature of the two is they are totally different and are diagonally opposite nature like light and shadow. One is light and another is dark. Brahmanvido vadanti those who deal with jnana kanda talks about these two jivatma and paramatma and even ritualists talk about these two jivatma and paramatma. Both karma kanda people and jnana kanda people talk about the heart where jivatma and paramatma resides. This mantra of kathopanisad is too close to bird example given in mundaka upanishad *dvau sparna sayuja sakhaya samanam vrksam parisasvajate, taylor anyah pippalam svady-atty-anasan anyo abhicakasiti* [ref iii.i.1 of mundaka upanishad]. The body is compared to the tree and heart to a branch and the heart branch jivatma and paramatma birds are seated. The mantra context and discussion we will speak guha pravistau very often. What is the controversy. There is some doubt in this mantra. What is the controversy which is to be resolved in this sutra. In the entire mantra the word jivatma or paramatma is not at all used. We only come to know they are two entities in the heart. Two things are experiencing the karma phalam. They are comparable to shade and light that indicates that there are two things. Mantra points out two things experience the karma

phalam. Mantra does not say what are the two things. Now we are going to establish what are they in the absence of the upanishad not mentioning what they are. We will establish that they are jivatma and paramatma because sankya philosophers do not accept paramatma separate from jivatma. We say that there is paramatma separate from jivatma. How do you say vedantins accept paramatma separate from jivatma? From vyavaharika dristya we accept paramatma and jivatma. Sankya do not do so. The main advantage is accept jivatma and paramatma from vyavaharika angle but from absolute angle jivatma and paramatma is one and the same. Now i will explain the general analysis of the first sutram of this adhikaranam.

The first one can be interpreted in two ways; adhi sankaracharya does not clearly present two interpretations. In this interpretation we will say that two experiencers of karma phalam located in heart is jivatma and paramatma and none else. The reason for this conclusion is that it is clearly stated elsewhere. The rule a vague mantra should be understood with a clear mantra outside. Here we have a conclusion that the entities mention are jivatma and paramatma. We see a parellel idea elsewhere.

The two birds mantra *dvau sparna sayuja sakhya samanam vrksam parisasvajate, tayor anyah pippalam svady-atty-anasan anyo abhicakasiti* [ref iii.i.1 of mundaka upanisad] one bird experiences karma phala and the other witness the karma phala which is paramatma bird and jivatma bird is pramata and paramatma bird is saksi which is clearly said in mundakopanisad. This is hinted by adhi sankaracharya. This is the general analysis of the first interpretation. Now we will go for the word for word analysis interpretation of the first analysis.

Guham; in the cavity of heart the physical heart, the mind which is located in the heart, we say he does the work whole heartedly means the invisible mind which is located in the physical heart. We talk of mind and the heart here it is physical heart; pravishtau means located literally it means entered; this is the paksa. Two things have entered, those two entities are atmanou jivatma and paramatma is our conclusion; hi means indeed because and it is jivatma and paramatma only and none else and the next word is taddarsanat; tad means this idea, that the idea that two entities located in heart is jivatma and paramatma only; darsanat means this is clearly mentioned elsewhere. Elsewhere is mundaka upanishad mantra 3.i.1. [see above para]. This is the first interpretation.

The second interpretation is clearly given by adhi sankaracharya. We will general analysis of the second interpretation. Here adhi sankaracharya shows that those two entities are chetana tattvam. He does not say jivatma and paramatma. He says they are sentient one and once you say they are sentient one and then it can be established that they are jivatma and paramatma only. There is one paramatma and within the heart there is only one jivatma and therefore once you say there are two sentient one we know that they are jivatma and paramatma.

How do you prove that they are two sentient one? Taddarsanat means they are two sentient things. In the heart jivatma is there is accepted by all philosophers. There is no controversy. The controversy is whether there is paramatma is there or not. The location of paramatma is the controversy. It is because sankya philosopher does not accept paramatma at all let alone accepting the location of paramatma in the heart. Who is the second one other than paramatma is the controversy.

The usage of dual number supports my case. When you give number to a thing, the rule is that the objects referred to will belong to the same class of things or objects or being.

Somebody has brought a cup of coffee. Then i say bring another one. That means the second one is coffee nothing else. Suppose people get into a vehicle. Someone say one more comes. Then another means another person comes. They talk about various devatas and the fifth one means fifth one belongs to devata only. When we count the people and say 150 means all the people only. We don't count other species. Here we talk about two entities. One of them is chetana jivah and the second one referred to dual number the other sentient one has to be paramatma only. The reasoning is taddarsanat. Previously we said taddarsanat means stated elsewhere. Now we say the well known rule as above.here dual number is present and the same species is chetana one. This is the general analysis of second interpretation.

Now we will see the word for word analysis. Guham means physical heart; pravistou means located; we have to supply a word that jivatma and paramatmanou. That means jivatma and paramatma only; those two located in heart are jivatma and paramatma. Then we have to give the reason. Atmanou hi. Here in the second interpretation the word atmanou means chetanou. Chaetanou merans, because both are sentient one. That is proved by the next word taddarsanat it is the reason to prove that he two entities are sentient one. Tad means the general rule. Wherever numbers are used the numbered things belongs to the same species one is jivatma and the other is paramatma darsanat means well known rule. With this first sutra interpretation is over.

Now we will enter into purva paksi. He does not allow us to conclude anything. What we have seen is our conclusion. Our conclusion is that the two entities in the heart are jivatma and paramatma. First statement he says is that you are wrong. He says that the two entities located in the heart are jivatma and adhikaranam.he says one is jivatma and the other is the mind and not paramatma. If you take it as paramatma there will be so many logical problems. They are not there if you take it as jivatma and intellect. Problem number one is that the mantra says two experiences of karma phalam. If you take jivatma and paramatma the problem will be jivatma is bokta and paramatma also becomes bokta which is not acceptable to you. Paramatma is not bokta. Paramatma is abokta non-experiencer. Second defect is that paramatma cannot be located in the heart because you say paramatma is all pwervading and how can you the all pervading paramatma is located within the small heart. There is one more defect which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 73.

### **Topic 3. Guhapravishtadhikaranam; [sutras 11-12]**

The dweller on the cave of the heart is the individual soul and Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.11 [42] contd.**

*Guham pravistavatmanau hi taddarsanat*

We see the third adhikaranam. This is based upon the kathopanisad mantra 1.ii.1. The topic of discussion is what are the two entities mentioned in this mantra which are located in the heart. Upanishad mentions two entities the experiencers of karma phalam and it has not explicitly mentioned them. Since the upanishad is not explicit it finds place in Brahman sutra. We have already given two interpretations. And we concluded that they are jivatma and paramatma. Now we discuss purva paksi objections discussed in bashyam.

He says that the two entities are not jivatma and paramatma. Sankya will accept jivatma and jagat but he will not isvara or paramatma. Because of dvesa for paramatma he avoids and says the two experiencers are jivatma and adhikaranam the mind. If you take it as jivatma and paramatma there will be several problems they say to advaidins. We see the three dosha. The word is dual number and mentions two experiencers of karma phlam. If you take them as jivatma and paramatma it is against your own philosophy. Paramatma should not be taken as karma phala bokta. One bokta and another abokta should have been said since paramatma is abokta. This is the first defect according to sankya.

The very statement that both are located in the heart and he says that one can be located since jivatma is subject to movement and how can paramatma all pervading paramatma be accommodated in the small limited heart.

The third defect is that the word chayatabah is like light and shadow and they are diagonally opposite. In advaidic interpretation jivatma and paramatma are not opposite with both of them being chetana they are not diagonally opposite. According to me they are buddhi and jivatma and buddhi is achetana and jivatma is chetana. According to us both of them are chetanam one is pratibimbananda chaitanyam and the other is bimba chaitanyam. Purva paksi says chetana and achetana shadow and light will fit in perfectly according to sankya interpretation they say. Hence they argue they are not jivatma and paramatma. He justifies his view. He says all the three defects mentioned in advaidic interpretation are not there in sankya interpretation.

First dosha is paramatma is not experiencer and in my interpretation both jivatma and buddhi are experiencers. Because both of them are savikarah. Both are savikara and both can experience the karma phalam. In advaidam this defect is not there.

The second defect is guham pratistou in advaidic interpretation paramatma cannot be located in the heart. Paramatma is big and heart is small. In our interpretation both mind and jivatma are small and can be comfortably be located in the heart.

Third interpretation is shadow and light. The mind is achetanam and jivatma is chetanam and they are like light and shadow. Because of these three defects, your interpretation that jivatma and paramatma are located in the heart is wrong. Our interpretation is right is the argument of purva paksi.

In advaidic interpretation we have to prove all the objections are not there and also establish that all the defects are there in your matham also. Now let us see one by one.

First defect is that jivatma and paramatma are not experiencers. Jivatma is experiencer and paramatma is not experiencer. Advaidic answer is that your statement is true but still because of the presence of paramatma alone because of the grace of paramatma alone jivatma is able to experience. Jivatma is able to be an experiencer because of paramatma alone. Jivatma is pratibimbananda and paramatma is bimba chaitanyam. The very existence of chidhabasa is because of chit and therefore we say that paramatma makes jivatma a bokta. It is because of the mere presence paramatma makes jivatma a bokta and since he makes jivatma a bokta we can figuratively say paramatma is also a bokta. For this we give an example also. We say i have cooked the food today.

Then i ask the question did you cook the food or the fire cooked the food. Cooking is process that takes place because of the fire. No. You are the one you made the fire and created the fire to get cooked the food. You do not cook the food and you caused the fire to cook the food. You are responsible for the fire to cook the food. In the same way paramatma is indirectly a bokta and figuratively paramatma is bokta. Since paramatma makes the jivatma to experience things, that paramatma is bokta. If you want any supporting scriptural statement we can give.

Refer to gita sloka 13.22 *upadrasta numanta ca bharta bhokta mahesvarah parramatme 'ti ca'py ukto deha'sminpurusah parah* the meaning of this sloka is the supreme spirit in the body is said to the witness, the permitter, the supporter, the experiencer the great lord and the supreme self. In the gita, no distinction is made between the knower of the field and the supreme lord. Paramatma is boktuh bokta like srortrasya srotra. The first charge is set aside.

Then comes the second charge. How can you say that paramatma is located in the heart. Whenever we say paramatma is in the heart you hve to put additional word that paramatma is in the heart also. All pervading paramatma is in the heart or not is absurd question. All pervading heart is everywhere means paramatma is in the heart also. Why you specifically say it is in the heart. Although paramatma is everywhere, the consciousness cannot be experienced outside. For me consciousness is available only in my body and in my mind as the witness of every thought every condition and every emotion. It is witnessed by all pervading consciousness. It is everywhere but appreciated in the heart and it is like the god in the temple. God is all pervading but in the temple god is especially available for our worship. The consciousness is manifest in the heart. It is not the place of location and it is the place of manifestation. In several upanishad Brahman is presented as guhahitam.

Next is shadow and light. If jivatma and paramatma are taken they are diagonally opposite they said. They are diagonally opposite from the angle of samsari and asamsari one is parichinna and one is aparicchinnah. Jivatma and paramatma are diagonally opposite not in the form of chetana achetana rupena. One is samsari and another is asamsari. Why not take it as chetana achetana rupena. The experiencers of karma phala the upanishad have already indicated that both are chetanam. Both belings to the same species. Light and shadow fits in

even though they are light and shadow because one is samsari and another is asamsari. Third defect is also not there.

Next job is that in your interpretation you have the problem. The first and third point you say are both contradictory. First, we have to take buddhi and jivatma as two experiencers; therefore my interpretation is better you said. Third point you said that buddhi and jivatma are totally opposite like light and shadow because buddhi is achetanam and jivatma is chetanam. If you say that buddhi is achetanam how can you say achetana buddhi and the jivatma are two experiencers. You say paramatma is non-experiencer and to solve the problem you replace paramatma by buddhi an achetana.

When you replace by achetana buddhi a non-experiencer, and how can you say that achetana buddhi and chetana atma are the two experiencers. Then suppose you argue that achetana buddhi is figurative experiencer, then i hold on to my answer that paramatma is also figurative experiencer and in what way your interpretation is superior. Thus you contradict your own first and third statement. You hold on to second point. Other than that all the points are wrong. Therefore my interpretation that jivatma and paramatma are two experiences is correct. We will go to the second sutra.

### **Topic 3. Guhapravishtadhikaranam; [sutras 11-12]**

The dweller on the cave of the heart is the individual soul and Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.12 [43]**

#### ***Viseshanaccha***

And on account of the distinctive qualities [of the two mentioned] in subsequent texts.

First i will give general analysis. Through this sutra vyasacharya points out that upanishad itself by later mantra sorts out the confusion with first mantra. If you read the later mantra applying your mind, you would have sorted the problem. It specifically refers to two experiencers mentioned in the first mantra.

For that you remember 1.3.1 of kathopanisad the chariot example. *Atmanam rathinam vidhi, sariram ratham eva tu, buddhim tu sarathim vidhi, manah pragraham eva ca.* The meaning of the mantra reads as know the atman as the lord of the chariot, who sits within it and the body as the chariot. Know the intellect as the charioteer and the mind as verily the reins. In the earlier mantra the experiences are not specified but in the entire third section the experiencers are very specific.

Here jivatma is presented as traveler and paramatma as the destination. This we see in the mantra 1.iii.9 of the same upanishad that *vijnana-sarathir-yastu, manah pragrahavan narah, so'dhvanah param apnoti, tad visnoh paramam padam* which means the man who has intelligence for his charioteer and the mind as the [well controlled] rein – he attains the end of the journey, that supreme place of vishnu [the all pervading atman]. Jivatma is the traveler, body is the carrier buddhi is driver jivatma is seated in back seat and the destination is paramatma.



Then upanishad points out where the paramatma is located. In which direction one should travel can be known only when you know where paramatma is there. Here it is not the outside journey but it is inside journey. This we see in mantras 1.iii.10 and 11 of the same upanishad that reads as *indriye bhyah para hy artha, arthebhyas-ca param manah, manasas tupara buddhih, buddher atma mahan parah* followed by the mantra 11 *mahatah param avyaktam, avyaktat purusah parah, purusan-na param kincit, sa katha sa para gatih*. The meaning of the upanishad mantra reads as beyond the senses are the sense objects; beyond these objects is the mind; beyond the mind is the intellect and beyond the intellect is the great self followed by the meaning of mantra 11 that beyond the great [mahat] is the un-manifested [avyaktam]. Beyond the avyaktam [prakrti] is the purusa' beyond the purusa there is nothing; that is the end; that is the highest goal.

In these two mantras upanishad presents panca kosa viveka. It is repeated in another kathopanisad mantra *avyaktat tu parah puruso vyapako 'linga eva ca; yam jnatva mucyate jantuh amrtatvam ca gacchati* the meaning of this mantra runs as and verily beyond the unmanifest [prakrti] is the all pervading purusa devoid of all distinctive marks knowing whom the creature [the knower] is emancipated and he attains immortality having talked about paramatma as destination upanishad says that paramatma is within you the destination and jivatma traveler is within; paramatma the destination is within you and jivatma traveler is also within you, the real experiencer jivatma is within and paramatma the destination if figuratively an experiencer is also within. Pramata is the traveler and the apramata paramatma is the destination. Small 'i' is the traveler and the big i is the destination. Soupathika is traveler is jivatma and nirupathika is destination is paramatma and both are within. Therefore gunam pratistah is not only jivatma but also paramatma is there. Upanishad itself specifies jivatma traveler and paramatma destination. Now we will see word analysis.

Viseshanat on account of distinctive qualities, because of the specific reference of jivatma and paramatma that too as traveler and destination the conclusion is jivatma paramatma guha pratistav eva with specific reference given in kathopanisad itself the reference is jivatma and paramatma only and not jivatma and buddhi. This is the meaning of viseshanat. And cha means and because of the reason also. With this word analysis of the second sutra is over. Now adhi sankaracharya introduces another purva paksa here. I will introduce the controversy. We have introduced jivatma and paramatma and we quoted the mantra in support of the first sutra. Mundaka upanishad also says the same thing. Now purva paksa says there is a problem. A mantra which is parallel to the mantra is discussed in another part of the veda. That part is called paingi rahasya Brahmanm parallel mantra is quoted that talks about two entities are detailed.

Veda writes a commentary on that. In saptanna Brahmanm of brahadharaynaka upanisad also we see the commentary on some mantras. There the upanishad says the two entities are satva ksetrajnaou. The word sattvam is mind or adhikaranam. Upanishad accepts that one of the entities is the mind. But the upanishad in question supports the purva paksa and says they are buddhi and ksetrajna. Buddhi and jivatma alone are two entity and we come back to the back to the square one. This we will have to be tackled which we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 74

### **Topic 3. Guhapravishtadhikaranam; [sutras 11-12]**

The dweller on the cave of the heart is the individual soul and Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.12 [43]**

#### ***Viseshanaccha***

And on account of the distinctive qualities [of the two mentioned] in subsequent texts.

We see guhapradistaadhikaranam, which is the third adhikaranam of the second pada. We have seen the meaning of the sutra. The sruti vakyam taken for analysis is kathopanisad vakyam 1.iii.1 of the upanishad. In this word occurs guhan pratistou where to entities reside and what are they is the topic for analyses. While establishing this particular fact, adhi sankaracharya gives a parallel sruti vakyam from mundaka upanishad. In this mantra also, two entities reside within the heart. One is the bokta jivatma and the other is abokta paramatma.

Adhi sankaracharya introduces another controversy. The same mantra is quoted in another part of the veda. This is known as pangi rahasya Brahmanam. In this portion this mantra is quoted. This Brahmana itself writes a commentary on the mantra. Now the question is, what is the eating bird and what is the non-eating bird. The eating bird represents jivatma and non-eating bird represents paramatma. The vedic commentary is different from your interpretation says purva pakshi. Sattva and ksetrajna are two entities in the mind and if you literally translate it, it is buddhi or mind and the word ksetrajna is stated to be atma. We interpret it as jivatma and paramatma but the upanishad says that the two denotes the mind and jivatma.

There are two answers to this objection. One is simpler and immediate method of answering which adhi sankaracharya does not take. Immediate and simple answer is that the buddhi and atma can be taken, as sattva and it is jivatma and ksetrajna that is paramatma. The word sattvam means the mind and the mind always exists along with pratibimbananda chaitanyam and the mind with chidhabasa is called jivatma, karta bokta etc. And the word sattvam relate to the eating bird.

Ksetrajna means it is paramatma. There is no contradiction to what we said and what the upanishad said. Adhi sankaracharya brings about the method of vedantic teaching. What he says is this. We talk about eating one and non-eating one. In vedanta eating refers to bokritvam and non-eating refers to abokritvam and our question is which is bokta. The word bokta indicates an experiencer. Experiencer must fulfill two condition one the entity should be sentient and experiencer should be subject to changes. Experiencer goes through the condition of good and bad, sukha and dukha, and other feelings has got to be savikara chetana vastu.

Adhi sankaracharya says on analysis we find that we do not have savikara chetana vastu in the entire creation on deep analysis. The entire creation consists of two-entity purusa and

praksrit and atma happens to be chetana vastu and it is nirvikara chetana vastu; but the second entity is anatma and it is achetana vastu and it is savikara achetana vastu. We have nirvikara chetana vastu and savikara achetana vastu. Bogta should be savikara chetana vastu or nirvikara chetana vastu and we do not have savikara chetana vastu as it is a nonexistence thing. If savikara chetana vastu is nonexistence, then there is no bokta at all and the upanishad wants to tell us that the bokta is a nonexistent thing and it is not at all there and that it is mithya.

Upanishad wants to teach that there is no entity called mithya at all since the student cannot swallow the truth, the upanishad conveys this in two stages. In the beginning it states that we take that i am a bokta and it is also taken that atma as the bokta. The upanishad wants us to remove the bokta totally; therefore in the first stage it says that you are not bokta but your mind is bokta; the anatma mind is bokta and this is the intermediary stage of the teaching. In the first stage it is said that 'i am a bokta' and in the next stage it says the mind is bokta and later it is said that it is anatma mind which is jadam etc., and then the sruti says that the mind is not bokta; atma is also not a bokta and then it says none of the two is a bokta.

In support of that adhi sankaracharya quotes that is there to hearer and who is there to smell etc. For this i will give you an example. Suppose we clean the house. Loft is the place where there will be a screen. One day you decide to clean. You want to remove the dirt in the loft and you put it down on the floor. This is the intermediary stage before throwing the dirt out you put them on the floor. Ultimately you remove the impurity and all the dirt and throw it away. Putting the impurity and dirt on the floor is intermediary state. Ultimately you throw the dirt away. Ultimately you remove the impurities from the floor also/

Loft is atma and the floor is anatma and all the impurities are bogritvam kartritvam etc. And the upanishad first remove bogritvam away from ksetrajna atma and it put on the sattvam the anatma and this is the intermediary stage and ultimately sattvam is also not bogta and you ultimately put it in the waste paper basket, the mithya.

Buddhi is the bokta is the temporary state and the ultimate state is that atma is not bogta buddhi is also not bokta. In the first the answer atma is abokta and chidhabasa sahita buddhi is the bokta and the chidhabasa sahita buddhi is atma and therefore adhi sankaracharya concludes that there is no contradiction between paingi ragasya Brahmanam interpretation and what i say. We will sum up the adhikaranam` format in technical format.

The subject matter of this adhikaranam is what are the two entities residing in the mind. Or the guham pratistou is the subject matter. That is why the adhikaranam is called so. This occurs in 1.3.1 of kathopanishad. The doubt is the two entities are jivatma and paramatma or something else like jivatma and buddhi. This is the doubt. This is raised by sankya philosopher for sankya does not accept paramatma and hence he raises this question. Therefore his doubt arises in his mind. Purva paksa says that is jiva and buddhi only. He thinks that paramatma is all pervading and how can that all pervading paramatma be located in the mind. What is the view of the opponent, they have to be jivatma and buddhi only. Why he does not accept paramatma? Paramatma is supposed to be all pervading and how can all pervading paramatma be limited. The view of the opponent is t the two entities should be jivatma and buddhi only. He does not accept paramatma is because all pervading paramatma be located in the mind.

Jivatma being limited jivatma can be limited in mind and adhikaranam can also be located both being finite it can be individual and should not bring in paramatma which is all pervading. Word enter cannot happen because paramatma is one 'all pervading'. This is the view of purva paksa. The conclusion is the two entities are jivatma and paramatma only.

The reason is that the two sutras are there for the discussion in Brahman sutra. It is summed up that the two entities are jivatma and paramatma alone and not jivatma and buddhi as claimed by purva paksa. It is presented as one and located as two because in mind alone it is recognized as consciousness. All pervading isvara resides in the heart, which is a contradiction. By pointing out that isvara is available in the heart also it is proved that isvara is both in the heart as also the same isvara is all pervading. The topic is in proper position.

#### **Topic 4. Antaradhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

##### **Sutra 1.2.13 [44]**

##### ***Antara upapatteh***

The person within [the eye] [is Brahman] on account of [the attributes mentioned therein] being appropriate [only to Brahman]

First we will have general introduction of the entire adhikaranam. This is known as antaraadhikaranam. Previously in the first pada we had another adhikaranam known as antaradhikaranam and we should get confused one from the other. This adhikaranam is known so because the first sutra begins with the word antara. This consists of five sutra 13<sup>th</sup> to 17. This is based on another chandogya upanishad 4.15.1. Here the topic is sagunam Brahman upasana or isvara upasana.

That is isvara endowed with various gunas. Guna visista isvara upasana. It is popularly known as upakosala vidya. Here the student happens to be upakosala. This is upasana taught to upakosala. Here the teacher is sathya kama jabalah. He gives this isvara upasana. This is the background and the context of this upasana. It is given in the form of a story.

The student upakosala has gone to the teacher sathya kama jabala. For doing the ritual he has to maintain vedic fire and for different rituals different types of fire is to be used and various homa kundas were also there. All were known by different names. The maintenance of fire is a big job and this is done by the Brahmancharis. Upakosala was tending the fire happily. Sathya kama jabala did a peculiar thing. Upakosala even though he was taught properly he was wondering. There was a session in which upakosala was not given any title or anything and after sending him away the guru went on pilgrimage. Upkosala was upset and still he did not misunderstand his teacher.

He had the shradda and he did not interpret it negatively. He was cursing himself. He started taking upavasa thinking he was not fit to be taught. Even though guru was gone, guru pathni was there and she cared for him. He asked why he did not eat. He said his mind was upset. He sat quiet where all the Agnis were present. At that time something mysterious happened and Agni devata began to teach him. All the fires became the guru of upakosala.

He was taught varieties of upasanas and one of them is nithya ananda rupa prana upasana. Kham Brahman kham Brahman. Nithya ananda upasana. Not only this was given and he was also taught various Agni upasanas were taught by the fires. Having completed the upasanas they told him your guru is sathya kama jabala. This is the present we give and it is not that and ultimately you have learn from your guru and the only the knowledge will have the value. They said sathya kama will come and he will complete the teaching and also give the phalam of this jnana. Mantra 4.10.10 to 14. We find all these teachings.

In 15<sup>th</sup> section we see sathya kama comes back. He sees the student and asks that you have extra brilliance and how come. Some Brahman tejas is there and who gave you the brilliance and sathya kama teaches him isvara upasana which is given in the 15<sup>th</sup> section and that isvara is endowed with two virtues and vamani is the technical word used. He is the master controller of the universe.

Second glory is that he is the illuminator of the whole creation. Vamani is the technical word used. For that isvara upasana some location is required. This isvara has to be invoked somewhere. Sathya kama says that isvara is to be invoked on your eyes that too dakshina Aksi the right eye. May you meditate upon that isvara. That is given in 4.15.1 of chandogya upanishad that reads as *ya esoksini puruso drsyata esa atmeti hovacaitada mrtamabhayametadbrahmeti tadyadyapyasminsarpirvo dakam va sincati vartmani eva gacchati* that reads as the teacher said [the person seen in the eyes is the self. It is immortal and fearless; it is Brahman. This is why, if anyone puts clarified butter or water in the eyes, it goes to the corners of the eyes. Here the rough meaning as we saw is that isvara is in the right eye. Lord is seen in your own body. Lord is seen in yourself. That alone is called paramatma which is amritam and abhayam and not only that this isvara is asangah to the papams that body perform. You put a drop of eye in the water and the water does not stick to the eyes and goes out and water that is dropped like water on the lotus does not affect eyes. The punya papam also will not stick to isvara and isvara is in your body but the body does not pollute isvara.

Here gita 13.31 says *anaditvan nirgunatvat paramatma 'yam avyayah sarirastho 'pi kaunteya na karoti na lipyate* the meaning of the mantra reads as because this supreme self imperishable is without beginning without qualities, so, o son of kunti thought it dwells in the body it neither acts nor is tainted. All the karmas will affect the atma. In the following sarva karma sauksmyad is talked about gita 13.32 *yatha saragatam sauksmyaa akasam na 'palipyate sarvatra 'vashito dehe tatha 'tma no palipyate*. As the all-pervading ether is not tainted, by reason of its subtlety, even so the self that is present in every body does not suffer any taint. It is said that isvara is the illuminator of all the things in the world. Upasana phalam is talked about in the fourth mantra of chandogya upanisad. This is the context.

Now we have to find out where is the controversy. The details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 75

### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.13 [44]**

#### ***Antara upapattēh***

The person within [the eye] [is Brahman] on account of [the attributes mentioned therein] being appropriate [only to Brahman]

Now we will see the fourth adhikaranam of the second pada, which is known, as antaraadhikaranam. I will give general background of this adhikaranam and i will explain the analysis of the first sutram. This part of saguna Brahman upasana and it is called upakosala vidya. It is known by the name because the student upakosala receives it. It was received first from Agni devata and that isvara upasana which is called Brahman upasana and it is sukha rupa upasana and isvara as ananda rupa Brahman upasana, the Agni devata told the other part would be taught by your guru.

Sathya kama jabala is pleased and he continues the same upasana and he starts this from mantra 4.15.1 to 4.15.4 of chandogya upanisad and sathya kama teaches some more virtues of isvara. One is ananda rupa isvara kham Brahman kham Brahman. Ananda rupa isvara is already taught and sathya kama teaches some more virtues of isvara. They are atmatvam – isvara is very atma, amritatvam freedom from death eternity, abhayatvam freedom from fear, Brahmantvam- infinitude asangatvam free from any pollution. He is the producer of all karma phala, vamaniya bhisammyanti all beautiful things come to him; the next virtue is vamanitvam it is karma phala prapakatvam; finally the virtue is bamnitvam sarva visaya prakasatvam Brahman is illuminator of everything. This Brahman should be meditated upon.

The Brahman talked about here is sagunam Brahman. We don't use the word isvara and it is replaced by the word Brahman and it is sagunam Brahman. For this Brahman upasana a location is required to invoke Brahman and that locus is our own eyes. Therefore this Brahman is presented as Aksi purusah. Aksi purusa is the Brahman with all the virtues enumerated above.

Where is the controversy here? Now we will find where is the controversy. Take 4.15.1 of chandogya upanisad that reads as *ya eso'ksini puruso drsyata esa atmeti hovacaitada mrtamabhayametadbrahmeti tadyadyapyasminsarpirvodakam va sincati vartmani eva gacchadi*. The teacher here says the person seen in the eyes is the self. This is the statement. There is a purusa perceived by us seen by us in the eyes of people. Now the problem comes because the word purusa is used in the scriptures in several meanings. Which meaning should be taken is our confusion. In common parlance itself purusa when you say you think of male gender the physical body.

Anna rasa may itself is called purusa. Word purusa is used in the name of jivatma. The very word means sarire. Jivatma, which resides in the body, is also called purusa. Again the word purusa is used for the devatas of various organs and devatas. Third meaning of purusa is devata. Finally and most importantly paramatma itself is called purusah. In kathopanishad purusa is used to denote paramatma. We have to find out which meaning is to be taken here.

Adhi sankaracharya gives a particular meaning and he does not justify why this meaning is taken. In Brahman sutra the analysis is why this particular meaning is taken and why cannot we take another meaning. Aksini drisyate means seen or perceived and paramatma cannot be seen. Some sayn drisyate is used and purusa is perceived purusa. Jivatma cannot be seen devata cannot be seen and we talk about purusa and purusa cannot be jivatma or paramatma or devata and if we take it as sariram the body, the sariram is seen and upanishad says Aksini purusa drisyate and sariram is seen in the eyes of the people. Do you see jiva in eyes do you see devata do you see paramatma in the eyes. You don't see paramatma; you see physical body.

Here the upanishad says purusa is seen in the eyes. Reflection is seen in the eyes of the person in front of him. I see physical body not in the eyes. I cannot see jivatma or paramatma and i see only sthoola sookshma pratibimba as the eyes are capable of seeing and that only we say Aksini purusa drisyate. It is chaaya sariram. We have got five meanings for purusa. The body, reflection of the body, jivah, devata and fifth meaning paramatma are possible and the first one only seems to fit properly which we can see in the eyes of the person. So we have established a controversy. This is the general background of the entire adhikaranam.

In the first sutra, first reason is given to establish our conclusion that Aksi antara purusah paramatma eva bhavati. Aksyantara purusa mentioned in 4.15.1 of chandogya upanishad is Brahman alone. All the virtues mentioned for the purusa will fit for paramatma alone. All the ashta guna cannot fit in with pratibimba sariram, jivah and devata. Because we find that the pratibimba sariram cannot be eternal. Bimba sariram is noneternal jivah is not eternal devata is noneternal but paramatma alone can be amritam abhayam asangam karma phala prabhakam etc. This is the first reason. Now we will go to the word meaning.

It has got two words antarah – person within and - upapateh being available; antarah purusah paramatma bhavati. The purusa obtaining within the eye is paramatma alone because that alone is logical. This is the total sentence. First word is antarah means within. We have to supply the word within the eyes. The purusa obtaining in the eyes mentioned in chandogya upanishad mantra 4.15.1 [ibid].

The next word we have to supply paramatma bhavati and this purusa is Brahman bhavati or paramatma bhavati. The third word is upapateh because that alone is logical because of the fitness. Now vyasacharya says because it is proper and all virtues are possible for paramatma alone. Asangatnvam sariram is not asangah and it is associated with all dust possible; jiva is full of punya papa sanga; devata has got lot of punyam and is not fit for any one of other purusa; sariram, devata all are having the fear. Even yema dharma raja is afraid of isvara and only fearless one is Brahman only. Karma phala utpatakatvam jiva does not produce karma phala and jiva produce karma alone. Devatas do not produce karma phala and they have received karma phalam from lord only. Isvara appoints them only. All are possible for paramatma alone. No single devata can illumine the entire creation. Caksur devata can illumine the forms. Every devata can illumine only a particular segment only and Brahman alone can illumine the entire world.

## Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]

The person within the eye is Brahman

### Sutra 1.2.14 [45]

#### *Sthanadivypadesaccha*

And on account of the statement of place and so on.

In this sutra vyasacharya answers a doubt, which can come in our mind. Brahman alone can have all the good virtues. Therefore purusa seems to be Brahman. I understand Brahman as all pervading; i understand Brahman as sarva adhistanam. Everything in the creation is located in Brahman. Therefore Brahman is not located in the creation. Once Brahman is located in creation it gets localized and becomes limited one. Brahman is locationless in my understanding. Purusa is located in the eye as per the mantra. How can you say Brahman because here purusa talked about is located purusa while Brahman is unlocated Brahman. That is why i suggest jivah. Devata, reflection etc. How do you say purusa Brahman is located in the eye. I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.

Here this question has been asked several times and the teacher has also taught umpteen times. Yet the teacher has to answer. How can Brahman be located? Brahman is not located really speaking and for the sake of upasana the sastra invokes Brahman in various locations. Every time we do puja we do avahayami. Avahayami means locating the devata, which is big in turmeric power. You should not take all these things literally. All the descriptions are for the sake of upasana. Meditate on Brahman invoking in the legs, tongues etc. You meditate on nakshatra.

Brahman is invoked on Surya mandalam also. Don't take it literally. Not only locations are meant for upasana. Various names and forms are also meant for upasana. Even though Brahman is nama rahitam, for the sake of upasana Brahman is given various forms. It has shining eye; we saw in previous antaradhikaranam where Brahman is given golden eyes, golden hair etc. Brahman is location less formless and nameless. Don't hold on to vishnu alone etc. They are for upasana purpose only. This forms and names you see for upasana are not real at all. Location is not real but figurative for the sake of upasana.

Now we will see the word meaning. It has got two words. Sthanadi the place and the rest; sthanam and adhi sthanam means temporary location for upasana; a lamp, an idol, a photo, every temple etc. Temporary alampanam for upasana; adhi means etc. A temporary name for upasana rama, krishna, etc. Upasana also gives special name sathyasya sathyam etc. And also temporary forms for upasana; all vishnu forms all shiva forms are temporary.

Which form is permanent and no form is permanent. There is no form for Brahman. Formlessness is the form of Brahman. Vyapadesat on account of the statement; it means they are mentioned in the sastra. In antarnami Brahmanam of brihadharaynaka upanisad Brahman is located in various places. Brahman is located in the tongue; Brahman is located in the eye; the whole antaryami Brahman location of Brahman at various places. Cha ; and. So also are the various statements in the bhagavatams etc. The next word is cha it means also because of this reason also. You complete the sentence Aksi purusah paramatma bhavati. So Aksi purusa is paramatma. Paramatma is in the eye means paramatma is in the eye also. Then there is no



limitation on Brahman. Brahman is invoked on eye for the sake of upasana. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 76

### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.14 [45]**

#### ***Sthanadivypadesaccha***

And on account of the statement of place and so on.

All the virtues mentioned in 4.15.1 of chandogya upanisad referred to purusa alone and not any thing else and it was also established that Brahman is located in the eye for the purpose of upasana in the last class. Although Brahman has no form, no place etc., for the sake of upasana Brahman has got several names. None of them belongs to Brahman. Similarly Brahman is given various forms although Brahman has no forms but they are attributed to Brahman for the purpose of upasana. One should remember they are superimposed rupas, superimposed forms and superimposed names. They do not really belong to Brahman. The superimposition is for the purpose of upasana only. The upanishad are superimposing nama, rupa and sthanam if someone questions we say superimpositions are of two types. One is erroneous superimposition caused by ignorance rajju sarpah and the deliberate superimposition for the purpose. The superimposition of vishnu on saligrama stone superimposition of Shiva on lingam superimposition of vinayaka on turmeric powder is knowingly made for the purpose of upasana. Therefore ajnatva aropaha jnatva aropah. Upanishad superimposes nama rupa etc., deliberately. This is for facilitating meditation. A devotee cannot invoke Nirgunam Brahman.

### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.15 [46]**

#### ***Sukha visishtabhidhanadeva cha***

And on account of the passage referring to that which is distinguished by bliss [i.e., Brahman]

I will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here vyasacharya gives another argument in favour of his argument that Aksi purusah is Brahman. Upakosala vidya starts from 4.15.1 to 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Now we go back to 4.10.1 of Chandogya upanisad wherein it is pointed out that Agni taught upakosala and he was taught ananta sukha vishista brahma upasana. Kham Brahma kham brahma occurs in the mantra 4.10.4 of chandogya upanisad. At the end Agni devata tells Upakosala that his acharya will complete the teaching. The brahma upasana was taught and the acharya would teach brahma upasana phalam. Acharya continued the topic and instead of teaching the phalam, the acharya teaches the upasana again. It is in

the form of Aksi purusa upasana. Ananta purusa brahma upasana taught by Agni is followed by the acharya and after talking about the upasana in 15<sup>th</sup> section and it is concluded with brahma upasana phalam. This is the movement or development of the five sections. The entire first section of brahma sutra is textual analysis. All the time you remember the texts. 4.10 of Chandogya upanisad is brahma upasana given by Agni devata and 4.15 of Chandogya upanisad is given by acharya sathya kama. If you have a doubt you go back to 4.15.10<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad and find out whether it is Brahma Upasana or not and if it is Brahma Upasana then 4.15 of Chandogya upanisad is also Brahma Upasana. If the Upasana taught by Agni is Brahma Upasana then the Upasana taught by Sathya Kama Jabala also would be Brahma Upasana because Sathya Kama Upasana is nothing but continuation of the Brahma Upasana taught by Agni in the 4.10 of Chandogya upanisad. Agni devata might have talked Brahma Upasana and Sathya Kama might have taught another Upasana. Adhi Sankaracharya points out that Agni devata had already said as per the Upanishad that your Acharya would continue the teaching and hence whatever taught by Agni is continued and since Agni had taught Brahma Upasana Sathya Kama also had taught only Brahma Upasana. The word Brahman is clearly used kham and ham are used and it means ananta sukham. Ananta sukham is possible only for Brahman. Ananta sukham Brahma alone is taught in 19<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. So in Aksi Purusa also the same Brahman alone is invoked. Now we will see the word analysis.

Sutra has got three words. Sukha bliss; visishta qualified by; abhidhanat; because of the description; the three words are compound sukhavisishta abhidhanat infinite bliss is endowed with has been introduced. It means Aksi Purusa has been already introduced in the 10<sup>th</sup> section as ananta sukha visishta Brahman endowed with infinite ananda and the same ananda is continued and how can the same Brahma be changed in the study continued by Sathya Kama. Eva means because of this reason also alone; cha and. To complete the sutra you have to add the word Brahman. Purusa in the eye is Brahman because of the reason also.

#### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

##### **Sutra 1.2.16 [47]**

##### ***Stutopanishatkagatyaphidhanaccha***

And on account of the statement of the way of him who has known the Truth of the Upanisads.

First we will have the general analysis of this sutra. We had given a particular argument in the previous sutra and based on this purva paksa may raise a question. Now we have to supply a purva paksa to the objection raised in the previous sutra. You should note all the five sections continuously that Agni devata has taught Brahma Upasana and the Acharya continues the Brahma Upasana and therefore Aksi Purusa is Brahman alone. Purva paksa says that as per the Upanishad the argument is improper. In section 10 to 14 of Chandogya upanisad Agni devata teaches Upakosala. The teaching starts with Brahma Upasana. But the problem is that Agni devata do not teach one Upasana and he teaches other Upasanas and therefore there is some complications. They are Agni Upasanas. First it was Brahma Upasana and thereafter many Agni Upasanas are taught by the Agni. After teaching Agni Upasana and at the end Agni tells the student that your Acharya will complete the teaching. They have taught

Brahma Upasana as also Agni Upasana and the teacher starts with Aksi Purusa Upasana. Aksi Purusa Upasana is continuation all right but it is not continuation of Brahma Upasana but it is continuation of Agni Upasana. Therefore purva paksa says it is the continuation of Agni Upasana and why should you take Aksi Purusa as Brahman. For that we say that the discussion of the Acharya Sathya Kama and Upakosala indicates sufficient clues if some exploratory job we will know that it is Brahma Upasana alone and not Agni Upasana as contended by the purva paksa. Adhi Sankaracharya clue is not given in the sutra. After Acharya comes back he looks at the student and says that you have got some more knowledge from someone. He asks from whom did you learn. In that dialogue the teacher tells Upakosala that he has effulgence in the face that of Brahma upasaka. He has not said that sishya had Agni upasana. He clearly says that you have the tejas of Brahma Upasaka. If a person does Brahma Upasana will not have papas and at the same time it is not possible for the Agni Upasana to be free of papas. Not only that at the end of the section Shukla or Brahma loka prapti phalam is mentioned for the Brahma upasaka. Brahma loka prapti is possible for Brahma Upasana alone and not to the Agni Upasaka.

This is said in the mantra 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *atha yada caivasminkaavyam kurvanti yadi ca narcisamevabhisambhavantyarciso'harahna apuryama napaksamapuryamana paksa dyansadudanneti masams tansmasebhyah samvatsaram samvatsara dadityamadit yaccandramasam cdandramaso vidyutam tatpuruso 'manavah sa enanbrahma gamayatyesa devapatho brahmapatha etana pratipadyamana imam manavamavartam navartante navartante* the meaning of this mantra is then, for those who know this, whether proper funeral rites are performed or not, they go after death to the world of light. From the world of light they go to the world of day; from the world of day to the world of the bright fortnight; from the world of the bright fortnight to the six months when the sun moves northward; from there they go to the year to the sun from the sun to the moon; and from the moon to lightning. There someone not human, receives them and leads them to Brahmaloaka. This is the way of the gods. This is also the way to Brahman. Those who go by this path never return to this mortal world. They never return.

How do you know Brahma upasakas alone get Brahma loka prapti. Here Krishna says in Gita *agnir yotir ahah suklah sanmasa uttaranam tatra prayata gacchanti Brahma brahmavido Janah* that reads as fire, light, day, the bright [alf of the month], the six months of the northern path [of the sun] then going forth the men who know the Absolute go to the Absolute. [Gita VIII.24] it is very clearly said Brahma vid reach Brahma loka. Here Aksi Purusa gets Brahma loka prapti and therefore Brahma loka prapti phalam shows that it is Aksi Purusa only.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Sruto hear the who has heard and practised upasakah; upanishatka Upanisads also Brahma Upasana together will mean one who has heard and practiced Brahma Upasana or Brahma upasakah; gati way also it means phalam, Brahma upasaka phalam the benefit attained by Brahma upasaka which is Brahma loka phalam; abhidhanat; because of the statement or because of the presentation because of the presentation of Brahma loka phalam to Aksi Purusa upasaka and if such upasaka gets Brahma loka phalam then the Aksi Purusa is Brahman alone and if had he been Agni, he would not have got Brahma loka phalam cha because of this reason also. whenever I use Brahman with Upasana it should be understood as Sagunam Brahman and not at all Nirgunam Brahman. This I want to make it clear to you.

#### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.17 [48]**

***Anavasthiterasambhavaccha netarah***

[the person within the eye is the Supreme Self] and not any other [i.e/. The individual soul etc.] As these do not exist always; and on account of the impossibility [of the qualities of the person in the being ascribed to any of these]

Until now he pointed out that Aksi Purusa has to be Brahman alone was explained in the above sutras. Now he says that Aksi Purusa cannot be anything other than Brahman. Now it is from negative angle Aksi Purusa cannot be any other devata. All the other description do not fit into any other devatas. Purva paksa says that the Upanishad has used a word [4.15.1 of Chandogya upanisad] Purusa only for the human being. He has understood Purusa means manusya sariram. Here again the manusya sariram which is visible in the right eye it is said. Here purva paksa wants to analyse and find out that which manusya sariram is visible in the eye. Only when I stand in front of the person and my manusya sariram is seen in the eye and the other man's eye is like a mirror and visible Aksi Purusa has to be Pratibimba sariram, the reflected body in his eye and the other mans body in my eyes. This is the Aksi Purusa so says purva paksa, here Vyasacharya says chaya sariram cannot be upasya devata. Two reasons are given one is that it is impermanent and unsteady. The second reason is all the other virtues given cannot fit into chaya sariram. Can the Pratibimba sariram be immortal. Aksi prati Bimba sariram cannot be immortal. It cannot be nirvikaram, abhayam, vamanitvam etc. Virtures do not belong to chaya sariram. Because of these reasons Aksi Purusa cannot be chaya sariram.

Sutra has got five words. Anavasthiteh; not existing always unsteady or impermanent of the reflected boy and therefore it cannot be upasya devata; even if one turns one's head the Pratibimba sariram or the reflected boy will go; asambhavat; on account of the impossibility of all the virtues that we should know amrtivam abhayatvam etc..mentioned in the Pratibimba sariram; cha and, also na not itarah any other the chaya sariram. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 77

### **Topic 4. Antaraadhikaranam [Sutras 13-17]**

The person within the eye is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.17 [48]**

#### ***Anavasthiterasambhavaccha netarah***

[The person within the eye is the Supreme Self] and not any other [i.e., the individual soul etc.] As these do not exist always; and on account of the impossibility [of the qualities of the person in the being ascribed to any of these]

This aksantara Purusa occurs 4.15.1 of Chandogya upanisad which is part of Upakosala vidya. We see the final sutra. In the previous sutras Vyasacharya establish that aksyantara Purusa is Paramatma alone and later various attributes were mentioned and all of them fit in with Paramatma only and finally the phalam also is mentioned as Brahma loka prapti phalam and Vyasacharya confirmed that only by Brahma Upasana alone Brahma loka prapti is possible but nothing else. All the first four sutra established positively and in this sutra Vyasacharya establishes negatively that the aksyantara Purusa cannot be anything other than Paramatma.

Here main purva paksa kept in view is a person who claims Pratibimba sariram as aksyantara Purusa, first he takes Purusa as human body that is widely understood meaning, because of the word drisyate he takes the Purusa sariram which is visible in the eyes and the only sariram which is the reflection of the body in the eye of the person standing in front. This is the main contention of Purva Paksi. Vyasacharya refutes Purva Paksi and says Pratibimba sariram cannot be Aksi Purusa, for that he gives two reasons.

The mantra describes aksi Purusa as eternal and if aksi Purusa as pratibimba` sarira eternity cannot be explained. The aksi Purusa is described as amrita permanent one. The other virtues mentioned there are impossible in the case of Pratibimba sariram Sarva karma pratitvam, Vamanitvam etc. Chayatma cannot have all these virtues. Therefore you have to supply aksyantara purusah. Itarah na bhavati. The reason being anavartate asambavaca. Being other virtues being impossible in Pratibimba sariram. Aksi Purusa cannot be taken even in the case of Jivatma also. Not only Jivatma is negated and says even the devatas in the aksi cannot be taken as Paramatma. In the aksi Surya devata is also not to be taken as Paramatma. All the three Atma is negated by itarah. If all the three are negated, the Paramatma alone is left out to be aksi purusah. With this antaraadhikaranam is over.

The subject matter is aksi antara Purusa mentioned in the mantra 4.15.1 of Chandogya upanisad/ the second factor to be noted here what is the doubt. Whether the Purusa is Paramatma or something else. Something else we mean Jivatma, chayatma or devatatma. Third factor is the view of the Purva Paksi and he says that it is chayatma alone. The meaning of chayatma means physical body reflected in the eye of a person. The argument of purva paksa is because of the word Purusa he takes it as body and because of the word drisyate it is

visible; aksi Pratibimba Sthoola Sariram alone. Fourth factor is siddhanta and we say aksi Purusa is Paramatma alone. The main reason is the virtues mentioned therein fits with Paramatma alone and not to any other one and hence it is concluded that aksi Purusa is Paramatma. This topic occurs in the right place alone which is called sangathi.

After establishing that Paramatma alone is aksi Purusa purva paksa raises a final question is that you have not explained on word properly. The mantra says aksini Purusa drishyate that is one visible in the eye. Now if you take aksi Purusa as Paramatma, the Paramatma visible in the eye and purva paksa asks the question that Paramatma is visible. In all the Upanisadm you have very clearly said that Paramatma cannot be tasted touched etc. How do you reconcile with the description mentioned in the mantra. Adhi Sankaracharya say the word darsanam has two meanings and one is literal meaning of sensory perception and the other meaning is the clear understanding. Jnanam is called darsanam. See means one is understanding and another is sensory perception. Just as seeing is final the understanding is also final and doubtless.

All over the Upanishad the word seeing is used to convey the idea of recognition and understanding. It means Paramatma is discerned in the eyes. In the eye I experience Consciousness I don't see Consciousness but experience Consciousness and the Consciousness in the eye is not seen but discerned. My body is conscious means I don't see Consciousness but I feel the Consciousness and when Upanishad says in the eye, it means I felt in the hand I Paramatma and if Consciousness is felt everywhere why specifically say eye alone because eyes alone is the source of 90 percent of the knowledge we gain. Eye is the locus of Consciousness and drisyate is not wrong thing and drishyate means feel the Consciousness.

## **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.18 [49]**

#### ***Antaryamyadhidaivadishu taddharmavyapadesat***

The controller of gods and others from within [is the Atman], for the characteristics of that [Atman] are mentioned.

This Adhikaranam is known as antaryamyadhikaranam. This is known by this name because of the first name of the first sutra. This is also a smaller Adhikaranam with three sutras only.

In this Adhikaranam topic taken is Mantra 3.7.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *yeh prthvyam tisthan prthivya antarah, yam prthivi na veda, yasya prthivi sariram, yah prthivim antaro yamayati, esa atmantaryamy amrtah*. This means Yajnavalkya said 'He who dwells in the earth, yet is within the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who cotnrols the earth from within, he is your Self, the inner controller, the immortal.

Now we have to know the background. Third chapter of Brahadharaynaka upanisad is an interesting chapter. Janaka maharaja conducted a big yaga and all scholars from various places attended the yaga. Janaka maharaja wanted to find out who is the best of all the

scholars and he conducted a debate and he offered to whoever is the learned scholar will be given thousand cows with gold tied to their horns.

Even before the debate started, he called his Brahmachari and ordered to drive all the cows to his asrama. This was looked upon by the scholars attending the debate as an arrogant action on the part of Yajnavalkya and Janaka's priest Asvala questioned the propriety of Yajnavalkya for having ordered the cows be driven to his asram without proving his worth. The scholars asked Yajnavalkya 'how do you consider yourself the best of the scholars'.

Yajnavalkya said that he wanted the cows and he ordered the cows to be taken to the asrama. Asvala the hota of the palace demanded Yajnavalkya to answer the question raised by them and only after proving his worth he could drive the cow to his home. In the seventh section one Brahmana comes his name is Aruni and he asks two questions to Yajnavalkya one regarding Hiranyagarbha and another about Isvara. There also we have an interesting story that says Aruni went to Madra desa for some teaching and he asked a Gandharva that possessed the wife of the teacher. They asked all about who is Hiranyagarbha and who is Antaryami for which the Gandharva gave the answers.

Hiranyagarbha in this section is termed as sutra Atma and Isvara in this section is termed as Antaryami. The question asked is who is greater Hiranyagarbha or Antaryami Isvara or sutra. Since Antaryami is superior this section is called Antaryami Brahmanam. Here Aruni asks who is Isvara and who is Antaryami.

This is explained in Sloka 61 of chapter 18 that reads as isvarah sarvabhutanam hrddese 'rjuna tisthati bhramayan sarvabhutani yantrarudhani mayaya that means The Lord abides in the hearts of all beings, O Arjuna causing them to turn round by His power as if they were mounted on a machine.

The lord is called Antaryami. Lord is inside everything, every devata and every being. Hence it is called antah. Yami means the controller. Antaryami means inner controller and the one who is inside and controls everything. Control means one who gives existence to all of them and one who gives Consciousness to all of them. Brahma alone lends existence to everyone.

If the mind exists it is because of Consciousness only. That alone is further explained in the form of a yaksa story in Kenopanisad. Inner controller of fire and vayu is Brahman only. Yajnavalkya explains all about Antaryami and he says Antaryami is both in microcosm and macrocosm and it is in all the devatas and in all the living beings. Antaryami also controls Antaryami controls Indra and individual. Antaryami also control Prithvi and Prithvi devata. Just I cannot know Antaryami so also Prithvi devata cannot know Antaryami. If at all want a body to Brahman the Prithvi is the body of that Brahman.

Residing within Prithvi controls Prithvi and lends Consciousness to Prithvi devata. In every panca bootha Antaryami is there and later he says Antaryami is in you and this essence is tat tvam asi and it is none but you yourself. This Antaryami is your eternal essence. What is the controversy here? The controversy here is that Antaryami it is said and it is not Paramatma. It is inner controller only and it is not Brahman. A vagueness has because inner controller it is said. Every devata is said to be the inner controller. Surya devata can be called Antaryami because Surya devata also is inner controller and it controls my eyes and solar disc and Surya devata resides in my eyes also.



Similarly Indra devata is within my hand and it can be called Antaryami. Akasa devata can be called Antaryami and akasa is in our ears controlling our hearing power. Each devata controls external world and also inner organs. Antaryami of Antaryami refers to a devata or does it refer to Brahman. Does it refer to Isvara or a devata? Purva paksa says it is devata talked about. And it is not Brahman is the contention of Purva Paksi. Siddhanti will prove that Isvara is the ultimate controller. It is like an intermediary boss and the ultimate boss. Intermediary boss controls his inferiors and the ultimate boss controls him himself.

Now I will give you a general analysis of the first sutra. Vyasacharya establishes Antaryami both in microcosm and macrocosm is Isvara because all the virtues mentioned fits with Isvara only and not with any devata. Three virtues are mentioned here. The word immortal fits with Isvara only and even devatas are not immortal and they occupy that status because of the punya karmas. Devatas are also perishable only. Amritatvam cannot fit into Isvara and Brahman only. It is said to be the innermost essence of jiva and Brahman alone is the essence of jiva and devata is never said to be the inner essence of jiva. Atmatvam fits into Brahman alone. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 78

### **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.18 [49]**

#### ***Antaryamyadhidaivadishu taddharmavyapadesat***

The controller of gods and others from within [is the Atman], for the characteristics of that [Atman] are mentioned.

We see Antaryami adhikaranam and the Antaryami discussed in 3.7.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The controversy is what is the Antaryami mentioned here. The word only means inner controller and inner controller can be anyone. According to sastra presiding deity can be called inner controller in the form of devata. It is immediate controller of every action. Behind the devatas we have Isvara or Brahman. This Brahman is the ultimate controller, which controls everything through devata. Brahman controls the eye through sun, the mind through moon etc. The ultimate inner controller is Isvara. In sandhyavandanam we invoke the immediate inner controller and we invoke only Brahman. Whether in the Brihadaranyaka upanisad whether Prithvi refers to the inner controller or Isvara is our question. Antaryami is Brahman only because all the attributes mentioned are Brahman's attributes alone. Atmatvam sarvantaryatmam and amritatvam and Vyasacharya arguments is all the three attributes relate to Brahman only and not to any devata. Brahman alone is inner Self of everyone. No particular devata controls every diety. Upanishad says Antaryami is my essential nature and therefore it must be Brahman alone. The second attributes are sarva antaryamitvam and here it is said that Antaryami is the inner controller of everyone. Everyone means all gods, all living beings Adhibootham and all organs Adhyatmam. Antaryami is the inner controller all gods, human being and all organs. Brahman alone is inner controller of all gods, all beings and all organs. No particular devata sarva Antaryami. Every particular devata is inner controller of only one thing. Surya devata can be Antaryami of eye alone and not any other organs. Third one is amritatvam means immortality and that does not belong to any devatas and Brahman creates all of them. They have longer life but they do not have immortality or amritatvam. There is one more argument. It is not there directly in the sutra. If you take the third mantra and see the meaning you will know that. The Antaryami resides in the Prithvi. And the Antaryami is inside the Prithvi and inner Self of Prithvi and em Prithvi na veda Prithvi does not know Antaryami. The earth does not know the Antaryami. What is the meaning of the word earth? Certainly word earth cannot be physical earth which being inert nobody need say it does not know anything. Here Prithvi does not know Antaryami and here Prithvi does not mean anything because Prithvi cannot know anything being inert. That means we mean Prithvi devata knows and the question is Prithvi devata knows Antaryami or not. Even Prithvi devata does know Antaryami. Vyasacharya argues if the Upanishad says Prithvi does not know Antaryami, then Antaryami must be someone different from even Prithvi devata and only then it is an object different from Prithvi devata. Prithvi devata does not know Antaryami means Antaryami is inner controller of Prithvi devata and Prithvi devata

does not know Antaryami which is nothing but Brahman. This is the next argument to establish that Antaryami is not Prithvi devata. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Antaryami; the ruler within; it means inner controller; residing within, indwelling; yami means controller that controller residing within is called Antaryami; Antaryami occurring in 7<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam of 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of Brihadharaynaka upanisad, this is the controversial word who is the controller. Adhidaivadishu; in the gods, etc. This relate various devatas; Antaryami residing in god etc., not only residing in the gods but also residing in living beings animals etc., which means Adhibootham and Adhideivam and Adhyatmam like Jnanendrias and karmendriani etc.it is within the prana also; then we have to supply to complete the sentence that is Brahman Antaryami residing in gods, humans and organs is Brahman alone and not limited devata; tad dharama vyapadesat; tad means Brahman; dharma means attributes; attributes kept in mind is atmatvam, savantriyatmam and amritatvam etc., devata cannot have any of the above three attributes. Vyapadesat because of the reference to mention; because of the reference you should take Antaryami as Brahman and not anything else.

Now purva paksa raises one objection. He asks the question how can Brahman be inner controller of everything because in the world I have to control anything I need have various bodies etc. It is only through our organs you control the everything. Antaryami if it is Brahman cannot be the controller because he does not have any controlling medium. This is the argument number one; you say Brahman is asangam. It does not have any relation-ship. How can relation-less connectionless Brahman control anything? Without relationship how can you control anything? How can Brahman without any relation control anything. There is no rule that a body requires to control everything. Body is utilized to control but there is no rule a body required. Now the question is how does Jivatma control the body itself. I move the cloth with the help of my hand. How do I move the hand. To move the hand I the Jivatma do not require any other hand and Jivatma has the sakti to move the hand and to move one body you don't require anything and you have the sakti and it control the body without the help of another body and the Brahman can certainly move anything without any body and that moving power is called maya. Brahman is asarirah and it has maya sakti. The second question is Brahman does not have any connection with the world and how can connectionless Brahman can control the world. Pure Brahman is asangam and maya sahitam Brahman has got relationship with the world and maya sahitam Brahman it has become vyavaharikam and world is also vyavaharikam and the vyavaharika Brahman and vyavaharika world has got connection. But Nirgunam Brahman has no connection whatsoever. With this first sutra of this adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.19 [50]**

#### ***Na cha samrtamataddharmabhilapat***

And [the internal Ruler is] not that which is taught in the Sankya smriti [viz. Pradhana] because qualities contrary to its nature are mentioned [here]

We will have general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya answers an objection raised by Sankya philosopher. Objection is not there but the answer is given here. Prakriti can be taken as Antaryami and he justifies saying that prakriti is moola karanam of the entire creation. The basic matter of prakriti with basic three gunas is modified into the entire creation. Since prakriti is the moola karanam of all creation, prakriti is Antaryami of all creation. So they argue prakriti is the very essence of all creation. Sarva Antaryami prakriti so sarva karanatvad. It is amritatvam also. Even in pralaya prakriti does not get destroyed and it goes into avyakta form. Therefore prakriti has got sarvantavitam.

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad itself Antaryami is discussed adristah invisible; apraryaksam it is said; Sankya philosopher says prakriti is also apratyaksam. You see the product and when all products are resolved that prakriti is invisible. Maya is invisible and maya turned product is visible. It is avyaktam and it is another word for prakriti. Antaryami is said to be indriya agocharam beyond sense perception. Antaryami is indriya agocharam; prakriti is also indriya agocharam and therefore Antaryami should be taken as prakriti alone says Sankya philosopher. Our answer is no. It is not correct.

Vyasacharya argues that you don't read the whole brahmanam fully. The Upanishad defines Antaryami it is invisible but seer of everything; asruta srota it is not hear but it is the hearer of everything; Antaryami is a seer and it is chetanam; because itr is drasta srota vijnata and it is chetana vastu whereas moola prakriti is unfortunately achetanam matter principle and how drasta Antaryami reveal achetana prakriti. It can reveal chetanam Brahma only.

Antaryami is mentioned as Atma of everyone. Atma means the inner Self of every living being and every god. The very word Self refers to chetana tattvam only and matter can never be the essence of a living being; Atma can refer to Conscious being and not an inert thing. This is the general analysis. Now we will take up word for word analysis.

Na neither; cha also and in the previous section devata was talked about. Not also another negation here; smartam; the prakriti of Sankya philosophy, in most of the place the word smartham means prakriti of Sankya philosophy; in the tradition word smriti was used for all secondary literature. All puranas and itihikas as are called smriti anything other than the primary literatures; four Vedas are primary literature, which is known as sruti even other system of philosophy literature are also called smriti. Any topic discussed in smriti is called smartam. smartham can refer to anything and here it is prakriti discussed in Sankya philosophy. That which is taught in [sankya] smriti; the you supply another word Antaryami it means inner controller mentioned in 3.7.3 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Inner controller mentioned in the above Brahmanam is not prakriti also. Ataddharmabhilapat; this is a common word atad dharma and abhilapat. Because qualities contrary to its nature are mentioned, more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 79

### **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.19 [50]**

#### ***Na cha samrtamataddharmabhilapat***

And [the internal Ruler is] not that which is taught in the Sankya smriti [viz. Pradhana] because qualities contrary to its nature are mentioned [here]

We see the 19<sup>th</sup> sutra of second pada, 3<sup>rd</sup> sutra of antaryamiadhikaranam which is discussed in 7<sup>th</sup> Brahmaanam of 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of Brihadaranyaka upanishad. There the word Antaryami is occurring and who is the inner controller is the doubt which is clarified in this sutra. All the properties of Brahman applies to Antaryami alone and none else can be immortal, devata are also found to be mortal and they will drop their devatatvam once the karma is exhausted. This is the essence of the first sutra.

Vyasacharya here in the second sutra negates the view of the Sankya that prakriti can be inner essence of the entire creation as prakriti is primary cause of all the creation. Not only that Upanishad says it is adristaha etc., and according Sankya philosophy prakriti's products are visible but the products are visible and because of invisible nature Vyasacharya says that it is not possible. At the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> brahmanam four words are there drasta, hearer, thinker and knower and these words indicate that the Antaryami is chetana vastu and prakriti is achetanam according to Sankya philosophers. Behind prakriti there is Purusa, prakriti may be the controller of everything but Brahman is the controller of Purusa. Prakriti is nonsentient Antaryami but Brahman is sentient Antaryami. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Na neither; cha also and smartam Antaryami cannot be prakriti of Sankya also. In the previous it was pointed out that Antaryami is not any devata and they are not ultimate Antaryami they are intermediary Antaryami only. In the previous sutra devatas were negated and here prakriti is negated. Tad refers to prakriti. Tad dharma means property of prakriti. Adatdharma a property does not belong to prakriti or which is contradictory to prakrit dharma is mentioned in the Upanishad; because a property which is contradictory of the property of prakriti which is sentiency or chetanatvam and therefore it is not Antaryami. Antaryami is chetana vastu and prakriti is achetanam. The word chetana is not mentioned but it is indirectly mentioned. In the words drasta srota vijnata and mantra seer, hearer, thinker and knower all are possible for chetana tattvam alone, because of chetanatvam, it is concluded that Antaryami is not prakriti but Brahman alone.

### **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.20 [51]**

***Sarirachobbaye'pi hi bhedenainamadhiyate***

An the individual soul [is not the internal ruler] for both also [i.e., both recensions viz., kanva and Madhyandina Sakhas of the Brihadaranyaka upanisad] speak of it as different [from the Internal Ruler]

First we will have general analysis of the sutra. Here, Vyasacharya is negating another possible suggestion from another Purva Pakshi. The subject matter of controversy regarding Antaryami is it a devata no; is it prakriti no; a third suggestion is can we say Antaryami as Jivatma which is referred in the sutra as sariarah Jivatma. Because Jivatma also seems to have all the properties mentioned there. Jivatma controls subtle body which is inert; it enlivens physical body nonfunctional inert body. Jivatma happens to be chetana unlike prakriti. Jivatma is also eternal punarabi jananam and punarabi maranam. The birth death cycle continues forever. Why not take Jivatma as Antaryami. It is now established that Antaryami is Brahman and not any other thing. Antaryami is presented in this Brahmanam as the controller of Jivatma also. So we are not talking about Jivatma the controller. We talk of Antaryami the Brahman and Vyasacharya points out Brahman are presented as Jivatma and both versions are presented in the Brihadaranyaka upanisad. One belongs to kanva sakha of shukla yajur veda and madyandina sakha os shukla yajur veda. Vyasacharya says in both the sakhas in both Brihadaranyaka upanisad versions ami is presented as inner controller of Jivatma. In fact two versions are almost closer but here and there some changes are there. Sankara has written to madyantina sakha and sureswaracharya has written a commentary on kanva sakha. Yaga vijnane drastan here vijnana means Jivatma as Jivatma is often referred to as vijnanatma. In madyandina sakha there is a slight variation. That mantra begins yaha atmani drastan; combining two mantras we conclude that Antaryami is different from Jivatma and Antaryami resides in Jivatma and controls Jivatma. Both kanva and madyandina saka reveals Antaryami is the controller of Jivatma. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we come to word for word analysis. Antaryami and na; sariraka the third word it is one who resides in the body that is Jivatma; ca is added to put the meaning also. The final meaning is Antaryami Jivatma ca na bhavati. Antaryami cannot be Jivatma also. Both the branches of Brihadaranyaka upanisad kanva and madyandina sakha are referred to by the word ubaye; hi means because; enam adhiyate Antaryaminam both reveal Antaryami adhiyate reveal; bedena as different from Jivatma. Different from Jivatma. Or different from sarira Jivatma. He says because Antaryami is presented as inner controller of Jivatma, inner controller must be different from the controlled. Not only that there is another expression also and that is Antaryami resides in Jivatma. Jivatma becomes the residence and Antaryami becomes resident and resident Antaryami is different from resident Jivatma. As the container content different is clear; as the controller controlled the difference is very clear. With this word for word analysis is over. Antaryami is not a devata; not a Jivatma, Antaryami is not prakriti and Antaryami is Brahman only. Now we will go to the fourth sutra.

Ami is not Jivatma and Antaryami is Brahman only. It is clear that Brahman is different from Jivatma and Paramatma1 is different from Jivatma. Antaryami is the controller of Jivatma. When the definition is very clear how come you say Antaryami is different from Brahman. One is the controller and the other is controlled. What is your philosophy whether Jivatma

Paramatma aikyam or Jivatma and Paramatma are different? Adhi Sankaracharya says both; Paramatma controls we will say Jivatma and Paramatma are identical we don't have any confusion. If you have confusion we will resolve the doubt. We say both are correct. How can we say both? If they are different they cannot be identical; if they are identical both cannot be different. Here we say that there is two-tier system. Fortunately all other systems do not agree with vyavaharika Paramarthika dristi beda. Vyavaharika dristi very much accept jivatma and Paramatma bedah. Advaidin also pay their worship to Lord. First he will accept aikyam and not agree with namaskara; then he will say he will accept namaskaram but not accept aikyam,. Controller means there is upadhi in the form of maya. When I say Jivatma is controlled that too sarira vishistah and maya visishtah and beda is highlighted. From Paramarthika dristi we agree to tat tvam asi. Now they ask who allowed the three-tier system of vyavaharika and Paramarthika levels. Where is the pramana from that. Adhi Sankaracharya say if you are available to listen to me the I will tell you that the same Brihadaranyaka upanisad says that where there is vyavaharika dristi is there, there is beda and from Paramarthika angle there is abeda. Avidya avasta is vyavaharika dristi and vidya is Paramarthika dristi. As long as one is ignorant he will say I am different and Brahman is different. Both are there from the standpoint of dristi. From vyavaharika dristi beda will be there. Now we will come to the summary of this adhikaranam.

The subject matter or controversy is Antaryami or inner controller mentioned in 3.7.3 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad; the doubt is this Antaryami is Brahman itself or anything else. It can be devata Jivatma or prakriti or siddha yogi etc. Third is purva paksa who says it is not Brahman. It can be devata, prakrit or Jivatma. His own reason for advocating this view which we have seen elaborately in the present and previous class. Siddhanta asserts that Antaryami is Brahman only. All properties mentioned for Brahman fit in with Brahman . This adhikaranam occurs in the right place.

I will conclude the summary of the adhikaranam. Antaryami discussed here is Sagunam brahmana alone. Here we talk about beda or division. Once controller status comes it is Sagunam Brahman. We do not classify as Sagunam or Nirgunam. We don't classify in this way. Sagunam Brahman is discussed in upasana and Vedanta prakaranm also. In aksi Purusa we analysed and it proved to be Brahman and it was for the purpose of Upakosala vidya. The phalam given is krama mukti. Brahman was discussed for Upasana purpose and that Brahman is Sagunam Brahman. Here also we talk of Sagunam Brahman but the purpose of the sutra is not for Upasana but to realize jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Sometimes Sagunam Brahman is a step stone for Nirgunam Brahman status. Sometimes Sagunam Brahman is introduced for nirguna jnanam. In Antaryami adhikaranam we talk of Sagunam Brahman only but it is not for Upasana but to realize Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Sometimes it is introduced as a stepping-stone for nirguna Brahma jnanam. For example in Taittiriya Upanishad iii.1.2 reads as *tasmad-ca etasmad-antmana akasah sambhutih, akasad, vayuh, vayor-agnih, agner-apah, adbhyah prthivi prthivya osadhayahm asadhibhyo-nnam annat-purusah*, from that this atman is space born; from Akasa air, from air, fire, from fire, water; from water earth from earth herbs from herbs food and from food man. Taittiriya Upanishad introduces Brahman as Sagunam Brahman. It is because Nirgunam Brahman is beyond Sagunam Brahman. The introduction of Sagunam Brahman is not for Upasana. It is for nirguna saguna aikyam is aimed at here. Sagunam Brahman are two; one for the purpose of Upanishad and we call the Brahman as Upasam Brahman whereas in Brahmananda valli jagat karnam Brahma is introduced but is not for Upasana but is stepping stone for Nirgunam Brahman and that Brahman is called Neyam Brahman. How to see the difference we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 80

### **Topic 5. Antaryamiadhikaranam [Sutras 18-20]**

The internal ruler is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.20 [51]**

*Sarirachobbaye'pi hi bhedenainamadhiyate*

An the individual soul [is not the internal ruler] for both also [i.e., both recensions viz., kanva and Madhyandina Sakhas of the Brihadaranyaka upanisad] speak of it as different [from the Internal Ruler]

With 20<sup>th</sup> sutra antaryamiadhikaranam is over. I pointed out Sagunam Brahman is seen as part of Upasana in which context it is called Upasyam Brahman where beda is retained and the purpose of Sagunam Brahman is Upasana and th bhalam is also krama mukti only it is often presented as jagat karanam Brahma. Jagat karanam Brahma is jnana prakaranam also the aim is ultimately to discover Jivatma and Paramatma and this Sagunam Brahman is not meant for krama mukti and it is meant for nirguna jnanam and jivan mukti and this Sagunam Brahman is called Neyam Brahman, in sandilya vidya Sagunam Brahman is presented for Upasana and it is called Upasyam.

In Taittiriya Upanishad the Sagunam Brahman is introduced for the purpose of gaining jnanam. What is difference between Upasyam Brahman and Neyam Brahman. The difference is this when Sagunam Brahman is present the focus is on the guna which makes Brahman superior and it emphasizes difference between Brahman and me.

The differences are retained until the end. Karantvam is highlighted my inferior quality is highlighted. Upasyam Brahman is guna pradhanam. In jagat karanm Brahma or Neyam Brahman it is not for highlighting but it a temporary attributes and the emphasis is on Brahman and karanatvam is loosely attached because sooner or late when tatvam asi coms karanatvam is unscrewed and taken away and jiva is going to lose the karyatvam status and it is neither karanam nor karyam.

We are not going to retain karantvam status of Brahma and at the same time we are not going to retain the karyatvam status of jiva and at the time of maha vakyam karya karana vilaksana Chaitanyam is there. When it is loosely attached we say it is Neyam Brahman and when the same Chaitanyam is tightly attached to attributes it is called Upasyam Brahman and when you gain jnanam we own up with Nirgunam Brahman the ultimate goal. Isvaratvam has no value because it is mithya because it is caused by maya. Upasyam Brahma is also Sagunam. In Upasyam Brahman is guna pradhanam and Neyam Brahman is jnana pradhanam. In Upasyam Brahman attributes are there and are highlighted but in Neyam Brahman the attributes are dropped once jnanam is attained and Nirgunam Brahman is realized. When we study every adhikaranam in Brahma Sutra we don't ask the question whether it is Upasana Brahma prakaranam or jneya prakarana Brahman. At the end I will point out which relates to Neyam Brahman and which relates to Upasyam Brahman. Antaryamitva status is loosely



attached and is dropped at any time. By studying the context, we will know. After Antaryami Brahmanam we see aksaram Brahman free from all attributes. Antaryami karanam, Brahma is introduced and aksaram Brahman karantvam status is dropped. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 6. Adrisyatvadhikaranam [21-23]**

That which cannot be seen is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.21 [52]**

#### ***Adrisyatvadigunako dharmukteh***

The possessor of qualities like indivisibility etc., [is Brahman] on account of the declaration of its attributes.

This adhikaranam is called adrisyatvadhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam consisting of three sutras and the topic taken for analysis is 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad that reads as *yat tad-adresyam-agrahyam-agotram-avarnam acaksuh srotram tad-apani-padam, nityam vibhum sarvagatam susuksmam tad-avyavam yad bhuta-yonim pari-pasyanti dhirah*. The meaning of this mantra is that which is invisible, ungraspable, un-originated and attribute-less, that which has neither eyes nor ears nor hands nor legs – that is Eternal full of manifestations, All-pervading. Subtlest of the subtle – that Imperishable Being is what the wise perceive as the Source of all creation.

First I will give you the background behind the mantra. Sounaka approached his guru asked the question what is that knowing which everything is known? What is in the mind of the student when he asked the question and he had the ‘basic knowledge’ that material cause alone appear as many types of creation.

Since ekam karanam appears as anekam karanam eka karana vijnanena sarva karya vijnanam bhavati. By knowing one, material cause one can know all the effect. Effects do not exist separate from cause. By knowing the cause the effects are as good as known. With this knowledge the student asks the question what is the one ultimate cause of the world ultimate material cause of the world knowing which entire universe is known. By knowing the wood you can know furniture only.

Similarly knowing gold you can know only about ornaments alone, but when you know the ultimate cause of the world eka karana vijnanena aneka karya vijnanam bhavati. The question is jagat karanam kim? Cause means material cause of the world. Angiras elaborately answers this question. We have to learn one is para vidya superior vidya and inferior vidya that is called apara vidya; knowledge of cause is higher knowledge and knowledge of effect is lower knowledge. Why knowledge of cause higher and knowledge of effect is lower.

By knowing one effect the cause is not known. By knowing the cause all effects are known. Karya vijnanena sarva vijnanam na bhavati; karana vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati. Karya vijnanam is aparam; not only that teacher will show karana vijnanam will liberate a person and karya vijnanam will not liberate a person. Karya vidya is apara vidya and it keeps you in bondage and karana vidya or para vidya liberate the person. The teacher removes the

curiosity of the student by calling it as aksaram. Karanam is aksaram. Next question is what is aksaram? Then the teacher gives the meaning of aksaram.

Even though you are supposed to know the meaning of the mantra 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad I will give you the meaning. Agreshyam that is not available for the five sense organs ungraspable; agnotram that which does not have any family at all; avarnam that which is free from all properties, or descriptions; indescribable attributeless; acaksuh srotram that which is organ-less or limbless; Jnanendria rahitam; first one is not object of sense organs now it is non possessor of sense organs; tad apani padam it is Karmendriya rahitam; then nityam that is immortal; vibhum capable of becoming everything; that which can become creation; sarvagatham all pervading susooshma extremely subtle avyavam without any decay and bhutayonim the material cause of all the beings that is known as aksaram and this aksara vidya is apra vidya.

Now the question is what is controversy. Why should the mantra is brought to the Brahma Sutra? The reason is this nowhere in the mantra the word Brahman is mentioned. It says it is material cause is there the word aksaram is there and how do you know it relates to Brahman, Sankya philosopher claims aksaram relates to moola prakriti which is known as pradhanam fundamental matter in Sankya philosophy. We say bhuta yoni refers to Brahman alone. That is topic of the sixth adhikaranam.

Now I come to general analysis of the first sutra. This material cause seen unheard etc., is Brahman alone. It is because the specific properties mentioned in the Upanishad. This belonged to Brahman alone. Where do we find the specific properties are mentioned? Three examples are given. From spider web comes from earth tree originates from body hairs grow similarly from Brahman the whole creation comes. Spider is both the material cause and intelligent cause of creation; second example form one earth varieties of plants come; here from achetanam chetana vastu emerges and similarly from one Brahman varieties of creations emerge; the third example is the hair growing from the body from live body lifeless hair comes. From chetana sariram achetana roma comes. From chetana Brahman achetana sristi comes.

From the Brahman creation comes. In 1.1.9 of Mundaka Upanishad mantra that reads as *yah sarvajnah sarva vid yasya jnana mayam tapah tasmad etad Brahma nama rupam annam ca jayate* the meaning of the mantra is from Brahman [Supreme realities – who not only is aware of the total happenings in the world but is equally in the know of all the details of happenings every minute whose very thought is of the nature of knowledge – are all these produced; the creator, names and forms and nourishness for all; it is said here that jagat karanam Brahma is omniscient; sarvavit is omniscient; Adhi Sankaracharya gives the significance also first is from the standpoint of para vidya and the second from apra vidya and Brahman is apra vidya from material science as also from spiritual angle also. Adhi Sankaracharya keeps in mind sarvjnaha sarvavit.

Vyasacharya says material cause has got to be Brahman your prakriti can never be said to be omniscient, cannot be all knowing it cannot even have limited knowledge and it is jada tattvam and therefore aksaram Brahma eva na tu achetanam pradhanam. This is the general analysis of the first sutra.

It has got two words. Adrisyatva invisibility, which is described as unseen; that which is endowed with properties of unseenness unheardness handlessness etc.; that material cause is

Brahman alone; why Brahman next word is dharmokteh after the mention of attributes of Brahman in the Upanishad; adi and the rest beginning with gunakah; one who possesses the quality; adrisyatvadigunakah possessor of qualities like invisibility. Dharmokteh; because of the mention of qualities. The word bhuta yonih means material cause mentioned in mantra 1.1.9. of Mundaka Upanishad *yah sarvajnah sarva vid yasya jnana mayam tapah tasmad etad Brahma nama rupam annam ca jayate*; one of the basic questions of all the systems of philosophy. All say the matter is ultimate cause from which the material universe has come. Material is called differently.

Sankya calls it pradhanam; nyaya calls it atomic; whether they call it atom, energy etc., the matter is fundamental from which the universe has come. Vedanta says Consciousness is the fundamental and from out of Consciousness alone the universe has come. Matter is Consciousness or matter is matter is the point at discussion.

Sankya philosopher comes to say and that your conclusion is wrong. And he puts various questions. He says that the prakriti alone can be the material cause of the world as the entire description tally with prakriti. Prakriti is invisible, it cannot be grasped and it is eternal and it is bhuta yoni and all pervading. Not only that the very translation we give is material cause and it is matter. How can material cause be Consciousness? Material cause has got to be matter alone.

All the examples given are in agreement with my conclusion only. Spider, pritvi and body hair example. Spider's web comes from the body and body is the matter. From earth plant kingdom comes from earth, which is a matter. So also hair comes from body and all the three are matter.

Then he says in Mundaka Upanishad there is no word indicating chetanatvam or sentiency. In Antaryami the chetanatvam was indicated by many words. But here there is no word to indicate chetanatvam.

Fourth point is sarvajnah and sarvavid is there in 9<sup>th</sup> mantra and it does not refer to material cause at all and it talks about Purusa tattvam which is sarva vid and sarvajnam. It is talking about the purusah. Don't take 9<sup>th</sup> mantra to support 6<sup>th</sup> mantra.

Next is that later in the second section 2.1.2 of Mundaka Upanishad the mantra goes like this *divyo hymurtah purusah sabahya bhyantaro hyajah; aprano hyamanah subhro hy aksarat pratah parah* the meaning is Self resplendent, formless, unorginated and pure that all pervading Being is both within and without; anterior both to life and mind, He transcends even the transcendent, unmanifested, causal state of the universe. Then he says in this mantra Purusa the Brahman is described. That Sankya philosopher accepts. Then Brahman is described here and last description is Brahman is beyond aksaram. That means different from aksaram which means aksaram is different from Brahman. Now Sankya says coming back to 6<sup>th</sup> mantra, therefore which talks about aksaram is different from aksaram is different from Brahman. Because of these reasons, it is pradhanam and pradhanam alone. This we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 81

### **Topic 6. Adrisyatvadhikaranam [21-23]**

That which cannot be seen is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.21 [52]**

#### ***Adrisyatvadigunako dharmukteh***

The possessor of qualities like indivisibility etc., [is Brahman] on account of the declaration of its attributes.

We see the 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam known as Adrisyatvadhikaranam and in this adhikaranam Upanishad mantra taken for analysis is 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad. Here Upanishad introduces the jagat karanam which is called bhuta yoni and aksaram. Bhuta means all the things and beings and yoni means the material cause of all things and beings and in simple language it is jagat karanam, aksaram. The controversy is whether this refers to prakriti or padhanam a technical word for prakriti used by Sankya philosophers/ whether bhuta yoni is chetanam or achetanam is being analysed. We said it is chetanam and we said that Brahman's character is specifically mentioned. Omniscience Brahma cannot refer to the achetana vastu. We have completed the general study of the first sutra. Here Adhi Sankaracharya gives five reasons to show that all description tally with prakriti alone. The examples given are also tallied with prakriti alone spider, plants and the hair.

In the cases of these examples is matter so also the cause of the world is prakriti the matter. The third reason he gave was that all description did not indicate the chetana dharma. Even sarvajna comes in the 1.1.9<sup>th</sup> mantra of Mundaka Upanishad. The omniscience mentioned in the 9<sup>th</sup> mantra has nothing to do with what is said in 1.1.6<sup>th</sup> mantra of Mundaka Upanishad. These two mantras talk about two different things and how can it be taken to indicate the same thing.

Another argument is mantra 2.1.2 of Mundaka Upanishad says Brahman is different from aksaram and I can also say aksaram is different from Brahman. And then coming to mantra 1.1.6 Mundaka Upanishad this mantra talks about aksaram and this Brahman is different from aksaram which is padhanam and which is different from Brahman. Because of these five reasons, the aksaram does not refer to Brahman but to the prakriti.

The first statement tallies with prakriti alone and not Brahman. For that our answer is that all description do not tally with prakriti. Only some of the description is extended to prakriti and only some of them can be extended. Prakriti is invisible and it is energy form and agrahsyam is ok. But certainly not nithyam sarvagatham and vibhum cannot tally with prakriti as it is subject to negation by Atma Jnanam. In the wake of knowledge prakriti is also negated and Brahman alone remains. prakriti is not nithya and it goes with only Brahman and not with anything.

Prakriti cannot be all pervading and according Sankya philosopher for prakriti produces only inert things and it can pervade only inert things karanam can pervade only the karyam and prakriti can pervade only its product and it can never pervade the jivas and jivas are not the product of prakriti. Any cause can pervade only its product and it cannot pervade jivah which is chetana tattvam and all pervasiveness also cannot tally with Brahman. All the attributes tally with Brahman alone. All the examples given are the achetana examples. Spider's body is chetanam; earth is achetanam and body is achetanam. Jagat karanam also must be achetanam.

Adhi Sankaracharya hints and asks a counter question you say all examples are achetanam. Then jagat karanam is also achetanam. All examples are pratyaksam. In spider example spider is pratyaksam; in second example earth is pratyaksam; in the third example boyd is pratyaksam and in all the three karanams are pratyaksam and prakriti is not pratyaksam and in the example all examples are pratyaksam. Your karanam is pratyaksam and it is not acceptable. Sankya says the example the karnam is pratyaksam and you should not extend the example lto the real life.

Achetanatvam example part you can take. Pratyaksam part you don't extend but achetanam part you should extend, which part to be extended and which cannot be extended and who will decide that. Who will decide which part of the example should be taken which should not be taken and can one person decide ti. That person is author of the example should decide which part should be extended which should not be extended. I say this person has got moonlight face.

Four different people gave commentary. One person may say that I understood the example all right. It blooms as we approach pournami and as the amavasya comes he will have no face. If you study the surface of moon, we see craters with mountains etc. Then the face of the person is rough. Moon is invisible in day and can be seen only in the night.

Fourth person says moon round the earth and this person will not stay at any place. Who will decide which part of the features he kept in mind. That person may say that the moon is bright and cool the author may say. No one has got right to say what he meant when he said the face is like a moon.

Similarly, when we take the example from the Upanishad, Sankya people have no right to interpret what the authors of Upanishad had in mind when giving the spider example etc. Whether pratyaksam part was kept in mind and if you study Upanishad, achetanatvam was not kept in mind. Spider has got eight leg and this was not kept in mind and it should not be taken that Brahman has got eight legs. It should be taken that spider is nimitta upadana karanam should be taken so also Brahman is the nimitta upadana karanam of the creation. Again in the case of earth, it should be taken that from one Brahman many things have emerged as from one Brahman the entire universe and the living beings have arisen.

Similarly from chetana human being from sentient one achetana hair is born similarly from chetana Brahman achetana Prapancha can come. You cannot interpret the example in your way. If we give the rajju sarpa example, Advaidin can say how to extend the example not other people. The nonadvaidins take Advaida example and they should ask us which part it will fix and where it will not fit in. Then they extend the example to all other example where this will not fit. They extend in the wrong places. Fourth mistake they conclusion the advida is wrong. Rajju sarpa you can extend only when the knowledge of rajju removes the ignorance. Rope and snake have different order of reality. How can you extend achetanatvam

as jagat karanam and extending the examples is not correct. Examples should be understood properly.

Next there no chetana dharma mentioned. They talk of inert thing only and chetana dharma is not extended at all. For this our answer is that chetana dharma is not mentioned in 6<sup>th</sup> mantra but mentioned in 9<sup>th</sup> mantra. 9<sup>th</sup> mantra talks about chetana but it talks about different subject in support of sixth mantra. According to Sankya 6<sup>th</sup> mantra talks about prakriti and 9<sup>th</sup> mantra talks about Brahman.

Adhi Sankaracharya says no and assets that both talk of jagat karanam alone and certain features are mentioned in 6<sup>th</sup> and some are mentioned in 9<sup>th</sup> mantra. There is a word bhuta yoni the cause of the universe. The crucial word is bhuta yoni jagat karanam. 9<sup>th</sup> mantra says *yah sarvajnah sarva yasva jnana-mayam tapah tasmad etad Brahma nama rupam annam ca jayate* from this sarvajna sarvavid alone are all these produced the creator, names and forms and nourishment for all.

Therefore in the 9<sup>th</sup> mantra it is said nama rupa is born from omniscient jagat karanam and definitely it is not born of prakriti which is not even sentient. Both 1.1.6 and 1.1.9 talk of jagat karanam Brahman alone and definitely not prakriti. Prakriti can never be omniscient. It does not have even the limited knowledge. With this fourth point is also answered.

Now we go to the fifth point. In the sixth mantra it talks about aksaram identical with Brahman. Aksaram and Brahma are identical we say. We find according to Advaidam that talks about aksaram and Vedanta equates aksaram and Brahman. Sankya asks how would you accommodate 2.1.2 *divyo hyamurtah Purusah sabahya bhyantaro hyajah apramo hyamanah subhro iti aksarat paratah parah* where it is said aksara and Brahman are different.

The word aksaram is used in Upanishad in two different meaning. In fact, the Upanishad is doing this as a mischief only. In every language words have got different meaning. In the same way the word aksaram has got two meaning one is maya and the other is Brahman. In 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad the word aksaram is used in the sense of Brahman and 2.1.2 the Brahman should be understood as maya. Maya is that which pervades the entire creation and that is why the creation is mayitha Prapancha. Therefore in 1.1.6 aksaram is Brahman and 2.1.2 aksaram relates to Maya. The word Atma is used in the meaning of mind, Chaitanyam, physical body also. The fifth point is also answered.

Having answered Sankya philosopher Adhi Sankaracharya gives further reasons that jagat karanam is Brahman alone. First reason is Upanishad has said that knowledge of jagat karanam is para vidya. Now why do we call it superior knowledge. Why call others अपरा विद्या. Adhi Sankaracharya says the reason is only one that para vidya is liberating knowledge whereas अपरा विद्या does not liberate. In this fifth and sixth mantra it is said jagarana vidya is para vidya that means jagat karana vidya is liberating knowledge. Now Adhi Sankaracharya say jagat karanam is prakriti that means prakriti vidya is jagat karanam vidya and para vidya and liberating knowledge. According to you the knowledge of prakriti liberates a person. This Sankya never agrees with it because they have said knowledge of prakriti can never liberate. If para vidya is liberating knowledge, the jagat karanam be Brahman alone and then only it is a liberating knowledge. The he gives some more additional arguments which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 82

### **Topic 6. Adrisyatvadhikaranam [21-23]**

That which cannot be seen is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.21 [52]**

#### ***Adrisyatvadigunako dharmukteh***

The possessor of qualities like indivisibility etc., [is Brahman] on account of the declaration of its attributes.

We have completed the 21<sup>st</sup> sutra in which 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad was taken up for discussion. The controversy was whether it applies to pradhanam or Brahman was the point at issue. The doubt whether jagat karanam aksaram is prakriti or Brahman. We saw that Vyasacharya pointed out that jagat karanam aksaram is Brahman only because the omniscience was pointed out while prakriti can never be omniscient. We further various objections raised by Sankya and in the last class we saw the answers to the five objections.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya gives some more reasons in support of our conclusion. The first argument is that in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> mantra the Upanishad presents the knowledge of jagat karanam as para vidya. This is superior to apara vidya said in Mundaka Upanishad. Why it gets the two names. Apara vidya is binding knowledge and it brings out limitations more and more. Para vidya is superior knowledge being the liberating knowledge.

Aksara vidya is para vidya and para vidya is moksa vidya and therefore it is Brahma vidya. If aksaram is prakriti, apara vidya will be prakriti vidya' knowledge of prakriti will not liberate and knowledge of Brahman alone will liberate therefore Brahma vidya is para vidya and para vidya is aksara vidya and therefore aksara is equal to Brahman.

The students in Mundaka Upanishad approaches his guru and asks the question what is that knowledge by knowing which everything else is known, the teacher para vidya as that knowledge that gives eka vijnanena sarva vijanam. Aksara vidya is para vidya and is equal to sarva vijnana prada vidya. Having this equation what can be aksaram. Aksaram is Brahman then Brahma Vidya is para vidya and Brahma knowledge will give knowledge of everything.

Suppose if you take aksaram as prakriti prakriti vidya is para vidya and is equal to sarva vijnanaprada vidya it will be equal to saying that by knowing this everything is known/. It is not possible by knowing prakriti you will know jada amsam of prakriti only the sariram sookma sariram and you cannot know chetana amsam of creation. By knowing basic matter you will know only material and not chetana vastu. Brahma Vidya alone can give you all knowledge. By knowing Brahman you know chetanam and achetanam only. This is an important argument, which Adhi Sankaracharya will repeat in later portion also. The teacher has presented aksara vidya as para vidya. The argument is whether this is Brahma viya or otherwise. When we go to the second section, apara vidya is elaborated. Chapter 1 section ii mantra 1 to 9 apara vidya is said to be karma Upasana. In the 11<sup>th</sup> mantra apara vidya

vairagyam is mentioned and not only that this person gets interest in para vidya. He goes to guru. Guru should teach para vidya and that is said in 12<sup>th</sup> mantra. The Upanishad says guru taught para vidya and instead using the word para vidya Upanishad uses the word Brahma vidya and from this we come to know para vidya is equal to Brahma Vidya. In the first section we saw para vidya is equal to aksara vidya and in the second section para vidya is Brahma Vidya and from this we infer aksaram and Brahman is one and the same. In 1.1.6 aksara laksanam should be taken as Brahma laksanam. This is the third argument.

Then comes fourth argument. Adhi Sankaracharya says that in the introductory mantra Upanishad begins saying *om Brahma devanam prathamah sambabhuva visvasya karta bhuvanasya gopica sa Brahma vidyam sarva vidya pratisthitham atharvaya jyestha putraya praha* that reads as of the gods, Brahmaji the creator and the protector of the universe was Self born first. He gave out the knowledge of Reality [Brahma Vidya] the knowledge of all knowledges the foundation for all sciences, to his own eldest son Atharva.

Upanishad says the Brahma Vidya was taught. And later having introduced this in 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> mantra Upanishad talks about para vidya and apara vidya. Para vidya is aksara vidya and apara vidya is karma Upasana knowledge. Para vidya is aksara vidya and what is the aksaram is the question. Sankya says aksaram is prakriti. If you give this interpretation where is scope for discussing the Brahman at all. There is no scope for studying Brahma Vidya at all. If there is no scope for Brahman the first mantra will become meaningless. If our interpretation is taken Brahma Vidya is aksara vidya and aksara is taken as Brahman. Thus we conclude para vidya is Brahma Vidya and Brahman is aksaram and aksaram alone is Brahman and not pradhanam. Now we will go to second sutra of this adhikaranam.

## Topic 6. Adrisyatvadhikaranam [21-23]

That which cannot be seen is Brahman

### Sutra 1.2.22 [53]

#### *Viseshanabhedavyapadesabhyam cha netarau*

The other two [viz the individual soul and the pradhanam] are not [the source of all beings] for distinctive attributes and differences are stated.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Our debate whether aksaram jagat karanam is prakriti or Brahman, which defined in mantra 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad. Aksara cannot be prakriti we argue. Sankya call prakriti as pradhanam. Sankya pradhanam is Vedantins maya. Half of Brahma Sutra is negation of Sankya philosophers. He derives pradhanam as the whole world is kept in pradhanam alone at the time of pralayam. Prapancha laya sthanam is pradhanam. Our controversy is whether aksaram is pradhanam or Brahmam. Here Vyasacharya says aksaram is neither pradhanam nor jiva. We can have doubt aksaram is imperishable and jiva is apparently seen imperishable and the second sutra he says aksaram should be taken as Brahman neither jiva nor pradhanam. Aksaram is not jiva because of special description of aksaram given in mantra 2.1.2 of Mundaka Upanishad. *Divyo hyamurtah Purusah sabahya bhyantaro hyajah apramo hyamanah subhro iti aksarat paratah parah* where it is said aksara and Brahman are different. The third line is relevant to us.



Aksaram is described as prana rahitam and manorahitam. Every jiva is called a prani. We have got pranam so we are called prani. Jiva is endowed with prana. Jiva is sapranah. Aksaram is defined as apranah amanah suprah and aksaram is different from jiva. Aksaram is not pradhanam. For this the sutra says the Upanishad itself describes aksaram as different from pradhanam. It is different from prakriti. The fourth line of the mantra is relevant. The Upanishad clearly says aksarat parah. Aksaram Brahma is different from aksaram prakriti. Therefore also because of this mantra also aksaram Brahma is not pradhanam or prakriti.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Viseshanabhedavyapadesabhyam on account of the mention of the distinctive attributes and differences cha and na not itaram the other two jiva and pradhanam also this description alone defines Brahman and therefore it is called specific description. It is without mind and prana is the specific description. Because of this specific description jiva is negated because jiva is not apranah jiva is sapranah. It is different from pradhanam. Vyapadesah means statement or reference. We have to supply the word aksaram. The fourth line aksarat parah means Brahman is beyond pradhanam. Because of the specific description of aksaram as pranaless and also because of the mention as different from pradhanam. Because of the two reason aksara is neither pradhanam nor jiva it is Brahman only. This is the second sutram. Ca means also..

## **Topic 6. Adrisyatvadhikaranam [21-23]**

That which cannot be seen is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.23 [54]**

#### ***Rupopanyasaccha***

And on account of its form being mentioned [the passage] under discussion refers to Brahman.

Here also Vyasacharya says aksaram is neither jiva nor pradhanam. The reasons she gives is the visva rupa varnanam of aksaram Brahma occurs in Mundaka Upanishad. In 2.1 we get sristi prakaranam the Upanishad says aksaram alone has become entire creation. Aksaram Brahma alone is the entire creation aksaram is visva rupam; and this visva rupam is described in two places one is 2.1.4 of Mundaka Upanishad *Agnir murdha cakssi candra suryau disah srotre vag virtasca vedah, vayuh prano hridayam visva masya padhhyam prthivi hyesa sarva bhutani ratma* that reads as fire [Agni] is his head; sun and moon – his eyes; four quarters or directions – his ears; the declared Vedas his speech; the air his breath; the universe his mind [heart] the earth originated from his feet; he is indeed the inner Self of all beings. The heaven is the head of aksaram; the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita is also drawn from this sutra only. Sun and moon are the eyes earth his teeth. Visvarupa description is given for the Brahma alone. Sarva bhuta antaratma and pradhanam is never presented as Atma anywhere. Visvarupa description applies to aksaram Brahma and not aksaram pradhanam. How can it be the description of pradhanam. It is sarva bhuta antaratma. This does not fit into jiva as also pradhanam. This is the general analysis.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Rupa form means visva rupam description of aksaram upanyasat because of the mention ca and rupa upanyasat thus Brahma alone is the description of aksaram and not pradhanam. With this third sutra is over.

Vishayah the aksaram occurring in mundaka 1.1.6 Mundaka Upanishad aksaram is the subject matter. The word can be applied to many things third topic is purva pakshi the main purva paksa is aksaram is jivah or pradhanam and the description also tallies with aksaram Brahman alone. More in the next class.

]

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 83

### **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.24 [55]**

#### ***Vaisvanarah sadharanasabdaviseshat***

Vaisvanara [is Brahman] on account of the distinction qualifying the common terms ['Vaisvanara ' and 'Self']

This adhikaranam is known as Vaisvanara adhikaranam. This is one of the very big adhikaranam containing the sutras 24 to 32.

This enquires into mantra occurring in 5.18.2 of Chandogya Upanishad. In the fifth there is a type of Vaisvanara Upasana or Vaisvanara vidya which is well known Upasanam and it is the saem as visvarupa Upasana. It is another name for virad Upasana. Here the description of virad or Vaisvanara is given. It is an another mula mantra for 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita. It is almost paraphrased in vishna sahasranamam dhyana sloka. I will give the background of this Upasana. This topic begins with mantra 5.11.1 chapter of Chandogya upanisad and it goes upto 5.24 section of Chandogya Upanisad.

This section begins with five students decides to discuss Isvara. They a raise a question what is Brahman which is known as Atma. Where Brahman indicates the Sagunam Brahman and it deals with Upasyam Brahman. Therefore they want to do Brahma Upasana or Isvara Upasana and they ask themselves what is Brahman. They approach another rishi Uddalaka Rishi.

They approach him not knowing what is Brahman. Uddalaka also says that he does not know and he asks them to go to Asvapathih Raja who is a great jnani. In the Upanishad the story is elaborated and they go glorify the raja. The king offers the Brahmana good daksina. But said to the raja that they wanted knowledge from the king. And the Brahmanas said that they wanted Brahma Vidya and not money. The king asked the Brahmana to come the next day.

Next day they go to the king. The king said that it was not proper for them to do namaskara to the king being Brahmana. Asvapathi accept them as sishyas and asked them what was their understanding of Brahman. They described what they understood as Brahman and what they meant by the word Vaisvanara. Each one says one one aspect of creation and each one claimed that aspect as Vaisvanara. One said heaven is Vaisvanara another said sun is Vaisvanara fourth said air is Vaisvanara fifth said earth is Vaisvanara and sixth aid space is Vaisvanara.

After they presented their understanding of Vaisvanara, the king said their understanding was wrong. Each one had understood the part but not the whole of Vaisvanara. Therefore asvapathi said that he was going to give the description of Vaisvanara. Refer to 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad.

The mantra reads as *tasya ha va etasyatmano Vaisvanarasya murdhaiva sutejascaksur vsvarupah pranah prthagvartmatma sandeho bahulo bastireva rayih prthivyeva padavura eva vedirlomani barhirhrdayam garhapatyo mano'nvaharya pacana asyamahavaniyah. Ityastadasah kandah.* The meaning is the bright and beautiful heaven is the head of this Vaisvanara Self they think that heaven is the whole of Vaisvanara but he is taught ultimately that heaven is only a part; visvarupa [having many forms the sun] is the eye he thought the sun is Vaisvanara and asvapathi says sun is only a limb of Vaisvanara.; prthagvarma [one who changes direction – air] is the prana of Vaisvanara; bahula [pervasive – space] is the middle part of Vaisvanara; rayi I 'wealth – water] is the bladder; the earth [pratistha – the support] is the feet of Vaisvanara; the sacrificial altar is the chest of Vaisvanara; the kusa grass is the hair on the chest of Vaisvanara; the Garhapatya fire is the heart of Vaisvanara; the Anvaharyapacana [i.e., daksinagni] fire is the mind of Vaisvanara; and the ahavaniya fire is the mouth of Vaisvanara this is Krishna's source of information for writing visvarupa darsanam; ahavaniya fire starts burning right from the moment of birth and child starts eating from then onwards; the implication is that none can be the Vaisvanara Self.

Lastly the benefit of Vaisvanara is given. It is as though eating the entire world. This upasaka not only eats through mouth but also through all the senses. Here I imagine myself as visvarupa or virad Purusa and I am in everything because of my imagination I am eating not only through my mouth and all the mouth as though. Because of this Upasana he learns to identify himself with samasti. He eats annam through all jivara and all the beings.

*Sarva anna asanam eating as it were through all the people. 5.24.3 tadyathesikarulamagnau protam praduyetaivam basya sarve papmanah praduyante ya etadevam vidvanagnihotram juhoti* this upasaka will destroy all papams by Isvara praptih. Just as the cotton fibres of the isika grass are totally consumed when thrown into the fire, similarly all sins are consumed of one who performs the agnihotra sacrifice with the knowledge of the Vaisvanara Self. At the time of death Gita says 8.5 *yam yam va 'pi smaran bhavan tyajati ante kalevaram tam tam eai'ti kaunteya sada tadbhavabhavitah* thinking of whatever state [of being] be at the end gives up his body so that being does he attain Oh son of kunti [Arjuna] being ever absorbed in the thought thereof.

Here the ksatriya teaches the Brahmanas. The meaning kept in mind is Vaisvanara Atma is Sagunam Brahman. For this Vaisvanara the various limbs are there. Vaisvanara upasakas gains krama mukti and he will reach Isvara and all his papams are burnt like grass. Sarva anna asanam and sarva papa nasah are the benefit of this Upasana. All these points will be taken to understand the Purva Pakshi and siddhanti clarification.

What is the controversy in this mantra. The controversy is because of the two words Vaisvanara Atma. The word Vaisvanara has three meaning and Atma has got two meanings which one we should take is our problem the first meaning it is digestive fire known as jataragni. The second meaning is the fire element. We will call it bhuta agnih. Jataragni is inside the body and bhuta Agni is outside. Agni devata means invisible conscious principle that presides over the Agni and it is called devata Agni. Bhuta Agni is visible and devata Agni is invisible. There is another Atma that adds further conclusion. Atma has two meanings Jivatma and Paramatma, samsari Jivatma miserable Jivatma and asamsari sarvajnah Paramatma. Here in this mantra both these words are used. Vaisvanara Atma has got this universal form. Which meaning should be taken is our question. We conclude that it is nothing but Paramatma or Brahman. Vaisvanara Atma Brahman. The reasons are given in

this adhikaranam. Vyasacharya establishes that it is Upasyam Brahma only and Vaisvanara is not any one of the other four. He should give reasons for his conclusion.

First we will take up general analysis of the first sutra. Here he says Vaisvanara is Brahman only. The reason that no doubt that Upasana uses general word with many meaning to create confusion. General I use the word is that the word having many meanings. Atma is sadarana sabda. Even though they are general words in later portion the teacher gives a specific meaning to avoid confusion. The description gives specific meaning to the general word. Thus the visvarupa varnanam is given. This can never fit into jataragni. Bhuta Agni is eka rupam; it is not devata Agni. Therefore the main reason can belong to Brahman alone and not to any other one. It is the meaning of the sutra.

Now we will go for word for word analysis. Two words are there. Vaisvanarah Vaisvanara; sadharana sabdah common word viseshat; because of the distinction. Vaisvanara the word is used in 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad. You have to specify it because the Vaisvanara is used in different sense. In Kathopanisad Brahmana is classed as Vaisvanara.

The next word is Brahma and it is nothing but Isvara or Sagunam Brahman. In Brahma Sutra Isvara is called Brahman only. So supply the word Brahman. Sadarana sabda visesat. Sabda means a word a padham. General word means vague word. Here when Vyasacharya says sadarana sabda, he means Vaisvanara. It has three meaning and therefore it is confusing. Then there is another sadarana sabdou that is Atma. Upanishad gives the visesha the specific meaning. Once visvarupa description comes the doubt is cleared.

The Upanishad gives specific meaning to Vaisvanara and Atma. He says specific meaning is Brahma or anything else. It is concluded Vaisvanara is Brahman. With this first sutra is over. Vaisvanara is Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam gives two more additional reasons to prove Vaisvanara is Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says because of the particular phalam to this Upasana. The phalam given is sarva anna asanam and sarva papa nash these are two results possible for visvarupa Upasana. Jataragni it is not possible bhutagni upasana it is not possible. In all the other Upasana only a portion of the papas will go. Any devata Upasana will remove a particular doshas. If you do Isvara upasana all the doshas will go. Isvara namaskara is sarva devata namaskara. Sarva papa nasa is possible only by Isvara namaskara. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 84

### **Topic 7. Vaisvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.24 [55] contd.**

#### ***Vaisvanarah sadharanasabdavisheshat***

Vaisvanara [is Brahman] on account of the distinction qualifying the common terms ['Vaisvanara ' and 'Self']

We see Vaisvanaradhikaran which is final adhikaranam of the second pada in which Chandogya upanisad chapter 18 is taken for consideration. This discussion is regarding the Vaisvanara and we will establish that this Vaisvanara is Brahman alone. In the first sutra we established Brahma only. Visvarupa discription is given and Vyasacharya says visvarupa discription fits with Brahman alone. Visvarupa varnanam is possible only for karanam. Karanam alone can have names and forms for karyam. Gold can have many rupams but bangle cannot have many rupams but one. Karyam has one form but karana alone can have aneka rupam. Jataragni, bhutagni and devatagni being karyam cannot have more than one form each. But visvarupa is possible only for karanam and here the cause is Brahman only. Adhi Sankaracharya gives some more supportive reason. First is the upasaka of Vaisvanara eat the food which will be eaten by all. Vaisvanara upasaka will get oneness with Vaisvanara.

As a person meditates so he becomes. This is possible only when you get oneness with Isvara or Brahman. In Gita Krishna says *bhoktaram yajnatapasam sarvalokamakhesavaram suhrdam sarvabhutanam jnatva mam santim yechati* 5.2.9 of Gita and having known Me as the enjoyer of sacrifices and austerities, the Great Lord of all the worlds the friend of all beings, he [the sage] attains peace. Sarva anna bhota fits with only Isvara and not to anyone.

Vishnu is the one who pervades all the people and Vishnu alone takes food through me. Second reason given by Adhi Sankaracharya is based on 5.24.3 of Chandogya upanisad. This mantra says *tadyathesikatulamagnau protam praduyetaivam hasya sarve papmanab praduyante ya etadevam vidvanagnihotram juhoti*. Just as the cotton fibres of the isitka grass are totally consumed when thrown into the fire, similarly all the sins are consumed fo one who performs the agnihotra sacrifice with the knowledge of the Vaisvanara Self. In this mantra it is said Vaisvanara will destroy all the papams. This is possible only by doing Isvara upasana. This Upasana gives krama mukti. This is the second additional reason.

Third reason is given in 5.11.1 of Chandogya upanisad which is the beginning of the Vaisvanara Agni portion. The mantra reads as *pracinasala aupamanyavah satyayajnah paulusirindradyumno bhallaveyo janah sarkaraksyo budila asvatarasviste baite mahasala mahasrotriyah sametya mimamsam cakruh ko na Atma kim brahmeti* Upamanyu's son pracinasala pulusa's son sathyaya jna bhallavi's son indradyumna sarkaraksa's son jana and asvatarasva's son budila these eminent householders, who were vedic scholars once met to decide the issue who is the real Self? And what is Brahman?

Everyone says that each one do not know and they go to the king and they raised the question kaha naha Atma kim Brahman. At the beginning they never used the word Vaisvanara. They use the word Vaisvanara is replaced by Atma and Brahman. If you are going to take any of the three agnis they are not myself and they are anatma different from me. Atma sabda indicates it is not bhutagni elemental fire and no one can say fire is myself. Fire is not myself. Even devatagni cannot be called myself and I don't look upon myself as devata and I worship devata and Atma indicates neither jadara or devata Agni. For this next word clarifies. Kaha naha Atma him Brahman. Vaisvanara is synonymous with Atma and Brahma are used and the word Atma negates three agnis and word Brahman negates Jivatma possibilities and therefore all the four possibilities are ruled out and therefore Vaisvanara is Brahman as said in Chandogya upanisad.

## **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.25 [56]**

#### ***Smaryaamanumanam syaditi***

Because that [cosmic form of the Supreme Lord] which is described in the smriti is an indicatory mark of inference [from which] we infer the meaning of this. Sruti text under discussion.]

This sutra is based on one basic rule that veda is the original scripture which is known as sruti and all other secondary scriptures are called smriti. According to our tradition all our smritis are based on sruti alone and none of them is original. They are derived from Vedas alone and the validity is not original validity and they are considered valid because they are derived from Vedas. The very word smriti indicates that they are recollected version and recollection presupposes the collection. They are collected from sruti and from smriti they are recollected. If any smriti contradicts a sruti then automatically the smriti vakyam will be rejected. The moment they contradict their very existence will be denied. This is an aside rule.

Second rule suppose there is an idea mentioned in smriti but not mentioned in sruti. In such case would we reject or not. We cannot reject it because only when smriti contradict sruti. Sruti has not made any mention about it and it is silent. The rule is since smriti is borrowed from sruti this idea also must have been borrowed from sruti and we should assume that it has lost in time and we supply sruti mantra and it called inferred sruti.

Vyasacharya argues there are many smriti slokas, which reveals. Vaisvanara belong to Brahman alone. Inferred sruti also says visvarupa belongs to Brahman. Extending that Vaisvanara has got to be Brahman because Vaisvanara and Brahman are one and the same. Vaisvanara has got visvarupa varnanam. In this Chandogya upanisad visvarupa belongs to Vaisvanara. Visvarupa belongs to Vaisvanara smriti says. So Vaisvanara is Brahman. The next question is what is the smriti vakyam based on which you infer sruti vakyam. The vakyam is from Vishnu sahasranamam. In this mantra we get visvarupa varnanam and that belongs to Vishnu the Paramatma. From this sruti we infer visvarupa is Brahman and therefore we infer Vaisvanara is Brahma because Brahman has visvarupam.

Samryamanam refers to sruti vakyam that reveals visvarupa relates to Brahman. Anumanam the word anumanam means lingam. Lingam means an indicator a clue. What is said in smriti must have been said in sruti. That is the traditional argument to say that manu vakyam is veda vakyam and it is like smoke indicating the existence of fire. Brahmanah visvarupatve. It will be the indicator of visvarupatve. Iti means therefore. Since the inferred sruti vakyam is therefore Vaisvanara with visvarupa rupam must be Brahman alone. With this second sutra is over. Now we will go to the third sutra of this adhikaranam.

## Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### Sutra 1.2.26 [57]

***Sabdadibhyo'atahpratisthanaccha neti chet na tatha drishtyupadesat  
asambhavat purushamapi chainamadhiyate***

If it be said that [vaisvanara is] nto [Brahman] or the highest Lord on account of the term [viz. Vaisvanara which has a different settled meaning viz. Gastric fire] etc. And on account of his abiding within [which is a characteristic of the gastric fire] [we say] no; because there is the instruction to conceive [Brahman] as such [as the gastric fire because it is impossible for the gastric fire to have the heaven etc., for the head and other limbs] and also because they [the vajasaneyain] describe him [viz. The Vaisvanara] as man [which term cannot apply to the gastric fire]

We will do the general analysis. Here Vyasacharya negates the Purva Paksi's views and he establishes his conclusion that Vaisvanara is Brahman alone. Purva Paksi view is Vaisvanara is number one and jataragni vada is two devata fire is three and bhutagni will be negated later. The sutra is divided into two portions. Second portion relates to Vedanta portion.

Purva Paksi argues that Vaisvanara is jataragni alone. For this purpose he depends upon the mantra occurring in satapata Brahmana which runs like this. *Sa esah Agni Vaisvanara sayo haitam eva agnim Vaisvanaram Purusa vidham puruse antarpratistitham veda.* Here Vaisvanara Agni is going to be commented critically. Later it is said puruse antapratistitham veda and that Agni is within the human beings. What is that Agni which is within the human being and that is jataragni. The mantra says Vaisvanara. It is clear Vaisvanara refers to jataragni alone. This is one support Purva Paksi takes. He says the very mantra we analyse now 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad.

Here Vaisvanara visvarupa description is given towards the end mantra says gargapadya Agni and ahavahaniya Agni anvaharya Agni or dakshinagni etc are different manifestation of fire only. While Vaisvanara is description the fire gargapadya and ahavahanya Agni is used and therefore Agni deva is used and not Brahman. Thus he establishes the Agni that is manifested within.

Third support comes 5.10.1 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *tadyadbhakatam prathamamaagacchettaddhomiyamsa yam prathamamahutim juhuyattam juhuyatpranaya svahetipranastrpyati III* the first part of the food is like oblation. One who eats should offer it as an oblation to prana saying 'pranasya svaha [i.e. I offer this as an oblation to prana] with



this your prana becomes pleased. Here eating is being compared to performing a sacrifice. Every time you put food into your mouth it is as if you are offering an oblation. Prana is the deity to whom you offer the first oblation. The word prana in this context means that aspect of the vital air that is responsible for respiration.

In this mantra it is said that the food an upasaka takes is an oblation to the Vaisvanara is homiyam and is an offering to Vaisvanara. Then that Vaisvanara should be directly going to jataragni and from this Vaisvanara is jataragni. Because of these three supports, we conclude that Vaisvanara is gani and that too jataragni. Because of these Purva Paksi concludes Vaisvanara is Brahman alone.

Adhi Sankaracharya says no doubt that Vaisvanara belongs to jataragni alone, here it is said that one should look upon Vaisvanara Agni as Brahman. This Upanishad refers to Brahman represented by vaisvanara. I accept that idol is stone alone. In this context you are not supported to look as stone. Even though it is like stone and varnanam fits into stone represented by Lord alone. But visvarupa varnanam fits into Brahman only then only visvarupa varnanam will fit properly. It is stone represented by Lord.

One more interpretation Adhi Sankaracharya gives will be seen in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 85

### **Topic 7. Vaisvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.26 [57]**

***Sabdadibhyo'atahpratisthanaccha neti chet na तथा द्रिश्युपदेशत  
asambhavat purushamapi chainamadhiyate***

If it be said that [vaisvanara is] not [Brahman] or the highest Lord on account of the term [viz. Vaisvanara which has a different settled meaning viz. Gastric fire] etc. And on account of his abiding within [which is a characteristic of the gastric fire] [we say] no; because there is the instruction to conceive [Brahman] as such [as the gastric fire because it is impossible for the gastric fire to have the heaven etc., for the head and other limbs] and also because they [the vajasaneyain] describe him [viz. The Vaisvanara] as man [which term cannot apply to the gastric fire]

We see the Vaisvanara adhikaranam 3<sup>rd</sup> sutra. In the first two sutras Vyasacharya has established Vaisvanara is Paramatma only. In the following two sutras Vyasacharya negates the Purva Paksi. Here he points out that Vaisvanara mentioned in 5,18.2 is jataragni only by taking a mantra in Satapata Brahmanam. His main arguments are the word Agni has been used clearly and the word Vaisvanara primarily mean fire only. This is the first argument of Purva Paksi. Secondly the sabda adityah the word adhi means some other reasons also. And the second reason that is implied the mantra we analyse while analyzing it there is mention of various agnis that feature different aspect of fire only. Also there is a mantra that the food comes first offered goes to Vaisvanara. Then it should refer to jataragni only digestive fire only and not to devata etc., Agni. This reason also comes under etc. Last reason is puruse antapratistitham veda Vaisvanara is located within the human being as stated in satapata Brahmanam.

Of the four reasons first and fourth are mentioned in the Sutra and second and third one we get it from etc. Thus through the four reasons Vaisvanara is to be taken as jataragni . We don't agree with their view. Tada dristi upadesat. It is because Upanishad wants Vaisvanara as a representative of virad Brahman. We say the meditation is for virad Brahman but represented by jataragni as sivalinga represents Shiva.

Therefore Vaisvanara represents Brahman alone. The difference is due to the description of visvarupa cannot fit into jataragni. The heaven is head etc. Therefore we take Vaisvanara is not equal to jataragni but take it as jataragni represented Vaisvanara Brahman. Next visvarupa rupa description is impossible for jataragni. The first reason is jataragni rupena Brahma upasana upadesat and the next portion is vivaraupa varnasya jata rupa is not to the jataragni and it is to Brahman alone. He explains another thing. In the satapata Brahmana there is an expression *puruse antapratistitham veda* it if it is within the human being it should be taken as Brahman how can you say it is within human being. This was Purva Paksi question. We say Brahman can be within human being. All pervading Brahman is within

human being also. I take it within human being also. In Gita [18.61] it is clearly said *Isvara sarvabhutanam hrddesa 'rjuna tithati bhramayan sarvabhutani yantraudhani mayaya* the Lord abides in the charts of all being causing them to turn round by his power as if they were mounted on a machine. The relations of our unborn nature and its fateful compulsion are regulated by the Divine who dwells in our hearts and guides and constrains our development. Also it is said that 'without Thee we cannot live for a moment. As the truth thou dost exist eternally within and without.' Therefore Brahman is within. There is a second argument also *puruse antapratistitham* is the topic of debate here. Purva Pakshi says it is fit for jataragni but we say it is possible for Brahman also. Adhi Sankaracharya says look at the *satapata Brahmana* again. It is said there is word *purusah* asks us to underline. Purva Pakshi wants to underline *Purusa antapratistitham* for he says it is Purusa and it is within Purusa. If Purva Pakshi interpretation is taken he can say jataragni is within Purusa he can explain. But what he has got to say it is within Purusa. If Vaisvanara is jataragni, according to Purva Pakshi jataragni is Purusa and jataragni is within Purusa. Vyasacharya says jataragni is within Purusa is agreed but only one the sentences fit in properly but the other one does not fit in. If we take Vaisvanara is Purusa and Vaisvanara is within Purusa if we take Brahman is Purusa and Brahman is within Purusa. It is perfectly alright if we take Brahman is Purusa and Brahman is within Purusa also. It is alright whatever we take is Purusa it applies for Brahman without, Brahman within. *Enam atiyate* means *satapata Brahmana* declares that this Vaisvanara to be *purusam abhi* to be Purusa also. The significance of the word also is not only that *satapata Brahmana* declares Vaisvanara to be within the Purusa but also *satapata Brahmana* declares not only within Purusa but also it is Purusa. Only if we take as Brahman only both the conditions apply. Siddhanta says because *upasaka* wants to meditation upon Brahman, jataragni word is used. Now comes the last question. How do you account for *gargapatya* etc, Agni description for they all belong to Agni alone. [5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad and 5.19.1 of Chandogya upanisad] if the first food is offered to Vaisvanara then it belongs to jataragni alone how do you explain these sentences Purva Pakshi asks.

For this Adhi Sankaracharya says with regard to Brahman all descriptions are possible for all features are possible for Brahman only. The features belonging to fire cannot belong to human being. As long as Brahman all the features belong to Brahman because everything belongs to Brahman only. So *gargapatya* feature belongs to fire also. That is why Krishna says *aham kratu aham 'yajnah svadha 'ham aham ausadham mantr 'ham aham eva'jyam aham agnir aham huta* [Ch. 9.16 of Gita] that reads as I am the ritual action I am the sacrificer, I am the ancestral oblation, I am the medicinal herb, I am the sacred hymn, I am also the melted butter, I am the fire and I am the offering. Ausadha or herb stands for the food of all creatures. The vedic sacrifice is interpreted as an offering of our whole nature; an entire Self giving to the universal Self. What we receive from Him we give back to Him; the gift and the surrender are both His. On the same principle the food although it goes to jataragni, there is nothing wrong if we say the food obligation goes to Brahman only. Through jataragni the oblations go to Brahman alone. That is why Krishna says [Gita 15.14] *aham vaisvanara bhuta praninam deham asitah prana panasamayatah pacamy annam caturvidham* becoming the fire of the life in the bodies of living creatures and mingling with the upward and downward breaths, I digest the four kinds of food literally like a cook. In the form of jataragni Brahman alone exists and jataragni represented Brahman. From this we have to derive an important corollary which is the foundation of our culture. Any principle in creation can be worshipped in two ways. One is that particular presiding deity or the very same principle can represent *samsti Isvara* also. If it is a particular principle it is finite and if it represent *Isvara* it is infinite. If a person does *Surya namaskara* we get a doubt whether sun represent Brahman or *caksur devata*. If it is *caksur* it is *paricchinnam* and if it is Brahman it is

apraicchinnam, and this we know only from the context. If he has eye problem and if he prays Surya devata it is finite caksur devata only. During sandhyavandanam when he worships sun, it represents Isvara. Similarly jataragni can represent simple jataragni or Isvara. Similarly Vaisvanara can represent devata or Isvara. When you do Vishnu sahasranama archana vinayaka represents remover of obstacles; but when you do archana for vinayaka then vinayaka represents Param Brahman itself. Every devata is paricchinnah as also aparicchinnah. That in our culture there is big confusion. This is to be understood clearly. Vishnu is finite deity when Vishnu represents sustenance; Shiva is finite deity when Shiva represents destruction function alone; Brahma is finite deity when we talk of creation alone. At the same time Brahma can represent sristi sthithi laya kartru Isvara. The word Isvara can represent which is one of the trinity but here Isvara represent maya sahitam Brahman Sagunam Brahman. Isvara can be totality also. So Vaisvanara can represent jataragni but here jataragni represents Brahman. In this context because of visvarupa description Vaisvanara has got to be Brahman only not jataragni. With this jataragni Purva Pakshi is negated.

Because of the location of Vaisvanara within the body as given in satapata Brahmana and the next word sadbavibhyaha a compound word and avibhyaha because of usage of the word Vaisvanara and Agni in the above brahmana mantra now I will give you the second part of Brahmanam and because of other reasons this points out garghapadhyah visualization and reference as the offerings are indicated by other reasons. The two words should be added na occurring in the mantra this will reveal Vaisvanara is not Brahman; because of the various reasons Vaisvanara is not Brahman. It is to suppose such question is raised, then hereafter our answer begins. Our first answer is 'na'. Purva paksha is not correct; the objection not valid. Tadadrishtupasedat because of prescription description in the Brahma upasanas. Because of the impossibility of visvarupa in regard to jataragni vaisvanara fire, connect it to na; and because of the impossibility of visvarupa with regard to Vaisvanara your objection is not right. The objection is Vaisvanara is Brahman only. The next word is adhiyate means satapata Brahmana reveals enam this Vaisvanara purusam abhica as Purusa also the complete by adding a sentence your objection is not correct.

## **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.27 [58]**

#### ***Ata eva na devata bhutam cha***

For the same reasons [the vaisvanara] cannot be the deity [fire] or the elements [fire]

First we will do general analysis. In this sutra Vyasacharya negates the other two Purva Paksi devata Agni and bhuta Agni. He says the word Vaisvanara occurring in 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad refers to bhutagni, which means fire element which is outside the individual; the next is Vaisvanara is devata Agni, the presiding deity of fire which is invisible intelligent principle. Vyasacharya negates both. He says because of the reasons used before or mentioned before. We should note all the reasons which being four that because of visvarupa description that can fit only Brahman not bhuta Agni or devata Agni. The upasaka will get the phalam of sarva anna adhanam. Third is sarva nasa papa phalam. It is only possible for Brahma Upasana and not for devata or bhuta Upasana. Lastly Atma is used. The word Atma and word Brahman can be used for Brahman only and not for anything else. It is neither devata Agni nor bhuta Agni.

Now we will do word for word analysis. Ata eva because of the reasons explained before only supply the word Vaisvanara that means the word Vaisvanara used in 5.8.2 of Chandogya upanisad; the next pair is na devata and it is not devata Agni, and also Bhutan cha. It is not bhutagni the fire element.

The fourth purva paksa Vyasacharya does not negate at all. Whether Atma represent Jivatma is the question. Athah eva because of the same reasons. Visvarupa description cannot belong to Jivatma; sarva anna phalam is not possible for Jivatma Upasana even the Brahman infinite cannot be applied to Jivatma. Now we enter fifth sutra.

## **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.28 [59]**

#### ***Sakshadayavirodham jaiminah***

Jaimini [declares that there is] no contradiction even[if by Vaisvanara] [Brahman I] directly [taken as the object of worship]

Vyasacharya has established Vaisvanara is Brahman alone and he has negated all the four purva paksas. He first accepted Vaisvanara is jataragni and alone and in this context we should know Vaisvanara is jataragni represented Brahman. He retained jataragni and think of it and should know that this represented Brahman. We don't look jataragni as jataragni but we see it as Brahman. I offer flower to the idol but worship Isvara visualized by idon.

Vaisvanara through jataragni represents Brahman. Jaimini says that jataragni is Brahman alone. There is no need to say it indirectly.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 86

### **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.2.28 [59]**

#### *Sakshadayavirodham jaiminah*

Jaimini [declares that there is] no contradiction even[if by Vaisvanara] [Brahman I] directly [taken as the object of worship]

In this interpretation is given by Jaimini Maharishi a disciple of Vyasacharya. Another interpretation to show Vaisvanara refers to 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad is Brahman. Until we have established that Vaisvanara refers to Brahman only. It directly refers to digestive fire only and upon the digestive fire we should visualize Brahman. In the previous interpretation Vaisvanara referred to jataragni the digestive fire symbolized Brahman. How should we do the Upasana. Just as we meditate upon Shiva through siva linga etc., similarly we have to meditate through digestive fire.

Jaimini says you need not go through digestive fire. Vaisvanara can directly reveal Brahman. This is jaimini statement. He says every word has got many meaning and one meaning is popular and it can reveal meaning other the popular menaing.

Suppose you analyse the word it consists of two words one is kh Akasa and other is gha mover. This is derivative meaning of the word. This is called yoga arthah derived meaning. If you jump from here to there for half a minute you are kagah. Primary meaning of jalajam is lotus, if you split the word jala means water ja means i.e other than lotus anything other than lotus called jalajah. We can have rubi artha as also yoga artha. So far we have taken rubi artha and Vyasacharya said Vaisvanara represented Brahman. Jaimini gives up popular meaning and takes up yoga artha which means virad Isvara. How can you take yoga artha for Vaisvanara.

I will give on interpretation given by Adhi Sankaracharya. Visve and nara are two words the part of the word represents sarve narah means visve sarve narah means visva narah eva vaisve narah that Lord who includes all the living heings who is that Lord that includes all beings is visvarupa and virad, the macrocosm includes all the microcosm. He says visve narah vaisvanarah. When there is rubu artha and yoga artha is possible there will be confusion which one we should take.

Then there must be a rule that rubi artha is powerful than yoga artha. Popular meaning is ever powerful. Popularity is powerful and there can be an objection and one can ask jaimini and say the rubi artha is powerful and how can you leave the rubi artha and take yoga artha. Here Vaisvanara means digestive fire; jaimini says normally rubi is powerful and take that meaning and fix it and see that whether it fits properly and if it does not fix and then you have right to take yoga artha. Jaimini argument is I am ready to take the popular artha and when I

take it mantra fit in properly because mantra gives visvarupa description for Vaisvanara. This visvarupa rupa can never fit in with digestive fire, which is within stomach, and therefore we drop the meaning of digestive fire and take the meaning of cosmic law. There is no contradiction to the general rule. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will take up word analysis.

The sutra consist of four words; Sakhat api means directly also it means without going through the digestive fire directly also; then supply two words Vaisvanara Brahman it means the word Vaisvanara occurring in 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad is Brahman avirodhum, means there is no contradiction; there is no error; there is violation. Jaiminih we have to supply the word vadadhi he says so. Vyasacharya quotes his disciple jaimini. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.29 [60]**

#### ***Abhivyakteryasmarathyah***

On account of the manifestatioin, so says Aasmarathyah

First I will do general analysis of this sutra. In jaimini's interpretation a problem can come. Vaisvanara directly refers to Brahman. This mantra points out that Vaisvanara is Agni, gargapadya etc, Agni. Normally we know they are aspects of fire only and how will you describe the expressions of gargabhadya etc., fire. This is question number one. Agains in Sadapata Brahmana it is said Vaisvanara is within the body how will you explain. And also in Sadapata Brahmana word Agni occurs. Vaisvanara Agni and Vaisvanara is within the body and how will you explain these three.

Now we will see one by one. The word Agni also should be taken in its yoga artha not rubi artha. The primary meaning of Agni is fire. If you take the derived meaning there will no problem. The derived meaning is agre nayati gacchadi iti agnih the one who moves in front or one who is the leader is Agni in short agragami agnih. Therefore Vaisvanara does not refer to fire at all but the leader of entire universe and Lord is the ultimate leader. The word Agni is explained.

The next question is Sadapata Brahmana it is said Vaisvanara is within the body. Since Bahaman is all pervading he can certainly within the body also. Vaisvanara is cosmic person who is everywhere and he is within the body also.

How do you explain gargabadya and other fire aspects. Jaimini avoids fire. How can you avoid fire, for that the answer is if that everything is different aspects of Lord alone because what belongs to Tamil Nadu is certainly the glory of India. Only the glory of Tamil nadu belongs to Karnataka etc. All the glories belong to India. Whether they are aspects of jalam, vayu etc, all them ultimately belong to Vaisvanara. Gargapadya is immediate aspect of fire but it is ultimately the aspect of Brahman alone. Since everything ultimately belongs to Brahman alone. In fact Adhi Sankaracharya explained all of them in previous sutra itself.



Finally one more problem is introduced based on 5.18.1 of Chandogya upanisad. In this mantra Vaisvanara is described. *Tanhovacaite vai khalu yuyam prthagivematmamam vaisvanaram vidvamso'nnamattha yastvetamevam pradesamatramabhivimanamatmanam vaisvanaramupaste sa sarvesu lokesu sarvesu bhutesu sarvesvatma svannamatti* the king said to Brahmins; those of you who re here meditate on the Vaisvanara Self only in part. [That is why when you eat you think you are eating separately] he who worships the Self as all pervasive and infinite, enjoys eating through whoever eats in the worlds, through all beings and through all selves, but for us the relevant part is pradesa matram this word creates problem when we take Jaimini's interpretation. Pradesa matram spatially limited. There is problem.

We are taking Vaisvanara as cosmic Lord who is all pervading. Upanishad uses the word spatially limited and how will you reconcile the spatially limited and all pevasiveness. For this problem different solutions are given by different acharyas. First solution is given by Asmarassya Sutra 29. Another rishi badhari rishi Sutra 30 gives another solution; sutra 31 Jaimini gies another solution. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 87

### **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.29 [60]**

#### ***Abhivyakteryasmarathyah***

On account of the manifestation, so says Aasmarathyah

We are in the final adhikaranam of the second pada which is known as Vaisvanaradhikaranam where Vyasacharya analyses 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad. The primary contention is that Vaisvanara should refer to primary meaning of digestive fire whereas siddhanti view it refers to Brahman alone. In the first four sutras interpretations were given and indirectly through jataragni it is proved that Vaisvanara is digestive fire only and we should meditate upon Brahman on the symbol of Vaisvanara fire. Our conclusion is Vaisvanara is jataragni pratiba Brahman. digestive fire symbolized Brahman.

Now another interpretation was given in sutra 28 and not through jataragni but directly it is Brahman. Primarily means jataragni but it can etymologically or secondarily it can mean sarvagatha Isvara. for taking secondary meaning there is support of visvarupa description. If we take primary meaning visvarupa will not fit in properly.

If we take this interpretation there is some problem. This is based on mantra 5.18.1 of Chandogya upanisad there is a word pradesa matram spatially limited, measurable. Therefore Purva Pakshi raises a question if Vaisvanara is taken as infinite Brahman how can you take the spatial limitation. How can describe Vaisvanara as infinite and finite way create doubt. We have to find out an ingenious method to convince both contradictory views. In the previous sutra we managed saying Vaisvanara represented jataragni. Wherever infinitive description comes we will connect it to Brahman and wherever there finite description comes we will connect it to jataragni as symbolized for Brahman. some of them may be connected to Brahman and some to jataragni Agni.

In this interpretation we are in trouble. Vaisvanara directly means Brahman and if so how will you connect to Brahman pradesa matram which indicates Brahman is within the body. Here Assmarathya rishi gives the answer. The problem is if Vaisvanara is all pervading Brahman how do you explain the word pradesa matram, which means spatially limited. The answer given is that no doubt Isvara is all pervading when a meditator wants to have darsanam for blessing the devotee all pervading Isvara can assume a limited form. Here Lord Krsihna says in 4.7 of *Gita yada yada hi dharmasya glanir bhavati bhārata abhyutthanam adharmasya tada'tmanam srjamy aham* here it is clearly stated that the Supreme though unborn and undying, becomes manifest in human embodiment to overthrow the forces of ignorance and selfishness. Since Isvara has got maya power, He can take manifestation the private appearance for the sake of a particular devotee and for the sake of the world he takes the avatar. The particular appearance is called abhivyakti the manifestation or appearance

for the upasaka's sake. It is for the purpose of the devotee alone Lord takes the various forms like Shiva, Vishnu, Brahma etc, this is the first answer.

Abhivyukteh because of the finite manifestation of Brahman for the sake of upasaka; then you hve to supply two words pradesa matratvam sadhu which means finite description of Vaisvanara is proper; iti in this manner the sage Assmarathya answers the objection. Aasmarathyah.

### **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.30 [61]**

#### ***Anusmriter badarih***

For the sake of meditation or constant remembrance – so says the sage Badari

Badari answers in the same direction. The problem if Vaisvanara is Brahman how do you account of pradesa matram. When a devotee wants to meditate Isvara or visualize Isvara he can do so only within the mind alone and the visualized Isvara will be confined to my mind. Unfortunately or fortunately mind is limited and finite. Although Lord is infinite our mind the container is limited the content the Lord, the memorizes Lord will also be limited. Because it is visualized mind it is finite. Appearing space being limited Lord is limited. This is the answer.

Anusmriteh because of visualization of Brahman through within the finite mind and the supply two words pradesa matritvam sadhu the spatially limited is fine because it is based on visualization focus and Badarih answers the question. Present answer is based on the appearance based on the meditation. Now we will see third answer.

### **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.2.31 [62]**

#### ***Sampatteriti jaiministatha hi darsayati***

Because of imaginary identity the Supreme Lord may be called Pradesamatra [span song]. So says Jaimini because so [the sruti] declares.

We will see the general analysis of this sutra. Here Jaimini answers the objection based on his own interpretation. He says whenever you have difficulty in interpretation of veda you will find the answer in veda itself. The word 'Pradesa Matram' occurs in some other place also. 5.18.1 of Chandogya upanisad creates problem, scan the sama veda and see Sadapata Brahmanam.

At the end alone Brihadaranyaka upanisad comes. We have already seen on mantra. Next to the mantra alone the word 'Pradesa Matram', is used. The significance of this mantra is this. Here the teacher says no doubt Lord is all pervading and Lord has got heaven as head sun and moon as eyes, space the visvarupa description is given. Since the person cannot visualize the totality I shall give you a specila Upasana called sambad Upasana or sambatti Upasana that means visualization of bigger one in a smaller locus. To see the head you have look up above the sky; to see the feet you have to see the bottom.

So the acharya says that he would simplify the process and see the visvarupa within your face itself. Beginning from your head to your chin or lower jaw tries to visualize the visvarupam. Acharya gives the description. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes the mantra in his bashyam. The head of virad is to be visualized as your head; the eye of virad sun and moon as your own eyes; nose as your nose; the body of virad is seen as space obtaining within your mouth.

All pervading space is body of the virad. In simplified version space within the mouth is the body of virad. Saliva is the bladder of the Lord. In original version ocean is taken as the bladder of the Lord. The chin is the feet of the Lord. This is pradesa matra of Vaisvanara. Previously the original version and this description is limited version of Vaisvanara. This Upasana is called sambatti Upasana and because of this pradesa matra is used and what is wrong in that. This is the answer given by Jaimini Rishi.

Now we will word for word analysis. Sabpatteh because of the special prescribed in sadapada Brahmanam where Vaisvanara is visualized in our face itself and then supply tow words pradesa matratvam sadhu the word pradesa matram used in 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad is perfectly alright. iti means in this manner jaimini jaimini rishi answers the obejection; tatha hi in this manner darsayati another Upanishad describes Vaisvanara in pradesa matra version another mantra described sadapata Brahmana mantra darsayati and it is clear that your face is His face etc. he gives further justification in the next sutra.

## **Topic 7. Vaishvanaradhikaranam [24-32]**

Vaisvanara is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.2.32 [63]**

#### ***Amananti chainamasmin***

Moreover they [the Jabalas] teach that this [Supreme Lord is to be meditated upon] in this [space between the head and the chin]

Vaisvanara is visualized within the face. How can this be done. He says it is for the sake of Upasana and if you are not convinced of that I can give you another Upanishad also and that is Jabala Upanishad. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes the mantra 2 of Japala Upanishad reads as *atha hainam atri papraccaha Yajnavalkyam, ya eso'nanto vyakta Atma tam katham aham vijnaniyam iti, sa hocaca Yajnavalkya so'vimukta upasya ya eso'nanto'vyakta tma so'vmukte pratisthita iti, so'vimuktah kasmin pratisthita iti, varunayam sasyam sca amdhye pratisthita iti* the mantra reads thereafter Atri inquired of Yajnavalkya 'how can I know that Self which is infinite and unmanifested? Yajnavalkya said [in reply] meditate on Avikukta [for] the Self, which is infinte and unmanifested is established in avikukta [Atri then enquired].

It is established in the middle of varana and nasi. Atri enquired what is varana and what is nasi? Yajnavalkya answered. As it overcomes all the faults done by the sense organs it is called varana; as it destroys all the evils done by the sense organs it is called nasi [Atri inquired] what is their abode [Yajnavalkya answers] it is the meeting place of the eyebrows and the nose. It is the meeting place of the world of gods and [the worlds] beyond.

The same meeting place is to be meditated on. He who knows it gains the knowledge, which makes for liberation. the infinite Paramatma abides in Jivatma and is identical with Jivatma. Avimuktah means Jivatma. Where is Jivatma located. It says Jivatma is located between varana and nasi the Lord is in varana and nasi. The question is what is varana and nasi. It is explained in the Upanishad. varana means eyebrows; nasi means the nose.

Between the eyebrows where we apply tilakam is varana nasi sandhih. Otherwise it is called Varanasi. Kasi visvanathar is called Avimuktamesvarah. Then he asks what is wrong in using pradesa matram. This is the answer. Now we will go to the word analysis.

Amananti cha means Jabala Upanishad also talks about; previously sadapata Brahmanam talks about it; keeping this only Chandogya upanisad talks about pradesa matram.

We will now see the summary of the adhikaranam. subject matter is the word Vaisvanara occurring in 5.18.2. of Chandogya upanisad. Samsaya the doubt is whether the Vaisvanara refers to jataragni digestive fire or does it refer to Brahman. then Purva Pakshi say Vaisvanara is jataragni alone and not Brahman. it is the primary meaning of the word and finite description given. Siddhanta says Vaisvanara refers to Brahman alone. Indirectly it refers to Vyasacharya and directly refers to Brahman as per Jaimini. According to us all the description that it is finite as also infinite also can be connected to Brahman. in the jataragni finite description alone fits in but infinite description will not fit in. this is placed in the right place. With this second pada is over.

In this pada 7 adhikaranams are there. all deal with aspashta Brahma linga vakya samanvaya. Wherever vague statements are there, are analysed and established that they relate to Brahman alone and nothing else. Of these seven, three deal with 1,4, and 7 Upasamyam Brahman all occurring in Chandogya upanisad. 2,3,5, and 6 deal with neyam Brahman. with this the second pada of the first chapter of Brahma Sutra is over.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 3			
Classes: 088 to 124 - Sutras: 1-3-1 to 1-3-43			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
88	303	1 . 3 . 1	64
89	306	1 . 3 . 1 to 1 . 3 . 4	64 to 67
90	310	1 . 3 . 5 to 1 . 3 . 7	68 to 70
91	315	1 . 3 . 8	71
92	318	1 . 3 . 8 and 1 . 3 . 9	71 and 72
93	322	1 . 3 . 9 and 1 . 3 . 10	72 and 73
94	326	1 . 3 . 10 to 1 . 3 . 12	73 to 75
95	330	1 . 3 . 12 and 1 . 3 . 13	75 and 76
96	334	1 . 3 . 13	76
97	337	1 . 3 . 13 and 1 . 3 . 14	76 and 77
98	341	1 . 3 . 14 and 1 . 3 . 15	77 and 78
99	346	1 . 3 . 15 to 1 . 3 . 17	78 to 80
100	350	1 . 3 . 17 to 1 . 3 . 19	80 to 82
101	354	1 . 3 . 19	82
102	358	1 . 3 . 19 to 1 . 3 . 21	82 to 84
103	362	1 . 3 . 21	84
104	365	1 . 3 . 22	85
105	368	1 . 3 . 22 to 1 . 3 . 23	85 and 86
106	371	1 . 3 . 24 and 1 . 3 . 25	87 and 88
107	375	1 . 3 . 26	89
108	378	1 . 3 . 26 to 1 . 3 . 28	89 to 91
109	382	1 . 3 . 28	91
110	385	1 . 3 . 28	91
111	388	1 . 3 . 28	91
112	391	1 . 3 . 28 to 1 . 3 . 30	91 to 93
113	394	1 . 3 . 30 to 1 . 3 . 32	93 to 95
114	398	1 . 3 . 32 and 1 . 3 . 33	95 and 96
115	402	1 . 3 . 33	96
116	406	1 . 3 . 34	97
117	410	1 . 3 . 34 and 1 . 3 . 35	97 and 98
118	413	1 . 3 . 35 and 1 . 3 . 36	98 and 99
119	416	1 . 3 . 36 to 1 . 3 . 38	99 to 101
120	420	1 . 3 . 38	101
121	423	1 . 3 . 39	102
122	428	1 . 3 . 40 and 1 . 3 . 41	103 and 104
123	432	1 . 3 . 41 and 1 . 3 . 42	104 and 105
124	437	1 . 3 . 42 and 1 . 3 . 43	105 and 106
	440		

## BRAHMA SUTRA – Chap: 1, Pada-3

Class 88

### **Introduction to the third pada**

The abode of heaven, earth etc., [is brahma] on account of the term, ‘own’ i.e., self

We have completed the first two padas of pradhmadhyaya and now we enter 3<sup>rd</sup> pada. The entire first chapter deals with samanvaya meaning consistency that there is consistency in the upanishad with regard to the revelation of brahman. To put it in another language all the upanishad consistently reveals brahman only. Brahma is the subject matter of upanishad and not karma or any other matter. This has been presented in fourth sutra sattva samanvaya and fourth is the foundation of the entire first chapter. The consistency is proved throughout the first chapter. All the four padas of the first chapter deal with consistency.

Then the question is what is the difference between the four padas if they reveal consistency alone. Then we said even though consistency; with consistency we have divided into four padas. It deals with consistency of those statements, which indirectly reveals brahman with the help of clear indicators. This is the subject matter of pada.

The idea is whenever there is indirect revelation it uses the indicators to reveal brahman and the indicators are two types one clear indicators and another is a vague indicator. The clear indicators are spasta brahma lingani and the other is aspasta brahma lingani. First pada discussed those that revealed clear indicators and the second discussed those statements that revealed vague indicated statements were analysed. We are not analyzing those directly revealing brahman because there is no confusion regarding brahman revelation. Such statements don't find any place in brahma sutra.

Now we have to find the subject matter of tridiya pada. It does the same job as the second pada. Aspasta brahma linga vakya samanvaya is the subject matter of tridiya pada. Then there will be a question when second and third deal with the same why third pada should be there. This i will answer at the end of the chapter to show the difference i have to analyse the subject of both. Both deal with the same subject only. The third pada has got 13 adhikaranams consisting 43 sutras. Having introduced now I will go to the general introduction of the first the third pada.

### **Topic 1. Dyubhvyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.1 [64]**

#### ***Dyubhvyayatanam svasabdat***

The abode of heaven, earth, etc., [is Brahma] on account of the term ‘own’ i.e. Self.

This is the first adhikaranam of the third pada. It is called dyubhvyadhikaranam. It is called so because it starts with the word dyubhvyayatanam. The subject matter of this

adhikaranam is based on the mantra 2.2.5 of the mundaka upanishad. The mantra reads as *yasmin dyaub prthivi contariksa motam manah saha pranais-ca sarvath, tam evaikam janatha atmana manya tam evaikam janatha atmana manya vaco vimunca thamrta syaisa setuh* the meaning reads as he is whom the heaven, the earth and the interspace are centered, together with the mind and all life-breaths [pranas] know him alone as the one self of all, and desist from all other talks. This is the man's bridge to the shore of immortality [across the ocean of life]

I will give you the general meaning of this mantra says that brahman is support of the macro cosmic as also micro cosmic universe of buloka and swarga loka etc. Loka triya adharam visvadharam brahma. Third line says may you know this visvadharam, which is otherwise known as Paramatma. Prapancha adhistanam brahma you should know that. Thereafter wards give up talking. Talking refers to all type of vyavaharas. It means take to sannyasa and i will not say that and you continue to be in grahasthasrama and spend more time on mananam and nididyanam.

Fourth line of Mundaka mantra says two different commentaries are there and two meanings are there. According to first interpretation is sethuh means a dam. It is one that holds water. There is bundh out of mud found in the fields is called sethu. Then amrtasya according to first interpretation it is immortality. This visvadhara Paramatma is possessor of immortality just as bundh holds water brahman holds immortality. It is as its nature brahman holds immortality. Since dam holds water you depend for your water, since brahman dam holds water of immortality and may you go to the dam of water of immortality.

The second commentary for the fourth line is that brahma jnanam said in the third line. Sethuh according to second interpretation does not mean a dam or bundh but a bridge. The bundh will serve in both ways to cross from one side of the field to the other side. It is not only holder of water but also it is a bridge. This brahma jnanam is a bridge for realizing brahman. First interpretation it is immortality. In second interpretation it is this brahma jnanam is the bridge to reach the immortal brahman. Brahma jnanam is the bridge to take you to brahman.

What is the problem? It is about visvadharam the support of universe by using the word otham supported in brahman. But the upanishad does not use the word brahman but it talks about visvadharam. Why do you take visvadharam as brahman. It is raised by sankya philosophers. In sankya philosophy pradhanam is concept very close to maya. Why cannot you take visva ayadhanam as basic matter from which visva has come, in which the world sustains and into which the world resolves.

The controversy is jagad adharam him and visvadharam kaha. Purva paksa claims the basic matter alone is the basic substance of the whole universe. Life means consciousness and the matter is visvadharam and vedantins takes it as brahman. Through seven adhikaranam visvadharam brahmaiva na pradhanam. This is the adhikaranam debate.

Now we will go to the first sutra. In this vyasacharya says visvadharam is brahman. He says that in the third line upanishad uses the word atma which is the clinching evidence. We know the word atma stands for chetanam brahman alone and it cannot be used for achetana pradhanam. Self is a reflective pronoun and it can be used for chetana vastu alone. Therefore atma sabda prayogad. That stands for Paramatma. This is the reason number one.



The second reason is that the upanishad itself clarifies this elsewhere. Here we do not know visvadharam is not clear and in some other place visvadharam is made clear. Adhi sankaracharya gives one example 6.8.4 of Chandogya upanishad. says *tasya kva mulam syadanyatrannadevameva khalu somyannena sungenapo mulamanvicchadbhih somya sungena tejo mulamanviccha tejasa somya sungena sanmulamanviccha sanmulah somyarmah sarvah prajah sadayatana satpratistha*. The mantra reads as where else, except in food, can the body have its root? In the same way, o somya, when food is the sprout, search for water as the root; when water is the sprout, o somya, search for fire as root, when fire is the sprout, o somya, search for sat [existence] as the root, o somya sat is the root; sat is the abode, and sat is the support of all these things.

In this mantra the crucial word is sadayatana sat means support and ayadhana is praja all jivarasis. This is one support to show that it is brahman alone. There is another supporting mantra in kathopanishad mantra 2.6.1 that reads as *urdhva mulo- 'vak sakha, eso- 'svatthah sanatanah tad eva sukram tad brahma, tad eva amrtam aucyate tasmin lokah sritah sarve, tadu natyeti kascana etad vai tat* the meaning of this is this is the ancient asvattha tree whose roots are above and branches [spread] below. That is verily the pure, that is brahman and that is also called the immortal., in that rest all the worlds and name and none can transcend it. Verily this is that.

For us the relative portion tasmin loka sritah sarve here brahman is presented clearly visvadharam in kathopanishad we have to drag it support that to this sutra. Now we will go to the word analysis. Dyu heaven bhu earth; adi and the rest that includes all the other things dyubhuadi means the entire universe; ayatanam; the support, abode or visvadhara occurring in mundaka 2.2.5, it does not directly say visvadharam. Indirectly says; you supply the word brahma; svar own sabdat from the word sva sabdat on account of the word. For this adhi sankaracharya two different interpretations are given.

This word sva is itself a compound word sva and sabdad. According to the first interpretation 'sva' means Atma. Sabda means word; because of the word atma used in Mundaka upanishad 2.2.5, sva sabdad is equal to atma sabda prayogad. Atma refers to chetana vasthu visvadharam and not achetana pradhanam. The second interpretation is sva means the upanishads themselves. Sabdad means clarification. Because of the clarification by the upanishads themselves elsewhere that visvadharam is brahman only and it is not pradhanam. That is 6.8.4 of chandogya upanishad and kathopanishad example quoted above.

Now adhi sankaracharya in his bashyam introduces a purva paksi and answers. Purva paksi says visvadharam cannot be brahman if you analyse the fourth line. That does not support your interpretation. Esah sethu is the fourth line. It is the first interpretation of the fourth line. This brahma, which is visvadharam, is sethuh a dam a water holder. Purva paksi says is only a dam or embankment and any holder of something is a limited entity. It has got boundary however big it is. If you take brahman as a dam and you cannot take it as dam.

There is second interpretation also. Esah sethu amritasya. It means immortal brahman. It is sethuh brahman is the holder of brahman. adhi sankaracharya in his commentary is not correct. The answer will be given in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 89

### **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.1 [64]**

#### ***Dyubhvadyayatanam svasabdat***

The abode of heaven, earth, etc., [is Brahma] on account of the term 'own' i.e. Self.

In this first adhikaranam of the third pada known as Dyubhvadyadhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses Mundaka Upanishad mantra 2.2.5. In this mantra the first half Upanishad refers to something that is substratum of the entire universe the heaven as also the earth. This is referred to in this adhikaranam as Dyubhvadyayatanam. Visvadharam is presented in the above mantra.

What is this visvadhara. We want to establish visvadhara is brahmaiva. Sankya however argue that visvadhara refers to achetana tattvan pradhanam. In the first sutra which we completed in the last class is visvadhara Brahma sva sabdad. For this we gave two interpretation the first is because of the expression Atma occurring in the mantra. The word Atma can refer to only chetana tattvam and not achetana tattvam and pradhanam being achetanam it will not fit in here.

The second interpretation is because of the clarification by Upanishad itself sva refers to Upanishad. Because of the clarification given elsewhere and that elsewhere is Chandogya upanisad 6.8.4 it says sat Brahman alone is pradistha. Then Adhi Sankaracharya introduces a Purva Paksi, which I introduced in the last class.

The fourth line of the current mantra we give two interpretations. Purva paksa contends the first interpretation of the fourth line. Esa refers to pronoun a line mentioned before. Esah is visvadhara Brahma or Paramatma. The word sethu according to our first interpretation refers to bund or dam, which holds water. Esah sethu means Brahma is a dam or bund if Brahma is a dam what does it hold. It holds immortality. It is the reservoir of immortality from where one can tap immortality. Based on the first interpretation raises two objection. He says sethu refers to finite or paricchina or limited entity. Since the fourth line refers to visvadhara refers to sethu and since Brahma is limitless entity and how can samanvayadhikaranam between sethu and Brahma.

Even if you accept sethu as dam the holder of amritasya, the word amritam does not eman immortality but the amritam means immortal means Brahma. Esah which is according to you is sethu a dam of amritam and this Brahma is holder of brahman.. Can water be the holder of water and Brahma cannot be the holder of Brahma and holder and held cannot be identical and therefore esah should be other than Brahma.

We have to answer the first part of purva paksa. How can you equate Brahman with limited dam. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says it is a foolish approach and he says that it is gouna prayogah and it is like a reservoir. Example and original will not have all features common.

Then example will become original itself. Certain original features will be there. Dam has water that can be tapped by us and make use of dam. Availability of water in the dam is example and so availability if immortal Brahman is there to bless you with immortality. Also Adhi Sankaracharya says you should not foolishly compare example and they you may ask Brahman is made of mud cement etc.

Second purva paksa is how can you say it is holder of immortal Brahman. For that Adhi Sankaracharya answers eventhough amritam means immortal but in this context you should understand umrittvam a compromise with the word is allowed if the tatparyam require contextual adjustment. There is nothing wrong. It want to tell the source of immortality, it is all right. Amritam is literally immortal but in this context it is immortality.

When we give the answer purva paksa is not satisfied and he says that you compromise with the word's meaning amritam. He says it is escapism. Taking amritam as immortality is not correct. Then Adhi Sankaracharya says if you are not satisfied \, we will give the second interpretation for the fourth line to avoid compromising with the meaning of the word amritam. Here we say esah does not mean Brahman at all. It means Brahma jnanam. If you see the mantra first line talks about Brahman; the third line talks about you should know Brahman means it talks about Brahma jnanam.

Esa is a pronoun refers to nearer thing and that refers to far away. Esa refers to something nearby. Brahman is near by or Brahma jnanam is near by; fourth line is closer to third line and therefore esah refers to Brahma jnanam only what is the meaning of sethuh. Here we say sethu does not refer to dam at all. Another is a bridge. Here bridge means a path, and path means a sadhanam; therefore sethu means sadhanam and esah means Brahma jnanam; amritasya means Brahman itself. Now esah this Brahma jnanam is the means to attain Brahman. Brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati. We say through Brahman you gain Brahma jnanam. Therefore first two lines talk about Brahman only.

You interpret esah as Brahma jnanam given in third line. According to Sanskrit Brahma jnanam is neutral gender. Esah is masculine gender. Now while Brahma jnanam is neutral gender can be referred to masculine gender. According to grammar, it can take the gender of the previous word which it refers to or future predicate it is going to talk about. Here pronoun is corresponding to sethu which comes later. Hence etad sethu is correct and esah sethu means the sethu which is masculine. Therefore there is no dosha. Therefore Dyubhvadyayadhanam is brahmaiva. Now we go to the second sutra.

## **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.3.2 [65]**

#### ***Muktopasripyavyapadesat***

Because of the declaration [in the scriptures] that that is to be attained by the liberated.

We will now see general analysis. Here Vyasacharya points out that visvadhara mentioned in Mundaka relates to Brahman only. Now he takes a future mantra in support of his statement. The mantra is 3.2.8 of Mundaka that reads as *yatha nadyah syanda-manah samudre- 'stam gacchannti nama-rupa vihaya, tatha vidvan nama-rupar vimuktah Parar-Param purusam upaiti divyam.* The meaning is as flowing rivers get themselves disappeared in the ocean their special names and distinct forms, so the wise man free from all his identifications with the names and forms goes into the highest of the high the Supreme divinity.

The mantra talks about the phalam of Brahma jnanam. It says Brahma jnani will merge into Brahman which was discussed before as visvadhara. Therefore we can say visvadhara vidvan or jnani merges into Brahman. An example is given just as rivers merge into ocean losing the individuality and nama rupa. Adhi Sankaracharya argues therefore if you take visvadhara as pradhanam then it will mean knower of pradhanam will merge into pradhanam and what will be the jnana phalam.

Visvadhara jnani who is chetanam will merge into pradhanam which is achetanam. Here becoming chetanam will become achetanam and that is the moksa phalam. Brahma jnanena Brahma praptih. Since visvadhara is presented as destination of a jnani in Mundaka 3.2.5 is presented as destination of jnani visvadhara should be Brahman only. If visvadhara is taken the destination will be pradhanam which nobody wantsit.

The sutra has got one word Muktopasripyavyapadesat. It is a common word consisting of three words mukta upasripya upadesad. Muktah means a jnani, upa sripya means locus of merger, gath, laksyam, goal, vyapadesah means presentation. Because of the presentation of visvadhara of Mundaka 3.2.5 as the destination of a jnani. Visvadhara is Brahman because of the presentation of visvadhara as the destination of jnani said in mantra 3.2.5. With this second sutra is over.

## **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.3.3 [66]**

#### ***Nanumanamatacchabdat***

[the abode of heaven etc] is not that which is inferred i.e., pradhana because there is no term indicating it.

In this sutra Vyasacharya establishes that visvadhara is not pradhanam, which is a basic matter as per Sankya philosophy. There are no expressions in the Upanishad, which indicates pradhanam, which are relevant to pradhanam. There pradhana referring in the Upanishad. All then words in the Upanishad are opposed to pradhanam. All the expressions used in the Upanishad indicate chetana tattvam and none referring to achetana tattvam. Atma refers to chetana tattvam.

Sankara also quotes 1.1.9 of Mundaka upanisad that says *yah sarvajnah sarva vid yasya jnana mayam tapah tasmad etad Brahma nama rupam annam ca jayate* the meaning of the mantra is from the Brahman [the Supreme reality] who not only is aware of the total happenings in the world but is equally in the know of all the details of happenings every

minute whose very thought is of the nature of knowledge, - are all these produced the creator, names and forms and nourishment for all.

The Sarvajna omniscient we find that omniscient principle is chetanam. All the words in the mantra are chetana vakyams only. Because of the absence of relevant expression visvadhara is not pradhanam. Hence visvadhara is Brahman only. This is general analysis of the sutra. Now we will go to the word analysis.

Na the next word is anumanam visvadhara the substratum of the world is not anumanam the word anumanam means pradhanam of Sankya philosophy the basic matter I have discussed this before according to their philosophy pradhanam is never perceptible the basic matter can not be perceived but it can only be inferred since it can be inferred it is called inferable substance or inferred substance; normally anumanam means inference but in this context anumanam inferred substance, and the inferred substance is pradhanam. Anumanam is pradhanam therefore1 visvadhara is not pradhanam atachabdat this consists of ah means absence tad means pradhana vacaka sabda means expression because of the absence of the expressions relevant to pradhanam we conclude that visvadhara is Brahman.

### **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.4 [67]**

#### ***Pranabhricha***

[nor] also the individual soul

First we will do a general analysis of this sutra. In the previous sutra Vyasacharya has negated pradhanam. In the following four sutra Vyasacharya establishes visvadhara is not jiva also. The doubt comes here because in the mantra 2.2.5 of Mundaka upanisad the third line says *tam-evaikam janatha atmana manya*. In the sastra there are two meanings Jivatma is called Atma and Paramatma also is called Atma. We need not take pradhanam which is chetanam. Since Jivatma is chetanam the doubt comes Vyasacharya takes pains to establish visvadhara is not jivah. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 90

### **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.4 [67]**

#### ***Pranabhriccha***

[nor] also the individual soul

In this first adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses a Mundaka mantra 2.25 in which Upanishad talks about the substratum of the world. The Upanishad does not clearly say what visvadhara is. Hence there is an enquiry in this regard in Brahma Sutra. It is Paramatma alone but not pradhanam as claimed by Sankya philosophy. Since pradhanam is achetana vastu and Atma is chetana vastu mantra must refer to Paramatma alone. In the third sutra Vyasacharya negated Sankya philosophy that pradhanam is visvadhara. There is absence of expression of which are relevant to pradhanam. Such expression should be achetanam revealing expression.

All the Upanisads express chetana Atma sabda. I want to add the incidental purva paksa connected to earlier purva paksa. Visvadhara can be vayu also supported by Brahadharaynaka upanisad aksara Brahmanam where the expression is by vayu alone the whole world is supported. Since vayu is presented as visvadhara third sutra negates vayu also because of the same reason. Just as pradhanam is achetanam vayu is also achetanam whereas Mundaka uses the word sarva vid and sarvajna and from this it is clear that it is chetana vastu. In absence of expression vayu is achetana.

Here in the fourth sutra Vyasacharya negates a purva paksa on the Mundaka mantra. The third line Atma is used as visvadhara the substratum of the universe is said to be Atma. The word can refer to Jivatma or Paramatma. When the word Atma can refer to both of them. Now the controversy is whether visvadhara is Jivatma and our view is visvadhara is not Jivatma but it is Paramatma only.

Before going further I will add an aside note. These are the situation very confusing for Advaitic student. From this it becomes indirectly very clear and Vyasacharya totally differentiates Paramatma and Jivatma and asserts Paramatma is visvadhara. That means Vyasacharya seems to indirectly establish Jivatma Paramatma beda and this adhikaranam seems to support bedavadi. Advaitin has to clearly understand the adhikaranam. Vedanta especially Brahma Sutra establishes both difference between jivatma and Paramatma and equally establish jivatma and Paramatma aikyam also.

Therefore especially in Sankara bashyam he establishes beda and abeda. Those who read sankara's bashyam criticize sankara himself does not know what he wants to say and even he is not clear about the Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam, therefore some people introduced a new philosophy beda abeda vada. What is our answer. We establish the difference from vyavaharika dristi. We establish the non difference from Paramarthika dristy.. Then the

question can come that vyavaharika dristya beda the difference from relative or empirically establish and is it not different from day to day life. Sastra need not say what we already know very clearly. Why should sastra vehemently establish beda. For that it is important because Sankya philosophers do not accept Isvara even at vyavaharika level. He accepts vyavaharika jiva and he accept vyavaharika jagat but he does not accept vyavaharika Isvara. Vyavaharika Isvara does not accept and we have twofold job one is vyavaharika dristi we have to establish vyavaharika Isvara different from vyavaharika jiva and vyavaharika jagat. In this task we take dvaida philosophers also.

We all become one Vedantins in facing Sankya and while facing Sankya we establish Isvara and say that Isvara is different from jiva and jagat and we say that Isvara is adham and jiva and jagat are adheyam. After establishing that we go to Dvaidin and vishistadvaidins and we have an internal difference whether jiva jagat Isvara beda is vyavaharikam and not Paramarthikam. Here in this sutra our dristi is that Isvara is different from jiva. Visvadhara Paramatma and not Paramatma from vyavaharika dristya and if we understand this there is no problem.

Visvadhara is Paramatma and not Jivatma and the reason we have to borrow from the previous sloka anuvritti. The reason is to be taken from previous sutra. Atha sabdad. Java vacaka sabda abhavad. But you should be careful here. There we said achetana vayu sabda abhavad. But now here jivah and it is not achetana. There are no expressions to reveal alpa jivah. Sarvajna etc., chetanam all right but it does not refer to jivah. Visvadhara is not jiva in the absence of reference to Paramatma.

Pranavid ca we have to supply visvadhara, na and adha sabdad. Visvadhara na prana brid ca adha sabdad. Prana brid means Jivatma. That holds prana for sometime and that which takes one to punarabi jananam and punarabi maranam is Jivatma. Ca also. In the previous sloka it was said visvadhara is not vayu and visvadhara is not pradhanam and now we add Jivatma also. Because of the absence of expressions, which are relevant to Jivatma, and such expressions are not there and in fact opposite expressions are there which goes against Paramatma. Now we go to sixth sutra.

## **Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]**

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.3.5 [68]**

#### ***Bhedavyapadesat***

[also] on account of the declaration of difference [between] individual soul and the abode of heaven etc,

This sutra also establishes visvadhara is not jivatma. Here a new reason is given. Vyasacharya says that Mundaka mantra indicates the difference Jivatma from visvadhara. Again we go to the third line which says *tam-evaikam janatha atmana manya* may you know that visvadhara. Janatha is second person, in that statement you is presented as subject of knowledge and visvadhara as the object of knowledge and from this it is clear knower is you Jivatma and visvadhara is to be known and there we see subject object difference is indicated

in the third line. You the knower is to be different from the known. Therefore it is not Jivatma. This is the general analysis now we will come to word analysis.

It has one word *bedavyapadesat*, *visvadhara na pranavid beda vyapadesat*. This is the full sutra. *Visvadhara* is not *jiva* because of *beda vyapadesat*. *Beda* means difference distinction between *Jivatma Paramatma* *bedah*. The next word is *vyapadesa* is indication. Indirect revelation or hint or clue any word you can take it. Because of indication of difference between *Jivatma* and *Paramatma* as the subject and object of knowledge. They are subject and object because may you *jivatma* know the *Paramatma*.

## Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.6 [69]

#### *Prakaranat*

On account of the subject matter

This sutra also establishes the same idea that *visvadhara* is not *jiva* for which third reason is given. All reasons establish *visvadhara* is not *Jivatma*. The context, which is *Paramatma*, it is not *Jivatma*. Here *Vyasacharya* quotes mantra 1.1.3 of *Mundaka upanisad* that says *saunako ha vai mahasalo-'ngirasam vidhivad-upasannah papraccha, kasmin nu bhagavo vijnate saram-edam vijnataam bhavatiti* which means the great householder *saunaka* duly approaching *Angira* in the prescribed manner asked 'what is that, my Lord, having known which all these become known?' Contextually we understand many things. In the third mantra the student asks the question.

What is that knowing which we know everything. *Karana vijnanena karya vijnanam bhavati*. Therefore the question is what is the root cause of the universe. It is certainly not *Jivatma* and it is not the cause of the universe and he is suffering birth death cycle in the creation. *Isvarah Paramatma*. It talks about *jagat adhara Paramatma*. Whenever the mantra clearly does not talk about *Paramatma*, we should see the context and arrive at the conclusion. Here taking the context into account, we find that *visvadhara* is not *Jivatma* but *Paramatma* alone. Now we will see word analysis.

Supply three words of *prakaranat*, *visvadhara na pranavid prakaranat*. *Visvadhara* is not *Jivatma*. *Prakaranat* means context. Because of the context of *Paramatma* *Jivatma* is not *visvadhara*. The context is decided by the question asked. The answer must be related to the question. Now we will come to the sutra 7 and the final sutra of this *adhikaranam*.

## Topic 1. Dyubhvadyadhikaranam [sutras 1-7]

The abode of heaven earth etc., is Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.7 [70]



### *Sthityadanabhyam cha*

First we will do general analysis where he asserts visvadhara is not Jivatma. Vyasacharya argues in a very indirect way. For this we must see a mantra 3.1.1 of Mundaka upanishad *dvan suparna sayuja sakhaya samanam vrksam parisavajate tayor anyah vrksam parisavajate tayor anyah pppalam svady-svadv-atty-anasnam anyo abhicakasiti* the meaning of the mantra is two birds bound to each other in close friendship perch on the Self-same tree. One of them eats the fruits of the tree with relish, while the other [just] looks on, without eating.

Jivatma and Paramatma are located in the same tree and Jivatma is as distinct from Paramatma and the Upanishad specifically mentions the difference. Of the two Jivatma experiences karma phalam and the Paramatma bird witnesses Jivatma eating and enjoying. It only witnesses and it is a nonparticipator. In this mantra Upanishad wants to reveal Paramatma or Jivatma. Which is highlighted?

Adhi Sankaracharya Paramatma alone is tatparyam of mantra and not Jivatma the reason being Jivatma, as an experiencer of karma phalam Upanishad need not reveal and we know that and we experience it daily. That mantra reveals only Paramatma, which is distinct boktru Jivatma. Adhi Sankaracharya says Mundaka 3.1.1.

Aboktru Paramatma as distinct from Jivatma. If the previous mantra talks about pradhanam jivah then suddenly introducing Paramatma in this mantra will become out of context. If you take visvadhara is talking about Paramatma this mantra continues Paramatma topic and the flow will be without any jerk. This is the essence of the argument.

Sthithi means non-participation keeping aloof; he keeps in mind the Upanishad mantra 3.1.1. Of Mundaka upanishad adanam it is literally eating but here it is involvement. He keeps in mind the Jivatma bird eating as stated in the mantra in question. Because of nonparticipation and participation of Paramatma and Jivatma respectively in experiencing the karma phalam revealed in 3.1.1.of the mantra. Visvadhara is not Jivatma due to what is stated earlier.

With this adhikaranam is over. The subject matter visvadhara is Paramatma. Doubt is visvadhara is Paramatma or pradhanam of Sankya philosophy or Jivatma. Visvadhara is doubted because pradhanam is basic matter of the universe. It is can be the casue of jagat karanam is the argument of purva paksa. Visvadhara is also taken as Jivatma on the basis of the word Atma in the third line of Upanisadic statement. Jivatma can be justified as visvadhara because the whole world comes into being for the benefit of Jivatma. World has not punyam and papam. It comes inot being to exhaust the punya papa of Jivatma. For the world there is no karma phala because it is achetana vastu. If the world does not come for whose sake does it come. Ti comes to give sukha and dukha anubhava of Jivatma. Hence Jivatma is responsible for arrival of the universe and when prarapta is exhausted the whole world goes. Visvadhara can be taken as vayu because of the upanishadic statement in Brihadharaynaka upanishad that because of vayu the whole world survives. Just as prana is supporter of the individual being so vayu is the supporter of the universe. Then comes purva paksah. Anything wrong he will say. He says visvadhara is pradhanam or it should be Jivatma sarvasristi hetutvad; Gita support is there; Jivatma alone brings the world through his karma; visvadhara is vayu because of the Brihadaranyaka upanishad mantra. With this third factor is over.

Siddhanta says visvadhara is Paramatma or Brahma. The reasons are given in the first two sutras. One reason is Upanishad itself clarifies by using the word sarvajnah. It can neither be inert nor pradhanam nor it can be vayu or jiva; it is only sarvajna sarvavid Brahman alone. Pradhanam can never be the destination. Therefore also it has to be Brahman alone. Later in the next five sutras Vyasacharya negated vayu, jivah vadha also and therefore it is concluded that visvadhara is Paramatma alone. The position of the adhikaranam is rightly positioned. With this first adhikaranam is over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 91

### **Topic 2. Bhumadhikaranam [Sutras 8 – 9]**

Bhuma is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.8 [71]**

#### ***Bhuma samprasadadhyupadesat***

Bhuma [is Brahman] because it is taught after the state of deep sleep [i.e., after prana of the vital air which remains awake even in that state]

The next adhikaranam is called Bhumadhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. The first sutra begins with the word Bhuma. Here Vyasacharya analyses Chandogya upanisad mantra, which is 7.24.1. The mantra is *yatra nanyatpasyati nanyacchrnoti nanyadvijanati sa Bhumatha yatranyatpasyaty anyacchrnotyyanya dvijanati tadalpam yo vai Bhuma tadamrtamatha yadalpam tanmartyam sa bhagavah kasminpratisthita iti sve mahimni yadi va na mahimniti* the meaning of the mantra is if you attain Bhuma then you have real happiness. What is Bhuma? It is Brahman. It is the biggest and it is Infinite one. Something is Infinite when it is without any limitation in terms of time and space; even our own lives are limited. We were born at a certain point of time and we shall live for a certain span of time. It may be for a hundred years or it may be less, but the body will not last forever.

First I will give you the meaning of the mantra. It is known as Bhuma laksana mantrah. The word Bhuma means Brahman. It is Brahma laksana mantra and this gives the definition of Brahman, Brahman is that in which no seer sees anything with a seeing instrument, no hearer hears anything with hearing instrument and Brahman is that in which triputi is absent. Three factors known as subject object and instrument is called triputi. Brahman is that in which all the triputis are absent. We can define Brahman as nirvikalpam. Since it is advidiyam it has to be anandam also and the final meaning is Infinite. Then the Upanishad says wherever triputi is there wherever duality is there that is alpam; savikalpam sadvayam vastu is alpam, which means finite.

Then the mantra says Bhuma is Infinite that which is finite is subject to end and we have to add that yad Bhuma tad sukham; Bhuma is sukha swarupam and alpam is dukha swarupam. Bhuma is supporter of anything and itself is the unsupported supporter of all. This is the meaning of this mantra. We should know the background in which the mantra has come. This occurs in the seventh chapter of Chandogya upanisad, which is called Bhuma vidya chapter. It is called Bhuma vidya the word Brahman is replaced by Bhuma.

The seventh chapter begins with the student narada and teacher sanatkuma. Narada comes and tells sanatkumara that I have learnt all in my life. I know veda veda angas etc. But the tragedy is that I am educated miserable person. All knowledge has not brought any change in me. Previously I was ignorantly miserable and now I am knowledgably miserable. I know that you would have heard sokham admavid. I have heard Atma vid Brahma vid knower of Brahman crosses over sorrow. Atma means biggest one Atma means Bhuma. The biggest one

is Atma Infinite is Atma Bhuma is Atma knower of Bhuma will cross over sorrow. Teach me the biggest thing in creation. He does not want to show the biggest one because the human mind is small.

So he introduces the series of thing each one is bigger than the previous one. First item is nama and the last one is asha. This comes in seventh one to 14 sections. Nama is big and vak is bigger and still bigger and in this series asha is biggest one as Bhuma. Nama is Bhuma vak Bhuma manah Bhuma asha is the biggest one. In the 15<sup>th</sup> chapter he says life principle is bigger than all the fourteen items and prana is introduced as 15<sup>th</sup> item that is Infinite and that is sarvam visvadhara and prana sustains everything.

The Upanishad also says whoever knows prana he knows the biggest thing in creation. Prana vadhi is adhvadhi. Who knows prana and speaks about prana he knows biggest thing in creation. The Upanishad deals with prana tattvam elaborately. In 16<sup>th</sup> section he says prana vadhi is not adhi vadhi and he is abeksita adhi vadhi and one who knows and talks about Brahman alone is adhi vadhi.

The mischief is that first it says prana is biggest thing that dwells on the topic elaborately and says Brahman is biggest it says. And confusion is that prana is dealt with elaborately and it says Brahman is biggest is said casually. From 17<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> section various sadhanas are discussed. There is one sentence about Brahma vadhi while prana is talked about elaborately. In 24<sup>th</sup> section we get the definition of the biggest of the biggest thing. This is called by the name Bhuma. It is a common noun the 'biggest'. The biggest is said to be 'triputi rahitam'.

The Upanishad does not clearly say that it is biggest whether it refers to prana or Brahman in the 16<sup>th</sup> section. Now our question is which is the biggest Prana or Bhuma in the absence of any clear-cut definition. Had the Upanishad used the word Brahma there would not have been any problem. But it has not been done. Hence alone this sutra has found a place in the Brahma Sutra. Having seen the general background to this adhikaranam we shall discuss the analysis of the first sutra of this adhikaranam.

Our siddhanta says Bhuma is not prana but Brahman, the Paramatma alone. The essence of the first sutra is Paramatma. Vyasacharya says you study the order of the series. The series started with nama and the fourteenth item is asha and the fifteenth item is prana and the sixteenth item is Brahman. Nama, asha, prana and Brahman is sixteenth. Sanatkumara says later item is bigger than the previous one and in that order after prana Brahman has been presented and going by the same logic, we say Brahman is greater than prana and Brahman is absolutely great and prana is relatively great.

This is the positional difference, the seating arrangement is sixteen and after Brahman none is there so it is the greatest. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Bhuma samprasadat, adhi upadesat are the four words. Bhuma means Brahman; Bhuma is Brahman only samprasadat adhi upadesat. Bhuma means the biggest and it is derived from the words bahu. And Bhuma is abstract noun. Fullness is itself is called Bhuma. Bahutvam is Bhuma and it is fullness. It occurs in Chandogya upanisad 7.24.1. The next word is in this context samprasadat means pranah. One meaning is jivah. In that context you have to derive that the jiva in sleep. That is one meaning. Second meaning is sleep itself, a state in which one is calm. Calm state is also called samprasadat. The third meaning is prana. First jiva, second is Sushupti and the third is prana. How can we accept the meaning prana?

In sleep everything is resolved except one thing. That one thing is prana. If prana is resolved the person will be disposed of. The very fact all the activities are stopped but prana functions. In sleep prana alone is awake. The next word is adhi means after; that is after prana. Upadesat means teaching. The teaching of Brahman takes place after prana in Chandogya upanishad 7<sup>th</sup> chapter.

In fact, Prana is taught in the 15<sup>th</sup> section and Brahman is taught in the 16<sup>th</sup> section. Why is it so? It is just because Brahman is bigger than prana. In the last fifteen items Sanatkumara says earlier one is smaller and the latter one is bigger. This applies to this mantra alone. Therefore Bhuma is Brahman, alone which is bigger than prana. This is the word for word analysis of the first sutra.

Here Adhi Sankaracharya introduces a big purva paksha. He says that no doubt when we look at the series nama to Bhuma and fifteenth is prana and sixteenth is Bhuma. He says if you study the seires you study one thing. At the end of every item student asks the question teach me further what is the next bigger thing. Sanatkumara says the second etc. After prana is introduced narada asks no question at all. Purva paksha says the series is complete with the 15<sup>th</sup> item.

Sanatkumara goes on talking. Sishya is satisfied with prana answer, which has been elaborately discussed. Life principle is all pervading. Therefore with prana series is complete and therefore prana is the biggest one and the Bhuma in the next is bigger thing.

The second is that this item is given special title speaker of prana is biggest thing. This title is not given to anyone of the earlier things. The next argument is after talking about in 15<sup>th</sup> section, sanatkumara teaches all right and he does not talk of Brahman because the word Brahman does not occur Brahman. He talks of sadhanas only but he does not use Brahman anywhere. It talks of sathyam sadhana but he does not talk anything about Brahman. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 92

### **Topic 2. Bhumadhikaranam [Sutras 8 – 9]**

Bhuma is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.8 [71]**

#### ***Bhuma samprasadadadyupadesat***

Bhuma [is Brahman] because it is taught after the state of deep sleep [i.e., after prana of the vital air which remains awake even in that state]

This second adhikaranam is known as bhumadhikaranam and it analyses a mantra occurring in Chandogya upanisad. We now discuss a purva paksa where Bhuma laksanam is questioned. Our argument Brahman is talked about after prana although prana is bigger than the previous 15 items, Brahman alone is biggest as it is taught after prana. Now Adhi Sankaracharya introduces a purva paksa.

Purva paksa says that upto prana alone there is question answer series between Narada and Sanatkumara. The dialogue is between nama and prana and narada does not ask anything further and Sanatkumara speaker of prana is speaker of adhidhiva. Pranavadhi is given the title adhidhiva. Later section it does not talk about Brahman but some sadhana only. Therefore they contend that prana is the biggest one.

Second argument is that in the 24<sup>th</sup> section [7<sup>th</sup> chapter] where Bhuma laksanam is given perfectly fits with prana. He contends that the prana laksanam and Bhuma laksanam tallies. While defining Bhuma [7.24.1 of Chandogya upanisad] is that in which there is no triputi and there is no vikalpa and one does not see anything, one does not hear anything; triputi rahityam Bhuma laksanam. Purva Paksi argues that this fits in with prana. During the sleep everything is resolved except one thing and that one thing is prana and that is why Sushupti is known by the word prana also.

In Sushupti prana alone is there and therefore the word prana and Sushupti are synonymously used. The definition of Sushupti is triputi rahityam. Sushupti and prana are identical. Therefore definition of Sushupti is the definition is prana and triputi rahityam is definition of prana. Sushupti and prana is identical and prana is triputi rahita and in 24<sup>th</sup> mantra Bhuma is triputi rahita and therefore all the three are one and the same. Hence Bhuma is prana is equal to Sushupti and therefore nirvikalpah. In 24<sup>th</sup> section Bhuma is equated to sukham. Purva Paksi says when do you experience bliss, a continued bliss. In Jagrat it is rare; I swapna it comes and goes but in Sushupti it is continuous. Sushupti is equated to sukham.

Sushupti is equated to prana. Prana is equal to Sushupti and Sushupti is sukham and prana is equal to sukham. In 24<sup>th</sup> section it is said Bhuma is sukham and therefore all the four words are synonymous. Therefore Bhuma has got sukatvam, triputi rahityam and prana is also like that and therefore both are one and the same. So Bhuma is prana alone. The definition of prana and definition Bhuma perfectly tally. The Bhuma fits with prana the biggest one; prana

is biggest one as it pervades all human being. Prana is sarvatma and it is all pervading and therefore it deserves the name Bhuma. This is the second argument of Purva Pakshi. Now we have to answer the purva paksa.

We give five reasons in negating the purva paksa. First reason is based on 7.16 Chandogya upanisad where the mantra runs as *esa tu va ativadati yah saryenativadati so'ham bhagavah satyendativadaniti satyam tveva vijinasitavya miti satyam bhagavo vijinasa iti iti sodasah khandah* the meaning of this mantra is 'but a person must first know the truth. Then he is truly an ativadi.' Narada said 'I want to be an ativadi by knowing the truth' sanatkumara replied 'but one must earnestly desire to know the truth'. 'Sir I earnestly desire to know the truth' Narada said .

Esa tu va ativadati in the 15<sup>th</sup> section Chandogya upanisad the dialogue is over with prana. Not only that prana vadhi is given a title adhvadi. Unfortunately Narada was satisfied with this teaching., he was about to go away and even though Narada was not ready to learn further, the dialogue was not over from Sanatkumara angle. Therefore Sanatkumara revived the teaching. He continues the teaching. When he begins the teaching he commences with esa tu va ativadati the word tu is highlighted here. Tu means but. Whenever we use the word but reduce the intensity of what is said earlier. But dilutes the previously what is said.

In the 15<sup>th</sup> section pranavadi is ativadhi and in 16<sup>th</sup> section it shows that pranavadi is only an relative adhvadi. That means prana is absolutely big but relatively big and one the following thing is absolutely big. Esah means the following person. Not only that Upanishad uses the expression vai. Which means really. From that we come to know that prana is really big but the following person is the biggest and it one who is sathyavahdi is a real adhvadi. Sathyam means Brahman. Brahmadhvadi alone is real adhvadi. Pranavadi is pradeksita adhvadi and Brahma is real absolute adhvadi. This sathyam Brahma is talked about as Bhuma in 24<sup>th</sup> section. This Bhuma alone is later talked about as Atma in the Upanishad in 7.26.1 of Chandogya upanisad. This is the argument number one.

The next argument is in the beginning of the teaching has said sarathi sokam atmavid the knower of Atma crosses sorrow and therefore Upanishad should talk about Atma alone and not prana. Therefore 16<sup>th</sup> section 24<sup>th</sup> section and 26<sup>th</sup> section Atma should be the teaching and not prana of 15<sup>th</sup> section. This is the second argument.

Third argument is prana is mithya and mithya prana can never said to be greatest thing in the creation. We have several arguments in support of this. First thing is up to 15<sup>th</sup> section Upanishad talked about asha etc., and prana. When it wanted to talk to Brahman, it chooses the word sathyam. Namadi pranantham the Upanishad respective words but when it wants to talk about the word Brahman sathyam indicating all others are asathyam mithya.

Then another argument is in 26<sup>th</sup> section the Upanishad says Atma is great and it is all pervading. Having talked about Atma, 26<sup>th</sup> section it is said atmanah pranah jadhaha from Atma prana is born. Atma karanam prana is karyam; Atma is cause prana is effect; karana Atma sathyah and karya prana is mithya. In the 15<sup>th</sup> section mithya prana is talked about. In 16<sup>th</sup> section sathya Atma is talked about in fact here it is said that prana is not the ultimate. This is not Brahman. Prana is a manifestation of Brahman but not Brahman itself; in order to know Brahman one must know the truth; that is to say one must know the meaning behind the words. . 24<sup>th</sup> section talks about sathya Atma and it cannot be mithya prana. And that

sathya Atma is Brahman and the Brahman is named as Bhuma in this section. Hence Bhuma is biggest of all is proved beyond doubt. It can never talk about mithya prana.

In other Upanisads also it is clear that the prana is mithya. Prasnopanisad *atmana esa prano jayate yathaisa puruse chayai tasminn etad atatam mano krten ayaty asmin sarire* [3.3. Of Prasna Upanishad] this prana is born or the Atman, the Self, as shadow is born of the man so is the prana spread out on the Atman. By the actions of the mind, it enters into this body. As mithya shadow is born of Sathya Purusa so is prana is mithya can never said to be greatest thing and therefore prana is not Bhuma.

Purva paksa said that prana fulfills all the definitions of Bhuma. Adhi Sankaracharya says no doubt it fits in but not perfectly. He said paid is free from triputi in Sushupti. Adhi Sankaracharya says that this freedom from triputi is relative freedom and this is not totally absent but if is only in dormant condition. We don't glorify samadhi very much. Because in samadhi if a person experiences nirvikalpa the absence of triputi is temporary and it is not a permanent case. Triputi rahityam of Sushupti, samadhi, samprasat is temporary but Brahman is permanently nirvikalpa.

Therefore should I go to samadhi for nirvikalpam. That is not real nirvikalpam. Once you come back it is savikalpam. We are not interested in experienced nirvikalpam. We are interested in the knowledge of nirvikalpam in all the three states, jagrat swapna and Sushupti and we want the knowledge of nirvikalpam. We are interested in jagrat and study in jagrat and we should become nirvikalpam in waking. Perceived this is savikalpam and really I will be in nirvikalpa state from Paramarthika angle. For communication the most important is eye contact. That is very important. Therefore open the eyes and experience Advaidam that I am. Therefore pranasya triputi rahityam abeksikam. Bhuma is not prana and it is Brahman alone.

Purva paksa now says prana is equitable to sukham also. So called sukham which comes temporarily in Sushupti can never be real sukha. It is available in all state. Brahman alone is adhyantika sukham.

The next argument prana is Bhuma for it is all pervading. For that our answer dthe bigness of prana is also abeksikam compared to be more pervading and prana is not said to be all pervading. Brahman is said to be even more pervading than Akasa itself. How can prana be the biggest. It is big but it is not the biggest. Brahman has got everything adhyantikam. Because of these reasons prana is not Bhuma and Brahman alone is Bhuma. Now we will go to the second sutra.

## **Topic 2. Bhumadhikaranam [Sutras 8 – 9]**

Bhuma is Brahman

### **Sutra 1.3.9 [72]**

#### ***Dharimopapattescha***

And because the attributes [declared in the scriptural passage to Bhuma] appropriately one to the pure Brahman.



First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that when you read other Upanisads all definitions of Bhuma tally with that of Brahman or atman given elsewhere. They don't fit in with prana. Whenever there is a vague statement in one statement you take the clear statement from another Upanishad. Suppose Krishna says in 3.20 of Gita *karmanai'va hi samsiddim asthita janakadayah lokasamgraham cad'pi sampasayan karyam arhasi* so it was even by works that janaka and others attained to perfection. Thou should do works also with a view in the maintenance of the world. There is doubt whether karma will give moksa or one has to gain jnana to gain moksa. Karma is neither is only means of moksa nor it is one of the means of moksa.

Here also Bhuma is sukham the world in 7.24 of Chandogya upanishad and Bhuma either refer to prana or Brahman. Hence we go to some other Upanishad. Sukha dharma belongs to dharma alone and not to prana. All the other attributes also belongs to Brahman alone and another Upanishad says only when one discovers triputi will be fully negated. In Sushupti triputi is dormant. *Sukhatva dharmanah brahmanah eva*. All pervasiveness also belong to Brahman only.

This we see in Isavasya upanishad *sa paryogin chukam akayam avramam asna viragm suddham apapu viddham kavir manasi praibhuh svayambhuh yatha tathyatah arthan vyadadhac chasva fibhyah samabhyah* the meaning is He, the Atman, is all pervading bright, bodiless, scatheless without muscles, pure, unpierced by evils. Wise, omniscient, transcendent and Self-existing, He alone allotted their respective functions [duties] to the various eternal years [creators]. Bhuma it is clearly said in Isavasya upanishad. All pervasiveness of Brahman is said in various other Upanisads and therefore here the word Bhuma refers to Brahman and not prana.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 93

### **Topic 2. Bhumadhikaranam [Sutras 8 – 9]**

Bhuma is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.9 [72]**

#### ***Dharimopapattescha***

And because the attributes [declared in the scriptural passage to Bhuma] appropriately one to the pure Brahman.

We do the second adhikaranam of Bhumadhikaranam. Through this analysis Vyasacharya establishes that Bhuma is Brahman alone. The main purva paksa introduced was pranavadi who claimed that Bhuma is nothing but prana. Adhi Sankaracharya refuted pranavadi's argument. After negating prana purvapaksa we had taken up the general analysis of the second sutra. Here all the features of Bhuma in the mantra 7.24 of Chandogya upanisad can fit into Brahman alone and not for prana. All the qualities of Bhuma said in the above mantra fit into Brahman alone. Several qualities are given.

First is beyond darsana Vyavahara aditatvam. Hearing and seeing transactions are not there for Bhuma. Our argument of Vyavahara aditatvam fit into Brahman only and prana goes out of Vyavahara then the person will sleep. Because of prana's Vyavahara all things take place. Vyavahara aditatvam belongs to Brahman and not prana. We have Isavasya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 4.5.15 says *yatra tva asya sarvam atmaivabhut, tat itara itaram tat kena kam jughred tat kena kam rasayet tat kena kam abhivadet, tat kena kam srnuyat, tat kena kam manvita, tat kena tam kena vijaniyat, sa esa neti nety Atma*. Brihadharaynaka upanisad clearly points out Brahman Vyavahara aditatvam is established. Who will see what and with what? Subject object and instruments are negated. Therefore Vyavahara aditatvam belongs to Brahman and not prana.

Second feature given is sukhatvam or happiness is the second feature given to Bhuma and this belongs to Brahman and not to prana. This is also revealed in various other Upanisads. Ananda Atma also we find this fact in Taittiriya Upanishad also.

Yovai Bhuma tadai amritam amritatvam is another quality of Bhuma. This can belong to Brahman alone and not to prana. Eternity or permanence belongs to Brahman and not to prana. Prana is marthyam. It is not amritam. Bhuma is amritam.

Next feature is swamahima prasthistitvatvam. It is independence. It is Self-reliance or Self sufficiency. It is given in 7-12 of Chandogya upanisad. Here Sanatkumara says Bhuma is supported by anyone but is supports itself. It is independent. Independence belongs to Brahman alone and not to prana. Nobody lives because of prana but Upanishad says prana survives something else which is called Atma or Brahman. Prana can never be Self reliant because prana is karyam and it has to depend upon karanam. Brahman is cause of everything and hence independent but prana is the effect and hence dependent on Brahman.

Sarvagatatvam is the fifth feature. It is given in 7.25.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Bhuma is in front is behind is in right is in left and it is everywhere. This sarvagatatvam is the feature of Brahman alone and it cannot be the feature of prana. Sarvagatha Bhuma is Brahman alone and not prana.

Sarvatmatvam 7.25.1 Chandogya upanisad; sarvatmatvam is the feature of Brahman alone and not of prana. Hence Bhuma alone is Brahman and not prana.

This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis. We have to supply Bhuma and Brahma. Bhuma dharma dharmopapattescha the word occurring in Chandogya upanisad 7.24 is Brahman only. Dharma upapattescha itself is a compound word dharma and upapatteh dharma means properties; properties of Bhuma mentioned in this section or in this chapter [six properties said above] upapatteh means because they fit; because six dharmas or bhumas mentioned in this chapter fit in with Brahman only. The next word is cha that means also. This is to add to the reasons previously given. With this the adhikaranam is over.

Vishayah is Bhuma occurring in 7.24.1 of Chandogya upanisad. The controversy is whether it is prana or Brahman. The word Bhuma means big one. It is that which is big. The third item is purva paksha. They say that Bhuma is prana alone. It is because the dialogue between guru and shishya concluded with prana. Each item is bigger than the previous item. In the gradation prana happens to be the last one and the dialogue is over with prana. Our conclusion is that Bhuma is not prana and it is Brahman only. We have presented various reasons in the two sutras. Dialogue continues without shishya asking no more questions. Initially it is called sathya, then Atma and then called Bhuma. Therefore Bhuma is Brahman and definitely not Atma. Now we will see the next adhikaranam

### **Topic 3. Aksaradhikaranam [Sutras 10-12]**

Akshara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.10[73]**

#### ***Aksharamambarantadhrith***

The imperishable [is Brahman] on account of [its] supporting everything upto Akasa [ether]

This is the third adhikaranam of the third pada and it is called aksharadhikaranam. First I will give you the general analysis of the entire adhikaranam that consists of three sutras. It is called so because the first sutra starts with the word akshara. Here Vyasacharya analyses a Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra which occurs in mantra 3.8.8.

The mantra is *so hocaca etadvat tadaksaram gargi brahmana abhivadanti asthulamanvahasvamadirgham alohitam asnehamacchayam, atamovayavanakasam, asangamarasam, agandhamacaksuskam, asrotram, avagamanatejaskam, apranamamukham, amatram, anantaram, abahyam, na todasnati kincana, na todasnati kascana* [Mantra 3.8.8. Brihadharaynaka upanisad] he said 'that O Gargi, the knower of Brahma, call the imperishable.

It is neither gross nor fine, neither short nor long, neither glowing red[like fire]nor not adhesive [like water] [it is] neither shadow nor darkness , neither air nor space, unattached, without taste, without smell, without eyes, without breath, without a mouth, without measure, having no within and no without. It eats nothing and no one eats it. It is the changeless reality.

In this mantra the word aksharam is occurring and it is analysed. Now we will see the background of the mantra. We have an interesting story in the third chapter of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. There is a competition and many learned people had come to the contest. Janaka wanted to find out who is the best scholar and he offered 1000 cows with gold attached to the horns as prize money for the best scholar selected from the assembly. When all were wondering,

Yajnavalkya asked one of his disciple samsvara took the cows even before the debate was over. All asked Yajnavalkya 'do you think that you are the best scholar'. Yajnavalkya was polite and he said he took the cow because he wanted the cows. In each section one one brahmana comes and asks the question. Among them was on lady known as Gargy. She was a Brahma vahini. She asked questioned twice. In the sixth Brahmanam she comes and again she appears in 8<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam. To avoid confusion this Brahmanam is called Aksharam Brahma.

The entire cosmos is supported by what is the first question. Yajnavalkya answers akase. Akasa supports the whole thing. Here the word Akasa has got a special name. What is the support of Akasa including the space. What is the ultimate karanam, which is called maya avyakta Akasa. Then Gargy says you are great. Then she asks the next question. What is that on which akasa itself is based and what is the substratum of avyakruta Akasa. To that question Yajnavalkya answers the question. The substratum maya is that I got from my guru. That is called aksaram. This is the substratum of the entire space. Aksaram has been defined as it does not have smell touch short etc, and it is Nirgunam, Nirgunam Brahman supports maya and maya supports the creation. What is the problem and why it is included in Brahma Sutra.

The Upanishad has not used the word Brahman and instead using Brahman it has used the word Aksharam. The word Aksharam has got so many meanings. If you take the most popular meaning Aksharam it is letter. Therefore the debate whether it refers to a letter or to Brahman. Purva Pakshi says it refers to varnah and the popular meaning he has applied. It is called primary meaning that is Aksharam. Therefore this adhikaranam is there. It is not varna and it is only Brahman we are going to establish in this adhikaranam.

Now we will see the first sutra. Vyasacharya says Aksharam is Brahman and it is supported to be the support of everything up to maya or Akasa. Therefore the universal support has got to be the Brahman alone. Akasa samastha prapanchasya adharatvad brahmaiva.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. You have to supply one word that is Brahma. Aksaram Brahma ambaranta dhriteh. The word is occurring in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.8.8. Is the meaning of the word Aksharam. You have to add the word Brahman and not an alphabetic letter. Ambaranta dhriteh. It has three words ambara anta dhriteh. Ambara means Akasa; anta means everything up to; dhriteh because of sustenance, the holding etc. Because of sustenance of everything up to is Akasa.

Adhi Sankaracharya puts a purva paksa. He says that I know that alphabetical letter will sustain the universe. Regular letter will not support the world. Here it is special letter which is glorified. There is an Aksharam called om. This can be called, as omkara rupa aksaram is the sarva adharah. If you are not convinced I will give the sruti support also. Om iti idahm sarvam [Taittiriya Upanishad] omkara is everything and it is everything past, present and future. Therefore, it is not Brahman. Omkara can support everything including Akasa. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 94

### **Topic 3. Aksaradhikaranam [Sutras 10-12]**

Akshara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.10[73]**

#### ***Aksharamambarantadhrith***

The imperishable [is Brahman] on account of [its] supporting everything up to Akasa [ether]

This is the third adhikaranam of the third pada. Here Yajnavalkya reveals Aksharam as the ultimate support of everything. The definition of Aksharam is one of the most important definitions, which Adhi Sankaracharya often quotes. Here Brahman is revealed negatively. It is not revealed negatively free from everything. All properties are negated. Sensory properties are negated; all elements are negated. Aksharam is Nirgunam Brahma is revealed. The controversy is that Aksharam is a letter ambaram refers to samastha Prapancha. The word ambaram normally means Akasa but here it is maya or avyakruta Akasa or everything up to maya. Dhriteh means being the support. Aksharam is Nirgunam Brahman only and covers entire Prapancha including maya. This we saw in the last class. Now I will continue the purva paksa I had taken up in the last class.

Purva paksa says that aksaram, the letter is the primary meaning and vachyartham only should be taken. Our answer that primary meaning should be given importance and if it does not fit in the context, we have to take to the secondary meaning. Primary meaning should be applied and if does not fit we have to take the secondary meaning, he it does not fit. Aksharam is presented as sarva adharah. No aphetical letter can be sarva adharah. In this context I am not taking the ordinary letter and I take that syllable which is omkara Aksharam is sarva adharah. In support of his contention he gives sruti pramanam also. 2.23.3 of Chandogya upanisad omkaraha eva idam sarvam. In Taittiriya Upanishad 8.1.1 it is seen omi Brahman omitidagm sarvam omkara is presented as sarvatmakam. In Mandukya Upanishad also we find a mantra in support of the above. Because of this purva paksa concludes that Aksharam refers to omkara sabda eva and not Brahman.

Our answer is that even omkara Aksharam cannot be sarva adharah. Maximum you can claim is that omkara is adhara of the words and it can never be claimed as sarva padartha adhara. It is sarva pada adhara and it cannot be sarva padartha adhara. Omkara is itself a sound produced which is subject to beginning and the end. Omkara is a sabda, which is a property of Akasa when Akasa itself is, subject to beginning and end what to talk of omkara, which is only a property of Akasa. Anithya omkara cannot be taken as sarva adhara. If it is taken as supporter of everything and it cannot be then supporter of Akasa. Akasa supports Omkara and therefore omkara sabda can never support of Akasa, our contention cannot be sarva adhara. This is logic. It is also against anubhava viroda. No word can support the creation, it is against our anubhava and yukti also. Then purva paksa asks the next question how do you explain all the omkara mantra and sruti statements. Then Adhi Sankaracharya argues even sruti statements are against anubhava and yukti pramana. We will accept those sruti, which

do not violate anubhava virodha. Aksaram is not omkara and aksaram is Brahman alone. Adhi Sankaracharya gives further argument when primary meaning does not fit into the context we have to take the derived meaning. The derived meaning of aksaram Adhi Sankaracharya gives. The first derivation is from the root to perish. Aksaram means that which is eternal and what is eternal is Brahman alone. Therefore it is concluded that Aksharam refers to Brahman alone. The all pervading one is aksharam. Eternal all pervading Brahman is called Aksharam. All pervading one is adhara of everything including Aksharam. Omkara is not all pervading. Only Brahman is all pervading. Eternal all pervading Brahman is indicated by the word Aksharam and that all pervading one can only be the adhara of everything. Now we will enter the second sutra,

### **Topic 3. Aksaradhikaranam [Sutras 10-12]**

Akshara is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.11[74]**

#### ***Sa cha prasasanat***

The [supporting] on account of the command [attributed to the imperishable, can be the work of the Supreme Self only and not of the pradhanam]

We will do general analysis first. In the previous sutra it was said that Aksharam is Brahman alone because it is sarva adhara. When this is said the Sankya philosopher argues that Aksharam is not an alphabetic letter and he says why should it be taken as pradhanam when pradhanam is qualified to be pradhanam. Pradhanam in Sankya philosophy is moola prakriti sometimes he calls prakriti sometimes he calls it avyaktam and our Vedantic equivalent is maya the basic matter because this basic matter is sarva adharah, and ultimately the whole creation. Vedantins says sarva adhara is Brahman. Now Vyasacharya has to negate pradhanam.

Sarva adharam cannot be and is not pradhanam. The reason is prasasanat. That is the approach of Vyasacharya. The reason he takes from the Upanishad itself. 3.8.9 of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In the 8<sup>th</sup> mantra Aksharam is defined as sarva adhara. The mantra reads as *etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi suryacandramasau vidhrtau tisthatah, etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dyavaprthivya vihdrte tisthatah, etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi nimesa muhurta ahoratnyardhamasa masa rtavah samvatsara iti sidhrtastisthanti; etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi pracyonya nadyah syandonte svetebhyah parvatebhyah, praticyonyah, yam yam ca dismanu, etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dadatp ,amisuj [rasamsanit yajamanam devah, darvim pitaronvayattah.*

The meaning of the mantra runs as verily, under the rule of this Imperishable, O Gargi the sun and the moon are held in their respective courses; sky and earth are held in their respective positions; moments, hours days and nights, fortnights, months, seasons and years are held in their respective positions; some rivers flow to the east from the snowy mountains, other flow to the west each keeping to their respective directions; those who give, shining ones depend on the sacrificer and the departed ones on the independent offerings.

Etasya aksarasya prasasanam here the prasasanam means to govern or ruling or commandment. Therefore because of the commandment of Aksharam the world is

maintaining its order. Now Vyasacharya says prasasanam or commandment can be done by Chetanam or achetanam. The ruling is done not by local AK 47 but it is done by chetana tattvam which is Paramatma; achetana prakriti can rule the world. Therefore Aksharam is not pradhanam because of the upanisadic usage of the ruling or commandment. This is the function of only the chetana tattvam.

We will do the word for word analysis. It consists of three words sa; cha; and prasasanat; you have to supply a word Brahma karma therefore sa brahmakarma prasasanat; sa means that and in this context ambaranta dhredih which means supporting the whole universe or holding the entire universe together; the supplied word is Brahma karma which means the function of Brahman; that sustenance of the entire world is the function of Brahman alone and not the function of pradhanam. Why we say so prasasanat which means prasasana sravanat, because of the Upanisadic usage of the word commandment or the word governance or the ruling.

How does the use of word commandment is that commandment means only chetana tattvam can command and not achetana pradhanam cannot command. Sustenance of the world is the function of Paramatma because of the usage of the word commandment and the commandment has to be of chetana tattvam and that tattvam is Aksharam and that Aksharam is brahmaiva and not pradhanam. We have talked about the word cha and the word prasasanat and now comes the word cha.

Adhi Sankaracharya does not say anything. Sub commentators say cha based on reasoning. The essence of the sutra up to Akasa is the function of Brahman and not pradhanam. Pradhanam is not sustainer up to ambaram Akasa. The meaning of ambaram or Akasa does not mean regular Akasa but avyakrita Akasa or avyaktam and this Avyaktam itself is called pradhanam.

That means we talk about the support of pradhanam also. When we talk about the support of pradhanam and support of pradhanam cannot be pradhanam itself for pradhanam is the supported. We talk about the supporter and we are not talking of supported pradhanam. Therefore the supporter Aksharam has got to be pradhana binnam Brahmam. With this second sutra is over.

### **Topic 3. Aksaradhikaranam [Sutras 10-12]**

Akshara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.12[75]**

#### ***Anyabhavavyavrittiscaha***

And on account of [the sruti] separating [the Akshara] from that nature is different [from Brahman]

This reason Vyasacharya did not directly give but he has given it indirectly. In this sutra also Vyasacharya says Aksharam is not pradhanam. He says again by quoting another Upanishad mantra and sruti indirectly negates pradhanam in a letter mantra. The mantra taken is 3.8.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The mantra reads as *tadva etadaksaram gagyadrstam drastr, asuntam strotr, amatam matr, avijnatram vijnatr; nanyadatosit drastyā, nanyadato'sit strotr, nanyadato'sit mantr; nanyadato'sit' vijnatr; etasminnu khalvaksae garyakasa otasca*



*protasceti* the meaning is verily, O Gargy that imperishable is never seen but is the Seer, is never heard but is the Hearer; is never thought of but is the Thinker, than this; there is no other knower than this; across this imperishable, O Gargi is space [Akasa] woven, warp and woof.

Sarvadhara Aksharam is the hearer of everything, never known it is ever the knower and Aksharam ever the experiencer never the experienced. Our question is whether Aksharam is chetanam Brahman or achetanam pradhanam. Here in this mantra Aksharam is presented as ever the experiencer and it can be only chetanam Brahman and achetanam pradhanam can never be the experiencer. Sruti itself negates pradhanam. It negates the properties of pradhanam which is inertness. It talks about sentiency and by talking about sentiency it negates insentiency and it negates property of pradhanam and by negating the property of pradhanam it negates pradhanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 95

### **Topic 3. Aksaradhikaranam [Sutras 10-12]**

Akshara is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.12[75]**

#### ***Anyabhavavyavritttescaha***

And on account of [the sruti] separating [the Akshara] from that nature is different [from Brahman]

The substratum of the entire universe is seen as Aksharam which is nothing but Brahman. This is negated by the Sankya philosophers. This pradhanam is negated in second sutra saying that Aksharam is the commander of this universe. Aksharam is not only the ruler as also the substratum. Aksharam pradhanam can be substratum but it cannot be the ruler. Jada pradhanam cannot be the ruler. If Aksharam is Brahman, then the Brahman happens to be the prasasana karta the ruler also. Now we see the third sutra where I pointed out that the third sutra also negates the pradhanam.

Aksharam cannot be pradhanam. There is another statement occurs the sruti vakyam negates the main pradhanam attribute indirectly pointing out that Aksharam is Brahman and not pradhanam. In 3.8.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad the attributes of aksaram is given. Aksaram is chetana tattvam and it indirectly reveals it is chetanam. Thinker hook knower hood etc., is possible only for the chetana aksaram and it cannot be achetana pradhanam.

The mantra reads as *tadva etadaksaram grgyadrstam drastir, asrutam srotr, amatam matr, avijnatram vijatr, nanyadato'sti drastya, nanyadato'sit srotr, nanyadato'sit mantr, nanayadato'sit vijnatr, etasminnu khavaksare gargyakasa otasca protasceti* the meaning of the mantra is verily, o Gargy, that imperishable is never seen but in the seer, is never heard but is the hearer, is never thought of but is the Thinker, is never known but is the Knower, there is no other Seer than this; there is no other Hearer than this; there is no other thinker than this; there is no other Knower than this; Across this imperishable, O Gargi is space [Akasa] woven, warp and woof. Therefore also aksaram is chetanam Brahma not achetana pradhanam. Now we will go to the word analysis.

There are three words sa three words we have to supply Aksharam na pradhanam cha and prasasanat. Aksharam mentioned in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.8.8., that reads as *so hocaca etadvat tadaksaram gargi brahmana abhivadanti asthula manvahasvama dirgham alohitam asnehamacchayam, atamovayavanakasam, asangamarasam, agandhama caksuskam, asrotram, avagamanatejaskam, apranamamukham, amatram, anantaram, abahyam, na todasnati kincana, na tadasnati kascana* [Mantra 3.8.8.Brihadharaynaka upanisad] he said 'that O Gargi, the knower of Brahma, call the imperishable. It is neither gross nor fine, neither short nor long, neither glowing red [like fire]nor not adhesive [like water] [it is] neither shadow nor darkness , neither air nor space, unattached, without taste, without smell, without eyes, without breath, without a mouth, without measure, having no within and no

without. It eats nothing and no one eats it. It is the changeless reality. Twenty-three properties are negated in this mantra.

Na pradhanam it is not pradhanam. It is not the basic matter. Anya bhava vyavrutte this is one common word anya bhava vyavrutte anya means the other one. Since we want to establish Brahman here the other one is one other than Brahman the pradhanam. Then bhavah means attributes, the properties of pradhanam again this means achetanatvam dharmah; vyavritteh being negated by the Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam 3.8.11.

This does not directly negate pradhanam but it says indirectly. Since the properties of pradhanam name inertness is negated by the sruti vakyam 3.8.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad, the Aksharam cannot be taken as pradhanam. Next word is ca; it is a simple conjunction and that adds the previous conclusion. With this the word for word analysis is over. Here Adhi Sankaracharya has given another note. It is extension to the word ca.

We negate another possible purva paksa also. If you take 3.8.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad aksaram is taken as thinker, knower etc., purva paksa may argue aksara is chetana tattvam is established but the same chetana tattvam may be Jivatma chetana tattvam or Paramatma chetana tattvam. Why do you take it as Paramatma and why not take it as Jivatma. Second times you study the sutra and negate Jivatma. Anyabhava should not be taken as Jivatma. Vyavritteh means Jivatma properties are also negated by the sruti.

Where does the sruti negates Jivatma dharma. It is negated in 3.8.8. Itself. *Asthula manvahasvama dirgham alohitam asnehamacchayam, atamovayavanakasam, asangamarasam, agandhama caksuskam, asrotram, avagamanatejaskam, apranamamukham, amatram, anantaram, abahyam, na todasnati kincana, na tadasnati kascana* it defines Aksharam as without any properties. Therefore Jivatma is endowed with all the organs. Aksharam is free from sense organs and therefore aksaram must be taken as sariratriya rahita Paramatma alone not sariratriya sahita Jivatma. The sruti negates both pradhanam and Jivatma and hence Aksharam is Brahman alone.

Visayah, subject matter occurring in 3.8.8 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is called Akshara Brahmanam. Samsayah is whether Aksharam means omkara or whether it means pradhanam or it means Jivatma or it means Paramatma. Purva paksa gives all wrong views. One says omkara the primary meaning of the word Aksharam; second purva paksa says it is pradhanam as it is presented as substratum of the whole world; third purva paksa says Aksharam is Jivatma only; it is said to be seer, hearer etc.

With this purva paksa is over. Siddhanta says and concludes that it is Paramatma alone because the description of Aksharam tallies with Paramatma alone. It is substratum, it is the ruler and it is without organs. Substratum omkara syllable is ruled out; because it is ruler the pradhanam is ruled out; it is without organs so Jivatma is ruled out; Paramatma alone has got all the three attributes.

Gita 8.3 also clarifies and supports siddhanti's views Aksharam is Brahman in this sloka *aksaram Brahma pramam svabhavo 'dhytmam ucvate bhutabhavadbhavakaro visargah karmasamjnitah* this means Brahma or the Absolute] is the indestructible, the Supreme [higher than all else] essential nature is called the Self. Karma is the anemgiven to the creative force that belongs beings into existence. Brahman assumes the form of jiva [chapter 15.7.] With this fourth item is over. Sangathi is that it is placed in the appropriate place only.

## Topic 4. Ikshatikarmavyapadesadhikaranam [Sutras 13]

The highest person to be meditated upon is the highest Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.13[76]

#### *Ikshatikarmavyapadesat sah*

Because of His being mentioned as the object of sight, He [who is to be meditated upon is Brahman]

I will give you a general analysis of this adhikaranam. It is known as Ikshadhikarma vyapadesat and hence ikshatikarmavyapadesadhikaranam. The statement analysed here is a vakyam occurring in Pasnopanishad. The mantra runs as *yah punaretum trimatrena-om-ityetenaiv-aksarena-Param purusam-abhidhyayita sa tejasi surye sampananah yatha padodarastvaca, vinir, mucyata evam ha vai sa papmana vinir-muktah sa samabhir unniyate Brahma lokam sa eatasmaj-jivaghanat Parat-Param purnasayam purusamiksate tad etau slokau bhavatah* [V.5 of Prasna Upanishad] the meaning of this mantra is but if again he meditates on this highest Purusa with the help of this very syllable Aum by all its three matras-s, he becomes untied with the bright sun,. As a snake is freed from its skin, so is he freed from all sins. He is led by the Sama hymns to the world of Brahma, the creator, and from Him – the mass of life [that Hiranyagarbha is] – he beholds the Supreme Purusa residing in the heart. There are the two following verses about it.

This mantra is going to be analysed here. Prasna Upanishad is called so because there are six disciples come to one Guru Pippalada and the latter answers the questions asked by the sishyas. Now we deal with the sixth question asked by Sathya Kama Pipplada dialogue. Here student asks about Omkara. Pippalada answers and he says Omkara can stand for both Nirgunam Brahman and Sagunam Brahman, both karanam Brahma and karyam Brahma and it stands for Para and apara Brahma and Para Brahma is called Paramatma and apara Brahma stands for Hiranyagarbha.

The same thing we get in Kathopanishad also. *Etad-dhyeya-ksaram Brahma etad dhyeya ksaram Param etad dhyeya ksaram jnatva yo yad icchati tasya tat* [I-ii.16 of Kathopanishad] the meaning of this mantra is ‘this word is verily Brahman alone. This word is also the highest, he who knows this word obtains, verily, whatever [of the two] he desires. Here Brahma means lower or Sagunam Brahman and the higher means Nirgunam Brahman.

Then Pippalada talks about Omkara Upasana. In first Upasana akara is talked about and in the second Upasana he talks about ukara is highlighted and in the third all the three letters are highlighted. The first two are not important and the third alone Omkara is fully taken. That full Omkara Upasana is given in the 5<sup>th</sup> mantra. Through that Omkara one should Para Purusa Upasana through trimatra Omkara. This line is the line for enquiry. Param purusam avidyayeta. What is meant by Para Purusa is over controversy? We take it as Paramatma alone which we will establish. He will not get mukti here and he will become one with Hiranyagarbha. Surya mandala is the place through which he will travels to Brahma loka. He will be free from all papams and he will become tremendous purity like a snake is free its skin. The front portion of the body will become the body. This Upasaka will be free from papa skin. He casts off his papa skin and he will free, he is taken to Brahma loka by various devatas.

Among various devatas one set of devatas are called sama veda devatas. There in Brahma loka, he will attend Brahmaji's classes on Brahma vidya. As a result of Brahmaji's teaching he will know the Param purusam. And he will practise Paramatma Upasana and he will know about Paramatma and this jnanam will give him moksah. According to us Omkara rupena Paramatma upasana Brahma loke Paramatma jnanam bhavati mukto bhavati.

Incidentally you should not that he practices Paramatma Upasana and then in Brahma loka he will get Paramatma jnanam. While practicing Paramatma Upasana he will not get Paramatma jnanam. How can he practise Paramatma Upasanam without knowing Paramatma jnanam? This upasaka does not Paramatma fully and he has got paroksa jnanam of Paramatma as sathyam jnanam anantam etc.

And he does know Paramatma but he meditates on unknown Paramatma, which is known indirectly and invokes on Omkara and what he has done is upon Omkara he has invoked Paramatma. Even though he does not Paramatma he invokes Paramatma on Omkara. This is like invoking Shiva on a stone, which is solidly known to me. Paramatma is unknown all right but he knows Omkara. This upasaka get krama mukti. What is the controversy here?

The controversy is Omkara rupena Param Purusa in the form of Omkara. Since the word Purusa is a vague word which can be used for any thing including male being on wards to everything. The question is what does Para Purusa means. Purva paksa says Para Purusa stands for Hiranyagarbha I would like to take Para Purusa as Brahman alone and it is not Para Purusa. Hiranyagarbha jnanam is presented here and according to siddhantis Isvara jnanam is prescribed in this mantra.

Now with this we will do the general analysis of this sutra. In this Vyasacharya says the Para Purusa which is the object of meditation is Paramatma only. It is not Hiranyagarbha. The proof is taken from the same mantra alone. The controversy is the first part of the mantra and proof is there in the final part of the mantra where the phalam is given. The phalam is stated to be Paramatma iksayam that is Paramatma jnanam. From this we have to establish that is Paramatma. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 96

### **Topic 4. Ikshatikarmavyapadesadhikaranam [Sutras 13]**

The highest person to be meditated upon is the highest Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.13[76]**

#### ***Ikshathikarmavyapadesat sah***

Because of His being mentioned as the object of sight, He [who is to be meditated upon is Brahman]

We now analyse the fourth adhikaranam known as ikshatikarmavyapadesadhikaranam. I will continue the general analysis of this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam relates to Prasna Upanishad. The first part deals with dhyana vakyam and second part with dhyana phalam. The dhyanam prescribed here is Para Purusa dhyanam in the form of Omkara. The rest of the mantra deals with the benefit to the upasaka. The meaning of the phalam is that this upasaka will get krama mukti and there in Brahma loka he will get Atma jnanam and from there he will gain moksa.

The controversy is that in the dhyana vakyam it is said Para Purusa in the form of Omkara and the word Para Purusa is a vague expression referring to male, jiva, Hiranyagarbha, and many things. Here the doubt is what is Para Purusa. Purva paksa argues it is Hiranyagarbha only. This is going to be purva paksa. Our argument is that Para Purusa refers to Brahman only. We do not make any difference between Isvara and Brahman. Siddantis say Para Purusa refers to Brahman alone.

In support of our conclusion Vyasacharya takes the phala vakyam of the same mantra. The phala vakyam is a long one. Towards the end there is an expression and from them we take three words as Param purusam and ikshade. Phalam is Param Purusa and ikshade. Object of meditation is one should meditate upon Para Purusa and Para Purusa ikshanam is the phalam. Ikshanam means jnanam. Para Purusa jnanam is the phalam. Para Purusa upasanam is sadhanam and Para Purusa jnanam is the phalam. This is the essence of this mantra.

Para Purusa jnanam means is it Hiranyagarbha or Isvara is the controversy. If in the dhyana vakyam if Para Purusa is vague take the meaning from the phala vakyam to ascertain the right meaning. Vyasacharya argues in the phala vakyam should refer to Paramatma alone and not Hiranyagarbha. Once you Purusa the phala vakyam is Isvara you can derive in the Upasana also Para Purusa is meant.

The argument is Hiranyagarbha jnanam can never be given as phalam of any sadhana. It is so because Hiranyagarbha jnanam does not give me any benefit at all. Knowing Hiranyagarbha does not give any benefit. If at I get any benefit after knowing Hiranyagarbha and if I practise I become one with Hiranyagarbha and then I get the benefit. It is like knowing the existence but not practicing. Knowing the exercise is of no use if it is not practiced. The benefit will come only when you do the exercise. Knowledge of Hiranyagarbha cannot give any phalam.

Knowledge of Paramatma will give moksha. It is ajnana nivrutti. Adhyasa nivrutti moksasya prapti bhavati. Param purusam ikshade will be fruitful benefit only if Para Purusa is Paramatma and other than Paramatma if any meaning is given Para Purusa ikshanam is of no use at all. Para Purusa is Paramatma alone because it is given the object of knowledge in the phalam in this mantra in question.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. There are two words ikshadi karma vyapadesat sah. We have to supply the word Paramatma. We have to rearrange sah Paramatma ikshadi karma vyapadesat. Now we will take up the words for analysis. Sah means he or that. Sah means dyeya Para purusah. It means Para Purusa the Supreme person which is presented as object of meditation in the dhyana vakyam of Prasna Upanishad 5.5 that Para purusah the Paramatma so that the supreme person is Paramatma alone and not Hiranyagarbha.

The reason is given in the next word. Ikshadi karma vyapadesat. Ikshadi means jnanam. Karma means object; it is object of knowledge; jneya visayah; vyapadesat means presentation, reference. It presents the same Para Purusa as an object of knowledge in the phala vakyam 5.5. Of Prasna Upanishad. Para Purusa occurring in the mantra is an object of knowledge; as an object of knowledge is Paramatma and therefore as an object of meditation is also Paramatma. This is ikshadikarama adhikaranam.

Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary takes a purva paksa where Purva Pakshi comes and makes a subtle argument, which Adhi Sankaracharya refutes. In the phala vakyam phala Purusa is Paramatma alone being the object of knowledge. Para Purusa in phala vakyam is Paramatma. If you study the phala vakyam two phala purusas are mentioned there/ one Para Purusa is Hiranyagarbha and there is another which is Paramatma. Now we have enumerated Para Purusa number one and Para Purusa number. Two.

There are two words Para and another Paraad. This is followed by the word Purusa. First Paraa refers where Purusa we have to supply. Saha Paraad purusad Param purusam ikshade. If you translate in English the upasaka will know Para Purusa number two who is superior to number one. And purva pakshi says Para Purusa number two is Paramatma and Para Purusa number one is Hiranyagarbha. The upasaka knows Paramatma who is superior to Hiranyagarbha. Therefore Purva Pakshi says from the phala vakyam we come to know the Para Purusa can be either Hiranyagarbha or Paramatma.

That being so how can you say it supports the dhyana vakya Para Purusa. In dhyana vakyam there is Para Purusa and there we find come conclusion. At the same time when we take to Para Purusa in the latter mantra also creates confusion because there are two Para purusas one referring to Hiranyagarbha and the other to Paramatma. He gives reasons to prove that Para Purusa refers to Paramatma alone. In phala vakyam there is a mention that the upasaka will go to Hiranyagarbha lokam and therefore Purva Pakshi says only if he does Hiranyagarbha Upasana he will get Hiranyagarbha prapti. As the Upasana is as the prapti is. Those who worship devas go to deva loka and so also pitru Upasana will take one to pitru loka. Para Purusa means Hiranyagarbha only and by doing Hiranyagarbha Upasana he obtains Hiranyagarbha lokam. This is argument number one by Purva Pakshi.

He says let us come to phala vakyam. At the end Para Purusa is repeated twice. If phala Purusa number one is preceded by a pronoun etasmat. Purva Pakshi argues that this pronouns can be used only when the object of the pronoun is already is introduced before. First I talk

about rama and this rama is intelligent only when I have already introduced rama the pronoun has be used.

The pronoun this is used for Para Purusa number one Hiranyagarbha and it is not used in Para Purusa number two the Paramatma. Paramatma number one must have been introduced already and then alone the pronoun can be introduced. Para Purusa number one is introduced in the dhyana vakyam. If you take Hiranyagarbha in dhyana vakyam and the first this in latter portion refers to Hiranyagarbha alone.

If Paramatma is introduced it will go with Paramatma. In this context in dhyana vakyam Hiranyagarbha alone introduced. One should meditate upon Para Purusa Hiranyagarbha then he will know the Para Purusa Paramatma who is superior to this Para Purusa Hiranyagarbha. Then this will tally perfectly. Therefore Para Purusa to be meditated is Hiranyagarbha alone and the pronoun also supports the arguments. What is our answer?

We have to refute their argument and then give our view. In the dhyana vakyam the Para Purusa must be Hiranyagarbha. Because phala vakyam says Hiranyagarbha praptih. It is not mentioned as ultimate result. It is intermediary state. Then Upanishad should have stopped Hiranyagarbha loka praptih. The ultimate phalam prescribed is Paramatma jnanam. Hiranyagarbha loka prapti is not the phalam but it is only a station in the middle. Therefore Brahma loka prapti is not the phalam. Paramatma jnanam is the ultimate phalam. Paramatma upasaka will attain Paramatma jnanam.

The same idea is seen in Gita 8.13 *Aum ity ekaksaram Brahma vyaharan mam anusmaran yah prayati tyajan deham sa yati Paramam gotim* the meaning of this sloka is he who utters the single syllable Aum [which is] Brahman, remembering Me as he departs giving up the body, he goes to the highest goal. In fact this sloka is exactly Ikshadikarma adhikaranam. In both Omkara rupa Brahma Upasana is the topic. The first argument is refuted.

Now we will refute the pronoun argument. He says in the phala vakyam 'this' is used and therefore it refers to the Hiranyagarbha given in the dhyana vakyam. He says that the pronoun is used in phala vakyam. Therefore Hiranyagarbha must have been discussed before. The conclusion that this refers to Hiranyagarbha said in dhyana vakyam. Hiranyagarbha is discussed in the phala vakyam alone. Brahma loka has been discussed in the phala vakyam itself and there the word Brahma loka reference is there. There is a word Brahma and that Brahma refers to Hiranyagarbha.

Hiranyagarbha has been already introduced Hiranyagarbha in phala vakyam. The pronoun this does not refer o Hiranyagarbha in dhyana vakyam and on the other hand pronoun refers to Brahma loka. According to answer, the translation is that one should meditate upon Paramatma and then he will know that Paramatma who is superior to this Hiranyagarbha who is in Brahma loka. Don't go to dhyana vakyam. Therefore pronoun refers to phala vakya Hiranyagarbha or dhyana vakya Hiranyagarbha. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 97

### **Topic 4. Ikshatikarmavyapadesadhikaranam [Sutras 13]**

The highest person to be meditated upon is the highest Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.13[76]**

#### ***Ikshathikarmavyapadesat sah***

Because of His being mentioned as the object of sight, He [who is to be meditated upon is Brahman]

Now we analyse the fourth adhikaranam of the third pada. We have completed the words meaning of the sutra. We now discuss the purva paksa raised by someone, which Adhi Sankaracharya answered in his bhashyam. Whether the object of meditation prescribed in 5<sup>th</sup> chapter 5<sup>th</sup> mantra of Prasna Upanishad is Hiranyagarbha or Paramatma is our discussion. We established that the object of meditation is Paramatma alone. Two purva paksas one based upon the phala vakyam and the other based on the pronoun etasmat. We negated both purva paksas and established that Para Purusa referred to Paramatma alone.

Adhi Sankaracharya discusses three more arguments. In the phala vakyam Para is mentioned indicating Para Purusa indicating the Hiranyagarbha as also the Paramatma. The word Paraad is there and then he supplies the word purusad and then there is again Param purusam occurring in the mantra Paraad Purusa ikshade. There are two Para Purusa and with one referring to Hiranyagarbha and the other indicating Paramatma. In dhyana vakyam there is one Para Purusa used.

We say it should be Paramatma alone and when purva paksa says in the phala vakyam the word Para Purusa is used to refer to Hiranyagarbha we find that the Para Purusa there is not fully used. Hiranyagarbha is not referred to Para Purusa. Para Purusa in the meaning of Hiranyagarbha is not fully used by the Upanishad. But it is fully used to indicate the Paramatma. In our case the word Param and the word purusam both are there to mean Paramatma. We have got full reference of Para Purusa in the sense of Paramatma. This is the third argument.

The fourth argument is relatively simpler. Adhi Sankaracharya says in the dhyana vakyam the Upanishad says Param purusam avidyadeeta. Purva paksa doubts Para Purusa is Hiranyagarbha or Paramatma. The word Param if used it means the highest as per the dictionary. Once you go to Para Purusa Hiranyagarbha can be great all right it can never be greatest. Virad cannot be the greatest and Param refers only to the Paramatma. And according to the rules of interpretation we have to first try the mukhyartha and only if it fails we have to go in for secondary meaning. We try to fit in with primary meaning and it is Paramatma and therefore dhyana says may you meditate on Paramatma.

This primary meaning fits in properly there is no problem at all. When primary meaning fits it properly why do you take other meanings and try to contest our argument. Other Upanisadic statement also supports this view.

It is supported by Kathopanisad vakyam also 1.iii.10 *says indriya bhyah Para by artha arthebhyas ca Param manah manasas in Para buddhiti, budder Atma mahim Para followed by mantra 1.iii.11 mahatah Param avyaktam avyaktat purusah Parah, purusan-na Param kincit, sa katha sa Para gatih* the meaning of the mantras is beyond the senses are the sense objects; beyond these objects is the mind; beyond the mind is the intellect; and beyond the intellect is the Great Self; beyond the Great [Mahat] is the unmanifested [avyaktam].

Beyond the avyaktam [prakrti] is the Purusa; beyond the Purusa there is nothing; that is the end; that is the highest goal. What is the superior most Purusa and it talks about graded level and it comes to Atma as Para Purusa the Upanishad says saha na Param kincit there is no other Para Purusa other than Atma. Para Purusa as Atma is the primary meaning. As it fits properly the Para Purusa means Paramatma alone.

The fifth and final argument is this. It talks about phalam of Paramatma jnanam. While talking about it, the Upanishad says that the phalam as sarva papa vinir mogah. It is sarva papa nasa is the phalam is given for this Upasana. Adhi Sankaracharya argues sarva papa nasa is possible only in the case of Paramatma jnanam and not by Hiranyagarbha dhyanam or Hiranyagarbha Upasana. Hiranyagarbha Upasana can give purity and not absolute purity. Because of this reason also the Upasana must be Paramatma Upasana alone. Adhi Sankaracharya concludes and establishes Para Purusa is Paramatma.

The first one is visayah. It is the word Para Purusa occurring in 5.5. Of Prasna Upanishad which reveals the object of Omkara meditation. The doubt is whether the Para Purusa is Paramatma or Hiranyagarbha. Whether Paramatma is karanam Brahma or karyam Brahma is the question. Our conclusion is that Para Purusa is Paramatma alone. And our main reason is Para Purusa jnanam is given as the phalam. If that is the phalam then the Para Purusa has to be Paramatma alone. Hiranyagarbha jnanam cannot be phalam for it does not give any benefit at all.

The fifth point is that this adhikaranam is occurring in its appropriate place only. With this the Ikshadhikarmanadhikaranam is over. Here Paramatma revealed is Paramatma as an object of meditation unlike the previous adhikaranam. There we establish Brahman alone, as the subject matter it was not Upasanam Brahman but it was jneyam Brahman the object of knowledge, in this adhikaranam it is meant for Upasanam.

## **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.14[77]**

***Dahara uttarebhyah***

The small [ether, Akasa is Brahman] on account of the subsequent arguments or expression.

This is a big adhikaranam and it is known as Daharadhikaranam. This has got eight sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses a Chandogya upanisad mantra no. 8.1.1. That mantra reads as *om Atha yadidamasminbrahmapure daharam pndarikam vesma daharo'sminn antarakasastasminyadantastadanvestavyam tadvaya vijjna sitavyamiiti* the meaning of the mantra runs as 'Om. This body is the city of Brahman. Within it is an abode in the shape of a lotus [i.e., the heart], and within that there is a small space. One must search within this space and earnestly desire to know what is there.

Here the Upanishad talks about an Upasana in this section, which is known as daharopasanam. The Upanishad reveals daharakasa in this mantra.

The Upanishad takes this typical body and it names the body as Brahma puram. This itself is a beautiful name. Brahma puram means it is abode of Brahman. The body is compared to a temple. Brahman means Paramatma and puram means abode. In mundakopanisad the physical body is compared to temple and heart is compared to sanctum and Paramatma is seen as the resident of that temple.

Within the Brahma puram daharam pundarikam vesma and here pundarikam means hridayam that is similar to lotus in bud form. The word vesma means sthanam or abode. Daharam means a small hridaya sthanam. Every human being has got a physical body and every body has a lotus like heart which is a beautiful thing. Already heart is small. Within that small heart there is a small space akasah. Dahara akasah means alpa akasah. It is the object of enquiry.

According to our interpretation it is chidakasa and this is nothing but Consciousness. Here akasah means Chaitanyam. Aa means everywhere kasah means manifests everywhere as sacchidananda rupam. Here the word Akasa means Chaitanyam, which is small as it were. For this tasmin edantah we have two interpretation and we will take first interpretation. It is the reputation of asmin antarakasah. This means tasmin hridaye antar akasah. Within the heart chaitanya Akasa is there. That daharakasa one should enquire into. Tadvava vijjnasitavyam means one should know this.

Within the daharasa the small heart there is Brahman and that daharasa within the heart one should enquire into and one should know and one should meditate upon. Daharasa Upasana is prescribed in this section of this adhikaranam. It is to be meditated upon the Lord the whole world is residing and that Lord is space like Lord. We have to note the beauty of this Upasana. Brahman is formless and cannot think of formless Brahman. Therefore the Upanishad gives the various forms to Brahman nirvisesham Param Brahman which is attributeless and most of them are helpless in recognizing this Nirgunam Brahman and those madha students who are not capable of realizing the Nirgunam Brahman and they are compassionately consider them by presenting the Sagunam Brahman.

Even though they initially meditate upon Brahman in saguna form and Upanishad does not want us to remain in Sagunam Brahman permanently. Therefore Upanishad wants us to elevate us to Nirgunam Brahman and the Sagunam Brahman is gradually refined and in this process the highest form of Sagunam Brahman is the most refined Sagunam Brahman and Akasa is as good as attributeless. It does not have any of the attributes.

That is why Om kham Brahma is an Upasana that is Akasa Upasana. First Upanishad pointed out Sagunam Brahman and then elevated us to Akasa Upasana and we have come to formless god and as long as you see the external god there will be Dvaidam and Upanishad wants to

refine us further and enough of meditating upon external Akasa to meditate upon daharakasa. According to the real rule sannyasis are not supposed to do the physical puja of god and they are supposed to do daharakasa Upasana only.

The Lord as external object is the first state; Lord as external Akasa is the second state is the second state; Lord as the internal Akasa is the third state; the fourth state is not Upasana but knowing the Lord as inner Akasa. In third state I imagine Lord as Akasa but in the fourth state I recognize Lord as inner space. Now what are we supposed to analyse is dahara Akasa. What is the inner space talked about in this mantra/

Purva paksa says inner space is bhuta Akasa is talked and we are going to say the word Akasa the primary meaning is Akasa the element and in this case as a special case we have to take daharakasa is inner space. Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra.

In the first sutra Vyasacharya says the inner space within the heart is Brahman alone. Adhi Sankaracharya says the heart talked about in Upanishad is the regular heart, which is seen inside. The word heart is used in two meaning and one is the physical or pumping heart; this is the mukya artha; there is a laksyartha also. According to sastra the physical heart is the abode of the mind at the time of sleep. Heart happens to be the residence of the mind. Mind in waking runs all over the body. The mind is behind the ears, eyes, tongue etc.

Therefore in certain context the word hridayam represents the mind located in the hridayam. When you talk of heart attack it means the physical heart. If you say I have given the heart to him or her in all such cases you cannot take it literally. Here heart means the mind alone. Within the heart there is Brahman alone. It is so because of the description of the inner space given latter. The latter description is that of Brahman and not of elemental space. When we study the mantra, we find the latter description refers to Brahman alone.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. There are two words daharah; the small and it is translated as daharakasah the small inner space within the lotus heart within the body called Brahma puram which is mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.1 this is the meaning of daharah. Next word is Brahman daharah Brahman means the small place within heart is Brahman. Uttarepyah; from the subsequent text or expressions or arguments. The latter description is given in the very same Chandogya upanisad. This is not of much use. We have to supply the word Paramatma or Brahman. Daharah Brahman uttarepyah. The latter description is given in the latter sutras. Even though Vyasacharya gives out the latter description here Adhi Sankaracharya brings out some of the important latter descriptions to support our conclusion which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 98

### **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.14[77]**

#### ***Dahara uttarebhyah***

The small [ether, Akasa is Brahman] on account of the subsequent arguments or expression.

We analyse the fifth adhikaranam of the third pada named Daharadhikaranam. The mantra talks about the physical body and within the body there is small heart like lotus and within the heart there is still smaller space. Is this daharakasa is Brahman or bhuta Akasa the elemental space. The doubt occurs because Upanishad uses the word Akasa and it means elemental space alone.

Here Vyasacharya mentioned that this daharakasa is Brahma alone because of the latter statements or latter description of daharakasa itself. Adhi Sankaracharya himself gives more explanation to the word uttarebhyah as to what are the latter descriptions that supports the view of daharakasa.

Adhi Sankaracharya takes the latter mantra and also latter portion of the mantra itself in support of our conclusion. Seven descriptions or seven features are brought out by Adhi Sankaracharya in support of our view. We will see each of the features along with the relevant mantra/

First is the relevant mantra is 8.1.1. Of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *om Atha yadidamasminbrahmapure daharam pndarikam vesma daharo'sminn antarakasastasmin yadantastadanvestavyam tadvaya vijijna sitavyamiiti* the meaning of the mantra runs as 'Om. This body is the city of Brahman.

Within it is an abode in the shape of a lotus [i.e., the heart], and within that there is a small space. One must search within this space and earnestly desire to know what is there. Antarakasa comes in the middle of the mantra. In the end it uses dad anvestavyam means that daharakasa should be enquired into. Enquirability feature. It deserves to be enquired into the daharakasa, which is the point of controversy. That should be known, recognized and realized. Second feature is knowability or realisability.

Adhi Sankaracharya says these two features that daharakasa should be enquired into the two descriptions are possible only when daharakasa is Brahman or else Upanishad will not ask us to know about Akasa, the elemental space. It is pouruseya visaya. By knowing Akasa we will not get any prayojanam of this study or the enquiry. This is possible only when daharakasa is Brahman. These two features support our conclusion that daharakasa is Brahman.

Then we will go to the next mantra 8.1.3 of Chandogya upanisad and here further description is given about the daharakasa. The mantra reads as *tam cedbruyuryadidamasminbrahmapure daharam pundarikam vesma daharo's- minnantarakasah kim tada tra vidyate yadanvestavyam yadvava vijijnasitavyamiti sa bruyati* the meaning of the mantra is if the disciples ask 'this body is the city of Brahman, within it is an abode in the shape of lotus and within there is a small space; what is it that one must search for within this space and what should one earnestly desire to know? The teacher should reply. The scripture says let us investigate it. Here it says daharakasa is seemingly small but it is as big as outer space, thus Upanishad compares daharakasa to all pervading elemental space or sarvagata bhuta Akasa sadrisyam.

The fourth feature is in this daharakasa alone everything is based sarvam asmin samahitam, the entire creation is based on the daharakasa, it is sarva adharah. It has sarva adharatvam. These two features are possible only when daharakasa is Brahman and not otherwise. Daharakasa is compared to bhutakasa. The very fact that daharakasa is compared to bhutakasa shows that it is not bhutakasa.

The definition of comparison is if x is similar to y, first condition is x is different from y though different from x it has many common features with y. Our point is x is different from y. Since daharakasa is compared to bhutakasa it is not Akasa. Sarva adharatvam daharakasa is said to be the substratum of everything and Akasa is relatively sarva adhara and Akasa is not adhara of Akasa. Akasa is support of everything and Akasa is support of Akasa. Akasa is supported by Brahman. And therefore daharakasa is Brahman only.

Now we will go to the mantra 8.1.5 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *sa bruyannasya jarayaitajjiryati na vadhenasya hanyata etatsatyam brahmapuram asmin kamah samahita esa Atma pahatapapma vijaro vimrturvisoko vijighatso'pipasah sathyakamah satyasankalpo yatha hyeveha praja anvavisanti yathanusasanam yam yamantamabhikama bhavanti yam janapadam yam ksetrabhagam tam tamevopajivanti* the meaning of the mantra is – in reply the teacher will say 'the body may decay due to old age, but the space within [i.e. Brahma pura] never decays.

Nor does it perish with the death of the body. This is the real abode of Brahman. All our desires are concentrated in it. It is the Self – free from all sins as well as from old age, death, bereavement, hunger and thirst. It is the cause of love of Truth and the cause of dedication to Truth. If a person strictly follows whatever the ruler of the country commands, he may then get as reward some land or even an estate. The idea is that an ignorant person may get whatever he wants as the fruits of his actions, but he remains bound.

We have two features there. The mantra says esah Atma. Not only it uses the word it says pahatapapma vijaro virturvisoka vijighatso this daharakasa is the Paramatma and that Atma which has eight virtues which are free from papam, free from old age, free from death, free from dukha, free from hunger free from thirst; it is with fruitful desires unfailing desires; then sathya sankalpa unfailing sankalpas which means plans. These are the eight glories of daharakasa. Before that esah Atma atmatvam. In this mantras two features are given that it is the very Atma and it is endowed with eight glories. Adhi Sankaracharya says these glories belong to Brahman alone and not to bhutakasa. Bhutakasa can never be described as Atma. Vimrityu means without death and it cannot fit to bhutakasa and it has got janma. Therefore

we have got six features to conclude that daharakasa is Brahman. One more is there the seventh feature, which comes in 8.1.6 of Chandogya upanisad.

The mantra reads as *tadyatheha karmajito tokah ksiyata evamevamutra punyajito lokah ksiyate tadya ihatmanamanuvidya vrajantyetamsca satyam kamamstesam sarvesu jokesvakamacaro bhavatyatha ya ihatmanamanuvidya vrajantyetamsca satyan kamamstesam sarvesu lokesu kama caro bhavati*. Everything perishes whether it is something you have acquired through hard work in this world or it is a place in the other world, which you have acquired through meritorious deeds. Those who leave this world without knowing the Self and the Truths, which they should, know are not free, no matter where they go. But those who leave this world after knowing the Self and the Truths, which they should know, are free, no matter where they are.

The gist of the mantra is that all the karma phalams are finite in nature but the knowledge of daharakasa gives infinite phalam. It is ananta phalavatvam and that daharakasa can give Infinite result and if it had been bhutakasa, it will not give infinite results when the Akasa itself is finite. Thus because of these seven features occurring latter in the Chandogya upanisad itself we should conclude that daharakasa is Atma itself.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives one more additional reason in this sutra. This physical body is Brahmapuram only because daharakasa happens to be Brahman and if it had been bhutakasa it would have never been named as Brahma puram. This title occurs in the mantra 8.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad. This gives us the clue that daharakasa is Brahman and Brahma puram means it is the residence of Brahman.

Purva paksa comes and raises an objection. How can you describe the body as residence of the body? You say Brahman is residence of everything how can that Brahman have miserable residence, how can the physical body be residence of Brahman. Here the residence is as though residence because why you say this is the residence of Rama, you can meet rama in that place. That person is available in the residence. Body is the residence of Brahman or recognizable or contactable in the body so Brahma puram means Brahman obtains in the body.

This view is supported by Gita in sloka 5.13 that reads as *sarva karmana manasa samnyasya 'ste sukham vast navadvare pure dehi nai'va kurvan na karayan* the meaning is the embodies [soul] who has controlled his nature having renounced all actions by the mind [inwardly] dwells at ease in the city of nine gates neither working nor causing work to be done.

The same idea is expressed in Kathopanisad *puram ekadasa dvaram, ajasya-avakra-cetasah anusthaya na sacati, vimuktas-ca vimucyate* the meaning of the mantra is this body of eleven gates is indeed of the unborn even minded Self. Having meditated upon this [the seeker] grieves not and the liberated one is ever liberated indeed. This is verily that. It is very clearly clear that body is Brahma puram and Brahman resides in that.

With this Adhi Sankaracharya's we will conclude this commentary. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.15[78]**

***Gatisabdabhyam tatha hi drishtam lingam cha***

The small Akasa [ether] is Brahma on account of the action of going [into Brahman] and of the word [Brahmaloka], because thus it is seen [i.e., the individual souls go into Brahman] is seen elsewhere in other sruti texts; and this daily going of the souls into Brahman [during deep sleep] is an inferential sign by means of which we may properly interpret the word 'Brahmaloka']

This also explains the *uttarebyah* of the previous sutra in this sutra. Here Vyasacharya takes two features of *daharakasa* from another mantra 8.3.2 of Chandogya upanishad. *Atha ye casyacha jiva ye ca preta yaccanyadicchanna labhate sarvam tadatra gatva vindate'tra hyasyaite satyah kama anrtapidhanastadyathapi hiranyanidhim nihitama ksetrajna uparyupari sancaranto na videyurevamevema sarvah praja aharahargacchantya etam brahmalokam na vidantyanrtena hi pratyudhah* the meaning of the mantra is further those of his relatives who are still alive and those who are dead, and also those things a person cannot get even if he wishes for them – all these he gets by going within his heart.

All true desires of a person are in his heart, though they are hidden. It is like when there is gold hidden someplace underground and people who are ignorant of it walk over that spot again and again knowing nothing about it. Similarly, all these beings go to Brahmaloka every day and yet they know nothing about it because they are covered by ignorance. Inside the heart is the whole universe. When we have *Sushupti* dreamless sleep, we are then one with Brahma and one with the whole world. We are not conscious of it, however, because of our ignorance.

Here three words we are going to focus *evema sarvah praja aharahar gacchantya etam brahmalokam na vidantyanrtena hi pratyudhah*. The context we should know. The Upanishad says during sleep every *jiva* resolves into *daharakasa* only. The word *daharakasa* is not there and the pronoun 'this' is there and 'this' refers to *daharakasa*. Vyasacharya says that we all know that whenever *jiva* resolves it resolves into Brahman only. It is so because Brahman is the *karanam*. All *jivas* are *karyam*.

We get the support from Mundaka upanishad also mantra *tad edat satyam yatha sudipat pavakad visphulingah sahasrah prabhavante sarupah tatha 'ksarad vivdhah somya hbhavah prajayante tatra catvapi yanti* [II.i.1.of Mundaka Upanishad] the meaning of this mantra is this is the truth; as from the flaming fire thousands of sparks, similar to its form [nature] issue forth, so from the Immortal [Brahman] O! My beloved youth diverse [manifold] beings [*jivas*] originate and they find their way back into it. We clearly see that all *jivas* are born of Brahman and resolve into Brahman whether it is temporary resolution or permanent resolution. The resolution takes place during sleep and also during *pralayam* or when we go to sleep we resolve into *Isvara* only. During permanent resolution also *viveka mukti jiva* resolves into *Isvara* only. During sleep *jiva* resolves into

Brahman and Upanishad says *jiva* during sleep resolves into *daharakasa* and joining these two, we conclude that *daharakasa* is Brahman. In this sutra four points are discussed. *Jiva* resolves into *daharakasa* and we know *jiva* resolves into Brahman and therefore *jiva* resolves into *daharakasa*. During sleep several other sruti statements prove *jiva* resolves into Brahman.



We get the support from 6.8.1 of Chandogya upanishad also *uddalako harunih svetaketum putramauvaca svapnantam me somya vijanihiti yatraitatpurusah vapiti nama sata somya tada sampanno bhavati svamapito bhavati tasmadenam svapitityavaksate svam hyapito bhavati*- this means when a person is said to be sleeping he becomes one with 'Sat' the existence, and he attains his real Self; that is why people say about him, 'when is sleeping' he is then in his Self.

The Upanishad clearly says that during sleep jiva is merged with Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes this only. Again in Prasna Upanishad 4.4 it is clearly said as *yad ucchvasanth svasav etavahuti samam nayatiti sa samanah mano ha vava yajamanah, ista phalam evodanah sa enah yajamanam ahar ahar Brahma gamayati* the meaning of the mantra is because the samana distributes equally the oblations of the 'inspiration and expirations' he is the priest [hotr]. The mind verily is the sacrificer [yajamana] and the Udana is the fruit of the sacrifice. He leads the sacrificer everyday [in deep sleep] to Brahman. It says udana during sleep takes jiva to Brahman.

Jiva resolves into Brahman in various Upanisads. Vyasacharya further says that there is another feature also which supports our conclusion. Jiva resolves into daharakasa which is Brahma loka. Refer to 8.3.2 of Chandogya upanishad. Brahma loka means Brahma Chaitanyam. Brahma lokam gacchadi means Brahma loka is Brahma Chaitanyam and daharakasa is Brahma Chaitanyam. Vyasacharya wants to say daharakasa is Brahman and in support of this he uses the word usage Brahma loka. Purva paksa says Brahma loka as

Brahma Chaitanyam and is it not a twisted interpretation. Purva paksa may wonder how do you interpret Brahmaloaka as Brahma Chaitanyam. For this answer is indicated in this sutra because of the appropriate clue to indicate that Brahmaloaka is Brahman only and not seventh heaven and the clue is the Upanishad says jiva merges into Brahmaloaka everyday. No jiva goes every day to Brahma loka. This refers to prajna alone and everyday he goes to sleep which is considered as Brahmaloaka. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we go to word for word analysis. There are four words in this sutra. Gatisabdabhyam tatha hi drishtam lingam ca. We have to divide into two portions gatisabdabhyam daharakasa Brahma; and tatha hi drishtam lingam ca; first word is gatisabdabhyam is gati and sabdah means merger, dissolution and layah is gathih. He uses it Gathi because of gacchantyah. Sutra uses the word merger only. Because of the merger of Jivatma into daharakasa during deep sleep as revealed in 8.3.2 of Chandogya upanishad. That much alone is Vyasacharya's expression. We know jiva merges into Brahman only. Hence jiva merges into daharakasa. This is Gathi's Gathi. Then the second word is sabdah means because of the expression that is the word Brahma loka.

Because of the expression Brahma loka given in 8.3.2 of Chandogya upanishad as an epithet of daharakasa the reference means etam Brahma lokam. This is the first part of the sutra. The second part is tathahi drishtam lingam ca. Drishtam means literally seen; jiva's merger into Brahman during sleep is seen in other parts of the Upanishad. In other parts of the Upanishad jiva's merger into Brahman during Sushupti is seen. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 99

### **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.15[78]**

#### ***Gatisabdabhyam tatha hi drishtam lingam cha***

The small Akasa [ether] is Brahma on account of the action of going [into Brahman] and of the word [Brahmaloka], because thus it is seen [i.e., the individual souls go into Brahman] is seen elsewhere in other sruti texts; and this daily going of the souls into Brahman [during deep sleep] is an inferential sign by means of which we may properly interpret the word 'Brahmaloka']

The second sutra of daharadhikaranam in which we analyse the word daharakasa, the small space within the heart which itself is within the body. There is the body within that there is heart and within that there is a heart which is daharakasa. Daharakasa as per Chandogya upanisad is Brahman alone. The word Akasa should be taken as chidakasa and word small should be taken as 'as though' small. This is our conclusion. But there is difficulty in establishing that.

Generally Akasa is element and the word small also creates problem. Brahman is big and how can it be small. Vyasacharya says that it should be taken because of the latter description in the Chandogya upanisad mantra. Adhi Sankaracharya talked of seven descriptions of Brahman, which tallied with daharakasa as Brahman. Vyasacharya also gave two descriptions Chandogya upanisad 8.3.32 and the second referred to the word sabda in the Upanishad mantra.

In the last class we analysed the word meaning. The word Gathi was given a long meaning and because of jiva merging in daharakasa during the sleep, it was concluded that daharakasa is nothing but Brahman. It used the word gacchandiah occurring in the mantra is the clue for finding daharakasa is nothing but Brahman. Because of the Brahmaloka as an adjective in the mantra of daharakasa also shows that daharakasa Brahman.

During Sushupti Jivatma resolves into daharakasa. It is proved that elsewhere in the sruti it is said that in Sushupti Jivatma merges into Brahman and here Jivatma merges into daharakasa and joining these two ideas we see daharakasa is but Brahman. Drishtam you have to supply many words. In Sushupti Jivatma merges with Brahman in other sruti statements. One is Chandogya upanisad 6.8.1 where Upanishad clearly says Jivatma merges with Brahman. Another definition I gave was from Prasna Upanishad. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Now we will go to the word lingam. Lingam is to explain the word Brahmaloka occurring in the mantra 8.3.2 of Chandogya upanisad. We say everyday Jivatma merges with Brahmalokam. We say daharakasa and Brahmalokam are one and Brahman. When you have an appositional usage we see both are the same thing. Similarly I said in .8.3.2 of Chandogya

upanisad are it is said Brahmaloka and daharakasa are identical. Brahma lokam means Brahma Chaitanyam and therefore daharakasa is Brahma Chaitanyam. But here there is a problem. I have discussed this in the general analysis. Purva paksa says that I can accept Brahmaloka and Brahma one and the same. How can you say that Brahmaloka and Brahma Chaitanyam are one and the same? Brahmaloka means Brahma's world and how do you take Brahmaloka is Brahma Chaitanyam. For that Vyasacharya uses the word lingam. There is a clue to show that Brahmaloka is Brahma Chaitanyam. There is a clue to prove Brahmalokam is Brahma Chaitanyam. What is the clue that Vyasacharya keeps in his mind? Adhi Sankaracharya gives that clue.

The expression daily occurring in the mantra is the clue. Jivatma daily going to daharakasa in Sushupti is the clue to prove that Brahmaloka and daharakasa are one and the same. In Sushupti. Jivatma goes to Brahmaloka everyday. The very fact daily is used that Jivatma does not go to seventh heaven and in Sushupti Jivatma goes to daharakasa which is Brahmalokam and which is nothing but Brahma Chaitanyam. The main reasons are given by the two words Gathi and sabda and the word drishtam is the explanation of Gathi and the word is the explanation of sabda. The arguments are two Gathi and sabda. With this the sutra is over.

Daharakasa is Brahman because in Sushupti Jivatma merges into daharakasa as revealed in Chandogya upanisad 8.3.2 and also because of the expression in Brahma loka used as epithet of daharakasa in mantra above. Then the next sentence the merger of Jivatma in Brahman during Sushupti is seen in other scriptural statements also. There is a clue in the form of daily merger revealed in 8.3.2 to show that Brahmaloka is Brahma Chaitanyam. There is one more word cha and it is a simple conjunction. With this sutra 2 of this adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.3.16 [79]**

#### ***Dhritescha mahimno'syasminnupalabdheh***

Also because of the well known meaning [of Akasa as Brahma the small Akasa is Brahma]

It is like the previous sutra and it is also an expression uttarebyah occurring in the first sutra. Then argument in support of sutra 14 is continued. In this sutra another latter description is given to establish that daharakasa is Brahman only.

In this sutra Vyasacharya keeps another mantra occurring in Chandogya upanisad 8.4.1 that reads as *atha ta Atma sa seurvidhrtiresam lokanamasambhedaya naitam setumahoratre tarato na jara na mrtyurna soko na sukrtam na duskrtam sarve papmano'to nivartante'pahatapapma hyesa brahmalokah* the meaning of this mantra is next this Self is like a dam. It supports the worlds and protects them from getting mixed up. Day and night cannot cross over this dam, nor can old age, death, bereavement good actions and bad actions. All sins turn away from it for this Brahmaloka is free from evil.

What is important here is the word *vidhrti is dredhihe* drihidhi means sustenance or protection. Here in this mantra Upanishad says that this daharakasa alone sustains the whole

creation by maintaining the law and order and makes sure every law is strictly followed. The universal laws are never violated and the universe survives is the proof for non-violation.

Some intelligent principle is keeping the order and supervises the law and order. The one who maintains the law and order is called *dhriti* the law maintainer. First meaning is sustenance and second is sustainer. Daharakasa is said to be sustainer of the world. Dritih is sthithi karta. Brahman alone is sthithi karta as per the Upanishad but here it is said daharakasa is the sustainer. Joining these two together we say Brahman and daharakasa are one and the same.

We can find any number of statements to show that Brahman is sthithi karta. Adhi Sankaracharya collects such statements in which dritih is used to convey the idea of sustainer. That comes in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. 3.8.9 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad reads as *etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi suryacandramasau vidhrtau itsthatah, etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dyavaprthivya vidhrte tisthatah, etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi nimesa muhurta ahoratranyardhamasa masa rtavah samvatsara iti vidhrtastisthanti; etasya va dante svetabhyah gargy parvatebhyah praticyonyah, yam yam ca disamanu; etasya va aksarasya prasanane gargy dadato manusyati prasamsanti yajamananam devah darvim pitaro'nvayattah* it is because of the governance the sun and moon do not violate the rules and functions. The rivers flow and the time go according to order and all the things work in order because of the Brahman sustaining the creation.

Chandogya upanisad uses the same word *vihriti* is used for daharakasa. Therefore daharakasa is Brahman. This is one quotation. There is another quotation Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.22 where the word vidhrana means sustainer Brahman. Here Brahman in vihruti and in Chandogya upanisad daharakasa is vihruti and therefore Brahman is daharakasa. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Daharakasa Brahma Dhritescha; the word daharakasa occurring in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.1 is Brahman; dhriteh is the sustainer of the creation as revealed in the mantra 8.4.1 through the word vidhritih cha; means also it means previous sutra he has given two reasons and the reason dhriti also supports the view; daharakasa may be the sustainer of the creation. The question is just because daharakasa is the sustainer how can that prove daharakasa is Brahman.

Vyasacharya says other Upanisadic statement we find that sustainer status is there only for Brahman. Here it is said daharakasa is sustainer and elsewhere we know Brahman is the sustainer and joining these two we see daharakasa is the Brahman. Asya mahimanah; the glory of the sustainer status the protector status sthithi kartritvam asya this particular status asmin; upalabdheh; is found asmin means in this Brahman alone. Because the sustainer status is found in Brahman alone since sustainer status is found in Brahman alone daharakasa, the sustainer should be Brahman only. With this the third sutra is also over.

## **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.3.17 [80]**

### **Prasiddhescha**

Also because of the well-known meaning [of Akasa as Brahma the small Akasa is Brahman]

The argument in support of sutra 14 is continued. Vyasacharya gives an independent view in support of the fact that daharakasa is Brahman. The word Akasa is often used in the scripture to reveal Brahman. Therefore Akasa as Brahman is well known in sastra. This we call it as sastra prasiddhi. Not only Chandogya upanisad Akasa is used in the name of Brahman and in other Upanishads also Akasa is commonly used in the meaning of Brahman. It is in Taittiriya Upanishad II.7.2 yadesa *Akasa anando na syat esa hyevanandayati* the sruti says that all have got Brahman inside in the form of akasah. Akasah ananda Brahman is there in every jiva.

Another instance is 8.14.1 of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *akaso vai nama namarupayornirvahita te yadantara tadbrahma tadamrtam sa Atma prajapateh sabham vesma prapadye yasoham bhavami*; here it is stated Brahman is the substratum of all the beings is established and the word Akasa is used to denote Brahman here.

There is another example in Chandogya upanisad 1.9.1 that reads as *asya lokasya ka gatirityakasa iti hovaca sarvani ha va imani bhutanyakasadeva samutpadyanta akasam pratyastam yanyakaso hyevaibhyo jyayanakasah parayanam* the meaning of the mantra is space for everything that exists arises from space and also goes back into space. Space is superior to everything.

Space is the highest goal. All are born out of Brahman, which includes Akasa. Kham Brahma kham Brahma kham purana also used and the kham also gives the meaning of Akasa. Aa means sarvatra and kasah means prakasate Chaitanyam rupena sarvatra satta rupena satatmakam. Brahman shines everywhere and hence Brahma is called Akasa. Daharakasa is Brahman because in sastra Akasa is popularly known as Brahman. We will go to word for word analysis in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 100

### **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.17[80]**

#### ***Prasiddhescha***

Also because of the well-known meaning [of Akasa as Brahma the small Akasa is Brahman]

We see the daharadhikaranam in which daharakasa is introduced as Brahman. the inner place in heart is nothing but Brahman is established while purva paksa says it is bhutakasa alone. Vyasacharya has established daharakasa as Brahman while negating the view of purva paksa. The normal meaning of the word Akasa is space but in sastra it has the special derivation of Brahman. Akasa means that which shines is Brahman. That which is appreciated as sat and chit is Brahman, which is available in the world and that availability, is called prakasate. In support of this Adhi Sankaracharya has quoted many quotations from Upanisads. Akasa is seen as substratum of the entire creation. I also gave a quotation from Taittiriya Upanishad.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Prasiddheh and cha and you have to supply daharakasa Brahma. Daharakasa Brahma inner space within the heart mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.1 is Brahman. The reason is because it is well known in the sastra as revealed in the above quotation. There is another quotation is from 1/9/1 of Chandogya upanisad. Three reasons are given already and this is in addition to the reasons already given. Gathi, sabda, vhrithi and prasiddha are the four reasons justifying that daharakasa is Brahman.

Now a Purva Paksi may ask how do you say Akasa is Brahman when everyone knows Akasa is space alone. This meaning is loka prasiddhi. How do you give up this meaning and you say Akasa means Brahman. if Akasa is loka prasiddha and Akasa as Brahman is sastra prasiddhah. Loka prasiddhi says Akasa is space and sastra prasiddhi says Akasa is Brahman. Certainly loka prasiddhi will win between loka and sastra, which one is to be taken, is our question. But the thing is in which context the word is used. During the study of sastram it comes and then sastra prasiddhi should be given importance. In loka Vyavahara loka prasiddhi should be given importance. Knowledge means in common parlour, it means that one is well informed. Once we come to sastra Vyavahara, the knowledge relates to Self-Knowledge or the Atma jnanam alone.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives another reason also. he says I am ready to accept loka prasiddhi normally and also accept daharakasa as space and when this particular meaning is illogical, then one should give up mukyartha and accept contextual meaning only. if daharakasa is bhuta Akasa, the latter attributes of Brahman does not fit in with bhutakasa. Hence we take the secondary meaning and therefore daharakasa is Brahman.

### **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.18.[81]**

***Itaraparamarsat sa iti chen nasambhavati***

Also because of the well-known meaning [of Akasa as Brahman the small Akasa is Brahman]

The sutra has got two portions, the first being the purva paksa and the second one the reply from siddhanti. The sutra has a question and an answer. *Itaraparamarsat sa iti* is the question portion and *chen nasambhavati* is the answer part. The first two words are purva paksa and the last two words are siddhanta's. the purva paksa raises a question on 8.3.4, of Chandogya upanisad. *Atha ya esa samprasado* is the relevant portion of the mantra we analyse here.

This daharakasa has been introduced 8.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad is shown as esah and *samprasadah* means Jivatma. This means one who becomes tranquil in sleep stage. Prasadah means one who becomes tranquil. Samprasadah means one who becomes totally tranquil. In jagrat jiva is fully active; and in swapna jiva is partially active and in Sushupti jiva is totally tranquil.

Purva paksa contention is that the word samprasadah means only jiva and jiva only becomes tranquil and Brahman need not become tranquil. One becomes tranquil means it refers to jiva only because Brahman has no avastha like jagrat, swapna Sushupti etc. so esah is equal to daharakasa and samprasadah is equal to jiva and hence daharakasa must mean Jivatma only.

Vyasacharya says no and he says daharakasa means Brahman alone. Vyasacharya says it is improper to the context. If you take daharakasa as jiva all the other descriptions does not fit in properly. It is free from all papas and it does not fit in because jiva is the product of punya and papa alone. Daharakasa is description as sustainer of the whole universe. Daharakasa is sthithi karta and Jivatma cannot even maintain his own family. He is not able to maintain his own body and how can he maintain the universe. Therefore daharakasa do not fit in with jiva and therefore it is not jiva and it is Brahman only.

Now we will go for word for word analysis. Now purva paksa is jiva purva paksa. he talks about Jivatma based on samprasadah. Itara paramasad sa iti chen na asambavad. Now we will take up first portion. We have to supply daharakasa. Itara paramasad daharakasa sa; itara paramarsad itara means other one; since we are repeatedly saying daharakasa is Paramatma because of the context the other one implies Jivatma. Paramarsad means reference mentioned; because of reference of jiva as daharakasa in mantra 8.3.4 of Chandogya upanisad.

How 8.3.4 refers to daharakasa as jivah because it does not directly say daharakasa is jiva but refers to daharakasa as esah. The daharakasa occurring in 8.1.1 saha means jivah. Is that jiva alone. Because jiva is referred to daharakasa in 8.3.4. of Chandogya upanisad. If such a question is asked suppose if such purva paksa is raised then comes our answer 'na asambavad' daharakasa and jiva you have to add. Daharakasa na jivah is our reply. Daharakasa that is daharakasa occurring in 8.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad is not Jivatma; because it does not fit in this context; illogical in this context. It is unfitting because daharakasa is described as Brahman in other places.

Every jiva starts with free will jivah. As we grow older and older and faith and free will becomes less and less and then we become fatalistic and we will say there is nothing in our hand. Sathya kamatvam and sathya sankalpam does not fit with jiva and therefore it should be taken as Brahman. in this context we vehemently establish that daharakasa is Paramatma and it is not Jivatma because Paramatma alone sathya kamah sathya sankalpah.

The corollary we get is Paramatma is Sathya Kama sathya sankalpah and jivah is asathya kamah and asathya sankalpah and therefore we derive that Jivatma and Paramatma becomes a fact one feels. There are many sutras in Brahma Sutra which gives this corollary. If Jivatma Paramatma aikyam is the vision of Vyasacharya why should he establish Jivatma and Paramatma different? Why he does not say ok to jivatma and Paramatma aikyam.

Some people even say Brahma Sutra supports vishistadvaidam and Upanishad supports Advaidam. Why such a view is there. it is because Vyasacharya says Jivatma Paramatma beda and I had earlier also pointed out before and I repeat this and caution that one should not take Jivatma Paramatma beda. You should take the context in the right way to take the right view. When we negate Sankya philosopher they don't accept Isvara even in vyavaharika dristi and he does not want an Isvara. In advaidam we want Isvara in vyavaharika dristi not only we want to establish but also establish that jagat is karyam and Isvara is karyam. Jiva and jagat are karyam and product and Isvara is karanam. In Brahma Sutra Sankya is primary purva paksa.

So when Sankya is purva paksa one of the problem of Sankya is vyavaharika dristi Isvara is not acceptable to them. Another context we establish beda is Upasana context. We should note that the present adhikaranam relates to daharakasa Upasana and therefore krama mukti is the phalam. at the end of dahara vidya the phalam is given as krama mukti. Upasaka upasya beda is maintained. In jnana prakaranam, abeda is underlined.

Thus in all jnana prakaranam jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is revealed from Paramarthika dristi and here dristi being vyavaharika dristi we should take Jivatma and Paramatma different. Daharakasa is not vachyartha Jivatma. When you take Jivatma as lakshyartha Jivatma okeyed. Lakshyartha Jivatma and Paramatma are identical. Daharakasa is not vachyartha Jivatma and if it is taken as lakshyartha Jivatma we have no objection. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

### **Sutra 1.3.19.[82]**

#### ***Uttaracchedavirbhutasvarupastu***

If it be said that for subsequent texts [it appears that the individual soul is meant, we say that what is there referred to is] rather [the individual soul in son far] as its real nature has become manifest [i.e., as it is non different from Brahma]

The argument in support of sutra 14 is continued.



Another purva paksa and siddhanta in one sutra. We will do general analysis. Here also Purva Paksi is Jivatma purva paksi. His argument is similar argument only. Vyasacharya says that daharakasa is jivah only because of latter descriptions. Adhi Sankaracharya also took some latter description. Now purva paksa says I will also give some objections that are latter descriptions. Vyasacharya used the word uttarebhyah plural number and he uses the word uttarad.

Now Purva Paksi's contention when you gave the description of latter descriptions, which are favourable to you. He says that you are not quoting those mantras which present daharakasa as jiva. There is not much difference between the previous and the present sutra. He says that this Purva Paksi is answered and now again the Purva Paksi again comes and argues. The previous and present sutras are almost similar. There are several mantras, which Purva Paksi quotes in support of his argument. Chandogya upanisad 8.7.1. The mantra reads as *ya atmapahatapapma vijaro vimrtyur visoko vijighatso'pipasah satyakamah satyasankalpah so'nvastavyah sa vijijnasitavyah sa sarvamsca lokanapnoti sarvamsca kamanyastamatmanamanuvidya vijanatiti ha prajapati ruvaca.*

The meaning of the mantra is the Self is free from sin, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, and free from hunger thirst; it is the cause of desire for Truth and for commitment to Truth. This Self has to be sought for and thoroughly known. The person who has sought for and known the Self attains all worlds and all desires. This is broadly divided into two sections and section 1 to 6 is one portion is daharakasa Upasana which is known as dahara vidya. It is Upasana prakaranam and not jnana prakaranam. Second portion is jnana prakaranam wherein daharakasa is revealed as Brahman. in dahara vidya dahara Akasa is imagined as Brahman and in the second jnana prakarandam daharakasa is Brahman and it is a fact.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 101

### **Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]**

The Dahara or the ‘Small Akasa’ is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.19.[82]**

#### ***Uttaracchedavirbhutasvarupastu***

If it be said that for subsequent texts [it appears that the individual soul is meant, we say that what is there referred to is] rather [the individual soul in son far] as its real nature has become manifest [i.e., as it is non different from Brahma]

We are now in the 19<sup>th</sup> sutra of Daharadhikaranam. Through this adhikaranam we establish daharakasa is Brahman alone for the purpose of Upasana. This adhikaranam has got 8 sutras. First four sutras Vyasacharya refute one type of purva paksa and in the second four he refutes another set of purva paksa. Bhutakasa purva paksa are negated in the first and in the second is jiva purva paksa. Jiva purva paksa we commenced from 18<sup>th</sup> sutra and now we analyse the 19<sup>th</sup> sutra now. We claimed daharakasa is Paramatma because of the latter descriptions. Now purva paksa claims daharakasa is Jivatma as per the latter descriptions. Thus only difference we used uttarebyah and they use the expression uttarad. The question is what is the description, which seemingly supports the purva paksa. I said that in the Chandogya upanisad in the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter we have six topics in the first group, which we call as dahara vidya, which means dahara Upasana. From section 7 to 12 the second group is called prajapati vidya, which refers to jnanam. In both dahara vidya and prajapati vidya daharakasa is the basis. In the first one daharakasa is imagined as Brahman while in the second daharakasa is known as Brahman. The first one is not fact based and imagination based but the second one is the fact based. I imagine you are beautiful means it is not a fact. I know you are beautiful means it is a fact.

Now while talking about dahara vidya, this daharakasa has got eight gunas of Atma, which we saw earlier. The Upasana topic we completed and the Upasana phalam was also given which ended with krama mukti. He goes to Brahma loka and gets jnanam and gets mukti. In prajapati vidya that is Brahmaji makes a statement, which is esah Atma prajapati also, makes asta guna vishista Atma he introduces. From that expression we come to know prajapati also talks about daharakasa only. Whoever knows this Atma he attains liberation. Thereafter prajapati makes a public notice and he never addresses any particular person. All the beings saw and approached Brahma and all devas and others go to Brahma and seek ashta vidha guna visishya jnanam. He teaches this Atma in four stages and he had two students one Indra and one Virocana. In the first session two students were there and in the second session he had only one student. In each stage the guru had to serve the guru for 35 years. The mantra reference is the public notice mantra occurs in the mantra 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad [the individual Self is Atma]. This is the general announcement. Here Prajapathi declares that this is the nature of the Self. And if you know the Self, you attain everything. He sent invitations as it were ‘come and learn from me’ here in order to teach the nature of the Self and also to emphasise the need for Self discipline to attain Self-Knowledge the Upanishad introduces this

story of Indra and virocana. The teaching begins in the mantra 8.7.4 of Chandogya upanisad. Here Atma is revealed as Aksi Purusa [that which is seen in the eyes is the Self] the waker Self is technically called visvah. The next stage of teaching comes in the mantra 8.10.1 Chandogya upanisad [when a man being asleep reposing and at perfect rest sees no dreams that is the Self] here ashta vidha guna Atma is revealed as taijasa. Again in the third stage the same Atma is revealed in the mantra 8.11.1 Chandogya upanisad [the immortal fearless] here the very same Atma is revealed as sleeper, the Self-prajnah. According to Vedanta atman and Brahman are one and the same. When we use the word atman we refer to the Self within us. The word Brahman means the biggest, the greatest, the ultimate that is superior to everything. These three statements alone purva paksa takes to his advantage. While Prajapathi talks about daharakasa he talks about waker, dreamer and sleeper, the purva paksa says that Jivatma alone is waker, becomes dreamer and sleeper because avasthatriyam belongs to jiva alone. Therefore daharakasa is affected by three avasthas and therefore daharakasa is visva taijasa and prajna because of these three mantras. This is jiva purva paksah. For this Vyasacharya gives his answer that daharakasa refers to Paramatma alone. Now we will see the answer.

Vyasacharya says 'yes'. Upanishad reveals daharakasa as jiva waker, sleeper and dreamer. Whenever sastra talks about jiva, jiva has got two meanings depending upon the context one is vachyarthajiva and the other is lakshyarthajiva. When we take vachyarthajiva for waker jiva the meaning is the waker jiva is conscious entity, which is the integral part of the physical body and the consequent jagrat avastha. It is sthoola sarira sahita Chaitanyam. It is a messy jiva. This is the meaning, which is commonly understood by every meaning.

When we use the word I we know the 'I' represents this physical body. In some cases Upanishad uses vachyarthajiva along with the human being. Even after knowing that sun does not rise and set and ti is the earth that goes round knowingly we use the mistaken expression sun goes round the earth. So also Upanishad joins the common man and uses jiva to indicate the sarira sahita Chaitanyam. It is called anuvada knowing the truth. Vachyarthajiva is anudita jiva an expression used along with the common man body mixed Consciousness. This is meaning number one for jivah.

The second meaning is the Consciousness as mixed with body but the witness of the body therefore distinct from body and uninvolved from body; the body separated from Consciousness and it is lakshyarthajiva Chaitanyam or upahita Chaitanyam. One is pure Consciousness and another is adulterated Consciousness. One is vachyarthajiva and another is lakshyarthajiva. First is vishista Chaitanyam [impure Consciousness with body] and the other is upahita Chaitanyam [pure Consciousness]. Take the meaning according to the context.

Suppose the father has gone to the temple and he has brought some thirtham on the puja table. Children get up late. Father addresses the son 'on the cup temple thirtham and bring it'. The son does even though he asked father thirtham only, the son understood container sahita thirtham and he brought the thirtham with container. Father says bring the thirtham. Suppose as in the first case, take thirtham. First thirtham included the container and second time he took the thirtham and not the container. Body is container; Consciousness is the thirtham. We have to understand whether the body with container or without container one should take the meaning according to the context.

Suppose the father does not ask him to bring the thirtham but drink the thirtham, the son takes only the thirtham and not takes the container. First time vishista thirtham and second time it is upahita thirtham. Body is the container; Consciousness is thirtham jiva; Upanishad uses the

wordc jiva generally and we have to understand in the context whether it is sarira sahita or sarira rahita.

When Prajapathi decided to reveal the daharakasa Atma, what he meant was Sthoola Sariram saksi Chaitanyam lakshyartha waker is revealed visvah is talked about and not vachyartha visvah. Consciousness that obtains in Sookshma Sariram does not include Sookshma Sariram. Daharakasa is lakshyartha Jivatma that includes tajasa, prajna and visva; many important Vedantic is revealed here.

Purva Paksi says daharakasa is not Paramatma and it is Jivatma and you say that Jivatma is vachyartha Jivatma and he says that daharakasa is Jivatma whether it is vachyartha or lakshyartha. It is Jivatma but qualified as vachyartha or lakshyartha. For that we answer lakshyartha Jivatma is another name for Paramatma. Therefore you cannot say daharakasa is not Paramatma. It is Paramatma for lakshyartha jiva is Paramatma only. Sometimes conversation takes place either without understanding what is what. Here Purva Paksi without understanding lakshyartha Jivatma is Paramatma he argues that daharakasa is Jivatma. Now we have to prove it is lakshyartha to establish aksi Purusa is aksi saksi Sthoola Sariram saksi alone is talked about. He says you read the mantra properly. If you read the mantra he says daharakasa is waker and this waker is amritam immoral abhayam ever secure; now tell me if the waker is vachyartha the conscious entity along with body can you he is immortal. Can you say the waker jivah is fearless? No. The sense of insecurity is ever with jiva. Therefore vachyartha jiva can never be abhaya jiva. Prajapathi says abhayam means the waker Consciousness is witness Consciousness alone and not Jivatma and jiva sariram. This is repeated in the next stage also. In swapna and in Sushupti also etad amritam etad abhayam is repeated. Prajapathi also says in the end etad Brahman. Visva is Brahma tajasa Brahma prajna is Brahman provided you take the right meaning.

Here Adhi Sankaracharya takes the fourth stage of teaching. The mantra goes like this. It is 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *evam esvaisa samprasadosmac charirat samutthaya Param jyotir upasampadya svena rupenabhinispadyate,, sa ultamah purusah, sa tatra prayeti jaksat kridan ramanah sribhir va yatha prayoga acarane yuktah, evam evayam asmin sarire prano yuktah* the meaning of the mantra is even so that serene one when he rises up from this body and reaches the highest light appears in his own form. Such a person is the Supreme person. There such a one moves about laughing, playing, rejoicing, with women chariots or relations not remembering the appendage of this body. As an anima; is attached to a cart so is life attached to this body.

Here Prajapathi says daharakasa taught of as visva tajasa and prajna is turiam separate from sookshma, sthoola and karana sariram when separated from sariratriaym it merges with Brahman. By making this statement Upanishad contributes to our confusion. Merges mean you may think that separate jivatma and pour this to Brahma Chaitanyam. This adds to confusion. This is a very important line on which the Advaita teaching is centered around. Svena rupena abhinispadyate means Jivatma Chaitanyam merges into Brahma Chaitanyam. This statement is refined as Jivatma Chaitanyam emerges in its original nature of Brahma Chaitanyam or Paramatma. The original nature Jivatma is nothing but laksayartha Jivatma. Now Purva Paksi may say in the fourth stage, the original nature of Jivatma may be taken as right but what about other three states. The first stage and second stage and third stage also must be talking about lakshyartha alone because Prajapathi repeatedly says that I teach this subject in every state. The fourth state of teaching refers to lakshyartha and the first three also the topic is same so the first three states also refer to lakshyartha Jivatma only. In all the four

stages lakshyartha Jivatma is talked about which is identical with Paramatma and therefore daharakasa is Paramatma only. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 102

### Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]

The Dahara or the ‘Small Akasa’ is Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.19.[82]**

#### ***Uttaracchedavirbhutasvarupastu***

If it be said that for subsequent texts [it appears that the individual soul is meant, we say that what is there referred to is] rather [the individual soul in son far] as its real nature has become manifest [i.e., as it is non different from Brahma]

We do the general analysis of the 19<sup>th</sup> sutra of Daharadhikaranam. This is purva paksa part and here purva paksa argues that the daharakasa has to be taken as jiva as the latter description tallies with his arguments. Daharakasa is revealed as visva, taijasa and prajna and the jiva is avastatriya sambandha can belong to jiva alone and therefore daharakasa is jiva. Siddhanta argues that the vachyārtha of these words should not be taken and it is not that the sthoola sarira visishta Chaitanyam you should take but you should take the lakshyārtha of sthoola sarira upahita Chaitanyam. So also in the case of sookshma and karana sariram one should take the lakshyārtha and the lakshyārtha of the respective sookshma and karana sarira Chaitanyam refers to Paramatma and not Jivatma as contended by the Purva Paksi is the arguments of siddhantis in this regard. Lakshyārtha Jivatma is nothing but Paramatma. The Upanishad consistently uses the word etad amritam and if vachyārtha is intended the samanvaya prayoga etad amrita is not possible. It is because etad amritam is there at every stage Visva Taijasa and Prajna, the Upanishad itself reveals what is meant is lakshyārtha in the mantra by the words etad Brahman and therefore daharakasa means Paramatma alone.

After revealing visva, taijasa and prajna the same daharakasa is revealed as turiyam in 8.12.3 reveals that this daharakasa separates itself from Visva Taijasa and Prajna and merges itself with Paramatma. And it emerges in its own original nature and from this it is very clear that his daharakasa is none other than paramjyoti or Paramatma it is very clear.

But purva paksa says that I am not worried of the fourth stage but I am worried about the first three states only. It looks redundant but says that Prajapathi makes it clear that Prajapathi hints of the fact that the same topic is discussed at all stages. At the end of 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> sections, the mantra says the same topic is discussed which means that whatever is discussed in fourth stage which is non-controversial is alone discussed in first three stages and it means the first three stages are also Visva Taijasa and Prajna the same Paramatma is discussed and similarly in the fourth stage also and this possible only if you take lakshyārtha Jivatma which is equal to Paramatma. The objection is based on 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad which reads as *evamevaisa samprasado'smacchariratsamutthaya Param jyotirurpasampadya svena rupanabhinispadyate sa uttarmah purusah sa tatra pryeti jaksarkridanramamanah sribhirva yanairva jnatibhirva nopajanam smarannidam sariram sa yatha prayoga acarane yukta evamevaya mamsmificharire prano yuktah* the meaning of the mantra is that in the same way the joyful Self arises from the body and attaining the light

of the Cosmic. Self appears in his own form. This is the Paramatman, the cosmic Self. He then freely moves about eating, laying or enjoying himself with so men, carriages or relatives not remembering at all the body in which how was born. Just as horses or bullocks are harnessed to carriages, similarly prana [life] remains harnessed to the body due to karma. When Visva Taijasa and Prajna comes out of this body, it merges and it becomes one with paramjyoti and it emerges out in its Brahma swarupam. A very confusing statement it is. Jiva gets out of the three sariram is one confusion and it get merges with Paramatma is another confusion.

Purva paksa asks the question you say Brahman is the very nature of Jivatma and the nature is that which obtains all the time. Swabhavam or swarupam is that which is never lost. Swarupam is something, which is always there. Emerging in its original form is a contradiction. Only when some impurity is there and after removing the impurity, the Atma gets its original form we can accept. But it cannot emerge out of original form and it is not even covered by impurity for asangam Brahman cannot have any impurity. The question is what is the meaning of emerging out in Brahman form. What process is that? According to you no process is involved. It is not an end product of any process. Where is the question of emerging out? This is the question from purva paksa.

Adhi Sankaracharya says emergence in the form of Brahman, merging with Brahman etc., are not actual event taking place any time anywhere, Jivatma was Paramatma, is Paramatma and will be Paramatma. Adhi Sankaracharya impurity is your notion that you are impure. There is no impurity other than the notion that I am impure. I said I am 'impure notion', means that the Sthoola Sariram has got impurity we know; Sookshma Sariram there is plenty of impurity kama kroda, anger etc. Karana sariram is ajnana malam and it is impure and we talk about I, the Atma is ever pure and the impurity is but a notion; I am embodied is only a notion. If the impurity is the form of notion the removal of impurity is nothing but dropping of the notion and it is only an intellectual process. Our samsara is an intellectual process that I am a samsari. Moksa also is an intellectual process to drop the notion of 'avidya' or samsara. Aviveka is equal to samsara and viveka is moksa. Viveka take place only in the intellect. Aviveka also takes place in the intellect. Therefore, Adhi Sankaracharya says here, viveka aviveka matram, other than the knowledge, no process is involved to become asariram. This topic is elaborately discussed before.

Tattusamanvayad 4<sup>th</sup> sutra we had discussed this matter. The embodied person is samsari and un-embodied person gains moksa and that is essence of the statement. Sariratvam samsarah and asariratvam mokсах. Here there is support in Kathopanisad 1.2.22 *asariram sariresu anavathesu anavathesva vasthitam, mahantam vihum atmanam marva dhiro na socati* the meaning of the mantra is that the wise man, who knows the atman as bodiless seated firmly in perishable bodies, great and all pervading, does never before. When Adhi Sankaracharya quotes the statement purva paksa says that you are trapped. The embodied person is samaari. Unembodied one is muktah. When Adhi Sankaracharya quotes it, he says that as long jiva's body is there jivan mukti is impossible. He says that now it is sadeha and that is why you talk about viveka you gain and from the sruti statement sadeha mukti is a contradiction. Adhi Sankaracharya says you are ever unembodied one. You are nitya vivekah. He further adds that Atma does not become sadeha because Atma is asangah and it can never get connected with the body.

Sahetvam is the notion that I am embodied is sadeha. During the notion I entertain I am sadehah also I am videha. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Katha mantra 1.2.22 as above. Moksa

is nothing other than knowledge cannot remove the notion that I am sadehah. Abinishpattih nama vivegah. Jivatma emerging as Paramatma is nothing but the knowledge; Jivatma emerging as Paramatma is nothing but dropping the notion that I am Jivatma. With this the last purva paksa is answered and with this the general analysis of this sutra is over.

Now we will take up the word for word analysis. Uttarat number one; chet number two; avirbhuta svarupam number three and tu is the fourth word. If Jivatma and Paramatma is eternally one why should the Upanishad negate it. Upanishad does not negate it because we have the notion of difference and Upanishad negates the notion held by jiva that he is not Paramatma. You supply two words in the beginning. Daharakasa and jiva add before uttarat. Daharakasa is Jivatma uttarat because of the latter description of daharakasa as Visva Taijasa and Prajna 8.7.4, 8.10.1, and 8.11.1 of Chandogya upanisad. It is described as waker, dreamer and sleeper, it Jivatma. Now the answer comes. Here you have to supply jiva and say we do agree that jiva reference is there. Avirbhuta swarupa means lakshyartha jivah jiva in secondary meaning and not in its vachyartha meaning. We take it in its exposed nature Sthoola Sariram, Sookshma Sariram and karana sariram and we see the waker minus Jagrat Avastha; dreamer minus swapna avastha; and sleeper minus Sushupti avastha the three avasthas are three layers and now we get exposed visva, we get exposed taijasa and we get exposed prajna; so we get avirbhuta swarupam yasya jivah. We get jivah in its secondary meaning which is Brahman. Primary meaning is jiva. Daharakasa deals with lakshyartha jiva which is none other than Paramatma. Tu means therefore the objection is negated. Therefore, the purva paksa nishedartha indicates the negation of purva paksa. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

### Sutra 1.3.20.[83]

#### **Anyarthascha paramarsah**

And the reference [to the individual soul] is for a different purpose.

The argument of sutra 14 is continued. There is possible objection from Purva Paksi if the Upanishad does not want to reveal daharakasa as Jivatma and if it wants to reveal it as Paramatma then why should Upanishad brings in Visva Taijasa and Prajna and confuse us and avoid the three. It need not have talked about Visva Taijasa and Prajna. Why bring in lakshyartha and vachyartha and why should you do talk in roundabout way. If you talk about Paramatma why say Visva Taijasa and Prajna and say it is vachyartha and lakshyartha. It adds to the confusion. Since Upanishad is using the word jiva, Visva Taijasa and Prajna it should be Jivatma alone and give the secondary meaning Paramatma etc. If it had not revealed so, we would have taken Paramatma is a separate entity and bed would have been there. Then comes you come and see Paramatma in vaikundam etc., for me to see Paramatma one day. The idea of division should go away. This makes Paramatma limited. And therefore Upanishad wants to say the visva is Paramatma. The separation of Jivatma from Paramatma should go away. Then waker Consciousness minus waking experiences is Paramatma. Even now the I, the Consciousness is Paramatma. I need not superimposition of body on the jiva and even now I realize the superimposition, I can realize the unlocated awareness and the location belongs to the body and I should know minus the notion of location I am Paramatma.



With the superimposing of the body and the various experiences like Visva Taijasa and Prajna, I get the notion that I am Jivatma and the very notion of Jivatma takes me to samsaritam. Once the notion of the body and its various experiences is dropped I feel my very nature and the very swarupam which is nothing but Paramatma status. Buddhi nivanartham jiva paramarsah. Otherwise Paramatma will be eternally Paramatma and Jivatma will be eternally Jivatma and you will say that that Brahmanis ever free and the Jivatma is ever in bondage without any solution of getting liberation. Therefore the essence of this sutra the reference of jiva is not to reveal that I am jivah but to reveal the fact that I am non-different from Paramatma.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis. We have to rearrange the words of the sutra from anyarthascaha paramarsah to paramarsah anyarthascahah. Paramarsah means reference to daharakasa as jiva in 8.3.44, 8.7.4, 8.10.1 and 8.11.1, and 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad here daharakasa is referred to as jiva in different words samprasaha word is kept in mind here. This is meant for some other purpose, which means it is not the purpose that you mean, and other than the purpose different. You think that daharakasa is jivah but it means the enlightened jivah or Brahman, which is non-different from jiva. The difference between Jivatma and Paramatma is negated and it negates not for the benefit of Upanishad but unfortunately we have the notion of difference and therefore it negates the notion of difference and therefore it negates the notion of difference between jivatma and Paramatma. Equation cannot be there between explicitly equal thing but equation can be there between two different things only. The condition for equation of the two things should be equal with a seeming difference and then only there an equation is possible. Eight is eight is not an equal. Eight is nine minus one is equal. Then only it is an equation. On one side eight is there and on the other nine is there; on one side nothing is there and on the other minus sign is there. Similarly between Jivatma and Paramatma there is vachyartha Beda. There does seem difference that one is superimposed by upadhis while the other is not. Therefore Upanishad has to reveal the aikyam and therefore jiva has been brought in and told about the aikyam with Paramatma. The next sutra we will take in the next class

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 103

### Topic 5. Daharadhikaranam [Sutras 14-21]

The Dahara or the 'Small Akasa' is Brahman.

Sutra 1.3.21.[84]

#### **Alpasruteriti chet taduktam**

If it be said that on account of the scriptural declaration of the smallness [of the ether] [Brahman cannot be meant] [we say that] that has already been explained. The argument in support of Sutra 14 concluded with this sutra.

We see the last sutra of this adhikaranam. It is connected with daharakasa obtaining in the heart is Brahman or something else with reference to 1.2.7 of Brahma Sutra, Purva paksa says that it refers to elemental space alone while siddhanta says that daharakasa refers to Brahman only. Daharakasa means small space; Brahman means Infinite. The small space is Infinite and we see the statement itself is contradictory. Therefore daharakasa is jiva which is alpam. Daharakasa as Brahman is so evidently contradictory. It is like saying that I have no tongue. The very fact that I talk means I have tongue. The very word dahara means alpa and word Brahman means mahat and you say paricchinna Akasa is aparicchinna Brahman. On the other hand if you take jiva there are several indications to show that jiva is small one in the Akasa and how can it be big Akasa or Brahman. Alpasruteriti chet is purva paksa part; taduktam is siddhanti argument. We have answered this question. The answer is given in 1.2.7 of Brahma sutra the answer is given. We have seen Brahman as manomaya resides in the heart. Daharam alpakam are synonymous and since manomaya is within the heart and how can we say Brahman is in the heart when Brahman is all pervading. Here the Brahman is within the heart means we correct the statement as Brahman is within the heart also. Brahman is in the heart also means Brahman is everywhere both in heaven and hell and Brahman is in the heart also. If you think Brahman is in the heart only there is problem. Even though Brahman has not location, and Brahman is all pervading and the scriptures prescribes location for Brahman for the purpose of Upasana alone. Brahman is located in the heart for the purpose of puja or meditation. I cannot invoke Brahman in the absence of a particular locus for the purpose of puja and dhyana. Daharatvam is superimposed for the purpose of dhyana and meditation and to perform puja in the absence of which it is difficult to perform any puja. The word Vishnu means all pervading. That Vishnu I worship in small saligrama and even when I worship I know Vishnu is all pervading but I temporarily invoke on a salgrama. So also daharakasa means small Akasa in the heart although the same daharakasa is all pervading Brahman alone.

Now we will see the word for word analysis. Alpastrute iti chet tad and uktam. There are five words in this sruti. The first portion is purva paksa portion. Supply two words as daharakasa and Jivatma. Daharakasa jivah alpastrute; this is Purva Paksi statement. The meaning is daharakasa which is referred to in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.1 is jiva lone is the argument of the purva paksa. Alpasrute because of the smallness of Akasa in the sruti. The word alpa does not occur there but the word dahara is mentioned there in the Upanishad. That jiva is small is

understood and accepted by all. Iti chet means suppose such an objection is raised and now comes the answer tad uktam the answer to that objection. Vyasacharya himself is already given the answer in the sutra 1.2.7. Smallness is superimposed for the purpose of jnanam for the sake of invocation or meditation. Daharakasa is neither Akasa nor Jivatma but it is Paramatma himself.

Visayah the subject matter is whether the small space within the heart mentioned in the 8.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad referred to as daharakasa. The point at issue is whether the small space mentioned above refers to bhutakasa or Jivatma or Paramatma. The first one the very Akasa is primarily bhutakasa; the second is the latter description of Atma, Visva Tajasa and Prajna Atma etc., refers to Jivatma is the basis and the third one Paramatma and siddhanta's base which we have explained. The Upanishad very heavily supports our stand. Purva paksha supports that it refers to bhutakasa and Jivatma. The siddhanta says daharakasa is Paramatma, which is the conclusion. The fifth sangathi and with regard to this we say it is occurring in its proper place only. This adhikaranam deals with Upasyam Brahman only. It is have nothing to do with jnanam.

Before going to the next adhikaranam I would like to discuss a topic. This is the first interpretation of the mantra 8.1.1 and I would like to discuss the second interpretation also. In Adhi Sankaracharya commentary both the interpretations are given. Hence I thought it would be better to give you both the interpretation. Within the body Brahma puram is sariram and pundarikam means heart; within the heart there is small space; body is one container; heart is one container and within the heart the space is another container. And within the space the container resides Brahman. Whatever is there is, you have to enquire. Upanishad uses the pronoun. 'Within that' is the expression we analyse. Tasmin we took again as the heart itself. Previous statement within the heart the space is there and within the heart whatever space is there you should enquire into. The object of enquiry is the space within the heart.

The second interpretation is within the heart space is there and within that what every is there you have to enquire is the first interpretation. The second interpretation is within the space whatever is there you should enquire into. The object of enquiry is not the space and within the space whatever is there you should enquire into. Daharakasa is not object of enquiry. Within daharakasa whatever is there you should enquire into. According to the second interpretation. Let us analyse further on the basis of the second interpretation. What is that space and what is within the space? The latter mantra analyses the container and the content. It says what is inside is daharakasa. It clarifies daharakasa is Brahman. What is there within the daharakasa. The content it says the entire creation is the content. Jagat the world is the content. According to the analysis there are three containers the body, the heart, the daharakasa within the heart and then jagat is the innermost thing and then it is clear that what is our enquiry is jagat alone. What is the benefit of jagat enquiry. Second problem is everywhere Upanishad talks about enquire about Brahman and now why should jagat need be enquired. During the body analysis, we said that Brahman is the object of enquiry. While talking about uttarebhyaha, we have said that Brahman is the object of enquiry. Within Brahman jagat is there and mantra talk about jagat anvesanam and why to you interpret is Brahman enquiry. Adhi Sankaracharya says that jagat anveshtabyam when Upanishad says sadharam jagat anveshtabyam. You should enquire into the world alongwith the content. The first container you need not enquire, second content you need not enquire and Upanishad says that the third container is enquired. Tad is interpreted as ubhayam. Upanishad prescribes the enquiry of the world along with Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya manages to enquire Brahman as the object of enquiry. It talks about jagat enquiry. Why do you say jagat enquiry along

with something. He says I have sruti support and logical support. He has the sruti support is 8.1.6 one who knows Atma and the desires existing in Atma attains everything. Upanishad talks about Atma and desires within. Atma refers to container jivakasa and desires are the entire ue. Atma refers to the container. But Upanishad talks about Atma sahita jnana phalm. By enquiring into the world there is no purusarthah. But Upanishad gives moksa phalam and therefore enquiry should take into account the adhistanam also. Refer to 15<sup>th</sup> chapter Upanishad talks about samsara saharah. Gita sloka 15.1 reads as *urdhavamulam adhakidkham advaitham prahur avyayam chandamsi yasya parnani yas tam veda sa vedavit* the meaning of the mantra is they speak of the imperishable advaitham [peepal tree] as having roots above and branches below. Its leaves are the Vedas and he who knows this is the knower of the Vedas. In the first three lines it discusses samsara vriksha and in the fourth line it says the knower of samsara vriksha is a jnani. We should have the confusion as to how the knower of samsari is liberated. The one who knows samsara vriksam along with its root and here the root is Brahman and knower of Brahman gain freedom or liberation. The container is daharakasa and daharakasa is Brahman and you have to enquire Brahma sahita daharakasa. This you should remember when you read sankara bashyam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 104

### **Topic 6. Anukriyadhikaranam [Sutras 22-23]**

Everything shines after Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.22.[85]**

#### **Anukritestasya cha**

On account of the acting after [i.e., the shining after] [that after which sun, moon, etc., are said to shine is the Supreme Self] and [because by the light] of Him [everything else is lighted]

A passage from the Mundaka Upanishad mantra II.2.10 is taken up for discussion.

First I will give a general introduction of this small adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya analyses the well known Mundaka mantra II.2.10 that reads as *na tatra suryo bhati na candra tarakam nema vidyuto bhanti kuto- 'yam-agnih, tameva bhantam anubhati sarvam tasya bhasa sarva midam vibhati* which is repeated in Kathopanishad mantra No. II.v.15. the meaning of the mantra is the sun does not shine there, nor does the moon, nor do the stars, nor the lightning and much less this fire. When He shines, everything shines after him, by His light all these shine.

With regard to that Atman the sun does not shine; that means when the question of illumination of Atma comes the sun does not shine means that is non-luminous. The sun does not illumine the Atma. We change the verb from illumine to shine. With regard to Atma the moon and stars do not shine that means moon and sun do not illumine Atma. With regard to the Atma the streaks of lightning do not illumine the Atma; what to talk of the miserable ordinary fire. With regard to Atma fire does not shine means this local fire also does not shine Atma. Then *tameva bhantam* in fact Atma need not illumine anything for Atma is Self-revealing Self luminous and Self-evident. Anything need not illumine these things. Everything else is shining with the help of Atma.

Everything reveals everything with the help of Atma alone. Everything shines after Atma light. Atma shines first and only that shines everything else shines. After the first person I all other things and beings come into being. This is indicated by the word *anu*. Similarly Ramah jathah and *anu Lokshmana jathah*. *Anu* always indicate the sequence. only when *agam vritti* arise *idam vritii* arises. This is said in *sad darsanam*. *aham* is first and everything else comes later only. in fact everything shines because of the light of Atma. Everything shines depending upon the Atma alone that means they do not have independently 'shining', independent capacity to reveal it won existence. I reveal my existence not because of anything else and therefore I shine myself and I do not dependent upon anything else for my shining nature. That Atma is Self-effulgent. Itself being not illumined by others it shines itself. It is *swapraksam*. *Swa itara aprakasatve sati* itself not illumined by others, *swa itara pakasa itvam illumine* all others. it is a very important mantra and from this alone we get an important corollary that Self-Knowledge is not an event. It is a very important concept of

Vedanta. When I know this particular cassette and cassette knowledge is possible because this knowledge was not evident to me. I know it means after knowing it I know the knowledge of the cassette. Knowledge is a process in which I change the non-evident category to the evident category. Atma Jnanam means change Atma from the non-evident to the evident category. That is called knowledge. Upanishad says that Atma is never under the non-evident category to switch over to evident category. Adhi Sankaracharya says there is no such case of non-evident category at all. It is wrong to say that Atma Jnanam is possible only if you convert the Atma from non-evident to evident category. It is so because that Atma is being ever self evident, Atma is ever evident. What is Atma jnanam? Adhi Sankaracharya says in Upadesa Sahasri Adhi Sankaracharya defines Atma Jnanam is the negation of superimposed limitation from the ever-evident I. Brahman is evident as I. just as elephant throws dust on its dark body, we throw attribute dusts and we don't stop with I am, and we add bio-data I am a man man-ness attributes, I am an M.A. it is another attributes; I am sat and I am 'sat' and with that we should stop and not add any attribute and this jnanam is nothing but Atma Jnanam. Atma jnanam is not a peculiar experience. Any experience is not connected with Atma and it is only a peculiar experience. Don't look for Atma anubhava. When this mantra is so evident, why do you bring the mantra to the Brahma Sutra? What is the confusion here for bringing it in Brahma Sutra? What is the doubt? The doubt is that in the entire mantra, either the word Atma or the word Brahman is not used but instead a pronoun tatra is used to indicate Brahman. Tatra means 'tasmin', which means 'with regard to that'. in this context, we want to find out what do we mean by the tat sabdah? 'Tat' refers to 'that' because of which everything shines. What is that we want to know by the 'that' ['tat' in Sanskrit] sabda? here the sruti says 'tat' sabdah refers to Paramatma alone. With this general analysis of the entire adhikaranam is over.

Now we will enter the general analysis of the first sutra of this adhikaranam. 'tat' sabda is nothing but Paramatma. The pronoun that occurs in the first, second and the third line of the mantra refers to the Paramatma only because everything else has got posterior shining while the mantra talks of something that has the independent shining or that which is Self-shining Atma or Brahman. Because of its posterior shining of everything else, the light principle is Atma. Here Atma is shown as the Self-shining one.

In 5.4.2 of Chandogya upanisad we see that *manomayah pranasariro bharupah satyasankalpa* and here *bharupah* means it is self-luminous. Why this particular quotation is chosen? In this mantra the Self-revealing nature is shown prior shining means it is Self shining. Here the word *anubhati sarvam* of the above Mundaka Upanishad mantra is used to show the prior shining or Self-shining nature. The second reason is that because everything has got dependent shining. Previous one is everything has got posterior shining the time-wise nature. Here everything shines because of borrowed shining. But Atma lends shining to others because that sabda refers to the lender of shining and that lender of shining is Atma. How should you understand this in empirical experience? What do you means dependent and independent shining. To the cassette is you require that 'I am' first and the I am the Self evident I should be there. Then alone you can say the cassette is. Without telling that 'I am' the this-ness is not there. 'I am'. The Advaita Maharantam sloka 7 reads as *nahi bhanadrte sattvam narte bhanam citio'citah cit-sambhandho 'pi nadhyasad rte tenaham-advayah* the meaning of this mantra is the world cannot be reckoned to exist without its experiences. The experiences, of the inert world, in turn are not possible without Consciousness; the association of the inert with Consciousness again, cannot be there but for the superimposition. I the Consciousness am one without second. To talk about 'is-ness' of something you should be conscious of that and to be conscious of that you require

Consciousness and that Consciousness is nothing but Atma and without Atma you cannot be conscious of anything. Without Atma's existence you cannot talk about existence of anything else. Therefore also everything has got dependent shining. That is the second reason. Since everything has got dependent shining, the must talk about only something that has got independent shining and that which has independent shining is Atma which is referred to in the Mundaka mantra as 'tat'.

Now we will go to the word analysis. Here there are three words *anukriteh tasya and cha*. We have to add two words. The words to be supplied are *tad sabdarthah* and the next word is *Brahman*. *tadsabdarthah Brahma anukriteh tasya cha*. First word is *tadsabdarthah* the meaning of the word 'that', occurring in Mundaka Upanishad three times in II.ii.10 they do not shine with regard to that that everything shines after that and everything shining because of that. The next one is *Brahman* or *Paramatma*; because of *anukriteh* means *anubhanam* or which is mentioned in the third line of the Mundaka mantra that is *tameva sarvam anubhati sarvam* the posterior shining; posterior means chronologically latter. *Anukrite* means because of the posterior shining of *sarvasya* so Upanishad must talk about the Self-shining of the Atma. Then comes *tasya cha* here the word *tasya* is used as an indicator of the entire fourth line of the mantra. *Tasya bhasa sarvamidam* so *Vyasacharya* uses this *tasya* that is because of the fourth line of this mantra which means *Vyasacharya* assumes the meaning of the fourth line that is because of the dependent shining of everything else *sarva anubhanad sarva basyatvacha* because of the dependent shining of everything else the Upanishad must talk of independent shining which is nothing but Self shining Atma alone. This is the essence of the mantra. The word *cha* is the conjunction of the two reasons. The final meaning of the sutra that the meaning of the word *tat* occurring in the mantra is *Brahman* alone because of the posterior shining of everything else. With this the first sutra is over. now *purva paksa* says I do not agree.

He says that the word 'tat' does not refer to Atma or Brahman. he says that it refers to some other powerful light principle. It is because of the various reasons. First look at the first line *na tatra suryah bahi* you interpret because of that sun does not shine. It is your interpretation. Here *purva paksa* says that I interpret that in the presence of that the sun does not shine. That means that in our experience we have seen when there are two light principle the powerful light overpowers the feeble light does not shine is not evident. The overpowering and overpowered light both are there. The stars are there in the sky in the night. They are there during the day also. They are luminous in day but because of the powerful light from *Surya* the stars do not shine. The same is the case with the moon. Suppose you keep a candle light in the day. You cannot see the candlelight. In the presence of powerful light the feeble light is not seen. The mantra says in the presence of some x light even the sun does not shine then the Upanishad must talk about very, very powerful light. This light must be much, much more powerful sunlight also. that in the presence of which the sun, moon or stars do not shine means the Upanishad talks about some powerful light. Then there is reason number two, which we will see, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 105

### **Topic 6. Anukriyadhikaranam [Sutras 22-23]**

Everything shines after Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.22.[85]**

#### **Anukritestasya cha**

On account of the acting after [i.e., the shining after] [that after which sun, moon, etc., are said to shine is the Supreme Self] and [because by the light] of Him [everything else is lighted]

A passage from the Mundaka Upanishad mantra II.2.10 is taken up for discussion.

In this small adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses the well-known Mundaka mantra. We have seen the meaning of the sutra and the meaning of that used is Paramatma alone because of the posterior shining of everything else in the creation and because of the dependent shining of everything in the creation. We have completed the meaning of the sutra and we see purva paksa observation. Purva paksa says that the pronoun refers not Paramatma or Brahman but some kind of effulgent principle more brilliant than the sun. it is a tejas tattvam and it does not refer to Consciousness principle. In support of his contention we saw the first one in the last class. All examples are tejas tattvam and boudhikam tattvam. All five refers to worldly perceptible light alone. In the presence of brighter light the lighter light does not shine. During day the stars are present and the light of stars are overpowered by sunlight and sunlight in this context is over-powering light and starlight is overpowered light. In the presence of a powerful light, even the sun does not shine means sun becomes dimmer in the presence of that light which is very brilliant. Tatra Surya na badhi means it must indicate that powerful light and the light which is introduced by the Upanishad must be boudhika light only. The principle is overpowering and overpowered light should belong to the same category visible to the eye. Extending the same principle the overpowering light should be boudhikam and the tatra is some powerful light. The second reason Purva Paksi gives is this. It is based on the word anubhati shine behind or shines after. Anu has the meaning of imitation, the imitation of any action indicated by the verb. Purva Paksi says the specific indicates anukaranam. Bhati is shining and anubhati means shining imitation. Then he introduces a law that imitation is possible only when two things have got similar features. Here Surya chandra and stars do the anubhanam and unknown principle is doing bhanam. That principle also should belong to the similar category. This is the second argument of the Purva Paksi. Tatra, tam and tasya occurring in the mantra refer to some boudhikam teja alone. Therefore it is said that tat does not refer to Paramatma.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives four arguments in support of his negation of Purva Paksi view. Firstly tatra should be taken as in its presence the sun moon etc., are overpowered. It talks about some brilliant light, which shines sun moon etc. Adhi Sankaracharya does not accept. Then he says it must be available for the perception of the eye. As it is not available to see, there is no light at all. It is not caksur pramana gocharam. That then light of the sun etc.,



should shine by some other material light is not known. It is absurd to say that one light is lighted by another. We do not know of any physical light, except the sun that can light Brahman. the manifestation of this whole universe has for its cause the existence of the light of Brahman, just as the existence of the light of the sun is the cause of the manifestation of all forms and colours. Brahman is Self-luminous. It remains in its own glory. It illumines the sun, the moon etc., the fire, senses, the mind and the intellect and all other objects. It does not need any other light to illumine it. Sruti texts like 'Brahman is the light of the light [jyotisham jyothi] clearly intimate that Brahman is Self-effulgent. It is quite possible to deny the shining of sun, moon etc., with reference to Brahman because whatever is seen is seen by the light of Brahman only. As Brahman is Self-effulgent, it is not seen by means of any other light. Brahman manifests everything else but is not manifested by anything else.

Adhi Sankaracharya adds there is no such a rule that imitation is possible only between two things of the same category. He gives another example. He says that there is an iron ball and it has no burning capacity. Suppose the iron ball comes in contact with fire, the fireball is capable of burning the iron ball. Here there is anukramam between the fire and iron ball and they don't have any similar nature while one has got the capacity to burn the other does not have the nature to burn. In fact when you take the example of shining they need not be of similar nature in fact Adhi Sankaracharya argues they should be of dissimilar nature only. Suppose there are two candles both emit lights. Samana swabhava is there. can you say that one is bhakti and the other is anubhakti one light does not depend upon the other light and anubhaktam cannot be possible between two light. It can be possible between one luminous and another non-luminous object. Samana swabhava anukramam rule does not apply here. Therefore this rule is not acceptable and that principle is not boudhikam jyoti.

The third argument is based on the word sarvam, which is highlighted here. If some powerful principle is boudhikam jyoti, which is more brilliant, then sun, any light or moon or fire they can help only in the illumination of forms and colours and not illumine smell, touch, taste etc. whereas the word sarvam according to our interpretation is that principle of Consciousness illumines everything which includes colours, touch, smell, knowledge, even your ignorance. The word boudhikam jyoti has got restricted meaning and the all cannot include taste smell etc. but in our interpretation that brilliant light lights everything without restricting the lighting anything. It means it lights without any exception. In the science of interpretation the meaning of word should not be restricted as far as possible. The word sarva means everything while Purva Pakshi restricts the meaning we don't restrict the meaning.

The next is the context of the mantra. Upanishad talks about Brahman and not anything about astronomy. The truth of universe is the question. The Upanishad here predominantly defines Brahman. hence this mantra refers to Brahman alone and not any other boudhika jyoti. That Brahman is there in the Atma and in the 9<sup>th</sup> mantra it is said that in vijñāna māyā kōśa the teacher has introduced Brahman in previous mantra. Atma is given the title light of the lights. The light of the light the teacher says that it is nothing but Self-effulgent Brahman alone. It is my explanation in the context of the expression. There is one more argument also. The very definition of veda is that instrument of knowledge which reveals things which are not available for human intelligence or instrument. Those that are seen by the instruments of knowledge need not be discussed by sastra. With this first sutra is over.

## **Topic 6. Anukriyadhikaranam [Sutras 22-23]**

Everything shines after Brahman.

**Sutra 1.3.23.[86]**

**Api cha smaryate**

Moreover the smriti also speaks of him i.e., Brahman to be the universal light.

An argument in support of sutra 22 is given. Purva paksa is not happy with the explanation given in the above sutra. Purva paksa says the explanation is not at all satisfactory. With regard to Atma sun does to shine. This is re-read as sun does not illumine the Atma. Here how can you give the meaning of illumine to the word shine. This is the argument put forward by the Purva Paksi. Shine is an intransitive verb and illumine is a transitive verb. The Upanishad uses an intransitive verb and you take the word as causal verb or transitive verb. How can this be done? For that answer is given in this sutra.

Whenever you are uncomfortable with veda vakyam you can go in for the smriti vakyams for smriti is a commentary on sruti. Kalidasa gives the example that Sita followed Rama like smriti following sruti. What a great example. If he could give this smriti follows sruti so closely. Smriti follows sruti very closely. here we have sruti support in Gita sloka 15.6 that reads as *na tad bhasayate suryo na sasanho na pavahah yad gatva na nivartante tad dhama paramam mama*. The sun does not illumine that, or the moon or the fire. That is My Supreme abode from which those who reach it never return. The word basayati is used and it is commentary on the word bhati. Basayate means illumines and we have not violated by any rules. This is the general analysis.

Now we will go for word for word analysis. It has three words. Api cha smaryate. The first two words should be taken together which means moreover. Already reasons are given and now one more is added. That means there is smriti support also. Vyasacharya says sruti support is there but he has not given the detail. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the number of the sruti. Another quotation is from Gita 15.14 that reads as *yad adityagatam teja jagad bhasyate'khilam yac candramasi yac ca 'gnau tal tejo viddhi mamaham* the meaning of this sloka is that splendour of the sun that illumines this whole world, that which is in the moon, that which is in the fire, that splendour know as mine. Jyotisham hyoti is my tejas the Brahman's tejas and this alone adityagatam tejah. Because of this light alone the sun shines. We complete the sutra smriti pramana tad sabdah and with this, this adhikaranam is over.

The subject matter of the adhikaranam is subda occurring in 2.2.10 of Mundaka Upanishad. The doubt is whether it refers to elemental light or spiritual light. Purva Paksi says that it refers to elemental light only because of the other elemental lights mentioned. Siddhanta says because of the various reasons given above tad sabda refers to Brahma alone. The adhikaranam is placed in the right place.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 106

### **Topic 7 pramitadhikaranam [Sutras 24-25]**

The person of the size of a thumb to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 1.3.24.[87]**

#### **Subdedeva pramitah**

From the very word, the term [viz. the term Lord supplied to it] the [person] measured [by the size of the thumb] [is Brahman]

Here mantra II.4.12 of Kathopanisad is taken up for discussion. The mantra reads as anguntha matrah Purusa Madhya atmani tisthati, isano bhuta bhavyasya, na tato vijugupstate with the meaning that the person [Purusa] of the size of a thumb, resides in the middle of the body, Lord of the past and the future and henceforward [after knowing Him] fears no more. This is indeed That. This followed by the next mantra of the same Upanishad 13 that reads as anguntha matrah Purusa; jyotir iva adhumakah, isano bhuta bhavyasya sa evadya so u svah the meaning of this mantra is that person of the size of the thumb, is like flame without smoke, Lord of the past and future. He alone is even today and will be verily tomorrow. This is verily That.

First I will give you to the general introduction to this adhikaranam, which has two sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses the mantras occurring in Kathopanisad angusta matra purusah as above. Here jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is revealed in this mantra. First line talks of Jivatma and the second line of Paramatma. Angusta mantra purusah means one who dwells within the body. This Jivatma, which is known, as Purusa is *angusta matra* means the Jivatma is of the size of the thumb in the middle of the body. Here Atma means sariram. sarira Madhya means hridaye. Jivatma dwells in the heart of the body is of the size of the thumb. This Jivatma really speaking is the Lord of the creation of the past, present and future creation. in 12<sup>th</sup> mantra it is said that whoever knows this jivatma and Paramatma aikyam never feels insecurity. He does not seek security from the external world. he does not desire for security]ty means he feels security within himself. This Atma alone was in the past, in the present and will be in future also. This Atma is eternal. This Jivatma residing in the heart of the size of angusta is none but Paramatma. The word *angusta matra Purusa* is the word for discussion. It is to be found that whether *angusta matra Purusa* is limited Jivatma or limitless Paramatma. The purva paksa assumes that it refers to the limited Jivatma alone. While siddhanta says it refers to Paramatma alone. Now we will enter into the general analysis of the first sutra.

In the first sutra *angusta matra Purusa* does not refer to limited Jivatma but to the limitless Paramatma. Vyasacharya says the second line gives the reason. *Angusta matra Purusa* does not refer to limited Jivatma but limitless Paramatma alone by using the expression *isanou bhuta bhavyasya*. The limitless Jivatma is not even the Lord of the house and how can he be the Lord of the creation. Jivatma is not even the Lord of the body even. The very fact it equates it with Paramatma alone.

We will go to the word for word analysis. There are three words *sabdat eva and pramitah*. You have to supply one word Paramatma and sutra should be read as pramitah Paramatma and the hetu is sabdat eva. The first word is pramitah. The word pramitah means the measured one, the limited one sized one, quantified one etc. this word refers to angusta matra Purusa. this Purusa is of the size of the thumb. This occurs in the Kathopanisad 2.4.13. the conclusion is that it refers to Paramatma alone. We have to take the lakshyartha of angusta matra and not the vachyartha. we should not take abasa chaitanya Purusa but we should take chaitanya Purusa. we should not take the reflected Consciousness but the original Consciousness the Paramatma. Because of the Upanisadic statement isanou bhuta bhavyasya and here Purusa is presented as the Lord of the universe. Here it is mentioned as jagat purusah. it should refer to lakshyartha Purusa Paramatma alone. Eva gives the emphasis. With this the first sutra word analysis is over. now we will see purva paksa's objection. How will you explain the size of the thumb when Paramatma is very big and he is sarvagathah. For this we ad eva and he is of the size of the thumb because he is in the heart and he is small as if. The space is limited within a hall and when we talk about the hall it seems limitation being factually it is not limited. If someone asks space within pot is limited we say space within the pot is wrong expression and it should be said that space is not within the pot and pot is within one all pervading space and in fact all the pots are within the space, the earth and the entire galaxy is within the space. The space within the pot is a figurative expression the limitation born out of figurative expression is aupathika parchedika. Limitation of pot is vasthavika paricchedah the real limitation. Similarly when Purusa is said angusta Purusa what we mean the Purusa seemingly is of the size of the thumb is nothing but sarvagata Paramatma alone. Even though Paramatma does not have the size of thumb and it is taken in the size of thumb for the purpose of meditation. These are the two answers to the first question. Now purva paksa comes with another question. He says that elsewhere in scripture angusta matra is used for limited Jivatma only. How do you contradict that? The elsewhere is a sloka in Mahabharatam in Sathyavan savitri story. in the story we find a sloka atha sathyavatha kayad pasavatham vasam gatham angusta mathram purusam niccha garsha yamo bhalad. Yama dharma raja drags the Jivatma of the size of the thumb from the Sathyavan's body. The Jivatma, which has been tied with the rope in the yama dharma raja's hand the Jivatma that is of the size of thumb, was dragged by yama dharma raja. The dragging is possible for the limited Purusa or limitless Purusa. dragging is possible to take an object from where it is from where it is not. Paramatma is available everywhere and Paramatma cannot be dragged. Hence purva paksa says only paricchinna Jivatma alone can be dragged and not aparicchinna Paramatma. All problem is due to taking not the right meaning. the direct meaning of Jivatma is Chidhabasa Chaitanyam, the reflected Consciousness. it is the vachyartha of the meaning of Chaitanyam. The implied meaning is the very chit the original Consciousness which pervades everywhere and which pervades Chidhabasa also. The chit alone and Chidhabasa being mithya lend the very existence of Chidhabasa. The chit the adhistanam is the lakshyartha meaning of the angusta Purusa. You take right meaning on the basis of the context. Whenever we talk of traveling Jivatma it refers to vachyartha Jivatma and when we talk of adhistanam of Jivatma it refers to lakshyartha adhistana Jivatma which is Chaitanya swarupam. In Kathopanisad it is lakshyartha meaning and in Savitri's story it refers to vachyartha Jivatma. When you talk of vachyartha Jivatma the limitation is factual. But when you take lakshyartha the pariccheda is seeming pariccheda, the limitation is seeming limitation. Here there is no confusion. The word Jivatma should be taken according to the context. Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is not possible if Jivatma refers to abhasa Chaitanyam. We should take adhistana Chaitanyam and it is Jivatma lakshyartha and Prapancha chaitanya Jivatma is vachyartha. with this all purva paksa are answered. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## Topic 7 Pramitadhikaranam [Sutras 24-25]

The person of the size of a thumb to Brahman.

### Sutra 1.3.25.[88]

#### Hridyapekshaya to manushyadhikaratvat

But with reference to the heart [the highest Brahman is said to be of the size of the thumb] as man alone is entitled [to the study of the Vedas to practise meditation and attain Self realization.]

This sutra answers another possible question. If you talk of the limitation of Paramatma for the sake of Upanishad or for some upadhi why should Upanishad refer to the size of the thumb? Vyasacharya gives the answer.

Vyasacharya says Paramatma obtains in the mind of everyone as the saksi or witness. Eventhough Paramatma is everywhere there the saksi manifestation is not there. everywhere it is jada Prapancha and in the mind alone Paramatma resides as saksi in adhikaranam. Paramatma is in the mind it is said by the scripture. But it is only a figurative expression. Paramatma is everywhere and as it obtains in Jivatma we compromise and say it is in the mind. One explanation is Paramatma is obtaining in the mind or we can say Paramatma is in the mind also. mind is in the heart. we talk of the physical heart only. therefore Paramatma is in the heart. the size of the heart is such that it will occupy the space indicated by the fist. Paramatma is within the container of this size and how can it be accommodated and try to put the thumb within. The space obtaining within your fist is the size of the thumb and therefore Paramatma is of the size of the thumb as it were. How can you say the heart is of the size of the fist. In the case of the elephant the heart will be of bigger of size. Heart can be bigger in the case of big animals. The heart size may vary. Since elephants do not study Vedas we need not worry about them. Human heart of the size of human fist. You take only manushya hridayam for example here since manushyas study the Upanishads.

It contains three words. You have to supply angusta matratvam. The words *hridi apekshaya and manushyadhikaratvat*. Manushya hridi apeksaya from the standpoint of human heart; the size of the thumb is mentioned. Manushyadhikaratvat because human beings are qualified to study the scriptures. The word tu indicates purva paksha object is not valid. Therefore the conclusion of this adhikaranam angusta matra Paramatma occurring in Kathopanisad is Paramatma. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two additional support also. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Kathopanisad that angusta matram Brahman is amritam Brahman. that is the reason number one. another support is at the end of 13<sup>th</sup> mantra it says that his Purusa is one that you wanted to know. Kathopanisad is the teaching to naciketetus and in the third boon he wanted to know Paramatma which was given in mantra number 1.2.14. of Kathopanisad and there naciketetus clearly asks him to teach about Brahman. then he says that this is Paramatma and it makes it clear the lakshyartha Jivatma which is Paramatma. With this the adhikaranam is over and the sutra is over. more in the next class.

Vishayah is the angusta matra Purusa occurring in Kathopanisad 2.1.13. the doubt is does it refer to samsari Jivatma or does it refer to samsari Jivatma or asamsari Paramatma. Purva paksha says it refers to Jivatma only because of the thumb size. Siddhanta says angusta matra

refers to Paramatma alone based on the second line of the sutra and the size is 'seeming size' and not the factual size. The fifth point is that it occurs in the right place.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 107

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.26[89]**

#### **Taduparyapi baadarayanah sanbhavat**

Also [beings above them [viz., men] [are entitled for the study and practice of the Vedas] on account of 'the possibility [of it] according to Badarayana. The description of the privilege of study of Vedas and meditation is continued.

We enter the next adhikaranam. I will give you the general introduction of this adhikaranam consisting of eight sutras. This and the next adhikaranam are the extension of the previous adhikaranam. these two adhikaranam answer two questions arising out of the previous adhikaranam. they are discussed incidentally and it is called prasanga sangathih. What is the question that may arise out of the previous adhikaranam. we discussed the kathopanisad mantras concerning the angusta matratvam. In the second sutras it was said that Paramatma is said to be the size of human thumb because human beings alone study the scriptures. Since Paramatma is obtaining as saksi in the mind, Paramatma is figuratively called Paramatma is of the size of the mind. manusyadhi karatvad is used in the previous adhikaranam and human beings alone has the right to study the Vedas. The question now is whether manusya alone has the right or manusya also has the right for Vedanta jnanam. here the subject matter is whether the Devatas have the right to study Vedas. If you go on nasthika approach or purely practical this adhikaranam has no relevance at all because we do not know much about the existence of Devatas and heavens etc. if we believe in sastra and believe in swarga and believe in Devata then this adhikaranam is going to be relevant. It is purely academic adhikaranam. because of the topic alone it has got the name Devatadhikarnam. The name is based on the subject matter and it being Devata adhikarah it is called Devatadhikaranam. We do not have a separate mantra vakyam because it is extension of the previous adhikaranam. for this also vishaya vakyam also it is 2.1.13 of Kathopanisad. The question is whether this angusta matra applies to Devatas also is discussed in this adhikaranam. our siddhanta conclusion is that Devatas also have sastra adhikara. Devatas also can get Atma jnanam by studying under the Devata guru.

Now we will discuss the first sutra. Vyasacharya says that Devatas have got sastra adhikara. He says for higher beings also adhikara is there. higher beings means those who live in higher lokas. For having the adhikara or rights three conditions are required. Devatas fulfill all three conditions and therefore they have sastra adikarah. Three conditions for sastra adhikara are the first karana is arthitvam; second is dakshatvam; and the third condition is appradisiddhatvam

Arthitvam means the need or requirement for sastra should be there. sastra deals with dharma artha kama and moksa and unless one is desirous of four, the sastra is going to be irrelevant. It requires rituals for acquiring kama, artha moksa and dharma. I am not in terstested in any

one of the four-I do not become eligible for any the arthitvam. Animal do not seek anyone of the purusartha and they don't have any need of sastra and even a jnani does not require sastra. Then the second condition is daksatvam means the capacity mere desire is not required. Therefore financial and physical capacity is required, and all angas should be in fit condition; physical body should be there and it should be fit for doing karmas and rituals. Wife, son, money deiva vittha and manusa vithha are required as stated in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad for doing any ritual or karma.

Third condition is apradisiddhatvam which means sastra's permission is required. It should not have negated the permission. A ritual meant for grahastha alone is permitted means sannyasi or brahmacharis cannot do that and they come under prasiddha category. He may have money, physical fitness etc., even then he cannot do that because he has apprasiddhatvam and he is not qualified to do it. for adhikara apprasiddhatvam is required. Desire, capacity and scriptural permissions are required for sastra adhikara. Now our point is whether Devatas have these three conditions fulfilled to perform rituals. If the three factors are there they can study the sastras.

Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary shows that all the three conditions they fulfill. Devatas have got desire for moksa being samsaris. They also suffer samsara as we have seen in Taittiriya Upanishad they do not have purna ananda subject of increase and decrease; they have mortality and they have raga dvesha. All the time they are afraid of their position and they yearn to get out of samsara. Second condition is daksatvam. Devatas also have the capacity because they have physical bodies; since Devatas are not knowable through pramana and sastras clearly talk about Devatas weapons, body etc. and we have to take sastra as pramanam. This we will analyse more later. Vighrahavatvam means body possession. Devatas possess the body to attend classes and to attain moksa. They have enough money and wife is there. all Devatas wife, money body etc., and we will focus on the body. The proof is sastra pramanam. Appradisiddhatvam means sastric permission also to study the scriptures. The vedic study is allowed only for those people who have gone through upanayana samskara is the rule. To become a dvija one should go through upanayana samskara. For this Devatas upnayanam is said anywhere. for Brahmana it is said in sastra. therefore they don't have right to study the sastra and for this Adhi Sankaracharya says upanayana is meant for memorization of veda. Memorization is pre-requisite for enquiry. upanayana is needed for the sake of knowing the veda. Veda adyayanam is first and veda vicara is the second process. One should know how to chant Vedas. Thereafter comes veda mimamsa and it is twofold veda purva mimamsa and veda utara mimamsa one deals with rituals and the with the knowledge. a person enters brahmacharya asrama study Vedas by heart and then he studies veda purva mimamsa and veda anta adyayanam. Then , he should enquires into veda purva mimamsa. These two are done in brahmacharya asrama. Then purva mimamsa should be implemented when he becomes a grahasthasrama. Forty one samskaras are there which one should do in grahasthasrama. In vanaprasthasrama also veda purva baga implementation. In sannyasa asrama it is veda anta vichara. This is the vedic scheme. Whether purva or anta mimamsa veda dyayanam is a must for veda purva and veda anta mimamsa. Devas do not have upanayanam and therefore they cannot do vedanta vichara. Adhi Sankaracharya says Devatas do not require adyayanam learning to chant veda. Devas do not require adhyayanam because of the very deva status they will have the knowledge of vedic chanting from the date of birth. They straightaway attain the youthful body. There is no problem of garbhavasa etc. devas are given the title swayam badha veda. It means by birth they have the knowledge of vedic chanting. Since they have vedic jnanam, they can do veda vicharah even without upanayana samskara.



When I say or sankara say devas have physical body means it is not like our physical body and they are physical enough to do the action but it is not subtle and we cannot perceive their body. For this sastra is the pramana. this will be elaborated in the next sutra. For this particular sutra it is enough to note that Devatas have body on the basis of the sastra. badarnarayan says devas have body and jaimini says they do not have the body will be discussed later.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Tad upari abhi badanarayanah sambhavat. We have to supply the words adhikarinah; iti manyate. Then rearrange the sutra tad upari abhi adhikarinah; sambhavat; iti badanarayanah manyate. This is the complete sutra. First word is tad, which means tasya or tesam manusyas the human being; upari means uparistah Devatah; the higher celestials above than the human beings; adhikarinah they also are qualified for sastric studies; in the previous we said human beings are entitled to do the rituals and now we add Devatas also can do it because of the conditions for sastric rites. With this the first sutra is over.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya includes a purva paksha. purva mimasaka is the purva paksha here. In the purva mimamsa there is a portion whether Devatas have right to do rituals. There they have established that Devatas and Rishis do not have karma adhikarah. The essence of the two sutras is all the rituals are defined as offering oblations in the fire which is meant for various Devatas. In the yaga Devatas are the beneficiaries because they receive the oblations. The benefactors are the manusyas. Suppose Devatas also give oblations what will happen will be discussed in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 108

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.26[89]**

#### **Taduparyapi baadarayanah sanbhavat**

Also [beings above them [viz., men] [are entitled for the study and practice of the Vedas] on account of 'the possibility [of it] according to Badarayana. The description of the privilege of study of Vedas and meditation is continued.

We do the first sutra of Devatadhikaranam and this is more an extension of the previous adhikaranam. here it is shown that manusyas as also Devatas have got eligibility to do vedanta vichara to gain liberation. Devatas are also adhikaris with regard to Brahma Vidya. This we analysed in the last class. Badanarayana accepts this. Thus Vyasacharya considers that Devatas have sastra adhikarah. Vyasacharya is the authors of the sutra yet he says Badanarayana says. this views is contested by Jaimini.

I pointed out a purva paksa is raised and that he says that in the Purva Mimamsa the same topic is raised and there in two sutras it has been negated and said that Devatas have no adhikaras. Devatas cannot have adhikara in the Vedas and in rituals Devatas are receivers of the oblations and it is conducted for the Devatas. Therefore yaga is not a yaga without Devatas receiving the oblations and if they have adhikara for performing the yagas and they will be givers of the oblations and who will be the receivers and as this is not possible, manusyas are offerers and Devatas are the receivers of oblations. This is extended to the Rishis also. Rishis are also invoked before employing any mantra. That is why it is said Devatas are invoked in the heart. Rishis are always invoked in vedic rites and the manusyas are invokers and Rishis are always invoked. If Rishis start performing rites none will be there to receive the oblations or invoking. So Purva Mimamsakas have concluded that Rishis and Devatas have no veda karma adhikara. It is said in Jaimini sutras. Based on this purva paksa says this rule should be extended to the Vedanta also. this is what purva paksa and Adhi Sankaracharya answers the purva paksa by saying that by saying that I don't want to dispute your conclusion and your conclusions should be confined to the karma kanda alone. This conclusion I don't want to challenge or question. With regard to jnana kanda this conclusion is not correct that Devatas have the right to do yagas etc. karma involves invocation of Devatas and so Devatas cannot do perform and these two reasons are not there in jnana kanda. Here there is no invocation of any Devata in jnana kanda. Since invocation problems are not there Devatas are not restricted. In fact the Devatas fulfill the conditions to perform yaga and also gain Self-Knowledge. Having given the logic in the argument he quotes sastric supports also. There are places where it is mentioned that Devatas gain Self-Knowledge by getting teaching from a guru. In the Kenopanisad Devatas gets Self-Knowledge from Uma devi. Thus in Chandogya upanisad Devatas get Self-Knowledge and similarly Rishis have got right for Self-Knowledge as stated in the Brigu valli Taittriya Upanishad III.1 where it is said the god Varuni went to his father Varuna sayi g sir teach the Brahma. The god varuna

possessed the knowledge of Brahman, which he teaches to his son Brigu. In Kailvalya Upanishad also the same idea is given and we have many sruti pramanam to support our stand. In 1.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad also the same idea is given. Here it is said whoever gains Self-Knowledge will get sarvatma bhava whether he is Rishi or Devata or manusyanam. The gods undergo discipleship in order to attain knowledge we read in Chandogya upanisad VIII-7.11 Indra lived as disciple with Prajapathi for one hundred and one years. All the three have adhikara and we have yukti pramana as also sruti pramanams to support our stand.

## **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

### **Sutra 1.3.27[90]**

### **Vidrodhah karmaniti chet, na, anekhapratipatterdarsanat**

If it be said that [the corporeality of the gods involves] a contradiction to sacrifices; [we say] no because we find [in the scriptures] the assumption [by then gods] of many [forms at one and the same time]

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. It consists of two portions one is purva paksha portion that is upto *karmani* and it *chet na anekha pratipatternarsanat* is our answer.

An objection against the sutra 26 is raised and negated.

It is based on the previous sutra where we said devatas have got eligibility for jnana kanda. The middle factor *daksatvam* means capability to do Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam, which Adhi Sankaracharya indicated in one word as *vigraha vatvam* if being negated by the purva paksha here.

Here purva paksha will say that devatas have no sariram according to Advaitins. The body is not visible to our eyes. The body is gross enough to have the body but it is not good enough for our perception. Purva Mimamsakas believe in Vedas but they don't believe in devatas in physical form. Other than the word Indra there is no physical Indra. so also other devatas. They are in *sabda rupa*. This is their strong argument. even Isvara they do not accept. They contend the law takes care of all action and where is the need for Isvara. they are not *pramana vakyam*. *Devatanam vighrahanam nasti* we say. But we say that devatas have subtle body. The discussion is whether devatas have any body or not. If devatas have bodies there will be problem if they have the bodies. If devatas have the body they have to physically take part in rituals. Devatas have to take part physically in all the yagas. among the people who claim devatas don't have body, Purva Mimamsa don't believe in devatas as *karma phala dadas*. According to them they are *sabda rupa devatas*. Other than the words *varuna* they don't have physical *varuna*. Indra as *sabda* give *phalam* is their view. Similarly by extension even Isvara they do not accept he actions give results and they don't believe in Isvara. even Isvara's descriptions are taken as *artha vada* by the Purva Mimamsas. We say devatas have got the body. The following sutras deal with the question whether devatas have the body or not. Purva paksha says if devatas have the body they will have problem in the field of rituals. There will be contradiction in the field of rituals. If devatas have the body they will have to physically take part in the rituals and devatas have to physically take part in the rituals as the

priests. Yejamana has physical body and they physically take part in the rituals. So also is the case for all the devatas. The problem is one rtvik can take part one ritual at one time. That is why I complain from the student and the priests do not come in time and so we lose faith in ritual. If one yejamana gives higher dakshina he goes there. all because a priest can take part in a ritual at a time. If devatas has to take part in ritual and if one takes part in ritual and many people perform ritual in the same time where will Indra will go. If he goes to one place he cannot go to the other places where the offerings are made. As many people perform offerings so many indras are required and there will be problem if sariram is there for the devatas. If sabda rupa Indra means such a problem will not rise. This is a contradiction and this is the objection. Thus Purva Mimamsa raises the objection that the Indra and other devatas do not have any sariram and they are sabda rupena devatas and without sariram they cannot do rituals and offer oblations in the yagas and hence the vedanta vichara will to apply to devatas. This is the argument of the Purva Mimamsa.

The reply given by vachyartha is this. We have two answers for this question. Devatas have powers to assume many roles to take with their power of siddhis. One siddhis is the capacity to have many bodies at the same time. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes smriti and other pramanas which I will quote later. Only difference devata and manusya and devata need not do any work but manushyas have to work to gain that status of yoga etc. in support of that Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.9.2 which reads as so *hovaca mahimana evatsamete trayastrimsatvena deva iti; katame te trayastrimsaditi; astau vasavah; ekadasa rudrah; dvadasdityah, te ekatrimsat, indrascatva prajapatisca trayastrimsaviti* Yajnavalkya said that there are only thirty three gods' these others are but manifestation of them; which are those thirty three? The eight vasus, the eleven rudras and the twelve adityas these are thirty-one and Indra and Prajapathi make up the thirty-three. This is the reply to the question that the student asked as to how many devatas are there. first Yajnavalkya said three thousand and odd devatas are there and Yajnavalkya answers that in fact I need not enumerate the devatas and they are only the extensions of thirty three devatas. Then sakalya asks are there thirty three devatas and Yajnavalkya says that there are only six devatas and again he asks the question and then he says that there are only three and when asked are there three and then he says ultimately there is only one devatas that is Prajapathi 3.9.2 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. And also in 1.4 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad says there is only one Prajapathi is there who assumes many sarirams. Again there is sruti pramana that one Indra can assume many bodies. This is the first answer to the purva paksa.

Then there is the second interpretation. The purva paksa said that if a devatas is embodied he cannot take place simultaneously in many rituals as the priest is embodied in one ritual he cannot take part in many rituals. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says no and he says that there are exceptions. He says suppose there is a guru or Brahmana or a respectable person and he is standing in one place and many people do namaskaras and one who do namaskaras are also embodied and one to whom the namaskaras are done are also embodied. If the person to whom namaskaras are done he cannot bless all the person who do namaskaras. It is because you are sure that namaskaras will produce benefit for you as also for other persons also. these are the two answers and we will take the word for word analysis.

Devanam for the devas if the physical body is there in the field of rituals Virodhah; there will be contradiction that many simultaneous rituals are impossible but veda accepts many simultaneous rituals are impossible and that is the vedic contradiction. Just as a priest cannot take part in many rituals. Iti chet if such objection is raised it is not logical.; karmani in the sacrifices iti thus; if; na not; aneka many [bodies] pratipatteh because of the assumption

aneka sarira pratipattih that is assuming or grahanam which means taking many bodies simultaneously by the devatas; devatas assuming many bodies simultaneously is mentioned in the sastras. When you says it need not be indras sariram not only he can take many bodies and each body can take any type of body even animal body one can take; even the word ishitvam means being a mini Isvara. one can even create a world. all siddhis are seen in the sastras. darsanat because it is found [in the scriptures]

Then comes the second interpretation of aneka pratipattih. Anekatra ekasya pratipattih. Anekha means in many places. Pratipattih means taking part anga bhavah. You have to supply one devatga. One devata is taking part in many places. First interpretation is one devata taking many bodies. Darsanat is seen. One guru takes namaskaras of the ten disciples simultaneously. Aneka pratipatteh darsanat karamana virodha nasti. Now we ill go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.28[91]**

#### **Sabda iti chet, na atah prabhavat pratyakshanumanabhyam**

If it be said [that a contradiction will result] in respect of the word [we say] no; because [the world] originates from the word as is known from direct perception [sruti] and inference [smriti]

Another objectiona against sutra 26 [with respect to the corporeality of the gods] is raised and refuted.

In this sutra the same purva paksa comes with another objection with regard to the same topic as to whether the devas have the bodies or not. Here also Purva Paksi says devatgas cannot have the body because of some other reason also. the first portion is sabde that is purva paksa portion. The Purva Paksi says that veda will become apramanam if devatas have the body. Firstly he says if devatas have body, they will also perishable. Where thereis body they also will become mortals. Vedas have been accepted by one and all as nithyam. Both purva paksa and Vedantins have accepted that if devatas have body they will become anithya. The Vedas will have the words of devatas and they will have no meaning. Vedas are nithya and devas are anithya. If that be case that the word Indra will be there without any body. Artha rahita sabdah will be there because devas are anithya. A sound symbol without any meaning is blabbering. If veda is apramana prasangah is the objection which we will discuss elaborately in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 109

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.28[91]**

#### **Sabda iti chet, na atah prabhavat pratyakshanumanabhyam**

If it be said [that a contradiction will result] in respect of the word [we say] no; because [the world] originates from the word as is known from direct perception [sruti] and inference [smriti]

We see the sutra 28 third of the devatadhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya wants to establish that devatas have got eligibility for Self-Knowledge and as a part of that devatas have got a form. This aspect the Purva Mimamsakas don't agree and according to them they are sabda swarupa and they do not have any body etc. In this and the previous sutra Purva Mimamsa raises an objection if devatas have got a body it will be difficult` for them to receive yahuti in karmas. For which Vyasacharya gave two answers. One is that they can appear in all the yagas in invisible form and receive yahutis. And another argument is that they need not go to all the yagas to receive yahutis but receive them as they are. For this an example is given that it is like several people doing namaskaram to the teacher and he is able to accept all namaskarams as the guru stands at one place with one body. Guru does not take several form of body to bless each disciple independently. So also devatas by remaining at one place in one form will be able to bless and offer yahutis as they are and receive yahutis from many places. This was one objection covered by the purva paksa. They raised that if they took the body it would take veda pramananyam would be affected. First we should understand the purva paksa. What is veda pramananyam. Sabda pramananyam has been discussed by Purva Mimamsa themselves which discussion has been accepted by us. The beginning of the sutra is aupattika sutra or sabda pramanya sutra. Here uniqueness of veda pramanya is apouruseya sabda pramananyam is brought out. It is a sabda pramanya, which is not created by human intellect. To understand the uniqueness of apaouruseya sabda, we should understand what is pouruseya sabda pramananyam. It is invented by and used by human beings to convey the ideas are called pouruseya sabda. we use the words to convey the ideas. Even new words are coined as even new products are made. All they convey the particular products and let this new product be termed by this sabda or word and the object is revealed by the sabda and artha the sabda and the sabda artha sambandha that means hereafter wards let this word be called by this sabda and then I am able to convey the object through the sabda and even if the object is not there that sabda is capable of communicating the object. Since I have created the sabda and I have created the sabda artha sambandha and others should agree for the sabda to become a pramanam. This sabda artha sambandha agreed by all is called saangethah a relationship by the word and object created by common agreement. This is the nature of all the pouruseya sabda pramana. when we analyse further whenever sabda artha sambandha is saangethika in the case of pouruseya on analysis we find they are not pramanam at all although they help one to communicate the objects and they cannot be called pramanam at all. It is only compromised pramanam and not real pramanam. In the case of pouruseya sabda

I have created the world and its objects. In fact before I invented the word the object is known to me or not. I know it already and therefore I invented the word and for communication I invented the sound symbol and I created the word to denote the object, which is known to me. Pouruseya sabda denotes an object that is already known to me with the help of other pramanas and through my sense organs. The object are knowable through other pramanas. They are pramanantara adhikatha vastu. In all such cases words reveal the object known or knowable through other pramanas. A pramanam is a means of knowing an object, which is not known through any other source. Pramanam is an instrument of knowledge, which reveals something, which is not known through any other pramanam. Eye is a pramanam for colours for it reveals the colour which cannot be known through any other pramanam. Similarly ears are pramanam for sabda because sabda cannot be known through any other pramanam. Words are pramanam for object, which cannot be known through any other pramanam. In the case of pouruseya sabda sabdhartha sabda is saangathika the sabda and artha are known to me and I create the sambandha and the sabda refers to the objects already known to me. If Vedas should be a pramanam, then the relationship between veda sabda and artha should not be artificially created by me and it should not be saangethika sambandha. if it is so, then I have created the world of the object known to me. It should not be artificially created word or the creation and for sabda cannot be saangethika sambandha and it should be aupattika sambandha. That means the word to be a pramanam should not be created by me then relationship between the object also be created by me and it will be apramanam. Sabda should be anadhi and sabda artha sambandha also should be anathi and it should be natural or else it should be aupattikam and veda should be anathi and of course it should be ananda also and veda should be uncreated and nithyam and veda sabda connection with object is not artificially created and sabda artha sambandha should be natural and eternal and this is explained as nithyasya sabdasya nithya arthena nitya sambandha. This is the uniqueness apouruseya sabda pramanam and veda pramanam. The word aupattikam means swabhavikam or natural. Veda should be not only u created and veda should be eternal also. if it is noneternal, the moment you say veda has to be created the word is created the relationship with the objects is created and you should know the word and the object and once the relationship between word and object is known then it will become pramanantara adhikatham and samanya will go. Nithya sambandha nithyena arthena is the uniqueness of veda sabdena and it is seconded by Advaidins. How the veda pramanam got affected and if devas have palm like human being, devas also will be subject to decay, aging and death. We are vighraha vandha and anithya and devatas also will become anithya then what will happen. Indra etc., are veda sabdah. Let us assume that they have got a abody and they will be anithyam. Now once devas go away and then nithya sabda is there the word Indra is there and sabda is there and the object is not there. sabda is nithya and artha is anithya. Indra sabda is nithya and Indra artha anithya and when artha is anithya what about the sambandha. the relationship also will go when one of them is gone. Without wife, wife husband relationship is not possible; so also the father son relationship. the sabda artha sambandha becomes anithya. The pramanya sambandha goes away. The pramanya goes means after Indra dies and the word Indra continues without an object and the word without object becomes apramanam and Veda will become an apramanam the object being not there. The word continues without an object and then the word is apramanam with the word no more revealing the object. Veda becomes an apramanam. the problem is Veda becomes apramanam and the problem two is when the object is not there and the word cannot do the function and the word cannot be used by anyone and the word also become the death. Word can be there only as long as it is capable of revealing the object and once the object is not there, there will be no need for the word and the word will wither and will not be of any use to us. That is why we say the word commonly

used will be used only as long as the object or person is there. Thereafter that word has no relevance. The word dies once the object goes. For this we have to give an answer.

Vyasacharya does not very clearly and directly present the answer. Adhi Sankaracharya has given the direct answer. Vyasacharya says this creation has come with the help of veda sabdas alone. Indra is created only through the word Indra and varuna is created through the word varuna. Veda sabda arthas are created from veda sabdas alone. It is not object is created first and thereafter words were created. This is the answer Vyasacharya said and he left it as it is.

By saying that all the objects are created through veda sabdas, it is said that veda sabda is anadhi. With the help of sabda alone Lord created all the devatas and other creations. Veda nityatvam is established by saying so. Even before creation of object this sabda was there.

The second thing to be established is veda pramanyam. Sabda was there before artha and sabda was not artificially created later and sabda artha sambandha is not artificially created later. It is not saangethikah. It is aupattikaha only and therefore it is pramanyam. Then the purva paksa says that this also will not solve the problem. Through the words alone objects are created you have established veda nityatvam. Sabda nityatvam you have established all right. Artha nityatvam you have not established. Indra with a body continued to be perishable veda may be nithya but artha is anithya embodied devata is anithya and perishable. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives an answer. He analyses what a word reveals. Suppose I want to teach a child what a tree is. I say to the child that this is the tree. Child understands that tree sabda reveals the tree what it is. When the word tree reveals the object tree, does it reveal that particular tree, or does the word reveal the tree as a class or as a jathi. Now the question is whether the word tree reveals the particular tree or the universal tree in general. The word reveals a particular thing is called vyakti vadhah and when it reveals the general thing it is called jathi vyakti vadhah. Advaidin's vadhah is jathi sakti vadhah. When I have revealed a tree to a person, I reveal that particular tree and when any other tree that word cannot be used to reveal that tree. Yet he uses the word tree for all that tree. Since the word tree is universal and it is not vyakti there is a problem. when I say bring the cow we find that person that particular cow. If you say the word cow universal species how do you count this universal phenomniion. Jathi is the primary meaning of the word. but it has got the secondary meaning that particular man is the secondary meaning of the word man. Vachyartha kyathih and lakshyartha jathih. When we say this is the pot, you take the vachyartha and understand all the pots. When I say bring the pot you understand lakshyartha and the pot. Vachyartha jathi is enernal and particular pot is ephemeral and it is general. It is anithyam. Vachyartha anithyah and lakshyartha nithyah man represents the class of human being. Jathi is nithya and vyakti is anithjya. If sabda rtha refers to jathi it is nithyah. Hence Indra says as a particular Indra is perishable; and the veda sabda Indra does not talk of particular Indra name and form. prime minister is here throughout but how long he will be there depends upon other factors. Even though Indra vigrah is perishable Indra sabdah comparatively lives longer. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 110

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.28[91]**

#### **Sabda iti chet, na atah prabhavat pratyakshanumanabhyam**

If it be said [that a contradiction will result] in respect of the word [we say] no; because [the world] originates from the word as is known from direct perception [sruti] and inference [smriti]

We will do the general analysis of this sutra in which we establish veda pramanyam. We have established the entire world came the sabda existed and sabdah nithyah. This established veda sabda nithyatvam. We also established the eternity of object nithyatvam through jathi sabdah. The word cow does not reveal the particular cow but the cow universal and this universal is nithyam while the particular cow is anithyam. Through sutra sabda nithyatvam as also artha nithyatvam have been established. Once we have shown nithya sabda and nithya artha their sambandha is nithyam we have established. Impermanence of Indra is anithya but the Indra position is permanent. Indra the particular is anithya Indra the universal jathi is nithyah even though particular nithya appear and disappear. Now we will go for word for word analysis.

The first word is purva paksa portion. First word is sabdah. and supply the word virodhah. Rama ate fruit and laxmana also means laxmana also means he also ate a fruit. Here 'ate the fruit' I drop and it is implied to be added in the next clause. If the word does not exist in the previous sutra and we supply in the context it is supplied word. purva paksa word is sabde virodhah means sabda pramanye and it in this context means veda pramanye with regard to the validity of the Vedas; virodhah means there will be contradiction. When will there be contradiction that is if devas had the body. How there is contradiction for veda pramanyam. Veda pramanyam requires nithyasya sabdasya nithyena arthena and deva had the body they will have death and devas will become anithya and sabda also will become anithyena arthena if devas had the body. Iti chet; it means suppose such an objection is raised that there will be veda pramanya banga is raised; the next word is na; it is not proper and such an objection is not valid; sabda pramanya virodhah nasti; athah prabhavat; athah means sabdad from sabda alone the word alone prabhavad means utpattihi origination emergence of the artha the objects because the objects are born out of the words alone. This means from Indra sabda alone Indra is born and buh sabda alone buloka is born; etc., sabdebyam eva arthanam utpatteh the significance of this statement is that when Vyasacharya says arthas are born of sabdas alone he means sabdas already existed and sabdas are anadhi and therefore sabdas are anadhi and they are nithya sabdas. It is sabda nithyatvam. Artha nithyatvam we have to supply based on Adhi Sankaracharya explantion. Artha is eternal. From eternal sabda and eternal artha Indra etc., are created. Nithya Indra sabdad nithya Indra arthad Indra utpannah. If nithya Indra arthah is nithyah how can you say Indra utpannah. How can you talk about origination of artha. When you say Indra arthah nithnyah here arthah refers to Indra the universal and from there if I say Indra is born means Indra vyakti utpannah jathih nithjya and

vyaktih is anithyah. Before creation Indra sabda and Indra jathi and the relationship between Indra sabda and Indra jathi also existed. There is sambandha existed but Indra vyakti did not exist for it was born out of Indra sabdah. Nithya arth aukta nithya sabda vyaktayah utpatyah. This is the significance of atha prabhavad. Pratyaksa anumanabhyam. Here the word pratyaksam means sruti pramanam. It does not mean sruti pramanam. Anumanam means smriti pramanam. Why so? Adhi Sankaracharya says sruti and pratyaksam have one common feature. Sruti is independent pramanam. That student is a lion means he has the same features of the lion. Because of the common feature we call him a lion. Therefore pratyaksam means sruti. We also see commonness between anumanam and pratyaksam. Anumanam requires pratyaksam. Without pratyaksam we cannot have anumanam. You should perceive the smoke then alone you can make an anumanam. Similarly smriti gets validity only because it is backed by sruti. Without that backing smriti cannot get validity. Therefore pratyaksa anumanabhyam means because of sruti and smriti support, atha prabhavatvam that the creation is born out of nithya sabdah is supported by sruti pramanam. Bu sabdad bu utpatti vitpanna. The creation is born out of nithya sabdam. We have not seen the creation and with regard to this we get sruti and smriti support. Sruti and smriti where does they support. That too Adhi Sankaracharya has given many quotations. The sruti support is there in the II.2.4.2.Taittiriya Upanishad that the god uttered the word buh and then created the bhoomi. The smriti is taken from manu 1.21 *nama rupeca bhutanam karamanca pratartanam karma namana bhutesu veda sabdebhyah isvarah nirmanah god created the world with veda sabdah alone.* The whole world is born out of sabdah alone it is stated in the above manusmriti. Nithyatvam is established; devanam vigrahatvam is established. Purva paksa says there is contradiction with regard to veda's validity if devas are embodied. Then our answer suppose such an objection is raised it is not valid. It is so because the whole creation has emerged from nithya sabdad alone because the entire creation has emerged from eternal words because this is revealed by sruti and smriti pramanam. This is the word analysis of this sutra. Now we have to go to varieties of objections raised by purva paksa.

Now a purva paksa comes and asks and the word atha prabhavad the world is born out of eternal sabdas. In the beginning of Brahma Sutra you said the whole creation is born out of Brahman. now you say that the whole Brahman is born out of nithya sabdah. Tell me whether jagat karanam is Brahman or sabda. Brahman is said to be upadana karanam of entire creation and sabda refers to nimittam the supporting cause. Sabda means nithya sabda artha nithya sabda and therefore there is no problem. therefore there is no contradiction. Now purva paksa says that also I cannot accept. In your teaching you say that Brahman itself abhinna nimitta upadhana karanam of creation and also quote the spinder both intelligent and material cause and now you change the topic and say sabda is nimitta karanam and how do you this. For this we say that nithya sabda and nithya artha does not exist as a separate entity and it is included in Brahman. Isvara has the knowledge of nithya sabda and nithya artha. Brahman did not produce nithya artha and nithya sabda but it existed in Brahman all the time. The veda is supposed to be the very breath of Brahman and as breathing is continuously going on in us so nithya sabda and nithya artha eternally existed in Brahman and what is created is vyakti and vyakti will come and vyakti will go but nithya sabda and nithya artha permanently exist in Brahman. suppose someone says a potter says I want to create the pot he has the pot knowledge. without pot knowledge he cannot create the pot. Potter is aware of the word pot and not only he is aware of the pot sabdah and he also knows the object pot; pot jathi also he knows and that is the knowledge of the potter. Gata artha gata sabda and gata sambandha he knows. Artha is not particular pot but it is pot jathi and he only creates the individual pot. If I say I want to build a house means I have house sabda, house artha and house sambandha I have all the time and I only create a particular house which I call it mine. The word means

jnanam alone and the Lord has the word with him means He has the sabda, artha and sambandha. artha refers to rupa and sabda refers to sabda. universal exists for ever and the vyakti the individual unit comes and goes. The objection and the reply is given.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya enters into another topic. When we say the world is created out of sabdah, what do we mean by the word sabdah. Sabdah means word in English and it is not the sound. From the word Indra Indra is created; from the word boomi boomi is created. Now what is the word we want to know. Word has got two concepts which Adhi Sankaracharya analyses here. What is the normal definition of a word. aksara samudhayah sabdah. Or varna samudhayah sabdah. It is a group of alphabets arranged in a particular order. it contains syllables or letter and it is a group and it has a particular order and that unitary word itself a collection of letters and it produces a unitary meaning and the object called for example an elephant. This is our concept of sabda. a particular purva paksa grammarians have got a philosophy vyayakarana darsanam and according to them this conclusion is not correct and they refute our theory and introduce a new theory spota vadhah. They also give a reason for this spota vadhah. They say that our theory is not sufficient to explain the phenomenon of verbal communication; he says that a word as a unitary entity can never exist at any time. It is so because you utter the letters one by one. That means at any time there is only one letter. A group of letter never exists at a particular time. Varna samudhaya nama nasti eva. A single letter cannot become a word and group of letters does not exist and how can group of letter form a uniform symbol and become unitary object. Just as sound is not unitary and it is a flow the thoughts also will be a flow only. Vrittis are a continuous flow. It never exists at any time. Can you say that letters form samskara is unitary? He says you can never talk samskara produce a meaning because samskara vasanas are invisible and invisible vasanas cannot communicate. Therefore that also will not work. Can you say the samskaras produce memories? Can memories produce unitary word? He says it is not possible; samskaras can get converted into memory in chronological order only. it cannot be simultaneous. It can be one at a time, it is also in continuous flow one following the other and thus group of memory vritti is not possible. Therefore varna samudhayah is not possible. So we have spota vadhah. It means when words are utters in particular order when the last letter is uttered in the mind some thing happens; something is produced in the mind as a unitary entity. By the letters uttered in a particular order, and when the last letter is uttered and concluded these letters invoke a symbol or a new entity called spotah. Spotah is one invoked by one unit by the letters. That unitary entity which is invoked which is activated which is manifested when certain letters are uttered in particular order and this spotah is eternal and it is one unit and it is not produced by letters but invoked by the letters. That one unit produces or reveals the meaning. varna samudhaya does not reveal the meaning but varna abhivyakta spotah artham bothayathi. This spota alone is called sabdah. This is their argument which we will analyse in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 111

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.28[91]**

#### **Sabda iti chet, na atah prabhavat pratyakshanumanabhyam**

If it be said [that a contradiction will result] in respect of the word [we say] no; because [the world] originates from the word as is known from direct perception [sruti] and inference [smriti]

We see the 28<sup>th</sup> sutra wherein Vyasacharya established veda pramanyam nithyasya veda sabdasya nithyena arthena veda sambandhah. Just as veda sabda and veda artha are nithya and so Parvathi Parameswara it is said. Devata jathi universal is nithya and devata vyakti is anithya and that sariram may be perishable that does not matter and therefore devatas have adhikara to do veda study. What do we mean by the word sabda. according to us the word is nothing but varna samudhayah. The group is called sabdah. It is seen as one unit called word. Joined to gather the letters becomes sabda and that unit sabda is varna samudhayah. This idea of ours is challenged by spotavadhi. He argues word as one unit cannot exist in your theory. There is no question of your word revealing one unit. Unitary symbol is required for forming one unit and therefore we have to introduce a unitary symbol, which they call as spotah. The group of letters he argues does not exist together at any time. When first is uttered the second is not there and still it is useful since letters are not unitary they cannot give unitary meaning but the letters are useful for creating spotah and that becomes manifest and this symbol reveal the unitary artha. Letters lead to spotah and spotah leads to communication. Letters can manifest spotah and the latter alone can communicate and not letters. Letters cannot understand the sabda and sabda should be understood as spotah pramana. When you say veda sabdah means veda sabdah spotah. Letters can never be eternal. Letters flow continuously. First defect is it cannot communicate and second is veda cannot be eternal. Since letters are ephemeral and words are ephemeral and since words are ephemeral Vedas are ephemeral. This is the purva paksa, which we saw, in the last class. Now we have to refute the spotavada.

The first argument that he gives is this. Purva paksa says that letters do not exist as a group at any time. Since they do not exist as one group it cannot give the unitary meaning. But it has to reveal one unitary object. We have to posit or propound or create a unitary symbol called spotah. Tell me what reveals or manifest the unitary spotah. He has to say that letters manifests the unitary spotah. And the unitary spotah symbol reveals the unitary artha. If you say letters reveals unitary spotah which letters or group of letters reveals which spotah. Spotah is revealed by which letter first, second third or last letters. You cannot say first letter reveals the unitary spotah to reveal the elephant. E can stand for any number of words. E cannot reveal can the la reveal and le also indicate element or elephant. Therefore which particular letter will reveal the spotah. You cannot say part of the elephant. That is also not possible for partial spotah cannot be seen and it may be in the mind of the speaker and it is not the mind of hearer. Partial spotah cannot reveal because the total spotah is not known. Total

spota cannot be known because partial spota alone is revealed with many options being there which are not identifiable. Therefore if the varna samudhaya does not exist to reveal a unitary meaning that means varna samudhaya does not exist for the existence of spota also. For that he gives the answer no. he says letters have got mysterious power. Even though one letter cannot communicate the total spota as even it is uttered the total spota can gradually manifest and when the final letter is uttered the full or unitary spota can take place. That unitary spota reveals the meaning. then we argue if you suppose the letters have mysterious power and invokes mysterious spota you have to assume that letters have mysterious power and that invoke mysterious spota and thus you presume two things. Letters have mysterious power and the letters manifests mysterious spota. You assume two mysterious spota, which will reveal the meaning. Why do you introduce a mysterious spota and then you introduce mysterious power to reveal the meaning but we introduce only one mysterious letters power alone. Why do you complicate the interpretation by bringing the mysterious power of letters and the mysterious power of the spota formed by the letters and why not you accept a simpler interpretation of accepting the mysterious power of letters alone that reveal the meaning. letters have to be uttered to invoke the unitary spota should the speaker know all the letters? He should know the last letter or the last syllable and the order in which the letters are to be uttered. All the syllable from beginning to end in a particular order should be there to invoke the spota in the mind of the speaker tell me varna samudhaya exist in the mind of the speaker or not. Therefore varna samudhaya as unitary group in the mind of speaker and therefore you cannot refute the varna samudhya.

The third argument is when the speaker utters the letters to invoke the symbol in the mind of the listener and the spota is invoked and does the listener tells he listened the spota or varna samudhaya or the word he says. The listener also tells the word elephant and he does not talk of any spota. What is invoked is not unitary spota and what occurs is series of syllable in the speakers mind and also the listener's mind also the unitary meaning.

The fourth and final argument is which Adhi Sankaracharya emphasizes in his bashyam is that spotavadhi argument is based on one assumption. When you hear the word we are not hearing the whole word simultaneously but in parts. Therefore we listen part by part how can one unit word can exist. The basic question is has the mind has the capacity to synthesize the parts of the words and can the mind listen to the parts and join all of them and take it as one word. This is the question. If the mind does not have the capacity you have to form a spota. We have to assume the capacity to synthesize the parts of words and understand the whole. That is why instead of saying I listened the mind is capable of saying I heard one word. Many syllables I heard but I say I heard one word. also when the words are heard and patched them and ultimately the mind says I heard one sentence. Again the mind has the capacity to patch all sentence and say one para and add all para and say one book etc. therefore you need not invent a spota to communicate. He adds if you don't accept the synthesizing capacity of the mind you have more problem. Making the parts and join together and make it in one fold. If you do not accept this, and invent a spota you may invent a spota to synthesize the word in the field of sabda and what will you do in the field of rupani or perception. In the field of perception also we have the total vision where the mind does not see everything simultaneously. Have you ever perceived asthika samajam in one perception? How do develop unitary perception of asthika samajam. The mind is capable of systhesis many parts and combine all to make it one unitary concept of asthika samajam. So also sena army, the forests, a long queue etc. eyes perceive one at a time but mind synthesise the unit and make a unitary entity. So also is in the case of sound and darsanam also. if at all if you want to invent a theory don't invent a theory for sabda Prapancha only and also invent for rupa

Prapancha. have one theory for all the total perception. Our theory is not based on the mysterious power spota or anything but it is mysterious power of intellect. Intellect has the mysterious capacity to unite all the letters and form one word and that word alone is called sabda and not spotah.

Now we have to answer the second objection. Words have varna samudhaya inside the mind. the second objection is if the letters form the words and the words veda and letter being anithyam and words being anithyam veda also is anithyam. Since varnas have got utpatti and nasa, formation and destruction they are anithya evidently. Veda is anithyam and pramanyam will go. Let us not go to that. The answer is that letters are nithyam and who said it is anithyam. In your own theory spota is nithyah. He goes to the extent of one with Brahman. Now in your own philosophy you say spota is nithya and you say when letters are addressed even though spota is nithya you invoke the letters by the mind takes place when one utters the letters. In the same way varna is nithya and nithya varnas are manifest and not produced. Nithya varnas are manifested. Therefore varnah nithyah and varna samudhaya nithya and veda is nithyah and the proof for varna nithyatvam is that purva paksa said that varnas comes and goes. If it is nithya it should not come and go. How do you prove nithyam. To prove this Adhi Sankaracharya gives an argument. The continuity of an object is proved by recollection of an object. The recollection is called pratyavijna. It is pramanam for continuity for anything. What is recollection? I will talk about three phenomena. Suppose I see this cloth for the first time. First time perception of cloth is called perception. The uniqueness is cloth is right in front of me and the vritti is there in the mind. After sometime when the cloth is not there and the remembrance is second type of phenomena and it is called smriti. The cloth thought is there but the object is not there. Now there is a third phenomenon. That is when you see the cloth for the second time is it not the cloth that you saw before. That cloth is this cloth. That person is this person. that is this and will this come under pratyaksam or smriti. In pratyaksam it is the first perception. Soyam cannot come. saha will not come in the pratyaksa. Can you say it is memory? In memory the object is in the mind and it is not the front. This means the object is in front. It is not memory. Therefore soyam is neither pratyaksam nor smriti. In perception that won't be there this will be there. in memory this wont be there that alone be there. Here that perception is this cloth. This is other than perception and memory and it is called recognition. Recognition. Re and cognition means you connect the past cognition. What does it reveal? When I recognize the cloth I connect the cloth with the past time and I connect the cloth with the present time and the recognition connects the object with present and past and if it is a new cloth you cannot recognize the cloth. If you connect the object with the past and present you continue the object with the past and present. You saw a friend thirty years ago. And now you have seen him after three years. You have recognized him now. This means the friend existed thirty years ago and he exists now reveals that he existed all the thirty years during the period when I had not seen him. All the changes I did not experience. Thirty years before cognition helped me to spot him. Thirty years after re-cognition helped to identify him. This implies that during the thirty years and I come to know that he continued to exist all the thirty years. Recognition proves continuity. Now Adhi Sankaracharya wants to say words and letters are recognized every time when uttered. The recognition of letters proves the continuity. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 112

#### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.28[91]**

#### **Sabda iti chet, na atah prabhavat pratyakshanumanabhyam**

If it be said [that a contradiction will result] in respect of the word [we say] no; because [the world] originates from the word as is known from direct perception [sruti] and inference [smriti]

We have completed the 28<sup>th</sup> sutra in which we established that there is no violations of validity of Vedas by accepting the embodiment of devas. That the veda sabda is nithyam by showing that the entire world emerged by sabda. words reveal not individual but reveal the universals, the jathi will continue. The embodied vyakti may perish the embodied jathi will not perish. Adhi Sankaracharya takes up what is the meaning of sabdah or vedah. Here he negated spotavadi's arguments and the spotah symbols. Adhi Sankaracharya established that veda is eternal. Recognition is a pramana for continuous existence of recognized object or thing. Recognition is a proof for continuous existence of recognized object. Adhi Sankaracharya says words and letters are eternal. When it is uttered second time we say I heard the same before. I recognize the word. when I repeat the sentence again you don't cognise as new sentence but you recognize it as the same word, same sentence and you know that the word existed before and it exists now and during the period it existed in invisible form. I don't produce new letter every time. It eternally exists. I don't produce the letter when I utter the letter a. when I utter it again I don't say new word or new letter but I only recognize the letter. Nithya letters are manifested by vak indriyam we say. That is why the alphabetical letters are called aksaram. Sabda is the property of Akasa in unmanifest form and that form is called aumkara. They are not produced. Aksaram nithyam, sabda nithyah and therefore vedah nithyah. Purva paksa says I cannot accept. The letter a is born when one opens the mouth and it is not there when he closes the mouth. The letter akara is heard differently at different times. Because when I chant in low sruti 'a' has different sound. The tone changes. The letter 'a' uttered by different times by different persons at the same time also differs and how can you say there is one nithya akara.

Adhi Sankaracharya says the letter akara or ikara has got two aspects. One is a, u etc. the letter part is there. the second part is the pitch or dhvani. Every letter has got aksara amsa and dvani amsa. It varies from time to time and person to person. Changes in dvani do not mean change in letters. For manifestation of letters dvani or pitch is require and when the frequency varies it appears as though the letter vary. Dvanis are many but aksara is one and nonvarying. He supports that by pointing out the idea prevailing in the grammar. One letter is made many on the basis of dvani. Dvanis may be many and aksara is only one. all svara bedas are dvani bedas. Our conclusion is that aksaram is nithyam. Mouth does not produce a letter and mouth manufactures a letter. Plurality belongs to the dvani alone. Spotavadha is not required to

establish the eternity of Vedas. Meaning of the words is varna samudhayah eva sabdah na tu spotah. With this sutra no. 28 is over.

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.29[92]**

#### **Ata eva cha nityatvam**

From this very reason also there follows the eternity of the Vedas

A side issue is deduced from sutra 28. the eternal nature of vedic words is also established from the same reason adduced in sutra 28 i.e., because those words signify permanent types.

This sutra is almost an extension of the previous sutra. There it was pointed out the world was born out of sabda. therefore it was veda pramanyam was established. Human being did not invent Veda sabda. Veda sabda existed even before world existed. Vyasacharya comes to another conclusion since veda existed before creation we can say veda is eternal. The validity of veda was established in the previous sutra. Here eternal nature of veda is established here. That is why a cha is added in this sutra. Veda nityatvam has to be said because veda pramanyam required nityatvam. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we go to word for word analysis. Ata eva cha nityatvena supply the word sabdasya. Reread it as ata eva sabdasya nityatvam cha; atah eva means because of the same reason alone; that being purvo sutrotra hetuna eva ata eva means atah prabhava eva it means since the word is born out of veda sabda; or if you rearrange since veda sabda existed even before the creation; creation of the individual or universal the universal also is eternal; before the creation of the world means the creation of a pot means does he create individual or universal and pot universal is already there in the mind of the potter the jathi is already there; because the veda sabda even before creation of the creation of the whole world since veda existed; nityatvam sabdasya the eternity of sabda means veda sabda; the topic is Vedas; cha means also. the eternity of veda sabda also bhavati. Why also? this is another reason already given in the previous sutra where the validity is established. The broad vision of this is that vaidhikam sabdas and vaidhika arthas are eternal and varuna post Indra posts etc., are eternal. Even varuna etc., posts are not created even by god. Then it has been existed in bhagavan all the time. during sristi bhagavan did not invent Indra sabda the unmanifest Indra sabda is brought into manifestation. Brahmaji does not create Indra jathi and even Brahmaji created only Indra vyakti. In pralaya kala it exists together as a part of maya. maya includes all the sabdas and arthas in potential form. that is why we quoted in sastra yoni adhikaranam the Vedas and other scriptures are naturally existed in bhagavan as breathing is natural to the human beings. Hence Indra varuna etc., have body and they also have the condition for Vedanta vichara and they have adhikara for doing Vedantic study.

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman



**Sutra 1.3.30[93]**

**Samana nama rupatvat cha avrittavapyavirodho darsanat smritescha**

And on account of the sameness of the names and forms in every fresh cycle there is no contradiction [to the eternity of the words of the Vedas] even in the resolving of the world cycles as is seen from the sruti and smriti.

An argument in favour of Sutra 29 is given in this sutra

We will do general analysis of this sutra. I said veda pramanam required a condition in the earlier sutras. Basing on this we say loukika sabdas do not come under pramana sabdah. By compromise we call it loukika sabda pramana. nithyasya sabdasya sabda is eternal and artha meaning of the word is also eternal. Object also should be eternal. Vyasacharya has established the eternity of the sabda in the previous sutra. But Vyasacharya has not established the eternity of the artha, the objects. Even though Vyasacharya has not established Adhi Sankaracharya has established it in his commentary. It is by the theory of jathi sakti vadha. Jathi sakti vadha is not individual but it is universal. The word man does not indicate a particular man but it shows the man the jathi the man-ness of the universe. So also the pot. A word reveals the universal alone and not individual. By this theory Adhi Sankaracharya has established nithyatvam of the object. Here Vyasacharya establish artha nithyatvam through jathi sakti vadha.

Vyasacharya says even though individuals are destroyed the universal continue to exist therefore the words are meaningful valid and purposeful. I need not destroy the word pot because one pot is destroyed. Even if pot is destroyed in one generation there is next generation. So also the devatas. If devatas are destroyed in one generation, devatas exists in potential form. purva paksa may ask when all individuals are destroyed how the universal can exist. It is because universal exists on the basis of the individual alone. Universal manness etc., is defined as nithyam ekam anekatmikam samanyam eternal one inherent in every individual. In pralayam all individuals perish and without individual how there be universal. If universal also is perished on pralayam artha nithyatvam is not there and if so veda pramanyam will not be there. how can there be universal in the case of destruction of individuals. Individuals are there at the time of pralaya in unmanifest form. all the castes etc. also exist during pralaya also. it is from this the next creation emerges. It is the next group of individuals is created. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives sruti pramana, smriti pramana and anubhava pramana. Every creation continues and it resembles in the next creation because of the avyakta rupa. Our Sushupti avastha confirms the continuity of the universe.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 113

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.30[93]**

#### **Samana nama rupaivat cha avrittavapyavirodho darsanat smritescha**

And on account of the sameness of the names and forms in every fresh cycle there is no contradiction [to the eternity of the words of the Vedas] even in the resolving of the world cycles as is seen from the sruti and smriti.

In these sutras Vyasacharya establishes that there is no problem regarding the validity of the Vedas by accepting the embodiment of devatas. For this he establishing the veda pramanyam veda sabda nityatvam veda artha nityatvam and veda artha sabda sambandha nityatvam were established. Here veda sabda artha nityatvam the objects of the world are external is established here. The individual may perish at the time sleep world resolves and at the time fo pralayam world resolves and vyakti nasah we do accept and what we say is in the next creation the individual comes and individuals may be different but the individual will belong to the same class. Indra vyakti is perishable and manusya jathi is imperishable. Manusya jathi will be there in every sruti but manusya individual will not be there. Vedic words do not belong to the individual but vedic words belongs to the universal which is unperishable. Therefore artha jathi nityatvam sambhavidham. In every sruti the universals are the same but not the individuals.

We with out limited human intellect cannot remember the previous sruti and cross check what happened in the previous sruti. Therefore to prove the nityatvam of individual we have to believe the sastra pramanam alone. He points out sastra based logical support as also our experiential support.

First is the sruti support. Surya chandramasou yatha akalpayatu purvam the sun and the moon the creator created and yatha purvam as the sun and moon were there in the previous sruti. Sun and moon differed individualally but in general the namarupa remained. There is smriti support also and Adhi Sankaracharya quotes shanty parva in Maha Bharata. Abimanah devah smpradayah devah adhitati devaihi tulyah devas of current sruti is same as that of previous sruti. Sastra pramana supports the eternity of the devas. Now he gives the anubhava pramana also. vaidhikas do yagas to get punya phalam, the various lokas for their karma phalam. it is based on sukha bhalam that is promised. It is created by indriya visaya sambandha sukha phalam. by the combination of indriya and vishaya sukham one gets desire for more and more desires. He wants to gain punya to enjoy the sukham many he enjoys in the present sruti and many in the next sruti. It is based on sukham experienced in the present sruti. He wants the same sukham ithe next sruti also. suppose in the next sruti visayam also different. He wanted swarga to see urvasi and by the time he went to swarga in the next sruti he found urvasi a donkey. If the punya should produce sukham indriyams should be similar and the ramba and urvasi also should be similar. For dharma sastra to be valid the creation should be

similar. If the creation becomes dissimilar the sukha hetu will become dukha hetu. You take masala dosa and having found it very tasty you order for another masala dosa keeping in mind the next one also would be as tasty one as before. The same vyakti you cannot keep in mind. you are not asking for the same masala dosa of the same jathi with the hope that it will give the same sukha. If the other person prepares the totally different one then sukha hetu will become dukha hetu. By doing punyam you want to get the same pleasure and he may create the same kind of creation and not different one for the punyam to give the same sukha in the next creation. therefore jathi nityatvam is supported by logic also. Adhi Sankaracharya gives another logic also. even though individual perish it cannot be total destruction. They all must exist in potential form. all human and devata species go back to unmanifest condition only and not total destruction. All the devas and manusyas go into avyakta or unmanifest form and get to vyakta or manifest form in the next creation. the Adhi Sankaracharya gives anubhava pramanam. This is Sushupti anubhava. In deep sleep state the words or worlds do not exist in deep sleep and everything is resolved and in the next day everything comes into being sabda artha sambandha and saba and artha continue. Sabda continues artha continues; but if sambandha is not there for someone then there will be problem. the communication problem will create difficulty. After waking sabda, artha and sambandha continue so also the pralayam, which is a cosmic sleep. Individual sleep is called layah and cosmic sleep is pralayah. In sleep we accept everything continue because we remember it the next day. How can we show that in pralaya the whole thing continue? How can we know. And how can we say it is eternal when we don't remember the whole things. Adhi Sankaracharya says just because you don't remember that it is anithyam. Just because one person don't remember the previous sristi, we cannot say the same thing comes back in the next janma. Between one sruti and another sruti humanity forgets veda and Brahmaji remembers veda blessed by Bhagavan. And Brahmaji sends Vedas to the humanity. Humanity has forgotten veda but Bhagavan does not forget Vedas. Rishis can recollect Vedas belonging to the previous sruti. That is they are called mantra drastarah. The same veda existed in the previous sruti. As we recollect table now and later so also the Vedas comes back and reemerge in the yugas to yugas. At the end of previous yuga Vedas go to potential form and rishis recollect by performing tapas blessed by Brahmaji rishis recollect sabda, artha and also sabda artha sambandha and pralayam is cosmic sleep and nothing is destroyed. Thus sabda artha sambandha is nithyah.

Now we will go into word for word analysis. The sutra contains many words. Samana nama rupaivat cha avrittav api avirodho darsanat smriteh cha and we have to supply sabde from sutra 28 has to dragged. First portion is sabde avirodah with regard to the validity of Vedas there is no contradiction at all. Avirittou abhi even in the next cycle of creation. abhi means also not only there is no creation but also in the next creation there is no contradiction because of the samana nama rupaivat since the absence of creation nama rupa belongs to the same universal. Indra nama rupa varuna rupa etc., continue and individual vyakti is perishable and not the universal. Since nama rupa belongs to the same universal. Then darsanat as supported by sruti vakyam here darsanam means sruti pramanam. It is equated to sruti pramanam because darsanam also is independent pramanam and sruti also independent pramanam so word darsanam is used to denote sruti pramanam. The rik veda 10.1.93 is kept in mind here. It occurs in the maharayan Upanishad also. it is supported by smriti pramanam also the Maha Bharata shanty parvata. The final meaning of the sutra that there is no contradiction with regard to validity of veda in the next janma also since individual nama rupa is same as supported by sruti and smriti pramanam. Therefore Indra's embodiment can be accepted and therefore Indra has got right to study.

## Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.31[94]

### Madhvadishvasambhavadanadhikaram jaiminih

On account of the impossibility [of the gods being qualified for Madhu Vidya etc., Jaimini [is of the opinion that the gods] are not qualified [either for Upasana or for the Brahma vidya or for the knowledge of the Self]

Another objection to sutra 26 is raised.

Another purva paksha has come to establish that devatas do not physically exist and Vedantins want to exist that they physically exist. Karma virodha problem we refuted. Then the veda pramanya virodha has been refuted. Now another problem is introduced by purva paksha. In previous context we mentioned that devatas are not qualified for Karma Kanda. They have no right to do rituals. The reason mentioned was that the very yaga means offering oblations to the devatas. Therefore in every yaga devatas are in receiving end and manusyas are in the giving end. Therefore primary condition for yaga to be yaga devata should be bogta and if devata becomes karta where the bogta will be there. they can be receivers and not givers of oblations. Advaidins do not want to argue. That because of the same reasons devatas cannot do Upasanas it is said because of the same reason. Here also there are upasya devatas in every Upasana. Then how can devata do the Upasana on themselves. Devatas are objects of Upasana and they can never be subject of Upasanas. If you look at Vedanta in Vedanta also there are many Upasanas. In taittiriya Upanishad the entire siksha valli is full of Upasanas. So also is the case in other Upanisads also. Vedanta contains Upasanas and devatas cannot do Upasanas and therefore devatas cannot study Vedas. This is the purva paksha, which is raised here. Vyasacharya gives one Upasana for example that is Madhu vidya, which occurs in 3.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *om asau va adityo devamadhu tasya dyaureva tirascinavamsa'ntariksamapupo maricayah putrah*. The meaning of the mantra is the sun over there is honey to the gods. Heaven is the crossbeam, the midregion is the beehive and the rays are the eggs Adhitya devata is the source of happiness here. Honey is sukha hetu. Deva madhu means devanam honey and it is adhitya and Surya bhagavan is the source of happiness. Therefore his inference Brahma Vidya na devata vishayah vidyatvad madhu vidyavad. It is not relevant for devata and they cannot resort to madhu vidya so they cannot do Brahma vidya. This is the question. The entire sutra is purva paksha sutra and the answer will come in the 33<sup>rd</sup> sutra alone. This is the objection in general.

Now we will go word for word analysis. Madh adishu asambhavat anadhikaram jaimini and we have to add devanam and vadhati. Jaimini devanam anadhikaram vadhati. Jaimini maharisi vadhati asserts devanam anadhikaram disqualification for Vedantic study jaimini asserts the disqualification of devatas for the study of Brahma Vidya because of their incapability with regard to Madhu vidya. Here Madhu vidya means Surya Upasana. The object of meditation is devata and subject of meditation is devata so the devatas cannot study Brahma Vidya. Vyasacharya has chosen an Upasana in Vedanta or the Upanisads portion. This is the objection. 4.3.1 *vayuvava samvargo yad va agnirudvayati vayumevapyeti yada suryo'stameti vayumevapyeti yada candro'stameti vayumevapyeti* the meaning of this mantra is the air swallows everything. When fire is extinguished it disappears into the air. When the

sunsets, it disappears into the air and when the moon sets it disappears into the air. There is another Upasana is suggested and it is vayu Upasana. In one form or another devatas are the object of meditation and not subject of meditation.

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.32[95]**

#### **Jyotishi bhavacca**

And [the gods are not qualified for vidyas] because [the words sun, moon etc., spoken of as gods] are used in the sense of mere spheres of lights.

An argument in support of the objection raised in sutra 31 is given.

The objection is raised by Purva Mimamsaka. Devatas are not there. they do not accept heaven and hell. They say they are all symbolic. Whenever a person says like this, he is not Advaitins but Purva Mimamsakas. they even say devas and asuras are not there and they say that they are all symbolic. We can present symbolically all right but not we negate what sastra says. adhithya devata means inert sun alone symbolized as devata. Then how can one do meditation? They also say chandra devata do not exist and they say all devatas are luminaries in the sky. There is no sentient Surya devata but it is inert sun. so also the case with moon and stars. This is the second purva paksa which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 114

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.32 [95]**

#### **Jyotishi bhavacca**

And [the gods are not qualified for vidyas] because [the words sun, moon etc., spoken of as gods] are used in the sense of mere spheres of lights.

This sutra refutes the arguments in the previous two sutras and concludes the discussion.

We see the 32<sup>nd</sup> sutra of devatgadhikaranam, which is an extension of the previous adhikaranam that deals with the eligibility of, devas for Brahma vidya. Manusyadhikara is the subject of previous adhikaranam and now devata's eligibility is considered in this adhikaranam. The various objections raised in this regard is refuted by Vyasacharya. Now he takes up the last objection raised by Jaimnini who is incidentally Vyasacharya's own disciple. The answer is given in the 33<sup>rd</sup> sutra.

It was pointed out that devatas couldn't perform vedic rituals as they are the receivers of the rituals. Devatas themselves perform the rituals that will receive the oblations. They cannot be object of karmas and they cannot be subjects. Vedanta sastra has got various many vidyas. Some of them are called devata vidyas in which devatas are meditated upon particularly Madhu vidya. Similarly we have samvarga vidya the Vayu rupa Upasanam. How can devatas become subject of vidyas. Purva paksa says for devatas are unqualified for all the Upasana, karma and also the Brahma vidya. Brahma Vidya is also a vidya in Vedanta sastram and hence they devatas cannot do certain vidyas including Brahma Vidya. These devatas refer to various natural forces Surya, sun, chandra the moon etc. They are all luminaries or in general various inert things of the creation. Therefore they are achetana jada vastu only. Only symbolically they are seen as living being. Therefore picturisation as living being should be taken only as symbolism or arthavadha and should not be taken literally and they are achetana vastu. None of the chetana vasuts cannot do namaskaram and how can they do rites etc. How can they do sravanadhikam and gain liberation.

Mow I will go for word for word analysis. There are three words jyotishi as mere spheres of light bhava because used in the sense ca. We have to complete the sutra by adding some words and they are devata sabdanam and devatanam Brahma Vidyayam adhikarah nasti. Now the final sutra is devata sabdanam jyotishi bhava ca devatanam Brahma Vidyayam adhikarah nasti. Devata sabdanam means the words revealing devata; adhitya the word candra the word Agni etc; here sabda means words; bhavad means operation or function; it refers to because of the operation or function then jyotishi means luminary or shining object; they are sun, moon, stars, fire, lightening etc., the common factor is inertness; it is inert luminary; in the field of inert luminary; if you join the three words because of the operation of the words revealing devatas or devata revealing words; in the filed of inert luminary; in simple language

since sun moon etc., reveal only inert luminary; up to this is hetu and then come to the conclusion ca means also already in the previous sutra one reason has been given and now second reason is given; devatanam Brahma Vidyanam adhikarah nasti it means devas are not eligible to pursue Brahma Vidya. With this purva paksha is over. Now we have to come to siddhanta sutra.

## Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.33 [96]

#### Bhavam tu baadarayano'sti hi

But Baadarayana on the other hand [maintains] the existence [of qualification on the part of the gods for Brahma Vidya]; for there are [passages indicative of that; body, desires etc., which qualify one for such knowledge do exist in the case of the gods]

This sutra refutes the arguments in the previous two sutras and concludes the discussion.

We will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Adhi Sankaracharya gives answer to the objection raised in the previous two sutras. Vyasacharya's answer is very simple. And he says that they have the eligibility so assets Vyasacharya. The reason is that there is evidence or vedic support for my conclusions. Adhi Sankaracharya elaborately discusses in support of Vyasacharya's conclusion. One is 1.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; the portion of the mantra reads as *yatha pasur evam sa devanam yatha ha vai bhavah pasavo manusyanam bhunjyuh* the gods are no pleased that men should know the ultimate turth for then they would know the subordinate place the gods hold and give up making them offerings; whoever gets Brahma jnanam will become Brahman whether he is a devata or manusya or rishi. Sruti very clearly says devas can gain Brahma jnanam and get liberation. The next is from Chandogya upanisad VIII.7.2 which reads as *tadd hobhaye devasura anububudhire; te hocuh; hanta tam atmanam anivcchama, yam atmanam anvisya sarvams ca lokan apnoti ssarvams ca Kaman iti; indro haiva devanam abhipravavraja, virocano'suranam tau ha samvidanav eva samit-pani praja-pati sakasam ajagmatuh* the meaning fo the mantra is that the gods and demons both heard it and said 'well, let us seek that Self, the Self by seeking whom one obtains worlds and all desires.' Then Indra from among the gods went forth unto him and Virocana from among the demons; then without communicating with each other, the two came into the presence of Prajapati fuel in hand;

Here we see that Brahma and Virojana goes to Brahmaji for gaining Self knowledge. Even if you discard asura raja, Indra got the knowledge. This is quoted by Adhi Sankaracharya. We can give further quotation. We see in IV.3 of Keno Upanishad *tasmad va indro'titaramivanyan devan, sa hy enan nedistham paspasrsa sa hy enat prathamavidamecakara brahmeti* therefore Indra surpasses greatly, as it were, other gods He, indeed has come into close contact with Brahman. He indeed for the first time knew that [it was] Brahman. Indra got Self-Knowledge from Umadevi and other devatas followed suit.

Now we will see word for word analysis. We gave bhavam; tu; baadarayana; asit and hi and we complete the sutra by adding devatanam adhikarasya and then adhikara karanam; you rearrange the sutra baadarayana tu devatanam adhikarasya bhavam manyate; the next

sentence hi adhikara karanam asti. This is the final arranged sutra. Baadarayana means Vyasacharya; sishya jaimini is purva paksa and Baadarayana is guru Vyasacharya. He refers to his own name. Then the next word is tu which means however; here the significance of the word is to eliminate the purva paksa; unlike jaimini Vyasacharya accepts eligibility; next word is manyate means accepts; bhavam adhikarasya the existence of adhikarasya of eligibility or right in the pursuit of Brahma Vidya; hi means because adhikara karanam asit there is evidence or vedic support the Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad and keno Upanishad vakyas etc. With this sutra part is over. Adhi Sankaracharya continues by giving more evidence. Now Adhi Sankaracharya gives the vedic support that devatas have got embodiment which gives them eligibility. He elaborately establishes that devatas have got body and they can go to guru and study Vedanta. Purva paksa has given two reason that devatas are ineligible and this has to be negated and elaboration of vedic evidence.

Purva paksa was given in sutra 32 and 33 that say Vedanta contains Upasana rupa vidya and jnana rupa vidya also. Vedanta is a mixture both Upasana and jnana vidya and since devatas cannot do Upasana vidya they cannot follow jnana vidya also. They are not eligible for Upasana vidya because they are the object of Upasana and how can they be subject and object of Upasana simultaneously. Therefore they cannot do Upasana vidya and therefore they said they couldn't do jnana vidya also. Just because they are unfit for Upasana rupa vidya how can you say they are not eligible for jnana vidya also. Partial ineligibility cannot prove total ineligibility. They need not study brahmananda valli and but study other valli which do not contain Upasana rupa vidya. In support of this contention he gives reasons. Let us take Karma Kanda itself. In Karma Kanda is any person eligible for all rituals. No. Rituals are based on varnasrama qualification. Raja suya yaga can be done by a raja. Brahmana can do Brahaspati saha only. Vyaya sthoma can be done by vysya only. Agnihotra can be done by grahastha and not by brahmachari. Nobody is eligible for all ritual. Partial eligibility is total ineligibility means you have to totally remove Karma Kanda. Whoever is eligible for whichever sadhana that person follows that sadhana? If this is your contention why cannot you extend yatedhikara jnaya in jnana kanda also? Let devata follow Brahma Vidya since they are not eligible for Karma Kanda and Upasanas also. Then the next purva paksa in sutra 32, all devatas reveal natural and inert natural forces. Devatas are not there and there are people who love symbolism. They say pandavas refer to noble thoughts and kauvaravas refer to evil thoughts. We accept pandavas with symbolic meaning as an additional factors. Advaidins accept swarga as real. Because Surya etc., are inert they are not eligible for Self-Knowledge. Even though devatas have got a loukika artha there is a satriya artha also. While studying sastra we should take satriya artha for words and not loukhika artha. Loukika artha of adhithya is inert sun but satriya artha of word adhitya is the adhistanam devata the intelligent principle or chetana tattvam behind the Surya sariram. Visible sun is the body and behind the body there is intelligent jivah. Behind every sariram there is chetana jivah similarly Vedanta accept behind Surya mandalam there is chetana devata; so also behind the chandra mandalam there is chetana devata at the adhistanam. When we do sandhyavandanam the sun rises seeing the world; the sun means not the solar disc but the solar devata; seeing is not possible for the inert devata sum; behind achetana Surya mandalam chetana Surya devata. Similarly chandra mandalam has got Agni devata; chetana part is devata; sariram part is inert sun. Therefore veda talks about all the devatas speaking etc., is pramanam for chetana tattvam. Veda says sun approached. All these vedic statement talks about chetana devatas and not inert ones. Purva paksa achetana jyotih but we say chetana devatas. That is why we worship panca bhutas. We worship water; the very fact the veda prescribes prayer for inert bhutas it is because that we are asked to pray the adhistanam devata. There is an elaboration of vedic evidence that devatas have got adhikara. Here Adhi Sankaracharya proves that devatas



have got embodiment. Previously he talked of devatas gained knowledge and now indirect evidence that devatas have got embodiment and therefore they can gain knowledge. Purva Mimamsa are so emphatic that devatas do not have body because Adhi Sankaracharya is emphatic to prove that devatas have got the body. Purva Mimamsa say that there is no person called Indra. What about Indra swarupam and according to Purva Mimamsa Indra has got sabda swarupam but he does not have artha swarupam. Whenever you write the word rama it is not sabda swarupam and it is artha swarupam. They always go together. But Purva Mimamsa in the case of devatas only there is a unique law. Indra swarupam is sabda swarupam and Indra does not have body or artha swarupam. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 115

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.33 [96]**

#### **Bhavam tu baadarayano'sti hi**

But Baadarayana on the other hand [maintains] the existence [of qualification on the part of the gods for Brahma Vidya]; for there are [passages indicative of that; body, desires etc., which qualify one for such knowledge do exist in the case of the gods]

This sutra refutes the arguments in the previous two sutras and concludes the discussion.

We see the last sutra of this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya points out that devatas also have the eligibility to study Brahma Vidya. Vyasacharya has refuted the objections raised by Jaimini. He asserts the fact because there are many vedic evidences in support of the devatas' eligibility to study Brahma Vidya. One is direct evidence and the other is indirect evidence. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.4.10 he mentions that Upanishad clearly says that anyone who gains Self-Knowledge is liberated whether that one is jiva or devata. In this devas are also included in the sruti vakya. Having given the direct evidence now we will see the indirect evidence that devas have got sariram. Because they have got body and they are embodied and they have problem of samsra and they can also attain moksa by gaining Self-Knowledge. Adhi Sankaracharya gives six proofs to establish that devatas are embodied to reveal that devatas have got forms and body. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes this vehemently because Purva Mimamsa vehemently refutes that devatas do not have the body. Purva Mimamsa says devatas are sabda swarupam in the absence of the body. Similarly Indra is sabda matram and Indra does not have any body. Vedanta says the word Indra there is corresponding artha. Having understood purva paksa we have to see the various supports Adhi Sankaracharya gives here.

All scriptures describe the forms of devatas. Mantra arthavadha vedic descriptions, ithikasas, and puranas give devata swarupam. That is why we have the description in the dhyana sloka. We often quote Vajra hasthah purandaraha. Purandaraha means indrah and vajra hasthah means holding vajrayudhah in his hands. If Indra is to hold ayutha in his hands he must have the body and limbs. Here we face a problem. Purva Mimamsa raises an objection. He says that I am aware of the vedic statements. But I don't accept them as facts. I don't accept them as valid means of knowledge. I don't negate the statements but I negate the validity of these statements. Some of the rules of the Purva Mimamsa we should know before taking up the subject. Purva Mimamsa is one who specializes the ritualistic portion of Vedas and who does not accept the Vedantic portions of the Vedas. They divide the Vedas into two types of statements. One is statements of commandments dos and don'ts. They are called vidhi vakyani. Second types of statements are the statements of descriptions where there are no injunctions. Description of heaven, devatas etc., come under this category. They are called arthavadha vakyani.

He says vidhi vakyas alone should be taken as pramanam valid source of knowledge because veda is serious about vidhi vakyams alone. All the statements of description veda is not at all serious. Since Veda is not serious about descriptive statements they should not be taken as valid source of knowledge. They are apramana vakyani. How did Purva Mimamsa discover veda is serious. Only vidhi vakyams produce results. Statement of injunctions has got utility because either I get dukha nivritti or sukha praptih. Artha vadha vakyas do not produce any benefit. I don't get any benefit by getting description of anything. Based on this he says all the description of devatas comes under vidhi or artha vadha vakyas is the question. We say that they do not belong to the vidhi vakyams. Since they are aprayocanam and they are not valid source of knowledge and therefore devas embodiment should not be taken as serious and such statements are non-valid statements and they are not facts since they do not come under vidhi vakyams. Hence the devatas need not study Vedanta. We also studied in 1.3.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad we studied the topic. We have to establish that the statement of description also can be valid source of knowledge. Purva Mimamsa says that statement of commandments alone is valid source of knowledge. But we want to establish that statements of description also are the valid source of knowledge. He says statement of description is not valid source of knowledge because they don't have any utility. Purva Mimamsa takes the utility as the criterion for validity of the statement. Vedantins argue who says that utility is criterion for validity of the knowledge. Utility is not the criterion at all for the validity of the knowledge. I see a star in the sky. What utility this has. The perception is a fact because the eyes are valid means of knowledge but I don't see any utility from the knowledge. Therefore the knowledge is useful although it may not have the immediate use from that knowledge. Just because it has no utility I cannot say eyes have revealed a false knowledge. There are so many instances are there that we see many are not useful and many are useful. We cannot say arthavadha statements are useless because there is no utility from that knowledge. If utility is the criterion of validity how do you know that the knowledge is not erroneous or right knowledge? There are two criteria for any source of knowledge one anagathitvam, which means it is a knowledge, which is not attained, by any source of knowledge. For example eyes are accepted, as valid means of knowledge especially of colours and the knowledge that we gather by eyes cannot be got by any other source of knowledge. Anumana cannot give the source of that knowledge. Therefore we say the first criterion is anagathitvam. This is condition number one.

Second is abaditvatvam. Anagathitvatvam is uniqueness is a source of knowledge which can be gained through any other means of knowledge. Anagathitvatvam means unnegatability. It should not be negated by another means of knowledge. That is rajju sarpah, or swapna padhartha. Rope snake is known through eyes alone but it is negated later and hence it is false source of knowledge. Anagathitvatvam and anagathitvatvam are two source of knowledge.

Next we come to arthavadha vakyani. It is divided into three types. They are statements of descriptions. Example number one; Agni himasya beshayam heat is a remedy whenever you feel cold. This is arthavadha vakyam because there is no commandment. We should take it as pramana vakyam or apramana vakyam. It should have unique knowledge. And it should not be negated later. You know this particular statement does not produce any new knowledge and it only restate what is already known. It does not have anagathitvatvam. It is anuvadha artha vadha vakyam and it is a restatement of already known fact. They are not considered apramana vakyam because the knowledge is already known. It is apramana vakyam. Then let us take second type of statement. There is another vakyam. Puruso bhava goutama Agni the man is fire. Woman is fire; this is another Vedic statement. This is vidhi or arthavadha vakyam. There is no commandment. It is only a statement. The idea conveyed is man is fire.

We have never learnt anywhere man or woman is fire. Anagatitvatvam is there. It is a unique idea. But is the second criterion for validity there. It should not be negated by another means of knowledge. Here the statement says man is fire. If you accept this as a statement, can you replace to cook food keeping the vessels on the head of the man who is fire? The pratyaksa pramana negates the idea conveyed by the statement. Therefore it is not valid statement of knowledge. It is called gunavadha arthavadha vakyam. Gunavadha arthavadha vakyam abaditva abavad apramanyam. In the first case no uniqueness is there and in the second case the statement is falsified. Adhithyah vyupah.

The third one is relevant thing for us. Vajrahasthah purandarah. Indra devata has got vajrayudham in his hands. Now we have to find out whether it comes under anuvadha or gunavadha. I have never experienced Indra before. How can I know whether he had vajrayudha or not. Anagatitvatvam varthate the uniqueness is there. It is not anuvadhah. Second criterion is that Indra devata has got vajrayudha. None can negate and none has seen whether he has vajrayudha or not. No inference also can be possible. There is no data available. It cannot be negated also. Since both criterion are fulfilled it must be third type of arthavadha it is neither restatement nor contradictory and such statements are called bhudhartha vadha. It means anuvadha gunavadha binna arthavadha. It reveals something unique which is never negatable. Then. We accept it as pramanam and therefore bhudhartha vadhanam anagatitvatva abaditva bhavad pramanyam. Bhudharthavadha is valid and unfalsified knowledge. All such statements are valid. Purva Mimamsa says all arthavadha vakyam are apramanam. Vedantins says anuvadha and gunavadha vakyas are apramanam and bhudhartha arthavadha vakyas are pramanam. Devatas head hands etc., come under bhudharthavadha vakyam and therefore such statements are valid and they are pramana vakyams. If it is falsified it is gunavadha if it is restatement it is anuvadha and if both other two are not there, if it neither anuvadha or gunavadha, it is bhudhartha vadha and arthavadasya triasmida. Purva Mimamsa has to accept the description of all devatas and therefore accept their embodiment. This is the first argument.

Second argument is that Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a vedic injunction which says before offering oblations during rituals one should meditate upon the devata who is to receive the oblations. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the veda itself ask the person to meditate upon devata and if the devata has no embodiment or form of the devata how could they meditate upon the devata. You cannot meditate upon the sound but you have to meditate upon the form only. If devatas do not have embodiment the dhyana vakyam cannot be implemented.

The third argument is in the scriptures it is said that many yogis and rishis have contacted and perceived the devatas by their supra sensuous perception. It is yogic pratyaksam. These yogis are supposed to have seen devatas and talked to them. Since yogic pratyaksa pramana implies vigrahatvam for devatas you have to accept the embodiment of devatas.

The fourth argument is from yoga sutra. There is a sutra, which says swadyayad ishta devata samprayogah. Chapter 2.44 the sutra says by[or from] Self study union with the desired deity. The nature of the communion will differ according to the temperament and capacity of the sadhaka and the nature of the ista devata. The study of the scripture connected to any devata that person will get contact with ista devata. That devata will come to him and he can have conversation. Saint Thyagaraja is supposed to have had dialogue with Lord Rama. This indicates the devata has embodiment and has sariram. Yoga sutra support our argument.

Krama mukti vakyani. Krama mukti is if a person is not able to study Vedanta he can do Upasana and that will give deva sariram and there in swarga get knowledge in devata janma and getting liberation. Krama mukti is possible only if devata is able to get liberation. It is said Brahmaji himself takes classes in Brahma loka. To attend the class body should be there.

Next is loka or chitrakara prasiddhih. Among the painters the devatas are wellknown as vighraha vandhana. Seventh is except in the case of Purva Mimamsa our worldly experience that every word has got corresponding object. Sabda artha bedah is prasiddham and how can you say in the case of devata sabda is there and artha is not there. Because of these seven arguments devatas have got bodies and they can study Vedanta. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 116

### **Topic 8 Devatadhikaranam [Sutras 26-33]**

The Devas also are entitled to the study of Vedas and to meditate on Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.33 [96]**

#### **Bhavam tu baadarayano'sti hi**

But Baadarayana on the other hand [maintains] the existence [of qualification on the part of the gods for Brahma Vidya]; for there are [passages indicative of that; body, desires etc., which qualify one for such knowledge do exist in the case of the gods]

This sutra refutes the arguments in the previous two sutras and concludes the discussion.

With the 33<sup>rd</sup> sutra Vyasacharya completes his discussion on devatadhikaranam and we have seen all the sutras of this adhikaranam. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is devatas, the celestial beings. Samsayah the doubt with regard to them is whether they have got Brahma Vidya adhikarah or not. Then the third step is purva paksha the view so the opponent who is against us. They say devatas have no right for Brahma Vidya. The reason he gives for this conclusion is that there are no persons called devatas and they do not have body, mind sense organs and so such persons or personalities called devata. He claimed that devatas exist in the form of sound alone. That is why according to them even devatas do not bless the people for they do not bless the people and only rituals are capable of blessing the people. The rituals are capable of giving the phalam. The creation and the laws and rituals give the ritual and we don't require intelligent people to bless the people. This is Purva Pakshi view. Siddhanti is the fourth step is devatas have got right for Brahma Vidya because they have embodiment. Every devata has got an embodiment as proved by scriptures themselves. They are not proved by perception or inference for we don't have data. It is only sastra pramanam. Vyasacharya has given many supporting proof. Every nama should have corresponding nami and it should have corresponding form or arthah. Sabda artha yoho beda urpa hetuh is the supporting hetu. Fifth step is sangathi the connection between this and the previous adhikaranam that it is in the right position only. In the previous adhikaranam Vyasacharya said manusyas have right to pursue Brahma Vidya and in this adhikaranam he decides to discuss whether devatas have right or not to pursue Vedanta. This knowledge is not require and even though it is not require it is called the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> are said to be a digression which is not required for Vedantic student. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.34 [97]**

#### ***Sugasya tadanadarasravanat tadadravanat suchyate hi***

[king janasruti] was in grief on hearing some ontemptuous words used about him by the sage in the form of a swan; owing to his approaching Raikva overwhelming with the grief Raikva called him sudra; for it [the grief] is pointed at by Raikva.

The discussion on the privilege of divine meditation begun in sutra 25 continued.

This is the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam known as abasudradhikaranam consisting of five sutras. First I will give you a general introduction of this adhikaranam. When we study the scriptures, they talk about the varieties of karmas. Kayika karmani vachika karmani manasika karmani and the results achieved through these karmas. Scriptures point out or prescribes who should do the karmas and as a part of that scriptures point out some condition to perform those karmas. And only those people who fulfill those conditions can perform those karmas and they have got the competence to do the karmas. Those who do not fulfill these conditions cannot do the karmas and they are prescribed by sastras and these conditions are called satriyam samartham.

For example there is a ritual called agnihotram. Sastra says only a married person can do this. Suppose there is an unmarried person has got all worldly competence that he has physical body and he has desire and money to do the ritual and also has got the knowledge and despite having all the worldly knowledge, he cannot do it unless he is a married man prescribed by the sastras. So also a sannyasi with all the conditions he cannot do the agnihotra rituals according to the scriptures. Any karma requires satriya samartham to do any karma. One should have loukika and satriya samartham to do any karma. If in want to get a passport I have to fulfill the condition. Or else we cannot get the passport. I should have loukika samartham to do any worldly action. Satriya samartham is required for completion of any satriya karmas. Agni hotra ritual can be done only when one fulfills the satriya samartham and worldly conditions. Loukika samartham is not sufficient and he should be married man and he should do the Agni adhanam and I get a special title ayidagni and then only he is qualified to perform agnihotra ritual.

Loukika samartham we can know by common sense. Sastrya samartham can be known only through sastras only., veda adyayanam is considered to be a satriyam karma because it is a vidhi prescribed by sastra. Learning to chant the Vedas comes under satriyam karma. Then veda mimamsa the study of the meaning and the bashyam of Vedas, vedanta vicara also is called satriyam karma. The rituals prescribed by Vedas and performance of the rituals also comes under satriyam karma. Veda adyayanam, mere chanting of Vedas; veda vichara means artha grahanam analysis of the meaning of veda mantras and veda karma anustanam means performance of karmas prescribed by Vedas and all the three come under satriyam karma. And once you put them under satriyam karma you have to apply the first law. All of them require not only loukika competence but also satriyam samartham to perform the rituals. Then I should have vak indriaym, physical competency. Satriyam samartham is apyutatvam. Now what is the satriyam samartham for veda adhyayana, veda vichara and veda anustanam to perform the karmas or rituals. Satriyam karma can be decided by sastra alone. What is sastric decision. Two conditions are to be fulfilled for satria samartham. The first condition is upanayana samskara the sacred thread ritual is condition number one. The second one is nithya karma anustanam. I will call it simply anustanam, these are the two conditions give the sastrya samartham. Such a person is called qualified human being to do rituals etc. Such a person is also known as dvijah or samskrta manusyah. Suppose a person does not fulfill either of the two conditions, that person is asamskrta manusyah unprepared unqualified human being. Suppose a person has not fulfilled the first condition, he is called

sudrah. He comes under asamskṛta manusya lacking sastrīya samarthyam. There is another person who has fulfilled the first condition but does not fulfill the second condition is known as dvija banduh. He is a fake dvijah. This bandu also come under asamkṛta manusyah and he lacks sastrīya samarthyam. Both together we call asamskṛta manusyah. Sudra and dvija bandu is asamskṛta manusyah and both cannot do the threefold sastrīyam karma veda parayana veda vicara and veda karma anustanam. Incidentally you should note that asamskṛta manusya has no right for the three sastrīyam karma so this division asamskṛtya and samskṛlita we make between manusyah only. This division is not there for rishi, devas and rishi patnis do not come under this category at all. They do not come under manusya category. The proof is there in Brihadharaynaka upanisad tad yo yo devanam praty vidyate tada devanam tada manusyanam. If rishi, manusya or deva gets the knowledge they get liberated. Sastra look upon devas and rishi panis under different category. Devas get adhikara need not fulfill these two conditions. Rishi patnis also samskṛta by being rishis they have sastrīyam samarthyam. With regard to manusya alone sastrīyam samarthyam is required. Veda adyayana veda vicara and veda karma anustana is called srouṛta sadhanani or you can call it vaidhika sadhanani and we insist upon the samskṛta manusya and this rule does not apply to smārtha sadhanani and all the nonvedic scriptural discipline. Suppose one wants to purana vicara purana adhyayana and purana anustanam this restriction the sastrīya samarthyam samskṛta manusyatvam is not required for smārtha sadhanani. Therefore in this ad\kartritvam Vyasacharya points out that all human being can follow smārtha sadhanani chanting of nonvedic scriptures performance of sadhana of nonvedic scriptures and all can get siddha suddhi through smārtha sadhanas and all can get moksa also through smārtha sadhanas. It is like going to any state in India without any restriction. If you want siddha suddhi you can follow smārtha sadhana and if you want samskṛta sadhana you should have the necessary qualification. This is the topic of apasudra adhikaranam. Asamskṛta manusyas are twofold one is sudra and the other dvija banduh. Here we discuss about sudra who is none but asamskṛta manusya adhikaranam. They are not incompetent for gaining moksa. Why the word apa and this indicates unqualified. This is a section that discusses the qualification for using vedic sadhanas. Asamskṛta manusya cannot do vedic sadhanas and samskṛta manusyas alone can do vedic sadhana. For this Vyasacharya takes a mantra that is going to be vishya vakyam. This mantra occurs in 4.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad. This we will discuss later. In Chandogya upanisad in the fourth chapter in the first three chapter discusses the samvarga vidya. These three sections deal with samvarga vidya means Vayu devata Upasanam. This is discussed in the form of guru sishya samvadhah. Guru is raikva and the sishya is Gnana srutih. Here there is story connecting the guru and sishya.

Gnanasruti is a great king and he gives plenty of danam and food to people. Therefore he has acquired lot of punyam and Brahma tejas also. This gnana sruti king was relaxing on the terrace of the palace. At that time some devata was passing by the palace. Then when one bird was flying above gnana sruti one was telling the other don't fly very low above him and he has so much tejas and if you fall within the range of his tejas you will be burnt. The bird answers why you glorify Janasruti so much as though he is as great as raikva. Gnanasrtui heard what the birds were speaking. Janasruti was satisfied when first bird glorified but was unhappy when the other bird insulted him. The king asked am I as great as raikva. The king tells him the glory as told by the bird in front of the other person. Raikva happens to be a great upasaka. He acquired all punyas acquired by all karmas by all the people will not be equal to the punyams acquired by raikva. The charioteer finds that he sits under the cart possessing nothing. Even though he does not possess anything he could get much without doing anything and by doing Upasana. The raikva says that the daksina is not enough. He



brings more daksina and also gives his daughter. This is the topic discussed here more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 117

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.34 [97]**

#### ***Sugasya tadanadarasravanat tadadravanat suchyate hi***

[king janasruti] was in grief on hearing some ontemptuous words used about him by the sage in the form of a swan; owing to his approaching Raikva overwhelming with the grief Raikva called him sudra; for it [the grief] is pointed at by Raikva.

The discussion on the privilege of divine meditation begun in sutra 25 continued.

I gave you the general analysis of this adhikaranam consisting of five sutras. Through this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses as to who is qualified for sroudha sadhanani and smartha sadhanani. Through this adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes all people are qualified for nonvedic discipline smartha sahdanani and through this all can get Self-knowledge and all can gain moksa also. Moksa is universally accessible. The vedic discipline or sroudha sadhana is not accessible for all people and only those who are specially eligible alone can get access to it. They are samskrta manusas aor dvijas and who have gone through upanayana and nithya karma anustanam. This is being established here by Vyasacharya in this adhikaranam.

To establish this idea Vyasacharya is analyzing the story occurring in Chandogya upanisad fourth chapter. Here Janasruti is relaxing in his terrace. Two birds converse between himself or herself while one bird glorifies, the other insults saying that he is not as glorious as Raikva the Brahmana who practices Upasana. When he overheard this he develops two powerful emotions one is pains caused by insult and second is the deep urge to study the Vayu Upasana the cause of raikva becoming great. With these two emotions he approaches Raikva who denies him complaining insufficient daksina. The Upanishad presents Raikva as great Brahmana and all should be positively interpreted. The denial also should be positively interpreted. Acharyas in old days tested the disciples in different ways and asking for large daksina is also to check the earnestness of gnana sruti. This appears to be negative method but the underlying factor is positve method of checking the earnestness of Janasruti. Janasruti brought greater daksina and also his daughter to Raikva and learnt Vayu Upasana from Raikva. In Chandogya upanisad Vayu Upasana is given a special title samvarga vidya. This helps us to establish samskrta manusya alone is eligible for samskrta sadhanani, which is the subject of this adhikaranam.

In this story there is a mantra occurring in this Upanishad. This occurs in Chandogya upanisad fourth chapter. While the Upanishad presents the story it makes a statement and it occurs in 4.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad and it is this statement which triggers the controversy and the debate. The mantra reads as *tamu ha parah pratyuvacaha haretva sudra taviva saha gobhirastviti tadu ha pounareva janasrutih pautrayanah sahasram gayam*

*niskamasvatariratham duhitaram tadadaya praticakrame* raikva said to him, 'you sudra, the necklace and chariot along with the cows – let all these be yours', janasruti left and then again came back – this time with one thousand cows, gold necklace a chariot drawn by mules and his own daughter.

The context of the statement is Janasruti is approaching Raikva for the first time and he gets the teaching second time only. He approaches with two powerful emotions caused by pain because of the insults heaped by the bird and the curiosity towards Raikava's learning. He brings cartloads of ornaments, his daughter to be his wife and also a village in which he lived and thousand cows and a chariot drawn by mules etc.

The controversy is that while making the statement raikva makes a statement oh sudra purusah. Here it is stated that Janasruti is not a king but he is asamskrita manusyah. Even though he is denied the knowledge, the same Janasruti was given vedic Vayu Upasana later. This is sroudha sadhana. The Guru Raikva has taught Asamskrita Janasruti smaskrta sadhana. It is evident from this that even without upanayanam all people can practise sroudha sadhana. Vyasacharya wants to point out asamskrita manusyas cannot gain the knowledge of sroudha sadhana. Vyasacharya has to establish that Janasruti is ksatriya alone and then alone his idea can be validated. He faces now a problem. In this statement Janasruti is addressed as sudra. Now he has to explain the meaning of sudra. This is the problem here. The entire adhikaranam is the analysis of sudra sabdah.

Vyasacharya has to establish that the word sudra does not indicate asamskrita manusatvam. Here Vyasacharya establishes two things that Janasruti is a ksatriya and he is not a sudra. This is the general introduction to this entire adhikaranam.

The first sudra Vyasacharya establishes that the word sudra should not be taken in its primary meaning and you should take only the secondary meaning for which he take the contextual support. The primary meaning of the word sudra is upanayana rahita asamskrita manusyaha a person who does not have the sacred thread therefore he is not fully qualified. The secondary or contextual meaning is that Janasruti has got two powerful emotions the insult heaped by the bird. Second is he does not want to be inferior and he wants to be either equal or better than Raikva and he wants to become Vayu upasaka. This mental state of Janasruti is not religious state. Raikva is also a mental reader. He knew that Janasruti was a sorrowful runner, which Raikva knew. Hence Raikva uses the word su and ra, which means sorrowful runner. Su mentions soha and ra represents runner. Therefore even though Raikva addressed him as sudra which had the meaning of sorrowful runner. Vyasacharya says we have to take the secondary meaning. In Sanskrit there is a word ajah which means goat. The secondary meaning is Atma is ajah. We should know what meaning should be taken where. Here Janasruti is sudra which means sorrowful runner.

We will see the word for word analysis. We have to supply two words. One is utpannah. Sugasya is to be split as sukh and asya; next is tad anadarasravanat; and tada adravanat and suchyate and hi. I will rearrange the words. Sukh means sorrow; asya means of this Janasruti king; then supply the utpanna which means which was born or which arose; the sorrowful state of Janasruti which arose; tad anadarasravanat means tad means the hamsa word the devata appearing in bird form; anadara means inflicting words the insulting statement; sravanam means hearing; the meaning is by hearing the insulting words of the birds; the sorrow of the king Janasruti which was born by hearing the insulting words of the hamsa bird and then hi means is indeed. The significance of this letter I will explain later; suchyate

means is revealed. Next is sudra sabdena means by the expression sudra. The sorrow of Janasruti which is born by hearing the insulting words of bird is revealed by the expression sudra. This only shows the sorrowful state of Janasruti and not the upanayanam or the nondivija status. Hi means the primary meaning of the word is more powerful than the secondary meaning. This is the general law. When both meanings are possible one should take primary meaning but he takes the secondary meaning. Vyasacharya compromises with an important law. There is another law we should know. If the primary meaning does not fit contextually, then the secondary meaning can be taken by dropping the primary meaning. The contextual secondary meaning is better than non-contextual primary meaning. This superceding nyaya is indicated by the word hi in this sutra. This is the first part of the sutra.

The sutra conveys the idea that Janasruti convey the meaning that he is a sorrowful runner. How does the word convey such a meaning. For that Vyasacharya says tadadravanat. This contains two words tad adravanam tad means sukh and adravanam means running. Since Janasruti was running with sorrow, he is called sudra and letter su referring to soha and ra referring running. Therefore sudra means ksatriya sorrowful runner and so Janasruti is not asamskrita manusyah and he is a ksatriya king and he deserves Vayu Upasana. With this the first sutra is over.

## **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

### **Sutra 1.3.35 [98]**

#### ***Kshatriyatvavagateschaottaratra chaitrarathena lingat***

And because the kshatriyahood [of Janasruti] is known from the inferential mark [supplied by his being mentioned] later on with Chaitraratha [who was a Kshatriya himself]

An argument in support of sutra 34 is given.

We will take up the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya proves that Janasruti is a ksatriya. In the previous sutra he proved that Janasruti is not a sutra. But here he proves that he is a ksatriya. He takes three statements from the veda. First is that there was a king known as Chaitrarathih. The next statement is that the Brahmins belonging to kapi gotra were the priests for the kings belonging to chitraratha family. Third is from Chandogya upanisad story itself 4.3.5 that reads as *atha ha saunakam ca kapeyamabhipratarinam ca kaksasenim parivisyamanau brahmacari bibhikse tasma u ha na dadatuh* once sounaka the son of Kapi and abhipratarin the son of Kaksasena were being served their meals when a brahmacharin appeared and begged for some food. They however refused to give him any. Using these three statements we are going to establish Janasruti is a ksatriya. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 118

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.35 [98]**

#### ***Kshatriyatvavagateschaottaratra chaitrarathena lingat***

And because the kshatriyahood [of Janasruti] is known from the inferential mark [supplied by his being mentioned] later on with Chaitraratha [who was a Kshatriya himself]

An argument in support of sutra 34 is given.

We do the general analysis of sutra 35 and the Chandogya upanisad statement 4.2.3 in which the Upanishad talks about Janasruti who is a student of Vayu Upasana and we want to find out who is the Janasruti. We want to find out whether he is a sutra or someone else. Vyasacharya wants to establish that the word sutra does not mean sutra in primary sense but should be taken as sorrowful runner. He is really a ksatriya one and Vyasacharya wants to establish Janasruti as ksatriya and will establish him as dvijah and he has upanayana samskara. And then he is eligible for samvarga vidya. In this sutra Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya want to do a very important textual analysis. Several ideas are given and each one is going to be connected to arrive at the conclusion.

First we have to take three statements, which Adhi Sankaracharya quotes in his commentary. First one is a king named chaitraratha and second statement is from tandya Brahmanam only. The meaning of the statement is that Kapeya kapi vamsa Brahmana and they priest and advisers of Chitrarathi vamsa ksatriyas. Third is taken from 4.3.5 of Chandogya upanisad. This third statement introduces two person as a part of the story. One is Kapeya and Adhiprathari. They were taking food together and someone was serving food. When they were taking food a brahamchari came asking for biksa. For our analysis the details can be omitted. We are interested in kapeya and adhiprathari were together. Having got the two statements, in the first statement the veda introduced chitrarathi as a king. All the members belonging to chitrarathi king is chaitrarathas. Non-only the contemporaries but also the future generation are called chaitrarathas. First idea is chaitra ratha belongs to king family.

The second idea we derive that family of priests advised all chaitra ratha kings named kapeya the descendents of kapi gotra or kapi vamsa the family of brahmanas.

The third idea to be derived is all the kapeya Brahmins were associated with chaitra ratha kings. Thus there is a flow of Brahmana and ksatriya families.

Coming to the third statement the Upanishad says that kapeya and abhiprathari were together. Since kapeyas were always associated with ksatriya kings abhiprathari must mean the chaitra ratha king. Family wise he belongs to chaitra ratha family and abhiprathari must be a chaitra

ratha. Abhiprahari must be his personal name but he belongs to ksatriya family of chaitra ratha.

What Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya say is that this pair Brahmana and ksatriya king is introduced as a part of story. Where does the story occur? This story occurs as a part of samvarga vidya or Vayu Upasana. The purpose of the story is that through the story the Upanishad wants to glorify the Vayu Upasana, we already have a previous story in samvarga vidya is Janasruti and Raikva.

The first story is to reveal Vayu Upasana and the second story is to reveal the glory of the Vayu Upasana. Now Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya says that in the second story we have a Brahmana and ksatriya pair. That means in the first story also which is occurring in the same context of samvarga Upasana we should have the similar pair only because that is the style of the veda. Raikva happens to be a Brahmana and Janasruti should be ksatriya and therefore the word sutra should not be taken as upanayana Purusa but should be taken as sorrowful runner. This is the essence of the sutra.

Now we will do word for word analysis. Ksatriyatva avgateh is one word. Next word is ca; then uttratra; the next is chaitratha; then lingat. First I will rearrange the words. Lingat means an indication, a clue for concluding that Janasruti is a ksatriya we have an evidence or proof. This is an internal textual evidence occurring in samvarga vidya itself. Next is the supplied words Janasruteh samvaibvyabavah the meaning is sruti mention of Janasruti. Chaitra rathena which means along with chaitra ratha king; Janasruti occurs in the mantra 4.2.3 and Chaitra ratha occurs in 4.3.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Thus because of the evidence in the form of Janasruti along with chaitra ratha; when Vyasacharya says vedic mention of Janasruti along with chaitra ratha you will find that in 4.3.5 chaitra ratha is not mentioned at all. There only word abhiprahari is there. Then we have to conclude tha bhiprahari is none but chaitra ratha vamsa king. Then next word is uttarathra means in the latter part of the text 4.3.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Compared to 4.2.3, 4.3.5 is latter text. Janasruteh ksatriyasya avagathah. Janasruti is proved to be a ksatriya from this story. One part of the sutra is over.

Now we will come to the second part of the sutra. Ksatriyasya avagatheh because of our knowledge of the ksatriya status then you supply three words Janasruti is not a sutra. He is not upanayana samskara rahitah; ca means also joining the previous sutra. The our conclusion is that vedic sadhana is meant for samskrita manusya alone and not for asamskrita manusya. With this the sutra is over. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

### **Sutra 1.3.36 [99]**

#### ***Samskaraparamarsat tadabhavabhilapacca***

Because purificatory ceremeonies are mentioned [in the case of the twice born] and their absence is declared [in the case of the sutra]

The discussion on the privilege of Brahma Vidya on the part of sudra is continued.

Now we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya wants to give certain general argument in support of his conclusion that samskrita manusya alone can perform samskrita sadhana and it has nothing to do with samvarga vidya. There are various references to upanayana samskaras in the context of sroutha sadhana and not in the context of smartha sadhana. Veda adhyayana veda vicara and veda anustanam comes under sroutha sadhana. The significance of the upanayana samskara is bringing a guru and sishya together acharya sishya sangamah samyohaha. When a vedic student and teacher comes together and it is a formal affair involving lot of formalities. It involves sacraments, prayers etc. This can be presented in twofold angle. From the standpoint of acharya acceptance of sishya it is called. Acceptance or admission is called upa nayana. I take sishya near me. Nayanam means sweekaranam. Upa means near. If you present the same coming together from the point of disciple means the formal approach of the student. The word used for formal approach is upa sadhanam or upa gamanam. Both indicate the formal coming together of vedic student and Vedic teacher. Every student who reads veda should know the two innocent words of upa and nayanam. I go to America means that includes getting the passport, getting visa, getting ticket, getting overseas insurance etc. This formalities everyone is familiar and hence one knows from the innocent statement that I go to America means he has undergone all the hassles of getting the passport etc. So also in ancient times people were familiar with the samskaras like upa nayanam etc. Adhi Sankaracharya gives references in 2.1.14 Brihadaranyaka upanisad, 6.2.7 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad; 7.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad all indicate upanayana samskara that indicate samskrita manusya alone has the eligibility.

The second part is that not only scripture refer to samskrita manusyas also they refer to asamskrita manusyas also equally vehemently. One such reference is occurring in Goutama Dharma sutra 2.1.51 where it is said sudra eka jathi which means upanayana samskrara rahitah. Once a person takes to upanayana samskara he is called twice born. He is dvijah. There are two births one is before and after. Before it is called physical birth from physical mother and the second is spiritual birth from spiritual mother gayatir. She is called spiritual mother. This upanayana samskara rahita is called sudrah and he is asamskrita manusyah. These two connections are made in several cases. Such people cannot do vedic sadhana. Therefore Janasruti must come under dvijah alone and not eka jathi sudrah.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Samskara paramarsat tat abhava abhilapat and cha. Samskara paramarsat means upanayana samskara paramarsat means vedic mention; because of the vedic mention of upanayana samskaras in several places or in the context of vedic sadhana; tad abhava abhilapat; tad means that upanayana samskara; abhava means the absence of upanayana samskara; abhilapat means scriptural mention of the absence of upanayana samskaras sudresu in the context of sudra or with regard to sudra. Because of the scriptural mention of upanayana samskara with regard to Vedic sadhana and because of the mention of upanayana samskara with regard to sudra combining the two the Sudra is asamskrita manusyas are not eligible for Vedic sadhana More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 119

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.36 [99]**

#### ***Samskaraparamarsat tadabhavabhilapacca***

Because purificatory ceremonies are mentioned [in the case of the twice born] and their absence is declared [in the case of the sutra]

The discussion on the privilege of Brahma Vidya on the part of sudra is continued.

In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses who is the adhikari with regard to sroudha sadhanas or vedic pursuits and want to establish that only those who have vedic qualification have the right to pursue the vedic sadhanas. One who does not have upanayana samskrlita does not have eligibility for vedic pursuits. In the three sutras he gives general conclusions in support what is stated above.

In the second part Vyasacharya says asamskrita do not have upanayana samskaras. Because of scriptural mention that asamskritia do not have upanayana samskara and therefore they are ineligible for pursuit of vedic pursuits.

I have given relevant sruti supports in the last class. The second part of the sutra is there is scriptural support for asamksrita manusyas cannot pursue the sroudha sadhana. They can purify the mind, gain Self-Knowledge and also gain moksa only through smartha sadhana. Smartha sadhana is following non-vedic sadhana ithikasa, purana sadhanas etc.

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.37 [100]**

#### ***Tadabhavanirdharane cha pravritteh***

And because the inclination [on the part of Gautama to impart knowledge is seen only] on he ascertainment of the absence of sudrahood [in jabala satyakama]

The same discussion on the sudras' right is continued.

Here Vyasacharya refers to the story of Satya Kama jabalah occurring in Chandogya upanisad 4<sup>th</sup> chapter 4<sup>th</sup> section, here he refers to a mantra 4.4.5 *ktam hovaca naitadabrahmano vivaktumarhati samidham somyaharopa tva nesye na satyadaga iti*



*tamupaniya krsanamabalanam catuhsata ga nirakrtyovacemah somyanusamvrajeti ta abhiprasthapayannuvaca nasahasrenavarteyeti sa ha varsaganam provasa ta yada sahasram sampeduh. Iti caturthah khandah* the meaning of the mantra is no Brahmin could speak like this [therefore you must be a Brahmin] O somya go and get me some fuel [for the sacrificial fire] I will initiate you [as a Brahmin by presenting you with the sacred thread], as you have not deviated from truth. After the initiation he selected from hundred feeble and famished cows. Addressing Satyakama Gautama said 'O somya take these cows away and look after them. As Satyakama was taking them away he said, 'I will not come back until there are a thousand of them.' He lived away for many years until they had become a thousand. The point is no matter what Satyakama's birth was, he had the qualities of a Brahmin love of truth and learning. Though he had to suffer much hardship living in the forest looking after the cows, he was more concerned with keeping his word than with seeking physical comforts.

Satyakama is a young boy and wants to gain vaidhika sadhana in the form of Sagunam Brahman Upasana and went to a guru. The guru asked for his gotra and the family lineage. This to check whether he had the cultural background for pursuing the vedic study. Self-knowledge cannot be taken and plant anywhere and this can grow only where the culture is there and this can be known by knowing the parampara. This is very well said in Upadesa sahasri. Vedanta gives the knowledge and the mental make up is given by mental make up for vedic culture.

This boy said that I don't know my gotra and even my mother does not know my gotra. I should be called satya kama jabalah. My mother's name is jabala. The guru says that you must belong to a cultured gotra only that I infer because you said that I don't know when you don't know. That means you did not choose to bluff and the very fact that you told the truth even though truth may lead to lot of rumours. No body wants to tell truth as that would bring ill fame to the family. The conditions to be a samskrita manusya is sathyam vadha speak the truth. The first qualification to speak the truth satya kama had. The first test is character test. You are a moral person a refined person. Even Karna did not tell the truth without bothering whether the speaking truth is advantageous or disadvantageous. Having ascertained the cultural qualification the guru did not teach and invited him for upanayana samskara and make him a samskara and gave him the second qualification. Having ascertained that the boy had complete qualification, only he taught him Brahma Vidya. Therefore the essence is that we come to know a teacher teaches vedic sadhanas only after ascertaining the absence of disqualification. This is the background of this sutra.

We will go in word for word analysis. Tad abhava nirdharane cha pravritteh there are four words in this sutra. Pravritteh means the commencement of the vedic teaching; by whom and to whom the sutra does not say. The commencement of teaching to satya kama jabalah; because of haritrumatas commencement of vedic teaching to satya kama jabala cha means also; in addition to the reasons in the previous sutra; tad abhava nirdharane consists of tad, abhava and nirdharanam; tad means disqualification; abhava means absence and qualification; nirdharanam means ascertainment making sure that the student has the absence of disqualification. The student has presence of qualification. It also indicates that the guru has the responsibility to ascertain the qualification of the new sisya or student. In the previous sutra qualification is required and in this sutra it is said that the guru should ensure that the guru has the desired qualification for the imparting of the Brahma Vidya. Only after the ascertainment of the absence of disqualification; because of this it is evident that asamskrita manusya is not eligible for sroudha sadhana.

## Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

### Sutra 1.3.38 [101]

#### *Sravanadhyayanarthapratishedhat smritescaha*

And on account of the prohibition in Smriti of the sudras hearing, studying and understanding the veda and performing vedic rites they are not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman.

The same discussion on the sudras' right is concluded here

I will do the general analysis first. Here Vyasacharya points out the smriti support. The smriti itself mentions what are the shrouha sadhana. Smriti goes one step further even veda sravanam listening to is a shrouha sadhana and all the four shrouha sadhana requires samskriti. Vashista smriti says the vedic chanting should not be done very near a asamskrita manusya. This means asamskrita manusya should not hear the vedic chanting. Then the next one is Gautama Dharma sutra says that the artha vichara and artha anustanam cannot be practiced by asamskrita manusya. Sravana, adhyayana, vichara and anustana cannot be done by the asamskrita manusyas. Since smriti negates the shrouha sadhanas we should conclude that asamskrita manusyas are anadhikaris.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Sravana adhyayana artha pratishedhat smriteh and cha; smriti refers to smriti pramana vashista dharma sutra and Goutama dharma sutra. Sravana adhyayana artha pratishedhat vedic hearing, vedic chanting, artha vichara and artha anustana, the analysis and the practice of rituals; pratishedhat means negation. The final meaning is because of the smriti pramana also, which negates vedic hearing, vedic chanting vedic enquiry and vedic rituals asamskrita manusyas are anadhikarai are not eligible for shrouha sadhanani. Adhi Sankaracharya mentions a few more points worth noting. Thus it is concluded Janasruti is samskrita manusya eligible for vedic study.

Adhi Sankaracharya adds another reason to prove that Janasruti is a ksatriya only. The support Adhi Sankaracharya gives is that if you read Janasruti story you come to know that he built many choultries where annadhanam was promoted throughout the country means he had lot of wealth and to find Raikva he sent his charioteer and if you read the puranic stories you come to know that chariot served only the ksatriyas only. The how can there be a chariot for any other person other than ksatriyas. The very word chatta indicates that Janasruti belongs to ksatriya community only. He had a status by which he commanded not only wealth but also the chariots. Then Adhi Sankaracharya makes another general observation. There is Mahabharat statement that says one should teach scriptural knowledge to all the four varnas. That means Mahabharat does not make any difference between samskrita and asamskrita manusyas. That means you contradict Mahabharat. It does not say shrouha sadhanani and it refers to vedic sadhana and it is applicable to smartha sadhana and therefore there is no restriction for smartha sadhana. This is there to enable all the people to benefit from the vedic study. Through shrouha or smartha one can get siddha suddhi and Self-Knowledge and moksa. The restriction is with regard to the route that is taken shrouha sadhana or smartha sadhanam both taking one to the Self-Knowledge and ultimate liberation. Then Adhi Sankaracharya makes a compromise in his bashyam. Now he says that I will relax a bit. Let us assume that Janasruti is a sudra or asamskrita manusya and even if he assumes

that our conclusion must be samvarga vidya is an exceptional vidya in the case of which asamskrita has an eligibility. The general rule for shroudha sadhana and samvarga vidya should come abhavada rule and never take an exception as a general rule and Adhi Sankaracharya technically presents this. In the Vedas there are two statements first is sudra that asamskrita manusya is not eligible for vaidhika karmas and there is another sruti statement that the tribals, hunters a tribal architect etc., asamskrita manusyas do not have upanayana samskrita and he should be assisted in the performance of yaga. He should be guided in the performance of vaidhika karmas. He should be assisted by other eligible persons. Our attitude towards vedic statement is veda statement cannot be negated. There is only one way validating both statement that the first rule is general and the second is an exception that asamskrita manusyas are ineligible for vaidhika karama and the second rule that asamskrita manusyas can be assisted in the performance of vaidhika karmas by other eligible persons. This is the essence of this sutra. Even if Janasruti is asmaskrita manusya we accept him as exceptional case allow him to pursue the study of Brahma Vidya. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 120

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.38 [101]**

#### ***Sravanadhyayanarthapratisedhat smritescaha***

And on account of the prohibition in Smriti of the sudras hearing, studying and understanding the veda and performing veidc rites they are not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman.

The same discussion on the sudras' right is concluded here

In the last class we completed the 38<sup>th</sup> sutra this particular adhikaranam is over. I will give you a summary of this adhikaranam. Vishayah samsayah purva paksah siddhantah and sangathi. Vishayah is Brahma Vidya shroudhya Brahma vidya as obtaining in original Vedas or Upanisads Brahma Vidya as shroudhya sadhanam is subject matter. The doubt is whether it is sarva manusya vishayah or not. Is it accessible to all or to some human beings. Purva paksa says it is available for all manusyas. He has two reasons in the mind that devatadikaranam and even though they have no right for karma and still they had right over Brahma Vidya. All human beings have adhiraka. Purva paksa is ready to samskrita asamskrita beda and accept all of them have right to pursue samvarga vidya. But in Chandogya upanisad uses the word sudra and Janasruti addressed as sudra and made him ineligible for Brahma Vidya. Siddhanti wants to say that Brahma Vidya as shroudhya sadhanam is accessible to samskrita manusya alone. Brahma Vidya as smartha sadhanam can be pursued by one and all samskrita and asamskrita manusyas. Brahma Vidya as smartha is accessible to all. As part of siddhanta the word sudra was said to belong to samskrita manusya as an exceptional case. Next is sangathih its position and it is rightly placed in the first chapter third adhyaya. With this, this adhikaranam is over. I will make some general observations. I would like to make two points.. One view is that when we study shroudhya and smartha sadhanam the latter appears to be superior to the former. Smartha sadhanam is more advantageous than shroudhya sadhanam. It does not discriminate manusyas. The discrimination causes complexes. One is samskrita and another is asamskrita manusya and it makes social confusion. Smartha sadhana does not create any problems. Therefore smartha sadhana seems to be superior and better and it does not have much vaidhika mantras. Learning sruti mantras creates problems and it is time consuming and it is painful while the person doing smartha sadhana is always easy. Thirdly these two advantages are there in smartha sadhana. When you talk about prayojanam shroudhya sadhana should give more prayojanam. Again smartha sadhana and shroudhya sadhana give the same benefit. In fact it is better to abolish the shroudhya sadhanam because it does not create any problem in the society. This doubt can arise. The answer is that smartha sadhanam has got all advantages and it is a fact. Also shroudhya sadhanam is not universally acceptable and smartha sadhana is less fire and no smoky problem also. This is true. But still shroudhya sadhanam has certain unique feature, which is not there in smartha sadhanam. As far as utility is concerned both are efficacious. Yet shroudhya sadhanam has got some unique features. Shroudhya is based on sruti and smartha is based on smriti. Sruti has originality and

smriti does not have originality. Anything original has got it has got its own original glory in terms of its originality, which is recognized by all sensible human beings. Original things are preserved for long time. If you study the original car and the present one the original one has better value. Even though there are many disadvantages the original will fetch better prize than the present car. The original car will to even be used for driving although the buyer is ready to pay a fabulous price to have that car. Everyone would like to preserve the original car. From utility value is forgotten the original car has got better value though not utility. When you want to have the original or the duplicate one would prefer to have the original rather than the duplicate. What makes one to respect the original and it has got its own value. Veda has got its originality. With all the disadvantages, it is made insignificant because it is original. Greater price is in the form of samskara, which is subtle price. If anyone asks whether shoudha sadhana or smartha sadhana is better, I will ask from what angle you ask the question. The second feature of veda is shroudha sadhana is associated with originator directly. The originator is the Lord. Veda is the very breath of the Lord. All others are pouruseya pramanam. It is connected with Lord indirectly. The content is borrowed from veda but the words are from manusyas alone. Every letter of veda is associated with originator Lord. Human beings value anything associated with a great personage. Simplem association is enough to make one happy. Imagine veda associated with bhagavan and how great is the veda? Such a Lord veda is associated. What should be the greatness of the Vedas? It is something unimaginable. The value is not tangible and it has different dimension and it requires particular eye to recognize. One stotra says the main guru is ten times more respectable than the secondary guru like visiting professors; acharyanam satam pitha one's own father is hundred times more respectable than acharya; mother is more respectable than father thousand times more than the father; Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam says sruti veda mata is more respectable even than the mother. It has a status. The superiority is not based on the utility and it is from the angle of association with the great people. Some are glorious because of original and some because of association and veda is glorious because it is original and it is associated with Lord. Some has to preserve the original. Let all follow smartha sadhana and original shroudha sadhana must be preserved by some members of society and use it as moksa sadhana and majority can use smartha sadhana and gain moksa. Thus veda has got some uniqueness and all discussions are needed because of the value not because of the utility. We all said that shourda sadhana has to be preserved. Preservation requires greater price. We also saw that samskrita manusyas must have two conditions. Now we face an unique problem in the society and it is samskrita manusya species has become endangered one. Number of people interested in upanayana samskara is going down. They do it for society and it more done as mockery or false and even if sacred thread is put they don't care for it. They don't do the sandhyavandanam etc. There are some people who do not want to preserve it. The upanayana samskara is coming down. Even now there are some people want to preserve the thread follow the nithya karma anustana. Parents cannot advise the youngster because the father himself do not follow and do the nithya karma. Samskrita manusyas will not be there in the time to come. Therefore if we go on insist upon samskrita sadhana rule it is difficult to preserve the shroudha sadhana and most of the people including the acharya that there should be relaxation with regard to the rules regarding the samskrita samskara. Sastra also gives some relaxation also. Only thing is that the rules are relaxed on different reasons. Some say rules are wrong. Some say the rules should be revised. There is other who says the rules are not wrong. They say that they are right and they cannot maintain. This is the consensus. Some declare openly and relax it and some don't have the courage and implement it without declaring. It is not done openly. Many do not protest relaxation and in fact the rules are relaxed and even the relaxations are appreciated. Previously it was objection then it was neutrality and now it has become appreciation. Once we accept relaxation and

what should be the degree of compromise. There are no clear-cut rules regarding the degree of compromise. Once there are sastric norms for the degree of compromise that will decide the degree of compromise in the absence of sastric norms. In other religion one head is there. In Hinduism there is no one head. The question is who will decide the degree of compromise since there is no one single head. Different people talk about different degree of compromise. Lot of subjectivity has come in this field. One will say with regard to sravanam we need not be strict about the rules and when it comes to the adhyayanam there must be rules. Other person may say with regard to chanting we can relax the rules and we may not relax the rules when the anustanam,. Why should we be so rigid why not we be rigid about ritual etc. This is a field you cannot say anything about right or wrong. We cannot find what is right and what is wrong. The second thing is the degree of compromise no one is to decide. What I should do is the question posed by somebody. It is intimately connected with me. What norm I should use. You cannot say right and what is wrong. If I have the capacity to judge and decide my course of action independently with confidence I can relax the rule as I wish dictated by the conscious. Suppose I am diffident and I don't know the social condition then he can take the guidance of someone who is superior and who is informed and whom you trust. This is most important thing. And ask that person to guide. You need not feel guilt. If you seek guidance from another person two conditions are important. If you seek guidance follow that guidance. And when you follow that this guidance is right and others are wrong etc. Never judge, once you have sought the guidance from the person you trust don't cross check whether what you do is right or wrong. One will say one thing and another will say another thing. Therefore if you want to follow a norm if you are confident enough or take the guidance without judging him or others and this is only solution to this problem. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 121

### **Topic 9 Apasudradhikaranam; [Sutras 34-38]**

The right of the sudras to the study of Vedas discussed.

#### **Sutra 1.3.38 [101]**

#### ***Sravanadhyayanarthapratisedhat smritescaha***

And on account of the prohibition in Smriti of the sudras hearing, studying and understanding the veda and performing veidc rites they are not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman.

The same discussion on the sudras' right is concluded here

With 28<sup>th</sup> sutra Aasudradhikaranam is over. This goes outside the flow of the main topic of this chapter. This is an incidental diversion. The main topic is all the Upanisads reveal Brahman as chetana upadana karanam of this world. this is revealed in the first pada second and third pada and in the eight and ninth only there is diversion as to who is the adhikari for shroutha vedanta sravanam. Even we discussed devas are eligible for the study in another we studied whether sudras are eligible for this study. Therefore these two adhikaranams are diversion. After the diversion Vyasacharya comes back to the main discussion. Therefore the coming adhikaranam should be read after the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam being 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> being diversion adhikaranam. We now enter the kampanadhikaranam. Interesting thing is the diversion adhikaranam is difficult` adhikaranam. with this background we will go to the tenth adhikaranam.

### **Topic 10 Kampanadhikaranam; [Sutras 39]**

The prana in which everything trembles is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.39 [102]**

#### ***Kampanat***

[Prana is Brahman] on account of the vibration or trembling [spoken of the whole world]

An argument in support of Sutra 24 is given here.

This is the tenth adhikaranam and it is one sutra adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya enquires into Kathopanisad mantra. II.4.2 that reads as *yad idam kinca jagat sarvam prana-ajat nihsrtam, mahad bhayam vajram udyatam ya etad vidur amrtas te bhavati* this whole universe evolved from the Brahman, moves [vibrates] in the Prana [in the highest Brahman]. The Brahman is a great terror, like an uplifted thunderbolt. Those who know this become immortal.

This mantra talks about Brahman. the gist of this mantra is whatever there is in the whole world has come out of prana and trembles in the prana. The prana is a great terror, a raised thunderbolt. Those who know it become immortal. The entire world revolves around Brahman. Everything in creation moves according to certain laws. The planet moves about according to some laws. And galaxies themselves move in the cosmos according to certain laws. All are regular and chaotic movement. The seasons come and go because of the movements. The day and night move because of the movement. This cosmic functioning is called revolving. The universal laws are inviolable laws. The entire universe functions according to the will of Brahman. The Brahman is frightening like a person who has a powerful weapon. The Brahman is cause of fear because the entire universe function without violating the laws. All the devatas are observing their limits and the very observation is the indication of fear. The traffic is regular because of the police only and nobody follows the signal. Yatra yatra orderliness tatra tatra policeness. The universal police is Brahman or Isvara. the Brahman is bhaya karanam. First Brahman is jagat seshta karanam. Whoever knows this Brahman becomes immortal the sruti says. from this we come to know that the Brahman is the cause of immortality also. it is the cause of universal functioning and universal fear and universal liberation. Why this mantra appear in Brahma Sutra. The mantra does not use the word Brahman. on the other hand it uses the word prana denoting Brahman. on hearing prana we take it as Vayu only. it refers to loka prasiddha pranavayu or Brahman the jagat karanam is the question posed here. Prana is Brahman only. This is the general introduction.

We will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says prana is Brahman only. the reason is kampanat. It means jagat seshta hetuh. The final meaning is the cause of universal harmony. In all Upanishad we find Brahman alone is the cause of universal functioning it is not only sristi karanam but also sthithi karanam. We have to control and prana is the universal controller and it is Brahman and not Vayu tattvam. Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra III.7.15 reads as *yah sarvesu bhutesu tisthan sarvebhyo bhutebhyo'ntarah, yam sarvani bhutani na viduh yasya sarvani bhutani sariram ah sarvani bhutanyantaro yamayati eso ta atmantaryamyamrtah ityadhibhutam; athadhyatmam*. The one who inhabits all beings yet is within all beings whom all beings do not know, whose body is all beings, who controls all beings from within, that is your Self; the inner controller the immortal. This is with reference to the beings; now with reference to the body. The Upanishad clearly says Brahman alone is the inner controller of everything.

Again in Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 3.8.9 that reads as *etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi suryacandramasau vidhrtau tisthatah etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dyavaprthivyau vidhrte tisthatah etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi nimesa muhurtamahoratranyardhamasa maasa rtavah samvatsara iti vidhrtastisthanti etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi pracyonya nadyah syandante svetebhyah parvatebhyah praticyonyah, yam yam ca disamanu etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dadato manusyah prasamsanti yajmanam devah darvim pitaro'nvayattah*. Verily under the rule of this imperishable O Gargi the sun and moon are held in their respective courses. Sky and earth are held in their respective positions; moments, hours, days and nights, fortnights, months, seasons and years are held in their respective positions; the rule of this Imperishable some rivers flow to the east from the snowy mountains, others flow to the west each keeping to their respective directions under the rule of this Imperishable people praise those who give, the shining ones depend on the sacrificer and the departed ones on the independent offering. In the presence of Brahman alone heaven remains where it is; sun remains where it is; moon



remains where it is; river flows according to the order; mountain remains where it is etc. because of this we conclude prana alone is Brahman.

We will see the word for word analysis pranah eva kamanat. Word prana occurring in kathopanisad is jagat karanam Brahman because it is because of the universal orderliness or universal functioning; there is a better reference in Bhagavad Gita sloka 18.61 that reads as *isvarah sarvabhutanam hrddesa 'rjuna tisthahi brahmayan sarvabhutani yantrarudhani mayaya* the Lord abides in the hearts of all beings causing them to turn round by His power as if they were mounted on a machine; the Supreme is the innermost Self of our existence. All life is a movement of the rhythm of His life and our powers and acts are all derived from Him. The whole universe is the puppets and Isvara controls everything through his strings of karma. Pranah is Brahman and he is the controller of everything.

Adhi Sankaracharya says it is jagat bhaya hetutvad. Isvara alone is the cause of universal fear and in Taittiriya Upanishad it is said *bhisasmad-vatah pavate, bhisodeti suryah bhisa-smad-agnis-candras-ca mrtyur-dhavati pancama iti* through fear of Him blows the wind. Through fear of Him rises the sun. Through fear of Him again fire and moon and lastly the fifth death proceeds to their respective duties..... Brahman alone is presented as bhaya hetu and here prana is presented as bhaya hetu and therefore prana must be Brahman. then there is a third reason also prana eva Brahman because it is said to be the cause of immortality.

Elsewhere it is pointed out Brahman is amrita hetu. 3.II.9 of Mundaka Upanishad says *sa yo ha vai tat paramam Brahma veda Brahmaiva bhavati nasyo Brahmavit kutle bhavati tarati sokam tarati papmanam guha granthibhyo viukto 'mrto bhavati*. He who knows that Supreme Brahma becomes Brahma and in his line [family] none who knows not the Brahma will ever be born. he crosses grief, crosses sin and being free from the knots of the heart becomes immortal. It is clearly said Brahman is amritasya hetu and here prana is said to be amritatva hetu and hence prana is Brahman.

Now comes Purva Pakshi and says I don't agree with you. I don't want to accept prana as Brahman and prana is only Vayu tattvam both samasti and vyasti which is widely understood by all the people. Why do you give up the widely known meaning and give some other meaning. purva pakshi says prana itself can be cause of three hetu. You say prana is jagat seshta karanatvad; prana is bhaya hetutvad and prana is amritatvad. I have got enough Upanisadic support to conclude in this manner.

In Prasna Upanishad second chapter prana glory is talked 2.13 of the Upanishad says *pranasyedam vasa sarvam tridive yat pratisthitam mateva putran raksasva sris-ca prajnam ca vidhehi na iti* the meaning of the mantra reads as whatever exists in the three world is all under control of the prana and prana protect us like a mother protects her sons. Give us prosperity and wisdom. The entire creation is under the control of prana. in individual level we know prana control all our action. If prana stops even involuntary action stops. All vyasti acts are controlled by vyasti prana and samasti prana Vayu tattvam alone controls everything. Hiranyagarbha sutra alone is the controller of everything. Just as a thread keep all the beads together in harmony, Hiranyagarbha sutratma keeps everything in their place. Vayu tattvam jagat seshta hetuh. There is another mantra just as the hub of the wheel sustains the wheel the universal wheel is sustained by the prana alone mantra 2.6 of Prasna Upanisad.

Then Purva Pakshi says that prana is bhaya hetu also. in mantra 2.10 the Prasna Upanishad says *yadi tvam abhi varsasya themah prana te prajah ananda rupas tisthanti kama yannam*

*bhavisyatiti* prana when you cause the rain to shower down, these creatures of thy glory sit delighted, hoping that there will be as much food as they desire. It says prana alone is responsible for the rain. In the form of Vayu tattvam prana brings cloud together and it is responsible for lightening and the rain to come. Vayu is the cause of the rain and Vayu is cause of thunder also. This thunder causes fear even today. Vayu through thunder causes fear.

Then there is another mantra also, this Vayu alone is Indrah etc. prana as Indra tattvam carries thunder and because of this it is the cause of fear. Prana is amritatva hetu and it is cause of immortality. You need not bring Brahman and prana Vayu tattvam is cause of immortality. Mantra 3.11 of Prasna Upanishad says *ya evam vidvan pranam veda na hasya praja hiyate'mrto bhavati todesa slokah* this wise man who knows the prana thus will not have to suffer his offsprings do not perish and he becomes immortal; here is the following verse about it.

The concluding mantra of the third chapter says 3.12 of Prasna Upanishad *utpattim ayatim sthanam vibhutyam caiva pancadha adhyatmam caiva pranasya vijnaya mrtam asnute vijnaya mrtam asnuta iti* the meaning of the mantra is he who knows the Origin, the entry, the seat the all pervasiveness, the fivefold distribution of the prana and the internal state in the body obtains immortality; yes he attains immortality. All the glories of prana know becomes immortal. Therefore these three reasons fit with Brahman as also prana. Purva Pakshi says that I have got better argument. now Purva Pakshi says that I have got extra support. When prana is taken as Brahman that is unpopular or secondary meaning and not primary meaning. you give in the primary meaning and take secondary meaning. but you take the secondary meaning. between the two prasiddha artha is more powerful. Therefore I conclude prana is Vayu tattvam.

Now siddhanti has to give the meaning. he says I will give up the primary meaning. he says that you also take the secondary meaning in an worse manner. Let us take three hetus. First is jagat seshta hetu and you say Vayu is sustainer of everything. We say Brahman is sustainer of everything. When you say prana is sustainer of everything and everything you mean totally everything and prana is sustainer of everything other than prana and therefore the word everything has got restricted meaning and it is only relatively everything. But when we say Brahman is seshta hetu it means everything including everything.

In Kathopanisad mantra 2.iv.5 says *na pranena na apanena martyo jivati kascana itarena tu jivanti, yasminn etav upasritau* not by prana not by apana does any mortal live; but it is by some other, on which these two depend that men live. He says prana is only a relative controller for Brahman controls prana itself. Therefore the word sarvam you give restricted meaning when you take prana is all you give restricted meaning and when we say sarvam and when we say Brahman is sarvam it gives unrestricted meaning. Vayu may be the controller of everything and it cannot be the controller of Akasa and during the pralaya Vayu get dissolved and how can Vayu be the controller of everything.

You say prana is bhaya karanam and we say Brahman is bhaya karanam. Prana is bhaya karanam of everything except prana. Whereas Brahma is sarva bhaya karanam when we say the sarva includes prana also. Even prana is afraid of Brahman bhaya hetutvam also has got restricted meaning but in our interpretation it is everything including prana.

Then again you say prana is amritatva karanam and we say Brahman is amritatva karanam. When you say it is abeshika amritatvam is not the real moksa and it is only Brahma loka

prapti. it gives long life and it does not make one immortal. Compared to life on this earth the life in Brahma loka is longer. Brahman is adhyanta amritatva karanam. Here also you have restricted meaning under your interpretation. Prana you take vachyārtha and we take lakshyārtha. You compromise more and I compromise less.

Second thing is that we say it is a compromise because prana as Vayu is popular in the world but prana as Brahman is sastra prasiddhah. Sastra uses the word in the meaning of Brahman alone. Mantra 1,2 of Keno Upanishad says *srotrasya srotram manaso mana yad vaco ha vacam sa u pranasya pranah caksusas caksur atimueya dhirah pretya smallokad amarta bhavanti* the meaning is the peceptor it is ear of the ear, the mind of the mind; the tongue of the tongue and also the life of the life and eye of the eye. Having abandoned the sense of Self or I-ness in these and rising above sense life, the wise become immortal. Brahman defined as pranasya prana. therefore we have taken sastra prasiddha artha.

In the context of sastra study we should take sastra prasiddha artha alone and not take loukikha artha. Therefore our interpretation is supported by the sruti.

The third argument is sandamsa nyaya when particular mantra is vague then you study the previous and later mantra and whatever be the previous and later mantra that alone must be the topic of the vague mantra. Here our vague mantra is 2.6.2 *yad idam kinca jagat sarvam prana ejati nihsrtam mahad bhayam vajram udyatam ya etad vidur amrtas te bhavanit* where it is said the whole universe evolved from the Brahman, moves in the prana. The Brahman is a great terror, like an uplifted thunderbolt. Those who know this become immortal. As this mantra is vague, we have to take the context by reading the previous and later mantras according to sandamsa nyaya. Here the mantra 2.6.1 *ibid* says *urdhva mulo 'vak sakha eso 'svatthah sanatanah tad eva sukram tad Brahma tad eva amrtam ucyate tasmin lokah sritah sarve tadu natyeti kascana etad vai tat* the meaning of the mantra is this is the ancient asvatha tree whose roots are above and branches spread below. That is verily the pure, that is Brahman and that is also called the immortal. In that rest all the worlds and none can transcend it verily this is that. The latter mantra 2,6.3 reads as *bhayad asya agnis tapati bhayat tapati suryah bhayad indras-ca mrtyur dhavati pancamah* the meaning of this mantra is the fear of Him the fire burns for fear of Him shines the sun for fear of Him do Indra, Vayu and death the fifth proceed with their respective functions. In the third mantra as above it clearly talks about Brahman, which is the cause of fear including Vayu. Third mantra makes it very clear that the Upanishad does not deal with Vayu but Brahman only. first mantra and third mantra deal with Brahman and hence the middle mantra deal with Brahman alone.

The very context is Brahma prakaranam and this mantra is Yama Dharma Raja's teaching to Naciketusa. He asks for something beyond cause and effect, which is beyond past and future and the entire kathopanishad, is answer to that. prana here is above cause and effect and that can be Brahman alone and not Vayu tattvam. Therefore prana in this mantra has to be Brahman and therefore pranah Brahma kamanat.

Visayah is prana; samsaya is prana is Brahman or prana Vayu; Purva Pakshi says prana is Vayu; siddhanti says it is Brahman. Therefore prana is Brahman. more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 122

### **Topic 10 Kampanadhikaranam; [Sutras 39]**

The prana in which everything trembles is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.39 [102]**

#### ***Kampanat***

[Prana is Brahman] on account of the vibration or trembling [spoken of the whole world]

An argument in support of Sutra 24 is given here.

With the 39<sup>th</sup> sutra the 10<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. now from 10<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam talks about Brahma samanvayah. There are certain adhikaranams dealing with upasya Brahman and some neyam Brahman. neyam Brahman is Brahman as an object of knowledge and it relates to jnana kanda. Upasya Brahman deal with upasana kanda.

### **Topic 11 Jyotiradhikaranam [Sutra 40]**

The 'light' is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.40 [103]**

#### ***Jyotir darsanat***

The light [is Brahman] on account of that [Brahman] being seen [in the scriptural passage]

The argument in support of sutra 24 continued.

I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam which is called jyotiradhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya analyses 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad *evamevaisa smaprasado'smacchariratsamutthaya Param jyotirupasampadya svena rupenabhinispadyate* this is relevant portion of the mantra that is discussed in this adhikaranam. the meaning of this mantra is in the same way the joyful Self arises from the body and attaining the light of the cosmic Self, appears in his own form. here the guru is teaching Indra the disciple and he teaches Brahman through avasthatriya viveka and turiyam.

Now Brahmaji has come to turiya pratipadanam and not only turiyam is revealed but also the benefit of this knowledge is revealed in this mantra. And the mantra says esah samprasadah asmat sarirat which means jivah in Sushupti avasthayam jiah is that who merges into samasti Isvara and therefore jivah gets the name samprasadah. Asmat sarirat samucchaya the jiva comes out of this body and here coming out means coming out of the body abhimana. Knowing that I am not Sookshma Sariram and I am not even karana sariram I am not visva tajasa and prajna and knowing that I am not Visva Taijasa and Prajna I come out of that and

there is no action involved and he comes out cognitively in terms of knowledge. and the moment I know that I am Visva Taijasa and Prajna vilaksanah paranjothi upa samyajna the jiva becomes one with paranjyoti turiyam and once I negate my visvatvam, taijatatvam and prajnatvam. Becoming one with turiyam is not a process but it is a cognitive change. I have disowned the vachyartham of I and I have owned up lakshyartham I. this is known as I have become turiya Chaitanyam. It is not an action in time. jivah comes out in his own original nature by discovering oneness with turiyam. This mantra we did analyse in the previous context that is 19<sup>th</sup> sutra. There we said svena rupena is an important role and turiya state is not new status and it is coming back to original status. We think that visva status is original and turiya status is incidental but the truth is that turiya status is original and it is my nature while visva etc., status is my incidental nature, which comes and goes. This is the meaning of svena rupena abhinabinispatdyate. The doubt here for it to find a position in Brahma Sutra is the vagueness here. The Upanishad does not use the word turiyam or Chaitanyam but it uses the word paramjyoti. The word jyoti is a confusing word because any fire or light can be called jyoti. Often sunlight is called paramjyoti. The debate paramajyoti is turiya Chaitanyam or Surya jyotih. Surya jyoti is called boudhika jyoti. Chaitanya jyoti is called aboudhika jyoti. Is it material light or spiritual light is the doubt here. This is the background of this adhikaranam.

Vyasacharya says this jyoti relates to aboudhika jyoti only. he says the context reveals that Brahman is the subject matter and not adithyah. Prajapathi vidya begins in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter 7<sup>th</sup> section. It is another name for Brahma jnanam. Prajapathi happens to be the guru and therefore it is called Prajapathi vidya. Prajapathi defines Brahman the Paramatma. Brahma laksanam he gives and he says whoever gains that knowledge will attain everything. This is given as general statement. After hearing this devaraja and asura raja asked for knowledge. After the first level of teaching virocana goes away. Indra comes back to learn second time. Each time he had to serve for 35 years. in the first stage he teaches visva; in the second stage he teaches taijasa and in the third stage he teaches prajna and in the fourth stage he teaches turiyam each time there is 35 years of service Indra had to render to his guru Prajapathi. The beauty is after each stage he goes back and Indra says that I am not satisfied because as long as sariram is there, there is problem; Sthoola Sariram creates problem and Sthoola Sariram creates problem and karana sariram also gives problem in potential form and that also is samsara. Here Indra asks Prajapathi to teach something to gain moksa. First Brahman is taught as means of moksa; thereafter wards each time Brahman says that the whole thing is moksa prakaranam. Then he says that the samsara is embodiment and asariratvam is moksa. From all the discussion we come to know that subject matter is beyond sariram and it relates to moksa. It is going beyond Sthoola Sariram Sookshma Sariram and karana sariram. Prajapathi takes Indra beyond sarira triyam and he goes to turiya Chaitanyam level and definitely not to Surya status. Then how can you talk about adithya jyothi after transcending all the sariram. the Upanishad talks about moksa phalam also for Indra wants moksa. Will adithya jyothi give moksa or chaitanya jyoti give moksa. Adhithya jyothi has got birth and death and hence it cannot give moksa and param jyothi the Brahma jyothi alone can give moksa or liberation. therefore the argument in the sutra is jyoti is Brahman and Brahman is the subject matter of this section.

It has two words jyoti and darsanat. Jyotih is equal to the light mentioned in 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad and you have to supply the word Brahman. then supply the word brahmanah darsanat. This means since Brahman is seen the you supply vishaytvena as the subject matter of that section the Prajapathi vidya section which begins with 7<sup>th</sup> section and ends in 12<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. Therefore subject matter of Prajapathi vidya.

The final meaning is light mentioned in the mantra is Brahman as the Brahman is seen as the subject matter of that section 8.7.1 and 8.12.1 of Chandogya upanisad indicate that the whole subject matter is Brahman indicating that the subject matter of this mantra is Brahman alone.

Now comes the purva paksha. to understand this you should know the background of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter. Here Brahma Vidya is taught twice from section 1 to section 6 and in this section Brahma Vidya is known as dahara vidya. And second time Brahma Vidya is given from section 7 to section 12 and in the second section Brahma Vidya is given in the name of Prajapathi vidya. Not only that in both section Brahman is given the same definition. There the mantra is 8.1.5 Chandogya upanisad here Brahman definition is given in dahara vidya portion. The same definition is given in 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad Brahman definition is given. We get the phalam for Brahma Vidya in both the sections. This mantra is the controversial mantra. Our mantra is 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad we get Brahma Vidya phalam only, Brahma Vidya phala mantra alone we have the problem. purva paksha says whenever you get confusion you go to a parallel sutra. You say dahara vidya gives the same phalam. if there is confusion here you compare the Brahma Vidya phalam there.

Brahma Vidya phalam is given in 8.6.5 of Chandogya upanisad which reads as *atha yatraitadasmacchariradutkramatyathaitaireva rasmibhirurdhvam aksramate sa omi va hodva miyate sa yavbatksipyenmanastavadadityam gacchatyetadvai khalu lokadvaram vidusam prapadanam nirodho'vidusam* the when a person leaves the body, he goes upward with the help of these rays. If he dies while meditating on om, his going up is assured; otherwise not. In the amount of time it takes his mind to move from on thought to another he can reach the realm of the sun; the sun is the gateway to Brahmaloaka. Those who know the meaning of Om and think of it at the time of death enter Brahmaloaka but those who are ignorant of it have no chance of entering.

Brahma Vidya phalam is said to be that this jiva comes out of the sariram. Coming out of the body is the phalam of dahara vidya as also prajapathi vidya as well. He says that jiva travels through the rays of the sun. When you say rays it is the rays of adhithayh. Therefore rasmi refers to adhithya rasmi and jiva goes through rays of sun to go to the sun. therefore that mantra indicates that the jiva who takes to Brahma Vidya through the rasmis alone and the paramjyoti should refer to adhithya jyothi alone. Therefore paramjyothi is adhithya jyothi alone as supported by 8.4.5 of Chandogya upanisad. In vishistadvaidam moksa is not possible and it is going to the Vishnu loka only. therefore it looks as though Brahma Vidya phalam is Surya loka praptih.

The answer Brahman was define in both dahara and Prajapathi vidya portion. The Brahman discussed in Sagunam Brahman and nirguna aspect of Brahman. therefore dahara vidya and Prajapathi vidya also Brahman is discussed both saguna and nirguna Brahman. dahara vidya is Sagunam Brahman Upasana. But the Prajapathi vidya the focus is Nirgunam Brahma jnanam. in dahara vidya the phalam travel after death but in Prajapathi vidya there will be no travels but realize Atma swarupam and gain liberation. Upasana phalam you take to jnana bhalam and how can both the equated.

Vishayah is the word jyothi the light occurring in 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad. Then samsayah doubt is that jyothi is boudhikam jyothi or aboudhikam jyothi whether it is material light or spiritual light. Adhithya varnam is visible and is bhagavan is visible> the word light is figurative. It is aboudhikam jyothi. Purva paksha says boudhikam jyothi is seen in this

mantra. Siddhanta says jyothi is aboudhikam chaitanya jyothi eva keeing in view of the context. Santgathih the position is all right.

## Topic 11 Arthantaradvadyapadesadhikaranam

The Akasa is Brahman

### Sutra 1.3.41 [104]

#### *Akaso'rthantaradvadyapadesat*

Akasa [is Brahma] because it is declared to be something different etc., from names and forms.

An argument in support of sutra 24 is given here.

Here Vyasacharya enquires into another Chandogya upanisad vakyam. 8.14.1 is the vishaya vakyaha. The mantra runs as *akso vai nama namarupayaornirvahita te yadantara tadbrahma tadamrtam sa Atma prajapateh sabham vesma prapadye yasoham bhavami brahmananam yaso rajnam yaso visam yasohamanuprapatsi sa haham yasang yasang syetamadatkamadatkam syetam lindu mabhigam lindu mabhigam iti caturdash khandah.* The meaning of the mantra is that which is described as space manifests names and forms. These names and forms are within Brahman. Brahman is immortal it is the Self. May I attend the court of Prajapathi. May I attain the fame of a Brahmin, and also of a prince and a merchant I wish to have real fame; I want to be famous among all the famous people. May I not have to be born again and have a body covered with blood and dirt, which is toothless and at the same time always wanting to eat. Brahman is Akasa and Brahman shines everywhere. Space is also called akasah because it shines everywhere. It is very well known as the creator or the projector of all the names and forms. And therefore all the namarupas exist in Brahman only. all namarupas are within Brahman. no nama rupa can exist beyond Brahman. nama rupa adhistanam is Brahman. that Brahma alone is immortal. That Brahman is the very Self of the jivah.

What is the problem here? The problem here is teacher could have said Brahman but it uses the word akasah. Here Akasa refers to Brahman? why cannot it be taken as the well known space. for this we give the answer in this adhikaranam. this is the general introduction and we will continue this in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 123

### **Topic 11 Arthantaradvadyapadesadhikaranam**

The Akasa is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.41 [104]**

*Akaso'rthantaradvadyapadesat*

Akasa [is Brahma] because it is declared to be something different etc., from names and forms.

An argument in support of sutra 24 is given here.

In the 41<sup>st</sup> sutra Vyasacharya analyses Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.14.1 in which Akasa is used by the sruti. It is analysed whether it is bhutakasa or chitakasa. We point out it is Brahman only. Chaitanyam Brahman is the creator of all the names and forms. All namarupas are within chitakasa and that chitakasa is Self of all and that Self is Brahman alone. This has got only one sutra. In this sutra Vyasacharya says Akasa is Brahman alone because sruti clearly shows the distinction of Akasa from all the namarupas. All namarupas are within the Akasa it is said. Sruti says all the namarupas are within Akasa. All nama rupas are contents and the Akasa is the container. Akasa is the product as per sruti. Bhuta Akasa also must be one of the namarupas. Since Akasa is born Akasa also must be along with all the namarupas. It should be within the contents or the container. Bhuta Akasa is nama rupa and it should fall under the content only and what should be the container and the container is chidakasa which is not nama rupa,

### **Topic 12 Arthantaradvadyapadesadhikaranam**

The Akasa is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.41 [104]**

*Akaso'rthantaradvadyapadesat*

Akasa [is Brahma] because it is declared to be something different etc., from names and forms.

An argument in support of sutra 24 is given here.

In the 41<sup>st</sup> sutra Vyasacharya analyses Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.14.1 in which Akasa is used by the sruti. It is analysed whether it is bhutakasa or chitakasa. We point out it is Brahman only. Chaitanyam Brahman is the creator of all the names and forms. All namarupas are within chitakasa and that chitakasa is Self of all and that Self is Brahman alone. This has got only one sutra. In this sutra Vyasacharya says Akasa is Brahman alone



because sruti clearly shows the distinction of Akasa from all the namarupas. All namarupas are within the Akasa it is said. Sruti says all the namarupas are within Akasa. All nama rupas are contents and the Akasa is the container. Akasa is the product as per sruti. Bhuta Akasa also must be one of the namarupas. Since Akasa is born Akasa also must be along with all the namarupas. It should be within the contents or the container. Bhuta Akasa is nama rupa and it should fall under the content only and what should be the container and the container is chidakasa which is not nama rupa,

Vyasacharya says there are other reasons also besides the above reason. Akasa is supposed to be the creator of all the namarupas. Now the question is whether it is chitakasa or bhutakasa. Bhutakasa also is one of the namarupas created and it cannot be the creator Akasa. If it is created Akasa it is bhutakasa and if it is creator Akasa it is chitakasa only.

That Akasa which is the creator of namarupa and that Akasa which is the created bhutakasa and that Akasa the container of Akasa is immortal. Bhutakasa is immortal or chitakasa is immortal. It is chitakasa is immortal and bhutakasa is marthyam and chitakasa is amritatvam.

The Akasa is said to be atman. Chitakasa is atman while bhutakasa is jada vastu. Self is a conscious being. Fifth and final reason is atmatvam and because of these things Atma is Brahman.

Akasah is the first word. The word Akasa occurring in 8.14.1 of Chandogya upanishad is Brahman. it is not elemental space. Then the next word is arthantatvadi vyapadesat. The sruti declaration of Akasa is distinction and then supply the word namarupapyam from names and forms. Here the word arthantaratvam adi vyapadesat is a compound word. sruti's declaration in the same portion. Namarupa is content and Akasa is the container and from this we have to deduce container is different from the content bhutakasa. Arthantaratvam means difference or distinction from all the namarupa, which includes bhutakasa also. All other four supporting statements is declared by the word adhi.

Now we will see the purva paksa. Purva Paksi says I don't agree with you. Why cannot you take Akasa as the regular elemental space? Any word should be given the primary meaning first and should not look for the secondary meaning. Primary meaning you should apply because it is primary. The Upanishad itself why nama which indicates prasiddhartha. When sruti uses well known and we should take the meaning well known and the inside space is not said but we should take bhutakasa only is the contention of the purva paksa. here muktyartha fits in properly because Upanishad says namarupayo nirvahita means the creator or even accommodator and the purva paksa argues Akasa is both a creator as also an accommodator because of the sruti support itself. From Akasa alone Vayu is created and Vayu water is created etc. Akasa is the creator and is the accommodator also which is the second meaning of nirvahita. We know Akasa as the sustainer of all namarupas and we know all namarupas are within the space and therefore why cannot you take Akasa as bhutakasa and why do you go in for Chaitanyam. This is purva paksa.

Siddhanta says you can take Akasa as elemental space. latter part of the mantra you cannot satisfactorily explain and you have to compromise with the mantra. You have to limit the meaning. Upanishad says Akasa is the creator of all namarupa. When you say bhutakasa is creator of all namarupas other than bhutakasa. Therefore Akasa except Akasa creates all namarupas. But when you say chitakasa is creator of all namarupas and all namarupas include bhutakasa also. in our interpretation namarupa has the absolute meaning. Similarly when you

say bhutakasa is accommodator of all namarupas means again you have to say it is the accommodator of namarupa other than Akasa. Upanishad says that bhutakasa is a product and any product is subject to decay and it is only a namarupa and it has the restricted meaning and only if we take Akasa as chidakasa it has unrestricted meaning and therefore Akasa is nothing but Brahman. When the Upanishad says tad Brahman, it will be clear that bhutakasa can never be Brahman and Chidhabasa alone is Brahman. On closer analysis even that compromise is not a compromise because we have to take sastra prakasa Akasa and not loukika Akasa. Therefore there is no real compromise at all. If you are taking Akasa as elemental space you have to divide into two portion and first portion talks about bhutakasa and the second portion talks about the chidakasa. In one mantra itself one part will talk about bhutakasa and another about Brahman and there will be no connection. The sudden entry of bhutakasa has no relevance at all. Chidakasa creates namarupa and it will fit in with our discussion and therefore purva paksa is wrong and this adhikaranam is over.

Vishayah is akasah occurring in Chandogya upanisad 8.14.1. then samsayah is whether Akasa referred to there is chitakasa or bhutakasa or it is chitakasa Brahman or bhutakasa the elemental space. Purva Paksi says it is elemental space because it is primary meaning. siddhanta says it is chitakasa eva for it is different from all namarupa including bhutakasa.. it occurs in the proper place only. in the three adhikaranam the discussion was prana is Brahman and jyotiradhikaranam we said light is Brahman and here we say Akasa is Brahman. But all these three topics we have already discussed in the first pada. We have discussed 1.1.8 to 1.1.10 all the three topics in different mantra. Prana is Brahman jyoti is Brahman and Akasa is Brahman. We might have a doubt when these have already been discussed why we should discuss now here. We can give an answer the mantras are different and the next question is topic being the same why cannot you put closer to that adhikaranam. sangathi vichara can go to pages by sub commentators. why not bring the earlier topics near this adhikaranam. The reason is that in the first context, there is indication to reveal Brahman.

When we have already discussed in the first pada why should it be discussed here. We can give an answer that the mantras are different and here certain set of mantras are discussed. This we call the positional enquiry. sangathi vichara goes and sub commentators discuss it very elaborately. Why cannot it be in first pada or bring the first topics here. For that that the reason the sub commentators say that in the first pada the indications are powerful indications. In the first pada the reasons that we gave are powerful prana is Brahma jyoti is Brahma etc are clear reasons. Here we face different problem and here Brahman indicating reasons are there and equally non-Brahman indicating reasons are also there. Therefore Brahma lingams are aspasta Brahma linga vakyani. Purva paksa has also got equally powerful reason. Therefore sangathi is correct only. With this, this adhikaranam is over. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 13. Sushuptyutkrantiyadhikaranam**

The Self Consisting of knowledge is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.42 [105]**

#### ***Sushuptyutkrantiyobhedena***

Because of the highest Self being shown as different [from] the individual soul] in the states of deep sleep and death.

An expression from the sixth chapter of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad is now taken up for discussion.

We enter the next and final adhikaranam of the third pada. I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam. this adhikaranam has got two sutras and here Vyasacharya analyses Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra IV.3.7 which reads as *katama atmeti; yoyam vijnanamayah pranesu hrdyantarjyotih Purusa; sa samanah sannubhau lokavanusanancarati, dhyayativa lelayativa; sa hi svapno bhutvemam lokamatikramati mrtyo rupant* the meaning of the mantra is ‘which is the Self? The Purusa, which is reflected in the intellect and is in the midst of the pranas, the Self-effulgent light within the heart [intellect]. Assuming the likeness of the intellect, it wanders between the two worlds, meditating as it were and moving, as it were. Being identified with dreams, it transcends this waking world, which represents the forms of death [ignorance and its effects] this we see in the swayam jyothi Brahmanam which is in the form of janaka Yajnavalkya samvadha Brahmanam. Here Yajnavalkya goes to Janaka and janaka asks for the boon which being the discussion on Vedanta. janaka is saving grace for all the grahastha and Maitreyi Brahmanam is saving grace for all the ladies. Janaka did not I have no time but ever prepared to take discussion on Vedanta. He asks what is the light the basis of which we transact. In the day sun is the light, in the night moon is the light and on amavasya day it is fire that provides the light. And when Agni is not available, vak functions as jyothi. Somebody helps you to do the job by directing you through words. When all are not functioning what is that light that helps you and he says that it is the light of Consciousness that helps transact business. Then janaka asks the question in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *katama atmeti; yoyam vijnanamayah pranesu hrdyantarjyotih purusah; sa samanah sannubhau lokavanusanancarati, dhyayativa lelayativa; sa hi svapno bhutanam lokamatikramati mrtyo rupani* the meaning of this mantra is the Purusa which is reflected in the intellect and is in the midst of the pranas, the Self effulgent light within the heart [intellect]. Assuming the likeness of the intellect, it wanders between thentwo worlds, meditating, as it were, and moving as it were. Being identified with dreams, it transcends this waking world which represents the forms of death ignorance and its effects.

What is Self is the question and for that Yajnavalkya gives his answer. He says Atma is chaitanya swarupa. This is known as purusah and which is antarjyothi, which is the inner light; it is the inner light residing in the heart that illumines every indriaym. It is intimately associated with every organ. the tree is on the rock means it is closely related to the rock. Thus Yajnavalkya defines Atma in the above mantra. The Upanishad uses the word Atma and we doubt whether it is Jivatma or Paramatma. Which Atma is talked about is the question and the conclusion is Paramatma because of the following reason. This is the general introduction.

In the first sutra Vyasacharya takes two particular portions occurring in the swayamjyoti Brahmanam. The mantras are 4.3.21 *tadva asyaitadaticchanda apahatapapmabhayam rupam tadyatha prtyaya striya sampartsvakto na bahyam kincana veda nataram evamevayam purusah prajna atmana, sampartsvakto na bahyam kincana veda nantaram; tadva asyattadapta kama atmakamam akramam rupam sokantaram*, the meaing of the mantra is that indeed is its form – free from desires free from evils free from fear; as a man fully embraced by his beloved wife knows nothing that is within, nothing that is without so this Purusa when fully embraced by the Supreme Self knows nothing that is within nothing that is without.

That indeed is its form in which all the desires are fulfilled in which all desires become the Self and which is free from desires and devoid of grief which talks about Sushupti and 4.3.35 which reads as *tadyathanah susamahitamutsarjadyayat evam evayam sarira Atma prajnenatmananvarudha utsarjan yati, ya traitadurdhvocchavasi bhavati* the meaning of the mantra is just as a fully loaded cart moves along creaking even so, the Self identified with the body being presided over by the Supreme Self moving along groaning when it is struggling for breath thus the mantra talks about ukranti the maranam or death.

This jiva the individual in Sushupti has become one with Atma; and because of the embracing merger into Atma this jiva does not know either the external world or himself neither he has the objective knowledge or the subjective knowledge. the Mandukya Karika no 12 reads as *na'tmanam na Param'caiva na satyam napi canrtam pramanah kincana samveti turyam tat sarvadrk sada* the meaning of the mantra is prajna does not know anything of the turth or the untruth, nor does prajna know anything of the Self or of the non-Self; prajna knows nothing. But Turiya is ever and it is always the all knowing the all seeing.

In this Upanishad says jiva has merged into Atma. If the Upanishad says jiva has merged to Atma means jiva must be different from jiva. And that should be Paramatma alone and therefore jiva has merged into Atma means jiva has merged with Paramatma and Atma her is used in the meaning of Paramatma alone. Here Atma cannot be jiva then jiva will merge with jiva and this is not correct. The word Atma is used in the meaning of Paramatma which is distinct from Jivatma. This is Sushupti context.

The same is the case with ukranti also. at the time of maranam jiva travels along with Atma it is said. It changes the house like a cart traveling with lot of materials. The carriage makes lot of noise. It is because one is ready for prayanam. The idea is that it travels with Atma which means Atma is other than jiva and that is Paramatma alone.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 124

### **Topic 13. Sushuptyutkrantyanadhikaranam**

The Self Consisting of knowledge is Brahman

**Sutra 1.3.42 [105]**

#### *Sushuptyutkrantyanobhedena*

Because of the highest Self being shown as different [from] the individual soul] in the states of deep sleep and death.

An expression from the sixth chapter of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad is now taken up for discussion.

We do the general analysis of sutra 42 in the final adhikaranam of the third pada and in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Yajnavalkya has pointed out that Atma is the light in whose presence all the transactions take place and when he talks of Atma jyoti he asks for what Atma is. Yajnavalkya answers that Atma is Purusa which is nothing but Consciousness obtaining in the hridayam. He uses the word Atma here and there is confusion whether it is Jivatma or Paramatma. We have establish that it is Paramatma alone. We keep in mind two mantras occurring in the same Brahmanam 4.3.21 and 4.3.35 of the same Upanishad. in this context Upanishad uses the word prajnena Atma samparrishatvaha and prajnena Atma anvarudah at the time of Sushupti the Jivatma or jiva merges into Atma. Jiva merges into Atma is the expression., if the expression Jivatma merges into Atma it cannot be Jivatma and jiva merges into Jivatma cannot be accepted and therefore Atma should be translated to Paramatma and extend it as Jivatma merges into Paramatma. The carrying on Atma jiva travels from one body to another and jiva travels mounting on the Atma means Atma cannot be translated into Jivatma in which jiva mounts on Jivatma and travels is meaningless. Therefore we must take it as Jivatma travels on Paramatma are the right expression. and it is clearly Jivatma is different from Paramatma. This is the general analysis. Now we will take up the word for word analysis.

We have to supply certain words. First is Atma. The word Atma occurring in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is Brahman. it is Paramatma only. vyapadesat and we have to borrow from the previous sutra. Since it [Atma] is said; bedena to be different; then you supply Jivatmanah from Jivatma shushupyukrantyo in the statement dealing with sleep and death 4.3.21 and 4.3.35 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad dealing with sleep and death Sushupti vakya is 4.3.21 and utkranti vakya is 4.3.35 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; bedena vyapedesat.

Now purva paksa comes and says that you conveniently quote those mantras where it is see Atma as Paramatma. Here itself there are mantras which refer to Atma as Jivatma and how do you choose to interpret Atma is Paramatma. He has enough quotation. In 4.3.7 itself Upanishad says Atma is in the hridayam and Atma is given a location indicating that Atma is in hridayam. Where the location comes it refers to Jivatma alone. It is closely associated with

indriyas or organs. It is closely connected with prana and prana means here indriyas. Prana sambanda indicates Jivatma location indicates it is Jivatma. That very same Atma jayamanah means is subject to birth and further it is said that it is associated with papam. Thus it gets associated with papas and exhausts papas and quits and all are descriptions of Jivatma alone. In the next mantra the Upanishad says that Atma is associated with three avasthas also. all are associated with Jivatma alone. Later in another mantra Upanishad says this Jivatma experiences punyam and papam in jagrat and swapna avastha and it clearly refers to Jivatma alone and hence purva paksa says Atma means Jivatma only.

Now siddhanti answers and we do not say Jivatma is not talked about. But what we say Yajnavalkya's subject matter is Paramatma alone. Subject matter of revelation here is Paramatma alone. The purpose of the prakaranam is Paramatma, which is distinguished in the two mantras as above, is our conclusion. Then purva paksa asks the question that Jivatma is talked about and Paramatma is also talked about and how do you know that Paramatma is subject matter and not Jivatma. When different topics are discussed and when there is vague idea, on analysis we come to know that Jivatma is not an unknown thing for Yajnavalkya to teach. It is already known and we have aparoksa jnana nishta and Jivatma is not apurva vishaya and jivatma is not anagathi vishaya and what is unknown is apurva vishaya is only Paramatma and therefore that alone can be the subject matter of the swayam jyothi Brahmanam. During the course of the dialogue off and on janaka says very nice Yajnavalkya I like your teaching etc. thousand cows he gives as guru daksina. He further asks the guru several times to teach him further to gain liberation. then again Yajnavalkya starts and so the teachings continue. The tatparyam is moksa sadhana bodhanam can Jivatma jnanam give moksa and if that is so we would have been liberated long before. The purpose of the teaching is the teaching of Paramatma and getting liberation. now purva paksa puts another question. There is no tatparya in it, Paramatma alone is moksa sadhanam. If Jivatma is known and need not be taught why should that be taught here. Yajnavalkya could have taught Paramatma itself and would have avoided confusion by not discussing Jivatma. Why all this confusion. This is purva paksa question. Now siddhanti says that Jivatma is talked in the beginning and Paramatma is talked about in the end because unfortunately or fortunately Jivatma and Paramatma are not totally different and Paramatma with attributes is Jivatma and Jivatma minus attributes is Paramatma. I am Paramatma if my attributes are negated. Saguna Chaitanyam minus attributes is nirguna Chaitanyam. Saguna Chaitanyam is Jivatma and nirguna Chaitanyam is Paramatma. That is why the Upanishad introduces Jivatma with attributes and then negates attributes and reveals Paramatma. Introduction of Jivatma is called anuvadah. If you see mantra 4.3.7 itslef it talks of Jivatma associated with organs it does variety of activities and in this context the Upanishad uses a very important layati eva leyalati iva by saying that it is as though involved in activities indicating the activities are as though activities and don't take it to Jivatma. Bogta minus bogtritvam is Paramatma karta minus kartritvam is Paramatma. Again later it does talk about three avasthas and Upanishad talks about sukha dukha anubhava. Later it says Atma experiences pleasures and pains etc and Upanishad makes a statement that whatever Jivatma experiences there it is not associated with those sukha and dukha. And why it does not stick to that is asangohi ayam Purusa and Jivatma is asangah and it does not have punyam and papam and Jivatma minus punya papa is Paramatma. It introduces Jivatma with punya papam and it concludes Jivatma minus punya papam is asanga Paramatma. It is to reveal the Paramatma Jivatma with attributes is introduced.

Then comes purva paksa why should Upanishad take to indirect method to reveal nirguna Chaitanyam. First introduce saguna Chaitanyam and remove the attributes and then reveal

nirguna Chaitanyam. Why this wasteful exercise? Why not reveal nirguna Chaitanyam directly. For that siddhanti answers unfortunately nirguna Chaitanyam is uncommunicable by any means. Nirguna Chaitanyam requires a container called guna and Chaitanyam is brought to us and afterwards asked to remove the container and drink the content the nirguna Chaitanyam. I say bring water. You bring the water in a glass. Automatically you bring water in a glass when I have not asked you to bring a glass. Then again you drink the water and return the glass. Because both know that water cannot be brought by itself and even than he has to bring in his hand. The idea is handva mouthva the container is needed and water means water plus container when I ask you to bring water. Suppose I say I drank water, I take water only and not the glass. I cannot take the tumbler. This is nirupathika water when I drink water and bring water means it is soupathika water. We should always drop the gunas and take only nirguna Chaitanyam. You should take Consciousness obtaining in the body but remove the location which belongs to the body and mind etc, part and when I aham Brahma asmi means you should take Brahman only and should not take the attributes and this filtering job am bagathyaha laksana. Bring banana means you bring banana with skin but when I say I ate banana it is the skin that I don't take. It is bagathyaha laksana. Jivatma is anuvada vakyam and Paramatma is tatparya vishaya and therefore there should not be any confusion at all.

### **Topic 13. Sushuptyutkrantadhikaranam**

The Self Consisting of knowledge is Brahman

#### **Sutra 1.3.43 [106]**

#### ***Patyadisabdebhyah***

The being referred to in sutra 42 is Brahman because of the words Lord etc., being applied to Him. 'He is the controller, the ruler, the Lord of all. Brihadharaynaka upanisad IV.4.22

The argument in support of sutra 42 is given.

Purva Pakshi is not convinced in spite of various clarifications. Vyasacharya gives further support. The subject matter of Atma started in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The discussion continues in 4<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam also [sarira Brahmanam]. He talks about punar janma of Jivatma. Just as a worm leaves from one leaf to another so also Jivatma leaves one body to another after death. The topic is completed in the mantra 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. This a very important mantra and it is long mantra also. here we find *yoyam vijnana mayam pranesu ya esibatargrdata ajasastasnubcgeta* Atma within the body along with sense organs and the same is *yoyam vijnanamaya* is said in 4.3.7 *yoyam atmanam vijnanamaya pranesu hradyantarajyotih purusah* [Brihadharaynaka upanisad]. Sava esah mahan ajah Atma this Chaitanyam obtaining in the heart is not located in the body and it is sarvagathah Atma. And not only that it is ajah means na jayate. This shows that there no real birth at all and Atma ajah nithyah. Further it says *sa sarvesvarah sarvasya vasi sarvasya sanah sarvasya athipathih*[*ibid*] Jivatma is dasa Paramatma is athipathih the Lord of the creation. not only that *sa sadhunam karmana bhuyan no evasadhuna kaniyan* it is not affected by good deeds or bad deeds that is papa punya, *esa sarveshvarah esa bhutadhipatih esa bhutapatah esa seturvidharana esam brahmana vividisanti* [*ibid*] the mantra goes on and on all indicating Atma is Paramatma alone. It is to know this Atma people take to various type of sadhanas. It is not affected by anything. It indicates that Atma introduced is not miserable Jivatma but what it indicates is glorious Paramatma. This is the general analysis.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. First we have to supply the word Atma occurring in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; is Brahman is Paramatma only; patyati sabdebyah because of the usage of expressions like the Lord etc., in 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; and the expression kept in mind is sarvasya athipathih esa bhutatibathih etc., the one which maintains the order of creation indicates the Atma sabda indicates Paramatma only; pathi adhi sabdah; pathi means Lord bhutatibathi adhi means etc., sarvasya isanah sabdah means expressions. Because of these expressions Atma is Paramatma only. with that this adhikaranam is also over.

The subject mater of the adhikaranam is Atma occurring in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; samsaya is it is Jivatma or Paramatma; purva paksa says it is Jivatma only because of location; association with organs, avasthas punar janma etc., fourth siddhanta says Paramatma only the Atma refers to. The main reason is Yajnavalkya question that it is moksa prakaranam therefore Paramatma alone can be the subject matter. then sangathi is that it is occurring in the right position alone. With this last adhikaranam is over. with this third pada is also over.

We had said that the first pada is spasta linga Brahma vakyam and second and third deal with aspasta linga Brahma vakyam. In all the three padas we only take statements in which Brahman is not clearly revealed. in all of them we prove Brahman only through Brahma lingani the indicators. In the first pada the indicators are very clear. In the second and third padas the clues are very vague and unclear. Brahman vague in all the three padas.

The question is second pada also deals with aspasta Brahma linga and third pada also deal with aspasta Brahma linga vakyani. Why there is difference between the second and third pada. This is a difficult issue. In second pada it deals with the Upasana phala vakyani and in the third pada it deals with aspasta Brahma linga jnana phala vakyani. Here also we get into problem. We get in second pada also Upasana phala and jnana phala vakyas are there. This we see in third pada also. Can we say that more Upasana phala vakyas are there? That is also not correct. Really speaking second third pada division is unexplainable.

In the second pada there are seven adhikaranams of that 1,4,7 [adhikaranam] are Upasana param adhikaranam and 2,3,5 and 6 [adhikaranam] are jnana param vakyas are there. In the third pada 4 and 5 are Upasana param and 8 and 9 are adhikara param and the rest of the nine are jnana Param. In both jnanam and upasanam are there. They say in the second pada 1 and 7 are Upasana Param and therefore it is Upasana predominant and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> pada does not begin and end with upasana Param and so we do not say that is upasana Param.



BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 4			
Classes: 124 to 143 - Sutras: 1-4-1 to 1-4-28			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
125	442	1 . 4 . 1	107
126	446	1 . 4 . 1 to 1 . 4 . 3	107 to 109
127	450	1 . 4 . 3 and 1 . 4 . 4	109 and 110
128	454	1 . 4 . 4 to 1 . 4 . 6	110 to 112
129	458	1 . 4 . 6 to 1 . 4 . 8	112 to 114
130	462	1 . 4 . 8 and 1 . 4 . 9	114 and 115
131	466	1 . 4 . 9 and 1 . 4 . 10	115 and 116
132	470	1 . 4 . 11	117
133	473	1 . 4 . 11 to 1 . 4 . 13	117 to 119
134	477	1 . 4 . 14 and 1 . 4 . 15	120 and 121
135	480	1 . 4 . 15	121
136	483	1 . 4 . 16 and 1 . 4 . 17	122 and 123
137	486	1 . 4 . 17 and 1 . 4 . 18	123 and 124
138	490	1 . 4 . 18 and 1 . 4 . 19	124 and 125
139	494	1 . 4 . 19 to 1 . 4 . 22	125 to 128
140	499	1 . 4 . 22 and 1 . 4 . 23	128 and 129
141	504	1 . 4 . 23 to 1 . 4 . 25	129 to 131
142	510	1 . 4 . 26 to 1 . 4 . 28	132 to 134
143	515	1st Chapter Summary	
	516		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 1, Pada: 4

Class 125

### **Introduction to the fourth pada**

We have completed the first three padas of the first chapter. Now we enter the fourth pada. Now I will give you the general introduction to the fourth pada. In the previous padas revealed that jagat karanam brahman samanvayah. All vedanta revealed jagat karanam brahman, this was established in the three padas. First it was spasta brahma linga vayani and in the second and third aspashta pada brahma linga vakyani. The consistency in revealing brahman is revealed in the three padas and in fourth also the same consistency in revealing continues. Here vyasacharya will take certain significant words occurring in the upanishad for discussion. There is confusion in interpreting some words while samkya philosophers interpret in their own way while siddhantis reveals the exact meaning while refuting the samkya views. Therefore pada vichara is going to be highlight of the fourth pada. Vakya vichara was the highlight of the three previous padas. In fourth pada also vakya vichara will be there but the highlight is pada vichara. Therefore it is called pada vichara pada. This has got eight adhikaranam or topics and 28 sutras. This is the background of the fourth section.

Now I will give you the general introduction of the first adhikaranam. It has seven sutras and it is called anumadhikadhikaranam. Before going to the details of this adhikaranam we will read the first sutra.

### **Topic 1; anumadhikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.1 [107]**

***Anumanikamapyekeshamiti chet na sarirarupakavinyastagrihiter darsayati cha***

If it be said that in some [recensions of the vedas] that which is inferred [i.e, the pradhana] [is] also [mentioned], [we say] no, because [the word 'avyakta' occurring in the kathopanisad] is mentioned in a simile referred to the body [and means the body itself and not the pradhana of the [samkyas]; [sruti] also explains [it]

Here samkya philosophy is being refuted in this adhikaranam. Samkya darsanam has got many things common to the vedanta. It is closely appear to be vedanta. Many similarities are there. Names of the philosophy are common and vedanta is often called samkyam. This is the first common feature. The second chapter of gita is samkya yoga. With regard to the name of philosophy there is similarity. Samkya philosophy is authored by kapila. Bhagavan kapila is revealer of samkya in bagavatam. Kapila is common to vedanta as also to samkya. There are many words common to vedanta and samkya and they are purusa and prakriti. Purusa is chetana tattvam conscious principle and prakriti is inert principle and both are anadhi. Avyaktam is there in both samkya as also in vedanta. Avyaktam means unmanifested matter,

which evolves into manifest universe. Therefore prakriti is common purusa is common; avyaktam is common; in both prakriti is presented as karanam of universe.

It is very material cause of the creation. 4.10 of svetasvatara upanishad says *mayatu prakritim viddhi, mayinam tu mahesvaram tasyavayava-bhutais tu vyaplam sarvam idam jagat* the meaning of the mantra is know then that prakriti is maya and the wielder of may is the great lord. This whole world is pervaded by beings that are part of him.

All the product are born out of prakriti. Thus these are the common features. These words are used in veda itself. In bhagavad gita 13.19 it is seen *prakrtim purusam cai'va viddhy anadi ubhav api vikarms ca gunams cai 'va viddhi prakrtisambhavan* know thou that prakriti [nature] and purusa [soul] are both beginningless; and know also that the forms and modes are born of prakriti [nature]

All the products are born out of prakriti. Thus these are the common features and they are used in veda itself. Therefore samkya can claim vedic support for their philosophy. It is veda pramanam. They have the support of veda. Veda uses the word purusa, prakriti and avyaktam and there are so many common features including vedic concurrence. So they claim vedic support for samkya philosophy. Here we want to show that they don't have vedic support and we say it is not vaidhika darsanam and it is seemingly vaidhikam and samkya is avaidhikam. At the same time we don't say it is nasthika darsanam. Buddhism is nasthika darsanam as they don't accept veda pramanam at all. Therefore they are nasthika darsanam. Samkya is not nasthika darsanam because it accept sabda and veda pramanam. For samkya philosophers veda is secondary support and not primary support for him. For him tarka and logic alone is primary support for them. Smkya, naiyayika, yoga etc., are tarka darsanam while vedanta alone is asthika darsanam. They take veda pramana and veda pramana does nto have prominence and they have tarka prominence and they have pouruseya darsanam. Vedanta is primarily veda based and therefore it is apouruseya darsanam and tarka is subservient to sruti and it is supporting sruti and samkya becomes pouruseya darsanam and it is not vedic teaching and veda based human teaching and it is avaidhika darsanam.

Now we will see what are the dissimilarities based on vedic pramanam and those relevant difference that is applicable to this study. Prakriti is basic matter which evolves the universe. Avyaktam is common to both. Prakriti is known as pradhanam in samkya philosophy. He calls the basic matter as pradhanam because it is a storehouse in which entire universe is located in potential form. In fact every seed can be called pradhanam. In the seed the entire plant or tree is located in potential form. This word pradhanam we do not use in vedanta. We should understand as basic matter as seen by samkya philosophers. In vedanta also we have got another word for prakriti which is unique to vedanta and that is maya, sakti, avidya etc. They are synonyms to prakriti in vedanta. Maya is unique synonym for prakriti used only in vedanta. Maya is basic matter as seen by vedantins. Prakriti and maya both are basic matter only.

Now we will see some conceptual similarity. In samkya philosophy prakriti is a totally independent principle. It is as independent as purusa is. Purusa is independent and prakriti independent and both are equally real and therefore they are parallel reality and they are essentially dvaidins aonly. They accept prakriti, purusa, and consciousness separately. Prakriti alone is material cause of creation. Purusa cannot be the material cause of the creation. In vedanta there is a difference. In vedanta also very often we say prakriti is material cause of creation. We put our hand on his shoulder and say that prakriti is the cause of

creation. We look upon prakriti as dependent principle and dependent on purusa. It cannot therefore function independently; prakriti is dependent on purusa both for existence and function. Prakriti is more like sakti or instrument of purusa in vedanta. It is a power of purusa. Whatever prakriti does can be attributed to purusa himself. It is because prakriti is after all a power of purusa an instrument of purusa whatever power does it belongs to the powerful and whatever instrument does it belongs to the owner of the instrument. The pen is writing and pen alone is designed to write. Pen cannot write independently and it requires one to write the notes. When you write the notes, you say i write the notes through the pen. Prakriti cannot evolve independently and it is more an instrument of purusa and purusa creates the world through prakriti and in vedanta purusa is said to be karanam. Ultimately purusa is karanam and brahman is jagat karanam in vedanta and it is not accepted by samkya. For samkya it is achetana karana vadha and for vedanta it is chetana karana vadha. For vedanta chetanam brahman alone through prakriti creates the whole universe. That is what vyasacharya presented through second sutra. Tad chetana karanam brahman. This is the same if you look at prakriti as sakti and sakti produces the world and we attribute the karanatvam to sakti possessor of brahman. When i speak that is but manifestation of speaking power. And the power alone evolves into speech. But i don't say speaking power speaks but i say i say i speak because speaking power is dependent on me. So brahman alone is jagat karanam ultimately. This is the primary teaching of vedanta. Prakriti is the cause of creation is compromise solution. Since this can create certain doubts i will add some more feature to avoid certain possible doubts.

I said prakriti is dependent on purusa. In samkya prakriti is independent. Swatantra prakriti is samkya and paratantra prakriti is vedanta. Prakriti is dependent on purusa and what kind dependent it is. We say the dependence is sathya mithya sambandha the higher form of reality and lower form of reality. We will discuss in detail later. Therefore when we say brahman is karanam through maya or prakriti and prakriti is mithya less real than brahman and prakriti evolved world is also less real than brahman and karana status of brahma is also less real. Karana status of prakriti is also less real. Karana status of brahman is because of less real prakriti. Prapancha mithya prakriti is mithya prakriti karanatvam is mithya prakriti dvara brahmana karanatvam is mithya. From vyavaharika angle brahman is karanam through prakriti. Therefore vyavaharika dristya we are chetana karana vadhinah. Whereas achetana karana vadhinah. These are some of the important and relevant portions of the adhikaranam. Sakmya achetana karana vadha he wants to take the vedic support. Wherever there are words supporting him, he will quote them in support of his plea. One such support he takes is from kathopanisad mantra and it is 1.3.10 and 11<sup>th</sup> mantra. The mantras reads as *indriye bhyah para hy-artha arthebhyas-ca param manah manasas tu para buddhih, buddher atma mahan parah manatah param avyaktam avyaktat purusah parah, purusan na param kincit sa kashtra sa para gatih* the meaning of these mantra is beyond the senses are the sense objects beyond these objects is the mind; beyond the mind is the intellect and beyond the intellect is the great self. Beyond the great [mahat] is the unmanifested [avyaktam] beyond the avyaktam [prakriti] is the purusa; beyond the purusa there is nothing; that is the end ; that is the highest goal. These are the to mantras where purusa is revealed by applying sakachandra nyaya. I will give you the meaning of the mantras briefly. Upanishad starts with indriyam. Superior to sense organs are the sense objects; from one angle superior to sense organs are sense objects for they influence the sense organs by creating desires. Therefore sense objects are more powerful than sense organs. Superior to sense objects is mind. He quotes a brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam sense organs are called grahah. The ghosts are called grahah. It keeps people under the control of the ghosts. Sense organs are the ghosts and they control the individuals. Sense objects are called adhighrahah ghosts of the ghosts. The sense objects

control the sense organs. Sense objects possess the sense organs and sense organs possess the individual. Each organ is supposed to be the gragrah and adhgrah control the sense organs and sense objects are superior to sense organs. [artha bagha brahmanam of brihadharaynaka upanisad] superior to sense objects is the mind. Superior to mind is the intellect because mind is controlled by the intellect. Superior to intellect is the total intellect mahat tattvam that is samasti buddhi. This portion is relevant to us. Superior to mahat is avyaktam the causal matter prakriti. Superior to prakriti is purusa. Mahat prakriti purusa is the gradual order. Here the portion to be focused is mahat avyaktam purusah. Three words are common to vedanta and samkya also. Whether veda talks vedanta philosophy or samkya philosophy. That is the question. We will refute samkya philosophy. There is a tug-of-war between vedantins and samkya. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 126

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.1 [107]**

*Anumanikamapyekeshamiti chet na sarirarupakavinyastagrihiter darsayati cha*

If it be said that in some [recensions of the vedas] that which is inferred [i.e, the pradhana] [is] also [mentioned], [we say] no, because [the word 'avyakta' occurring in the kathopanisad] is mentioned in a simile referred to the body [and means the body itself and not the pradhana of the [samkyas]; [sruti] also explains [it]

In this adhikaranam vyasacharya analyses a kathopanisad mantra 1.3.10 and 11 *indriye bhyah para hy-artha arthebhyas-ca param manah manasas tu para buddhih, buddher atma mahan parah manatah param avyaktam avyaktat purusah parah, purusan na param kincit sa kastha sa para gatih* the meaning of these mantra is beyond the senses are the sense objects beyond these objects is the mind; beyond the mind is the intellect and beyond the intellect is the great self. Beyond the great [mahat] is the unmanifested [avyaktam] beyond the avyaktam [prakriti] is the purusa; beyond the purusa there is nothing; that is the end; that is the highest goal. Three words occur in the same order mahat purusah and avyaktam and our question is whether they refer to the concept of samkya philosophy. Therefore our analyses whether they refer to samkya or otherwise. We will concentrate on the word avyaktam occurring in the katha mantra. According to samkya avyaktam means karana prapancha. In veda also the word avyaktam means karana prapancha. Veda supports the samkya concept or veda we have to analyse. We are going to say that the word avyakta means karana prapancha. In samkya and vedanta karana prapancha means the world in potential form. But the meaning of karana prapancha under samkya and vedanta are different conceptually. Samkya karana prapancha avyaktam is real entity and independent entity. In vedanta when we talk about karana prapancha is both dependent and unreal. It is para tantranca and mithyanca. In samkya it is sathanca and independent. This is the general analysis introduction.

Now we will see the general analysis of the adhikaranam. First part is purva paksa and the second part is siddhantha part. Purva paksa says the veda uses the word avyakta in the meaning of karana prapancha which is exactly same as samkya. So veda supports samkya. When purva paksa says veda uses avyakta in the meaning of karana prapancha which is identical with samkya philosophy, siddhantis say it is not so. The real answer is that avyakta means karana prapancha and according to us it is mithya and unreal. The real answer is given in the third sutra. In the first and second sutra he gives a mischievous answer. In kathopanisad above mantra avyakta occurring in 1.3.11 means karana prapancha only. Vyasacharya establishes avyakta means sthoola sariram and not karana prapancha. I say it is mischievous because 1.3.11 avyakta means karana prapancha only. Yet just for teasing the samkya avyakta means sthoola sariram only. He gives a temporary answer with lot of difficulty. How can the word avyakta mean the physical body. Avyakta means invisible and that which is not

perceptible to sense organs. Here avyaktam means sthoola sariram and we know that sthoola sariram is available for perception. Therefore how do you say that the word avyakta means physical body? Its primary meaning is un-manifest and by implication avyakta means sthoola sariram. We have to take the implied meaning in this context instead of primary meaning. The whole section supports our interpretation. Now the next question how does this section supports our meaning. Before revealing the purusa that is the step-by-step observation, the whole thing talks about spiritual journey the upanishad talks about chariot imagery. The chariot imagery is six factors are introduced. Number one is vishayah means sense objects. Sense objects are comparable to the roads of journey. The physical body is compared to the chariot, which travels. Sense organs are compared to the horses that drag. Fourth factor is manah the mind that reins that control the horses. The intellect is compared to the driver that holds the rein. The jivatma is the traveler who sits behind. These are the six factors introduced in chariot imagery [mantra 1.iii.3 and 1.iii.4 of kathopanisad].

Now vyasacharya says in this spiritual journey talks about six things. Artha, indriyam, manah buddhi, avyakta and purusah; here also are six factors and in the chariot imagery also there are six factors are there. In both the concepts of samkya and vedanta there are sense objects are there; then indriyams are there in both; mind is there; buddhi is there and purusa is there in both; chariot image rathi and purusa tally. There are avyaktam is standing out in spiritual journey. Here sariram is there and their avyaktam is there and so avyaktam refers to sariram. This is the only argument we have to take to prove that avyakta refers to the body. But it will raise the other question as how the avyaktam will refer to the body. For those questions vyasacharya answers in the next sutra. Here it is said that avyakta means sariram. Otherwise the imagery and teaching will tally. This is the general analysis of the first sutra.

Anumanikam abhi samkya pradhanam also is [revealed in the mantras]; belonging to certain [branches of the vedas]. Iti chet if this is argued thus it is not so; sarirrupaka vinyasta gethiter physical body or sarira introduced by the avyaktam in katha 1.3.11 is supplied idea; this is the running meaning. Anumanikam means the pradhanam of samkya philosophy; he uses the word anumanikam because in samkya philosophy pradhanam or karana prapancha is known through inference only but in vedanta avyaktam or prakriti is known through sastra pramanam. Both talk about karana prapancha. Ours refers to sastra pramanam and his refers to inferred entity that is anumanikam that is samkya pramanam. This was discussed in sutra 1.3.18 and 1.3.3 the same word anumanam is used in the meaning of pradhanam. Both mean samkya pradhanam. Abhi means also; not only your brahman is revealed but also my pradhanam also is revealed. The next word is ekasam sakayam means in certain branches of the vedas; in sanskrit eka is singular number but in plural it becomes certain; when he says in some branches means kathopanisad mantras. Iti chet means it is not so; then comes the next word sarira rupasya vinyasta grihitech; sariram means the physical body; rupakam means simile ratha rupakam chariot imagery; vinyaktam means presented grihitih means mentioned; rupaka viyaktam means introduced in chariot imagery. It is adjective to sariram; the physical body which is introduced in the chariot imagery. This is how sanskrit words communicate our idea. Darsayath veda itself clarifies that through the chariot imagery. That avyaktam and sariram tally. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

### **Sutra 1.4.2 [108]**

### *Sukshmam tu indarhatvat*

But the subtle [body is meant by the term avyakta] on account of tis capability [of being so designated]

An objection to sutra 1 is refuted

First we will have the general analysis of the sutra. The previous sutra has complicated. Hence we have the second sutra because we have said avyakta means sthoola sariram. Vyasacharya says the word avyakta means sariram karana sariram in potential form. The body in un-manifest form is vachyartha and by implication it reveals sthoola sariram and karana sariram alone later becomes sthoola sariram. Primary meaning is causal body and by implication it is sthoola sariram. Cause can imply effect. For that different examples are given. In the sastra the word sattvam is used in the meaning of the mind. In the gita 16.1 it is said *abhayam sattvasamsuddhir jnanayogavyavasthitih danam damas ca yajnas ca svadhyayas tapa arjavam* the meaning of the sloka is fearlessness, purity of mind, wise apportionment of knowledge and concentration, charity, self control and sacrifice, study of the scriptures, austerity and uprightness. How can sattvam refer to the mind? It is convention of the sastra a word in the meaning of a cause is used in the meaning of the effect so he says avyaktam has the meaning of karana sariram and it can be used in the meaning of sthoola sariram also. Karana sariram is avyaktam and avyakta primary meaning is karana sariram and by implication it is sthoola sariram. This meaning is given in brahma sutra only and not in kathopanisad.

One more problem is there. We accept avyakta means sthoola sariram. In the graded hierarchy how can sthoola sariram be subtler than indriyam, manah buddhi etc. For that we answer karana sariram and sthoola sariram are same ultimately and by implication it is turned to karana sariram. Thus avyaktam is sthoola sariram only. This is the meaning of this sutra.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis. Sukshmam the body in the causal state is primarily meant by the word avyaktam here; however avyaktam means body in causal state here; tad arhatvad it is appropriate meaning of the word avyaktam. And you supply the next sentence the physical body and its paratvam are implied. However the body in causal state is primarily meant for avyaktam the physical body is implied. The word sookshmam means the body in causal state the karana sariram. Avyakta sariram is directly talked about; tad arhatvad tad means avyakta sabdah arha means the appropriate meaning; karana sariram preserves the word avyaktam; karana sariram is the primary meaning of the word avyaktam; we have to add sthoola sariram is revealed by implication. With this second sutra is over.

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutas 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.3 [109]**

### *Tadadhinatvat arthava*

On account of its dependent [on the lord such a previous seminal condition of the world may be admitted because such an admission is] reasonable.



The argument in support of sutra 1 continued.

Now the problem we have seemingly solved. We have said in the katha mantra avyakta sabda is used in the meaning of sthoola sariram by implication. In this process we have accepted avyakta means physical body by implication. We have accepted the primary meaning is karana sariram. Even in the other parts of the veda the word avyakta is used as karana sariram only. Therefore purva paksa says in this context it may mean sthoola sariram and you have to accept where avyakta means karana prapancha. Therefore in other places veda supports avyakta as karana prapancha. Thus, avyakta word supports samkya philosophy. From the third sutra alone it is anumnika adhikaranam. Our karana prapancha is dependent entity but samkya's karana prapancha is independent entity. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 127

### **Topic 1; anumadhikaranam {sutas 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.3 [109]**

#### ***Tadadhinatvat arthava***

On account of its dependent [on the lord such a previous seminal condition of the world may be admitted because such an admission is] reasonable.

The argument in support of sutra 1 continued.

We do the general analysis of anumadhikaranam. We analyse the word avyakta occurring in kathopanisad mantra. Here purva paksa is samkya philosopher and he claims avyakta refers to pradhanam of samkya philosophy which is none other than jagat karanam or karana prapancha. We establish that the word avyakta samkya pradhanam jagat karanam. In the first two sutras a peculiar meaning was given as sthoola sariram. While giving that particular meaning we admitted that the word avyakta means karana prapancha alone. We said contextually the word avyakta means karana avastha or karana prapancha. This is the gist of the first two sutra.

Thereafter wards samkya philosopher continues their argument. They accept that the word avyakta in 1.3.11 of kathopanisad is sthoola sariram only by implication that vedantins agree that the word avyakta means karana avastha only. It is karana avastha means the entire universe which means jagat karanam. Thus scripture supports the samkya philosophy. Therefore it should refer to pradhanam. Even if in this context avyakta means sthoola sariram there are so many places where avyakta means karana prapancha.

The occasions are brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.4.7 the upanishad uses the word avyakritam that is karana prapancha. In bhagavad gita 8.18 also krishna says *avyaktad vyaktayah sarvaha prabhavanty aharagame ratryagame pralyante tatrai'va'vyahtasamjnake* at he coming of day all manifested things come forth from the unmanifested and at the coming of night they merge in that same, called the unmanifested; here the unmanifested is prakriti.

In samkya philosophy avyakta means karana prapancha and samkya supports sruti and smriti. For this answer is given in this sutra. It brings out one of the main difference between samkya and vedanta. In fact because of this primary difference alone vedanta is called advaidam and samkya is called dvaida philosophy. This primary difference is shown in this sutra.

Now we do accept the word avyaktam means karana prapancha. In kathopanisad 1.3.11 avyakta means sthoola sariram and it only meant samanya artha. It is basic matter or basic energy and we do accept that the samkya philosophy also karana prapancha is basic matter and we use common words. We say avyahritam and we also use the word pradhanam and we also use the word avyaktam; samkya also uses the words avyahritam, pradhanam and

avyaktam and moola prakriti. All are used both in samkya and vedanta with a common meaning karana prapancha. They say prakriti say prakriti is jagat karanam. We also say prakriti is jagat karanam. Then what is the dissimilarity? When we say prakriti or maya is jagat karanam is the secondary version. Our primary teaching is brahman is jagat karanam. This chetana karana vadha is primary teaching of the upanishad. It is fully supported by the upanishad. We give two arguments in support of our argument that chaitanyam alone is jagat karanam and the first argument is brahman is that from which all are born in which all sustain and into which all are resolved. Brahman is defined jagat karanam and that is the foundation of brahma sutra. Vedanta primary teaching is vyasacharya presents chetana karana vadha alone and in support of argument he quotes ii.1.2 of taittiriya upanishad that reads as *tasmad va etasmad Atmana akasah sambhutih aksasad-vayuh, vayor-agnih, agner-apah, adbhyah prthivi, prthivya-asadhayah, asadhibhyo-‘nnam annat-purusah* the meaning of the mantra is from that [which is] this Atman, is space born; from akasa, air; from air, fir; from fire water; from water, earth; from earth, herbs; from herbs, food and from food man... this also reveal atma is jagat karanam and that reveals chetana jagat karanam. Only if brahman is accepted as karanam eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena is possible. Karna vijnanena samstha karya vijnana prapancha bhavati. If prakriti is accepted as karanam and eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam will come and brahman need not be known at all. This itself is going to be analysed later. Because of this reason also brahman has to be accepted as the ultimate cause. In samkya achetana prakriti is jagat karanam and in vedanta chetana brahma is jagat karanam. The second point is when we accept brahman as the jagat karanam the first advantage is sruti support is there and eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena principle is accepted but at the same time there is some problem also. The problem is sruti says brahman is karya karana vilaksanam. To be a karanam it has to undergo a change. But brahman is not subject to any modification. How can brahma karnavadha when brahman is not subject to any change. We point out that brahman has got sakti. Brahman alone is jagat karanam and kevalam brahman cannot be jagat karanam and brahman requires sakti to be jagat karanam and that sakti is called maya, avidya etc. The difference between samkya and vedanta is prakriti is cause of the universe according to samkya and prakriti is not the cause of the world and prakriti is the sakti of brahman with which it becomes the jagat karanam. The second difference is prakriti is independent entity but in vedanta prakriti is a sakti dependent on brahman, when the saktiman is brahman. This is the second point to be noted. Prakriti is dependent principle with brahman being independent.

Except a brahman, sakti by which brahman is jagat karanam. Sakti is resting with brahman and sakti also must be eternal as eternal as brahman how do you talk about advaidm. Brahman and brahma sakti maya is another. Even if you say sakti is part of brahman and then brahman will be with parts and be subject to swagatha beda. Brahman is substance and brahman has got sakti. Then how can we talk about nirgunam brahman. Anantah we do accept. Sakti continues even during pralaya. Sakti or maya is eternally present with brahman. Even though both are real one is eternally real and the other is eternally unreal. One is paramarthikam and another is vyavaharikam. Jnanam knows eternal brahman and eternal maya. He will accept the eternal brahman and maya and he will not count maya as real. He accept maya but he will count it. Because of maya i have everything. Experientially he counts maya and he will not count really. The maya should not be counted along with brahman is the realization of brahman. Maya loses its countability statys. Even after losing its countability it does not lose its experience-ability. The sunrise has lost its reality but it has not lost its experiencability. Maya or prakriti is mithya for Vedanta and for samkya prakriti is swatantram for samkya. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Being dependent on brahman avyaktam is not independent pradhanam of samkya. Arthavad it is purposeful also. It means dependent avyaktam is purposeful also. Tad adhinatvad tad and adhinatvad. Tad means brahman adhinatvam means dependent. Tad adhinatvad means brahman dependence. Because of brahman dependence; because of the brahman dependence of avyaktam our avyaktam has got brahman dependence but samkya's avyaktam is independent hence our avyaktam is difference from samkya's avyaktam. The words are similar and the concepts are dissimilar. Athavat means it is purposeful. Avyaktam is purposeful. Maya is purposeful. Adhi sankaracharya explains avyakta is purposeful in what way. In samkya avyakta is jagat karanam. In vedanta avyakta is purposeful in making brahman the jagat karanam. Therefore avyakta is only an assistant of brahman. It is like the wife of the olden days. All the glory goes to purusah. Avyakta is purposeful not creating but assisting. Brahma karanatva siddhyartham avyaktam arthavat bhavati. Tasmad swatantram brahman karanam avyaktam bhavati. It does not have independent existence. Our avyaktam does not have swatantra satta.

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutas 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhyas tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.4[110]**

#### ***Jneyatvavachanaccha***

And because it is not mentioned [that the avyakta] is to be known [it cannot be the pradhanam of the samkhyas]

The argument in support of sutra 1 continued.

First we will do general analysis. Again there is a beautiful argument. Vyasacharya says in samkya philosophy purusa and avyaktam both are important and both have independent existence and hence they believe in dvaidam. All are dvaidam except vedantins. In fact vishistadvaidam also dvaidam. To attain moksa one should know both purusa and prakriti distinctly and now we know them in general manner. The samkya philosophy gives dvaidam vastu jnanam and purusa as also prakriti one should know clearly and also the difference one should know clearly. In samkya both purusa and prakriti should be known. In vedanta purusa alone should be known. We only say brahma vijnanena moksa. We don't say maya vijnana moksa. Kevala brahma vijnanena moksa. Therefore samkya and vedanta differs. Their avyaktam is jneyam and in vedanta avyaktam should be dismissed and we should know purusa. Mahatma prada avyaktam avyaktad purusa paraya. As even you go to higher and higher stages previous stages should be negated.

Avyaktam is not an end but it is only a means to reach brahman. Avyaktam also should be known. Therefore avyaktam is equally important. For that we answer if both are equally important the next mantra will not be there. In the next mantra the upanishad says having talked about various stages 1.3.10 and 11 of kathopanisad it talks about mahat, avyaktam and purusa; and finally it says you should know brahman. Even though all the things are talked about esah that brahman alone should be known finally. Esah purusah drisyashe. You have to sharpen your mind. This is the second difference between the avyaktam of samkya and vedanta avyaktam. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Jneyatva avachanat cha. Cha moreover; jneyatvavachanat since avyaktam is not mentioned as something to be known; avyaktam is not pradhanam of samkya. The last portion is to be supplied. This is the word meaning. First word is jneyatvavachanat. Jneyatvam means knowability a thing to be known for liberation. In samkya prakriti is to be known and in vedanta brahman is to be known for liberation; avachanat means non-mentioned; the if you literally translate because of the non-mention of knowability of avyaktam avyaktam is not pradhanam. Cha is conjunction because this sutra gives another reason in addition to the previous sutra.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 128

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sstras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.4[110]**

#### ***Jneyatvavachanaccha***

And because it is not mentiuned [that the avyakta] is to be known [it cannot be the pradhanam of the samkyas]

The argument in support of sutra 1 continued.

We have completed the fourth sutra of anumanika adhikaranam the fourth pada of the first chapter. The discussion is with regard to the word avyaktam. Samkya claimed avyaktam is un-manifest form of universe. That which is not revealed by sense organs is called avyaktam. Whatever is not revealed by sense organs is apratyaksam and it can be known by anumanam only. This world must have been in potential form before manifestation. Samkya also says the same thing when they say avyaktam. Avyaktam is common both to samkya and vedanta. Samkya says their philosophy has veda pramanam.

No doubt avyaktam reveals un-manifest matter and the universe. Up to this part we don't have any disagreement with samkya philosophy. Only with regard to the status of avyaktam we have some problem. For them the basic matter is swatantram and it has independent existence, which means the consciousness has a separate reality and that means there are two parallel reality one is matter and the other is spirit. Samkya is exactly middle between science and philosophy. Consciousness depends on matter and that is why they consciousness is phenomenon on brain.

In vedanta it is the otherway round. Consciousness is independent and matter depends upon consciousness. Samkya says why one should depend upon other and they say two independent reality and prakriti is independent matter and purusa is independent consciousness. If you use avyaktam you refer to independent mattern and vedanta use avyaktam we talk of dependent matter. Tad adinatvad chaitanya adhinam is matter. That is why your philosophy does not have vedic support. In samkya the matter and spirit enjoy equal important and moksa require the knowledge of both. One require prakriti knowledge as also purusa knowledge also. Jneyatvam is common to both. The necessity of the knowledge of both is required.

In vedanta we say brahma jnanatvad mokсах. Maya is not a thing to be known but a thing to be rejected as avidya. We use maya as a stepping-stone to reach brahman and we should reject after reaching brahman. Mahat superior to that avyaktam and superior to avyaktam is brahman. In 12<sup>th</sup> mantra upanishad says *esa sarvesu butesu, gudho'tma na prakasate, drsyate tvagryaya buddhya, suksmaya suksma darsibhih* this Atman hidden in all beings reveals [itself] not [to all], but is seen [only] by seers of the subtle through sharp and subtle

intellect. This purusa tattvam chaitanyam tattvam is hidden in everyone and this hidden purusa has to be known only by subtle intellect. One should know the purusa to gain moksha the upanishad says. One should not stop with knowing mahat and purusah and one should ultimately realize purusa which is nothing but brahman so vedantins say. Veda does not talk about avyaktam a thing to be known, the avyaktam is said but it is meant here brahman alone.

## **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

### **Sutra 1.4.5[111]**

#### ***Vadatiti chet na prajno hi prakaranat***

And if you maintain that the text does not speak [of the pradhanam as an object of knowledge] we deny that, because the intelligent [supreme] self is meant on account of the general subject matter.

An objection to sutra 4 is raised and refuted,

First we will do the general analysis. Samkya philosopher is nor ready to give up. We said avyaktam is not enough to be known for getting liberation. Avyakta is not presented to be known for liberation. Samkya philosopher says who says so. He says you don't know how to study veda properly. He says avyaktam is an object of knowledge and it also presents that knowledge is liberating knowledge. We ask them where it is said. He says that 1.iii.15 of kathopanisad says *asabdam asparsam arupam avyayam tatha rasam nityam agandhavat ca yat; anadya nantam mahatah param dhruvam, nicayya tan mrtyu mukhat pramucyate* the meaning of the mantra is he, who has realized that [atman] which is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay and also without taste, without smell without beginning, without end beyond the mahat [great] eternal and unchanging, is freed from the jaws of death. This is oft quoted mantra.

This is a very important mantra. This is in the hands of samkya philosopher. He says avyaktam prakriti only. We say it talks about purusa the brahman. But he says it talks about avyaktam only. Every description tallies with avyaktam un-manifest universe which we call prakriti is asabdam, asparsam anvayam etc. It is nithyam because in pralaya kale it is in un-manifest form. It is anadhi anandam and the crucial word is mahatah param the word used in the mantra.

That means it is beyond mahat. In 1.3.11 the mantra says mahata param avyakta param superior to mahat is avyaktam. 1.3.15 talks about prakriti or pradhanam only and not only veda commands to know about avyaktam but also by knowing that one will transcend mortality and will get moksha. Therefore samkya philosophy is correct interpretation. This is purva paksa of samkya. Veda does talk about avyaktam one should be known.

Vyasacharya gives the answer in the second part of the sutra. He says 1.3.15 talks about purusa alone and it does not talk about avyaktam the prakriti. It talks about purusa the conscious principle. If you study the flow of the upanisadic teaching you will come to know it talks about purusa. In 11<sup>th</sup> mantra upanishad talks about mahat, avyaktam and brahman. 12<sup>th</sup> mantra talks about atma the purusah and it does not refer to avyaktam at all. This atma

should mean purusa alone and not to avyaktam then 13<sup>th</sup> mantra talks about atma only and how can one know it by resolving everything. Each one is resolved into next superior one and ultimately all will resolve into atma the purusa and 14<sup>th</sup> mantra says that it is not easily understood and atma jnanam is like walking on the razor's edge. All the three mantras talk about atma jnanam only and the 15<sup>th</sup> mantra should talk only about atma jnanam and how can talk about avyaktam. Therefore asparsam avyavan etc.

Refer to atma alone and not avyaktam. If it talks about purusa how does it use the expression mahatah param. Superior to mahat is avyaktam only. Superior to mahat is avyaktam and superior to avyaktam to brahman only. Purusa can be said to be mahata param and superior to mahatah is brahman alone. Then two mre argument are there. In all vedic mantra we talk of brahma jnanat moksa and we don't find prakriti jnanat moksa. Even kathopanisad talks of atma jnanam alone as the means of moksa.

Third and final argument is this. Let us assume that 1.3.15 of kathopanisad talks about prakriti or pradhanam and the last line of the mantra says knowing that prakrit one gets moksa will be the meaning of 1.3.15. Even if that be the meaning of the mantra it does not talk of samkya philosophy because samkya philosophy never says prakriti jnanat moksa. It does not talk about samkya philosophy. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to word for word analysis.

Vadati sruti speaks of avyaktam; as something to be known in 1.3.15 of kathopanisad. This is the quote of samkya philosopher. Iti chet if it is argued thus na it is not so; parjnahi purusa is indeed; spoken of katha 1.3.15; prakaranat because that is the topic. Vadathi it is said by the samkya philosopher. Avyaktasya jneyatvam kathopanisad bhavati iti chet na etc., we have seen the meaning; prajnah is used in the sutra in the meaning of nirgunam brahman only. Here prajna means chaitanyam. Then hi is emphasis. The previous and later portions always decide topic. The context is atma jnanam and not prakriti jnanam.

## **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutas 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

### **Sutra 1.4.6 [112]**

#### ***Trayanameva chaivamupanyasah prasnascha***

And these is question and explanation relating to three things only [not to the pradhanam]

The objection raised in sutra 5 is further refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. This is more an elaboration of the previous sutra. The context vyasacharya explains here. It can be interpreted in two ways. One is my interpretation. This is simpler one. When you study the context you will find tha entire kathopanisad is the answer to the three question asked by naciketetus. First is the father's peace of mind 1.1.10; 1.1.11 of kathopanisad is the answer; second is the ritual for attaining heaven the question was asked in 1.1.13 and answer was given in 1.1.15 of kathopanisad. Third boon was for atma jnanam, which he asked twice in 1.1.20 and 1.2.14. 1.2.14 he asked does on survive after death; 1.2.14 he asked about atma vidya. Third question is answered in the rest of the upanishad. What happens to atma after death. Yamadharma answers what happens to



the ignorant one and the wise one. This was elaborately discussed. The three question deals with father's peace of mind, a ritual to gain heaven and thirdly to gain atma jnanam. Nowhere yama dharma raja did answer any thing about pradhanam. There is no pradhana vishaya or question. There is no pradhanam. This is a simple approach.

Now we will see vyasacharya's approach. What adhi sankaracharya does is when sutra talks about three questions and the questions deal with ritual for reaching heaven; jivatma is question number two and paramatma is question number three. Father's peace of mind is not taken into account at all here. 1.1.20 is the question about jivatma and the answer for that is 2.5.7. *Yonim anye prapadyante sariratvaya dehinah sthanam anye 'nusamyanti yatha karma yatha srutam* the meaning of this mantra is some souls enter the womb to have a body, others go to the plants, just according to their work and according to their knowledge.

The question regarding the jivatma was whether the jivatma dies or not and what happens to that. For that upanishad answers that it takes rebirth; the third question is *anyatra dharmad anyatra adharmad anyatra asmakritad* and it is about paramatma. Most of the kathopanisad is all about the paramatma. Whether you take those three questions or these three questions and either way there is nothing about pradhanam. Adhi sankaracharya talks about the complication, which he elaborates now.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Evam similarly; prasnah question upanyasah cha and answer; prayanam eva with regard to three topics only are found here; cha there are two chakaras therefore pradhanam is not mentioned here; cha means therefore; pradhanam is not mentioned and it is to be supplied. Trianam eva three topics are talked about. What are the three topics? I took father's peace of mind, jivatma and paramatma; adhi sankaracharya does not take father's peace. He talks about swarga ritual, jivatma and paramatma. Prasnah means questions upanyasah means answer. Evan means by topic analysis. By studying the context we come to know three questions and three answers but pradhanam is not mentioned here.

Now I will briefly mention the complication only. Purva paksa asks is jivatma and paramatma identical or separate according to you. And either way you are in trouble. If you say jivatma and paramatma are identical you cannot count as three questions and it will be only two questions; therefore you are in trouble. To avoid you should say jivatma and paramatma are separate then he says if you say they are separate i will ask you the question how many boons yama gave.

Three boons were given. One is father's peace and second is swarga ritual and third one is either jivatma or paramatma. How can yama talk about paramatma, which is not included in the boon? If you say third boon is jivatma how did yama talk about paramatma, which is not in the boon? If you say he talked about paramatma, which is not in the boon, i will say that he included pradhanam also which is not in the boon? More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 129

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkhya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.6 [112]**

#### ***Trayanameva chaivamupanyasah prasnascha***

And these is question and explanation relating to three things only [not to the pradhanam]

The objection raised in sutra 5 is further refuted.

Vyasacharya says swatantra pradhanam does not have support of veda prmanam. Vyasacharya talks of atma and not pradhanam at all. In support of that vyasacharya gives further argument in this sutra. By analysis of the topic of kathopanisad there is no scope for pradhanam at all. Only three questions have been asked and entire upanishad is the answer for the three questions. There is no mention of pradhanam in any of the three question or in the answers. Vaidhika karma jivatma and paramatma are the three topics and where is the question of pradhanam? Now purva paksi asks you have the problem

The problem is that when you ask question of jivatma and paramatma do you mean jivatma and paramatma aikyam or jivatma paramatma beda. Purva paksi say either way you are in trouble and if they are identical vyasa sutra is in trouble. It talks of three question and you say karma jivatma and paramatma are identical and that means there are two questions and the sutra is wrong. There will not be three questions.

To avoid this if you say jivatma and paramatma beda then there will be no problem in sutra and all the three question are answered but the upanishad problem will be there. In the upanishad three boons are given. And through the first boon father peace of mind and through the second boon ritual given and through the tell me third boon jivatma is discussed or paramatma is discussed. If you say jivatma and paramatma are two then paramatma topic will be outside the boon and if you say the paramatma is outside and then one will be short. How can there be three boons and four topics be there. The purva paksi asks this. Yama dharma raja asked three boons and fourth one is bonus topic is the only answer we can give. For that samkya philosopher says if you can add a bonus topic why cannot i add a bonus topic of pradhanam. That bonus pradhanam is added in 1.4.15 of the kathopanisad. There will be dosha in three questions or dosha in three boons either way. Adhi sankaracharya riddles out somehow.

While discussing three boons we have to assume jivatma and paramatma aikyam. While discussing three questions we have to assume jivatma and paramatma bedah in brahma sutra. In his commentary he says the first is father's peace of mind and the second is jivatma and the third is jivatma and paramatma aikyam. Adhi sankaracharya elaborately proofs jivatma vishaya varam and paramatma vishay varam. While discussing vyasa sutra adhi sankaracharya says jivatma and paramatma beda should be taken in to account.

Samkya will ask how can you do all the mischief. While talking of varam you talk of aikyam and while talking of questions you talk of beda. When you talk of aikyam how can you talk about beda. How can you take aikyam and beda. Vedantins can very comfortably talk about aikyam and very comfortably talk about beda also. Vyavaharika and paramarthika dristi beda. Paramarthika drishtya jivatma and paramatma refer to upahita chaitanyam and vyavaharika dristya it refers to vishista chaitanyam. Vachyartha drishtya bedah and lakshyartha drishtya aikyam; when you talk of varam it is paramarthika drishya and when you talk of vyavaharika drishtya it is about questions and either way pradhanam is not discussed in the mantras.

Three questions either way whether on the basis of questions or on the basis of varams, it does not make any difference because either way pradhanam is not talked about here. With this sixth sutra is over. Now we will go to the seventh sutra

### **Topic 1; anumanikadhikaranam {sutras 1-7}**

The mahat and avyakta of the kathopanisad do not refer to the samkya tattvas

#### **Sutra 1.4.7 [113]**

#### ***Mahatvaccha***

And [the case of the term avyakta] is like that of the term mahat.

An argument in support of sutra 1 is given. Just as in the case of mahat, avyakta also is used in the vedas in a sense different from that attached to it in the samkya.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here vyasacharya discusses in the upanishad talks about mahat also which is a word used by samkya philosopher. In the upanishad also we have mahat, avyaktam purusah. Samkya philosophers use these three words also. Let us look at the mahat occurring in the mantra. Once we know mahat is used in different meaning from the samkya meaning we can extrapolate the meanings of other two words also. As mahat is different from samkya mahat the word avyakta also different from samkya sabda can be proved. This is the approach of vyasacharya.

Here vyasacharya says it is different from samkya mahat. The word mahat is used in mantra is mahan atma. It is used in 1.3.10 is used as mahan atma and in 1.3.11 of kathopanisad is mahat. Mahan atma is there that focus on the word atma and the word atma can be used in a chetana vastu. Reflective noun can be used only to a conscious entity. Clip will never use the word self. It is achetanam. Only chetanam can use the word self. I self etc is chetana mahat tattvam, which is equivalent to hiranyagarbha principle, which is a chetana tattvam. In samkya mahat is used to inert matter prakriti modification. Samkya mahat is achetanam and vedanta mahat is chetana hiranyagarbha tattvam and the word atma gives the clue to the chetana vastu. If vedanta mahat is different from samkya mahat vedanta avyaktam is also different from samkya avyaktam. Now will go to the word for word analysis.

First we will take the word cha moreover; mahadvad means like the word mahat occurring in 1.3.10 and 1.3.11 of kathopanisad does not reveal samkya pradhanam; moreover like the word mahat occurring in upanishad word avyakta also does not reveal samkya pradhanam 1.3.10 of kathopanisad. The significance of the word cha is another reason added to the reason given in the previous sutra. 'madh' is given in the meaning of comparison. Mahat sabdah eva

avyakta sabda abhi samkya sabda na bodhayati. Adhi sankaracharya gives another example saying that mahan is used for atma also in 1.2.22 of kathopanisad. Here mahan atma refers to brahman itself. Sometimes mahan atma refers to hiranyagarbha sometimes paramatma itself whether it is hiranyagarbha or paramatma it reveals only chetana vastu but does not reveal achetana pradhanam. With this 7<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. This adhikaranam is also over.

The subject matter is the word avyaktam occurring in 1.3.11; samsayah is avyaktam is samkya pradhanam or it is anything else. Purva pakshi says that the word avyaktam reveals samkya pradhanam only. Samkya pradhanam is the basic matter principle, which has got an existence independent of consciousness. It is swatantra achetana tattvam. The support he says that upanishad also uses three words mahat, purusa and avyaktam. Samkya philosophy also uses the three words.

Samkya philosophers assert that the three words relate to pradhanam alone. The word avyaktam refers to the physical body alone which is indicated in ratha chariot imagery. This is the primary approach. The second approach is we can take avyaktam as the basic matter. A compromised version of avyaktam is basic matter or energy which is dependent on consciousness and it does not talk about independent matter. It is paratantra moola prakriti. Whether the first meaning or second meaning we do not accept pradhanam as per samkya philosophy. It is in the appropriate place only. The first adhikaranam is over,

## **Topic 2; chamadhikaranam {sutras 8-10}**

The aja of svetasvatara upanishad does not mean pradhanam.

### **Sutra 1.4.8 [114]**

#### ***Chamasavadavisheshat***

[It cannot be maintained that 'aja' means the pradhanam] because no special characteristic is stated, as in the case of the cup.

An expression from svetasvatara upanishad is now taken up for discussion in support of sutra 1.

The author next refutes another wrong interpretation given by the samkyas of a verse from the svetasvatara upanishad.

I will give you the general introduction to this second adhikaranam. It has three sutras. Here vyasacharya analyses a mantra 4.5 of svetasvara upanishad. The mantra read as *ajam ekam lohita sukhla krsnam bahvih prajah srjamanam sarupah ajo hy eko jusamano'nusete jahaty enam bhukta-bhogam ajo'nyah* the meaning of the mantra is the one unborn, red, white and black who produces manifold offspring similar in form [to herself], there lies the one unborn [male] delighting., another unborn gives her up having had his enjoyment.

It is a well-known mantra often quoted by adhi sankaracharya. Both in brahma sutra and sankara's bashyam many of the svetasvara upanishad mantra is quoted. Many people say the available sankara bashya is not his own. The mantra in question not only occurs in this upanishad but also it occurs in mahanarayana upanishad with slight modification.

Why do we take this mantra for analysis? Samkya philosopher takes this mantra for vedic support for he wants to take independent purusa tattvam and independent prakriti tattvam. This is samkya philosopher aim. They want to say that there is independent consciousness and independent matter and both are reality. It is sat chit and ananda swarupam.

Matter is also defined just as ours. Samkya wants basic support from veda. Vyasacharya is ready to accept purusa as nirgunam and prakriti as sagunam and vyasacharya is not ready to accept both as real. He says purusa is real and prakriti is unreal. For real prakriti samkya philosopher want support and samkya philosopher quotes this mantra in support of their view. In support of their view, they interpret this mantra in four ways.

Samkya philosopher gives one interpretation and three interpretations belong to vedantins. One is not acceptable. In all the interpretation we will focus the word 'aja'. For the word 'aja' there is an adjective lohita shukla krishna; this also we will analyse in detail. Samkya philosopher gives first interpretation of this mantra. He says aja means swatantra prakriti the basic matter which is independent and real. The nature of prakriti is lokita shukla krishna. It means red colour signifies rajo guna; shukla means white colour, which signifies sattva guna and krishna, signifies black or dark colour; samkya philosopher refers to this last one to tamoguna. This prakriti creates many products. It creates many effects.

A karyam is called praja. Karyam according to samkya philosopher is mahat, ahankara, mana, panca bhutani, panca jnanendriyani karmendriyani etc. The products are similar to the cause; the similarity is that all of them are trigunatmakam. Prakriti also trigunatmakam. Karanam is sagunam and karyam also is sagunam. The word aja means jivatma. And ekah ajah means one jivatma and one jivatma means some jivatma.

They go after the prakriti; they serve the prakriti certain jivatma goes after prakriti nourish prakriti and enjoy prakriti and go along with prakriti and undergo samsara and punarbi maranam and punarabi jananam and they go after prakriti and suffer whereas the other intelligent jivas make use of the prakriti intelligently to get all purusarthas and they make use of purusarthas and having got all the purusarthas through prakriti they give up prakriti and they are intelligent people; second set of people use the prakriti intelligently and throw away.

Here the first word aja means swatantra prakriti and second aja means jivatma; prakriti means aja because it is anadhi and birthless. Therefore prakriti is called aja and it is anadhi and similarly jivatma is ajah and jivatma is purusah and also birthless. Aja prakriti aja purusartha and veda talks about samkya philosophy and the we have to vedantic interpretation which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 130

### **Topic 2; chamadhikaranam {sutras 8-10}**

The aja of svetasvatara upanishad does not mean pradhanam.

#### **Sutra 1.4.8 [114]**

#### ***Chamasavadavisheshat***

[it cannot be maintained that 'aja' means the pradhanam] because no special characteristic is stated, as in the case of the cup.

An expression from svetasvatara upanishad is now taken up for discussion in support of sutra 1.

The author next refutes another wrong interpretation given by the samkyas of a verse from the svetasvatara upanishad.

We are in the second adhikaranam of the fourth pada of the second adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam vyasacharya analyses well-known svetasvara upanishad 4.5. In this mantra the word aja is given focus and samkya philosophers say that the mantra reveals pradhanam of samkya philosophy. Vyasacharya establishes that this mantra does not reveal samkya philosophy at all. I said this mantra has four interpretations. Therefore if we get the idea of four interpretations we will get a better idea to appreciate the discussion. I gave you the first interpretation in the last class.

The word aja means birthless one and according to samkya philosophers. Sattva rajas tamoguna prakriti vartate and this prakriti is capable of creating anything and all of them are swarupa and similar to prakriti. This is the interpretation of the first line. Here ekah ajah means a particular jiva. First line aja means jiva and second line aja means jivatma some jivatma runs after birthless prakriti and some other intelligent jivatma do not run after birthless prakriti and make use of the prakriti to gain moksha; he gives up the aja.

Samkya also claims since ekah aja purusa and anyah aja purusa and it is support of atma bahutvam also. The prakriti is trigunatmaga and purusas are many and purusas are beginningless and prakriti is one and prakriti is also beginningless. Some purusa run after prakriti and some makes use of prakriti and attain moksha and get rid of prakriti. Shukla krsihna aja is equal to gunatriya vishishta swatantra pradhanam. This is the first interpretation given by samkya to claim that his claim is backed by sruti pramanam.

The second and third interpretations refer to vedantic interpretation only. Here we also accept aja as prakriti or pradhanam exactly like samkya philosophers. And they say lohita shukla krishna represents three gunas and we also agree with that. Where do we differ. While they say swatantra prakriti, we say it is pratantra prakriti. Swatantra means independent and pratantra means dependent. The first one is samkya and second is vedantic interpretation. There is no controversy in the later three padas.

Adhi sankaracharya gives the third interpretation in this adhikaranam. It is not svetasvara upanishad commentary. According to him aja means paratantra prakriti only. Paratantra means dependent. The word lokita shukla krsihna adhi sankaracharya has taken as three colours and not as three gunas. Lokitam is red shuklam means white and krishna means black means varnatriya vishishta paratantra prakriti.

First interpretation is gunatantra vishishta swatantra prakriti; second interpretation is gunatriya vishishta paratantra prakritih is aja and the third interpretation is varnatriya vishishta paratantra prakriti. Then comes the fourth interpretation, which is given by vyasacharya in this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam interpretation is given by vyasacharya through this sutra. He says aja does not mean prakriti at all.

Aja means bhutatriyam Agni, apah and prithvi. And lohita shukla krishna aja means varnatriyam; here aja means varnatriya vishishta bhutatriyam. For one aja sabda four meanings are given. Of these four interpretation, the third and fourth are given in this adhikaranam.

The first is purva paksa interpretation and second does not occur in this adhikaranam. One three and four are in siddhanti's interpretation. The essence is the upanishad does not support the samkya philosophy. The details of the third and fourth interpretation I give later.

With this general introduction we will go for the general analysis of the first sutra. Vyasacharya says the Svetasvara mantra is very general mantra, which does not specifically support any philosophy. aja the birthless can be taken for anything. Atma can be taken as ajam; Brahma can be taken as ajam; Jivatma can be taken as ajam. How can this be taken as one of samkya philosophy? All philosophers interpret to suit their philosophy. The word lohita shukla Krishna also is very, very general word and it represent three colours. This can be defined in any manner one likes symbolism can be interpreted in any manner they like. Therefore symbolism can be used anything in any manner. There is no vyavastha at all.

The word aja and gokila shukla Krishna there is no norm to define and sastra should be taken as the norm as the mantra occurs in the Vedas. Symbolism should be closer to the sastra. in some places sastra explains symbolism. Where sastric vyakyanam is there, we can take that vyakyanam. Seven types of annam is defined in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. If you go by that samkya has no support at all.

Vyasacharya refers to Brihadharaynaka upanisad example. The word chamaka is a ladle to offer material in the yaga. Second meaning is a vessal. Upanishad talks about a vessal. This comes in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.2.3 says *tadesa sloko bhavati arvagbilascamasa urdhvabudhnaah tasminyaso nihjilam visvarupam tasyasata rsayah sapta tire vagastamt brahmana samvidna iti* the meaning of the mantra is there is a bowl with its opening below and bulging above; in it manifold knowledge has been placed; what does the mantra say. There is a vessal, which is upside down; its bottom is up; it is an upturned vessal and it is filled and manifold glory is there in the vessal. On the sides of the vessal seven rishis are seated. Not only there is eighth rishi is also there. The organ of speech is the eighth rishi. You can interpret this in any manner you like. Please tell me what is upside down vessal full of glory with seven rishis sitting around. We better go by sastra and fortunately Brihadharaynaka upanisad itself explains that. idam sirah eve. Your own head is set upside down; if you cut the head there is an opening at the bottom. The glory is the knowledge received from sense organs; knowledge belongs to the head. It is called visvarupam because

knowledge is also manifold. Prana vai yaso vai yaso visvarupam; the holes are taken as sense organs; prana vai rishayah; Upanishad gives the names of the rishis; since the mouth is eating all the time atri rishi is mentioned. There is no question of right or wrong. We accept it as it is sastra anusari. You interpret ajaha also generally.

Now I will give the word for word analysis. Chamasavat like the cup avisheshat because there is no special characteristic; the word aja in svetasvara Upanishad does not reveal samkyas pradhanam because there are no specific references chamasavat as in the case of chamasa in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.2.3; this is the meaning of the sutra. Aviseshat any specific indication is not there in the mantra itself. Mantra says birthless of what is not defined or specifically mentioned. Which birthless thing aja says we do not know? Gokula shukla Krishna also do not indicate anything except mentioning the colours. Chamsa mantra also does not give any clue. A clueless mantra you cannot define as you wish. When you go by sastra how do you prove that it reveals Vedanta. that we will see in the next sutra.

## **Topic 2; Chamadhikaranam {sutas 8-10}**

The aja of Svetasvatara upanishad does not mean pradhanam.

### **Sutra 1.4.9 [115]**

#### ***Yotirupakrama tu tatha hyadiyata eka***

But [the elements] beginning] with light [are meant by the term aja] because some read so in that text.

This is explanatory to sutra 8.

We will do the general analysis. We said in the previous sutra that the mantra was too general and we have to study sastra further. Wherever doubts are there read the sastra further. Now we have to interpret keeping the interpretation of sastra itself. Adhi Sankaracharya's interpretation is the third interpretation. Adhi Sankaracharya says the word aja means a beginningless entity. Since it is in feminine gender it should refer to prakriti. the question this birthless prakriti is swatantram or para tantram. The mantra does not say anything about it. we cannot blindly take anything to suit our view. In beginning svetasvara mantras give us some clue. 1.3 gives some clue here the idea is that it talks about the power of Brahman by which Brahman is able to create, preserve and resolve the universe. The mantra reads as *tu dhyana yoganutata apasyan devatma sahtim sva gunair nigudhaam yah karanani nihhilani tani balatma yuhtany adhitisthaty etah* those who followed after [were devaoted to] meditation and contemplation saw the Self-power of the divine hidden in its own qualities. He is the one who rules over all these causes from time to the end. That sakti is devatma sakti and later we find the elaboration of that power and that power is said in our sutra as 'aja'. Sakti can never exist independently and sakti has to depend upon saktiman and sakti is never swatantram. Your thinking power cannot exist independent of you. Your speaking power cannot exist independent of you. Hearing faculty cannot exist independent of the hearer. Therefore prakriti being sakti, it can never be swatantra and it is para tantra only. This interpretation is correct because it is based on the same Upanishad itself. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives another mantra of the same Upanishad [4.10] *mayam tu prakrtim viddhi, mayinam tu mahesvaram tasyavayava-bhutais tu vyaptam sarvam idam jagat* the meaning of the mantra is know then that prakriti is maya and the wielder fo maya is the Great Lord. The



whole world is pervaded by beings that are parts of Him. The present mantra is 4.5 and in support of this Adhi Sankaracharya quotes one previous as also later mantra. The purva mantra is 1.3 and 4.10 is the apara mantra. Apara mantra says maya is prakriti and the nature of maya is mahesvarah [called mayi] and is one who controls maya. that mahesvara keeps maya under its control and Isvara means controller; from this mantra we come to know that maya is equal to prakriti and prakriti is under the control of Isvara and therefore prakriti is para tantra and not swatantra prakriti. thus Adhi Sankaracharya concludes aja is para tantra only. lohita shukla Krishna do not refer to gunatriyam but varna triyam. Upanishad talks about the same thing in the same Upanishad. that is Chandogya upanisad there is a mantra 6.4.1 reads as yadagne rohitam rupam tejasastadrupam yacchuklam tadapam yatkrnam tadannasyapagadgneragnitvam vacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam trini rupanityeva satyam which means the red colour of gross fire is from subtle fire, the white colour si from subtle water and the dark colour is from subtle earth. Thus that which constitutes the fireness of fire is gone. All changes are mere words, in name only [i.e., fire is only a name indicating a certain condition]. The three colours are the reality. When fire is gross it has a red colour, which comes from its subtle aspect; but there is also a white colour in it, which comes from the sutle water element. Similarly sometimes it has a dark colour, which comes from the subtle earth element. The Upanishad says in reality fire is nothing beyond these three colours red, white, and black. This proves falsity of the idea of the gross fire. Chandogya upanisad talks about three colours and they represent three elements the red the fire; the white the water and the black represents anna tattvam the Prithvi tattvam. in Chandogya upanisad three element tattvam is talked about. Bhutatriyam is talked about. First is Agni sristi. Adhi Sankaracharya says I will choose bhutatriyam, which has got Upanishad support. Gunatriyam has no Upanishad support. Then comes the problem. three colours belongs to three bhutas only and how do you say that the varnatriyam belongs to Prithvi alone. How Adhi Sankaracharya takes varnatriyam to Prithvi and for that Adhi Sankaracharya says that the bhutatriya has got three colours potentially and therefore lokita shukla Krishna represents bhutatriya only. more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 131

### **Topic 2; Chamadhikaranam {sutras 8-10}**

The aja of Svetasvatara upanishad does not mean pradhanam.

#### **Sutra 1.4.9 [115]**

#### ***Yotirupakrama tu तथा hyadiyata eka***

But [the elements] beginning] with light [are meant by the term aja] because some read so in that text.

This is explanatory to sutra 8.

Now we do the general analysis of sutra 9 of the fourth pada of the first chapter. This is the second sutra of chamasadhikaranam. This sutra analyses svetavatara Upanishad 4.5. the topic discussed in the meaning of the word gokila shukla krishna aja. This samkya philosophers quote this mantra in support of their view while Vyasacharya refutes their argument as seen in the last class. The word aja only means a birthless entity or a she goat. If you take the etymological meaning it is a brithless entity and it is too general entity to take it as birthless. Lokika shukla Krishna is also too general words to take to the support of samkya philosophy. It is a non-specific mantra and it does not give clinching evidence to take it as a swatantra prakriti. since the mantra does not give internal evidences where such evidences are lacking we have to go in for external evidences. Then we have to see the previous or later portions of purva apra vichara we will arrive at the context. The context will give external evidences in interpreting this mantra. How to interpret is given in the second mantra. We get two interpretations the first being Adhi Sankaracharya's interpretation based on contextual support and the other of Vyasacharya. Adhi Sankaracharya said the word aja means maya paratantra prakriti only. it cannot mean swatantra prakriti. What is the reason because we saw two mantras 1.3 and 4.10 of Svetasvara Upanishad mantra talks of paratantra prakriti [dependent] only? Why we say it should refer to paratantra is due to the fact that prakriti is Brahma sakti and we know that sakti has to be paratantra only depending upon sakti man. So Adhi Sankaracharya concluded that aja means paratantra sakti or Brahma sakti. Having interpreted aja as paratantra prakriti Adhi Sankaracharya analyses lokita shukla krsihna should be interpreted on veda mantra alone and he said in Chandogya upanisad 6.4.1 the Upanishad has talked about the three elements having three colours. Varnatriya vishista bhutatriyam is talked about Chandogya upanisad and the above refer to varnatriyam and not guna triyam. The next question is the Chandogya upanisad talks about three colours of elements only bhutani how can Adhi Sankaracharya take the three colours of prakriti. How do you interpret aja as varnatriya vishista bhutatriyam. Adhi Sankaracharya says that it can be very easily interpreted like that. aja is karanam and bhutatriyam is karyam and therefore karanam contains the karyam in potential form as seed contains the tree in potential form. if aja prakriti includes bhutatriyam it should have varna triyam also. bhutatriya rupa karya drishtya varna triyam siddhyadhi. The final meaning of the word is varna triya vishista maya or prakriti. this is the interpretation given by Adhi Sankaracharya. Now we have to go to the interpretation given by Vyasacharya. This is given in sutra 9 and 10. he says aja does not

mean prakriti. According to him aja does not mean swatantra prakriti or para tantra prakriti also. it does not mean maya at all. It means bhutatriyam. The three elements taken as a group is as one principle. Aja is equal to bhutatriyam. Kokila shukla Krishna is varnatriyam. Aja is equal to bhutatriya varna triyam Agni, water and Prithvi. From these three alone all boudhika vastus have emerged. Entire boudhika Prapancha has emerged from aja. We will go to the word for word analysis.

Tu means avadharane verily indeed; jyotrupakrama three elements beginning with fire is the meaning of the word aja; this portion must be in brackets. This is not in the sutra. Eke some vedic followers adhiyate read means they chant; tadahi means so in Chandogya upanisad 6.4.1; in Chandogya upanisad 6.4.1 is supplied idea and it is not there in the sutra.

This word consists of jyotih and upakramah jyotihn means the fire elements and upakrama means etc., and so on. In the etc., we have to include the other two elements jalam and Prithvi. Fire is in the beginning of the group of elements. Fire is in the beginning means he has Chandogya upanisad mantra in his mind. 6.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad *sadeva somyedamagra asidekamevadvitiyam; taddhaika ahurasadevadamagra asidekamevadvitiyam tas madasatah sajjayata* the meaning is somya before this world was manifest there was only existence one without a second; on this subjectsome maintain that before this world was manifest was only nonexistence, one without a second. Out of that non-existence, existence emerged. About the creation of elements, it does not talk about panca bhutani and it talks about three bhutas. In Taittiriya Upanishad, it is said *tasmad-va etasmad-atmana akasah sambhutih, akasad-vayuh, vayor-agnih, agner-apah, adbhyah prthivi, prthivya asadhayah, asadhibhyo-;nnam, annat purusah* it means from that [which is] this Atman is space born; from Akasa air; from ari, fire; from fire, water; from water, earth; from earth, herbs; from herbs food and from food man. That portion we should not bring here and we should bring only the portion of Chandogya upanisad. It talks about teja sristi app sristi and anna sristi means Prithvi sristi. When we talk about the sristi what about upakrama is jyotih. The Upanishad talks about three elements beginning with Agni tattvam and this is the meaning of aja. The reason for such an interpretation is that adjective given in the mantra is lokita shukla krisha. Since adjectives are same the noun also should be the same. Here noun aja should refer to bhutatriyam alone. Bring bhutatriyam from Chandogya upanisad and take aja as bhutatriyam in Svetasvatara Upanishad. the next word is tu and it for emphasis; in the previous sutra he pointed out that the mantra is vague allowing many interpretations. Vyasacharya wants to say that my interpretation alone is correct as it is based on the veda mantra. Veda based interpretation of mind alone is correct. Then the next word is eke means some vaidhikas; Vyasacharya wants to refer to sama veda chanters here. Support is from Chandogya upanisad and therefore eke means samavedinah especially who chant the Upanishad mantra 6.4.1. adhiyate means some read. They chant the mantra tatha hi means as I talk about. As I talk in the way Varnatriya vishishta bhutatriyam. So what I say is correct.

## **Topic 2; Chamadhikaranam {sutas 8-10}**

The Aja of Svetasvatara upanishad does not mean pradhanam.

### **Sutra 1.4.10 [116]**

#### ***Kalpanopadesaccha madhvadivadavirodhah***

And on account of the statement of the assumption [of a metaphor] there is nothing contrary to reason [in Aja denoting the causal matter] as in the case of honey [denoting the sun in Madhu Vidya for the sake of meditation] and similar cases.

The argument in support of sutra 8 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis. Purva paksa raises a question here. He has interpreted as bhutatriyam. I am not saying trini bhutani. I use the word bhutatriyam the group of three elements. We take three elements as one unit. It is because the mantra ajam ekam as mantra specifically state ekam aja. The controversy is about the word aja and how can you take bhutatriyam as aja. Adhi Sankaracharya took aja as paratantra prakriti and aja means birthless. When you take aja as bhutatriyam there is a contradiction. All the three elements are born and how can you use the word aja for ajata bhutatriyam. Vyasacharya asks who said aja means birthless? Vyasacharya says I don't want to take etymological meaning at all and I want to take the popular meaning of aja. Popular meaning is more powerful than etymological meaning. What is the popular meaning of the word aja. Aja means goat. What about ajaa? Ajaa means she goat. In the second line ajah means he goat. The mantra talks about he and she goat. Then purva paksa asks the question what the goats have got to do in the Upanishad. for that Vyasacharya says this is an imagery given. He goat and she goat should be taken as examples because the Upanishad conveys the teachings through imagery. It is kalpana upadesah. Vyasacharya says it is kalpana upadesa mantra. Here Upanishad wants to talk about intelligent jiva and unintelligent jiva and one is compared to one type of he goat and another type to another type of he goat and prakriti is compared to she goat and once she goat is attracted by the he goat and in another male becomes a sannyasi which is not attracted by the sense pleasures. One gets the vairagyam of renouncing the sense pleasures. One example is given in the sutra. Here Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a Chandogya upanisad 3.1.1 and here sun is compared to Madhu honey. The mantra reads as *asu sva adityo devamadhu tasya dyaureva tirascina vamso'ntariksamapupo maricayah putrah* the mantra reads as the sun over there is money to the gods, Heavens is the crossbeam the mid region is the beehive and the rays are the eggs. The sun is honey of gods. There is no connection between sun and honey but it is imagery. In kathopanisad the body is compared to chariot. Similarly jiva is not goat but goat imagery is given. As regard lokita shukla Krishna Vyasacharya says that you imagine lokita shukla Krishna goat. Not only is a she goat with three colours but it has many children also.

Now will go for word for word analysis. Cha is taken first and it means moreover. Kalpanopaesat it means since the teaching is through imagery madhvadivad like honey imagery for the [sun]. avirodhah there is no contradiction. This is the running meaning. now we will see the significance. Kalpana and upadesat it is a compound word. kalpana means imagery and upadesah means teaching. it is teaching through imagery. Kalpanopadesat because of this reason; sadhyam kept in mind is avirodhah is the conclusion for which the reason is kalpanopadesat. Cha means further supportive argument. the next word is madhu adhivad it consists of madhu and adhi. Madhu means honey. He keeps in mind the honey imagery given in 3.1.1. adhi means etc., not only honey imagery is there but also there are many imageries are there. physical body is compared to a tree in some place. As is the case of imageries in various other Upanisads goat imagery should be taken. There is no contradiction if aja is taken as birthless. instead of taking it as birthless we should take it as goatlike three elements there is no contradiction. Purva Paksi's problem is etymologically and Vyasacharya takes the popular meaning. if you take aja as varnatriya vishista prakriti there is no need of goat imagery. Adhi Sankaracharya's interpretation does not require goat imagery. It is taken

as birthless prakriti there is no problem. in the previous problem Avyaktam as body and here he translates aja as goat. Now we will complete the adhikaranam in traditional format.

Vishaya subject matter is aja sabda in svetasvara Upanishad; samsaya is whether ja represents samkya pradhanam or not; does it reveal samkya pradhanam or prakriti. the contention of opponent is that aja reveals beginningless cause of the word and therefore it is beginningless prakriti. lokita shukla Krishna refers to three gunas. Fourth is siddhanta that our conclusion is that word does not reveal samkya prakriti. the reason is because that interpretation is unvedic interpretation. it is not supported by veda because veda does not talk about independent matter. whereas samkya philosopher talks about independent matter. vedic interpretation is two fold which we saw aja must mean varnatriya vishista paratantra prakriti or varnatriya vishishta bhutatriyam. Thus samkya interpretation is wrong. This is the siddhanta. The fifth item is sangathi and the adhikaranam is in appropriate place in the Brahma Sutra. With this second adhikaranam is over and we will take up third adhikaranam in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 132

### **Topic 3; Sankhyopasangrahadhikaranam [Sutra 11-13]**

The five fold five [pancha panchajanah] does not refer to the twenty-five Samkyan categories.

#### **Sutra 1.4.11 [117]**

#### ***Na sankhyapasangrahadapi nanabhavadatirekaccha***

Even from the statement of the number [fivefold five i.e, twenty-five categories by the sruti it is] not [to be understood that the sruti refers to the pradhanam] on account of the differences [in the categories and the excess over the number of the samkyan categories.

This sutra discusses whether the twenty-five principles of the samkyan philosophy are admitted by the sruti.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. this is also a small adhikaranam consisting of three sutras. Here a Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra IV-4.17 is analysed. The mantra reads as *yasmin panca pancajana aksasca pratisthitah; tameva manya atmanam vidvan brahmamrto'mrtam* the meaning of the mantra is that in which the five aggregates and the Akasa rest, that Self alone I believe is the immortal Brahman, knowing which I am immortal. This mantra talks about Nirgunam Brahman, which Brahman is adhistanam for the karya karana Prapancha or vyakta Prapancha or avyakta Prapancha. Having divided into karya karana Prapancha the mantra says Brahman is the adhistanam of both of them and therefore it is different from both. Karya karana vilaksana Brahman. The mantra says that adhistanam Atma is myself. It is clean jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. Then the Upanishad gives the phalasaruti also. One who knows karya karana adhara Brahman becomes immortal. He becomes mukta. The first half talks about karya karana adharah is Brahman and the second half talks of jivatma and Paramatma aikyam and the one who knows that Brahman is immortal. The word panca janah means the karya padhartha the products. Panca panca janah means five fold karya padhartha which represents the entire karya Prapancha. five fold products signifies the entire karya Prapancha. not only the karya Prapancha is based on Brahman and akasah the karana Prapancha avyahruta Prapancha avyakta Prapancha also is based on Brahman. Akasa means one of the five elements is one meaning. Akasa is also avyakrutam the karana Prapancha that is sued on certain context. This is found in Gargy Brahmanam that is Aksara Brahmanam where Akasa is based on the substratum. Here Hiranyagarbha represents karya Prapancha; Akasa represents karana Prapancha and Aksara represents the basis of karya karana Prapancha; any way what I want to say in the context of Aksara Brahmanam Akasa means karana Prapancha. Akasa is also Brahman in certain context. Akasa is one element; Akasa is karana Prapancha and Akasa means Brahman. therefore yasmin Brahmani in Brahman both panca jana karya Prapancha and karana Prapancha are based. Karya Prapancha and karana Prapancha are based on Brahman. that karya karana vilaksanam Brahman is myself. Adhi Sankaracharya in Viveka Cudamani [sloka 260] says *ekameva sadanekakaranam karanantaranirasakaranam karya karana vilaksanam svayam Brahma tattvamasi bhavayatmani* that means that being one

only, is the cause of the multiplicity, superimposed. Itself it is not anything else. It is distinct both from the effect and the cause and exists by itself. That Brahma thou are; meditate on this in thy mind. Or it may be read as that which even though it is one existence is the cause for the many which refutes all others causes but itself is without cause which is distinct from cause and effect and is independent that Brahman thou art; meditate on this in your mind, tam atmanam manye. In the final portion it is said the knower of immortal Brahman becomes Brahman. Thus karya karana vilaksana Brahma aikyam and aikya phalam is the essence of the Brihadharaynaka upanishad mantra. This mantra occurs in the dialogue between Janaka and Yajnavalkya and after every teaching Janaka offers thousand cows. This is part of the rg veda mantra. Why should that mantra appear in this Brahma sutra. Yasmin is not a problem. panca panca jana is the one we focus in this sutra. It is fivefold karya padhartha. According to Advaitin one word is panca and the other word is panca jana, which means karya padhartha. Totally there are two words panca and pancha jana. This is interpretation of Advaitins. Samkya instead taking it as two words they take it as three words. Panca panca and jana. They take this as three words. We are going to say that is not the case. he says if you split in this manner panca panca will mean five fives which means twenty-five and therefore samkya says it means twenty five means samkya philosophy has got twenty five tattvams. The moment he finds twenty five samkya is happy and says that veda talks of samkya darsanam and he twists all other things also to suit him. He says Janaka you take as tattvam. panca panca as pancha vimsadhik. It talks of twenty-five principles of samkya is talked about here. We have discussed this earlier. The top one is Purusa who according to samkya philosophy is karya karana vilaksanah. Then mula prakriti is tattva number two. This is moola karanam. Then he talks about twenty-three products. Mahat tattvam, ahankara tattvam; from ahankara comes sixteen manah, panca jnanendriyani and panca karmendriyani and pancha sookshma bhutani and panca sthoola bhutani all that makes twenty three. Two non-products are mana and ahankara. Samkya says that this represents twenty five tattvam. samkya takes support from the Vedas. Here we will say that panca panca jana as twenty five categories is not acceptable. This is the general introduction. Not only we establish our interpretation but also negate samkya interpretation here.

Now I will enter the general analysis of the first sutra. Here Vyasacharya refutes samkya interpretation by giving two reasons. The first reason is that twenty-five tattvam of samkya cannot be meant here through panca panca. Upanishad uses the word panca panca and you take each group consisting of five members of five group. Vyasacharya argues that twenty-five tattvams cannot be made into five groups. If you are making into five groups each group should have some common factors. The twenty-five tattvam how can you make it five groups. Four groups you can manage panca jnanendriya, panca karmendriyani, panca sthoola bhutani and panca sookshma bhutani four groups are there and mana and ahankara will not form any group. Each member is distinct not allowing to form themselves to form a group. Therefore panca panca twenty-five tattvam and his group consist of four only. The first group consists of one Purusa; the uniqueness of Purusa is it is neither karanam nor karyam; the second is moola prakriti that is moola karanam it is only a cause; the third group consist of seven members they are mahat, ahankara, panca sookshma bhutani; they happened to be effects also and also happens to be the cause karya karana upayatmakam; from one angle they are products and from another they are karanam; then he talks about another group of sixteen are manah, panca jnanendriyani and panca karmendriyani and panca sthoola bhutani; and the unique characteristics is that they are all born and from them no tattvam is created. This grouping is done by samkya philosopher themselves. When you have made four groups of different numbers how can you call it panca panca. This is argument number one.

Next one is that we ask them to interpret the sutra. Samkya takes panca panca. We ask them to take the whole sloka. Panca panca refers to twentyfive principle. This is based on Atma. So the sloka talks about Atma, which is adhara of twenty-five principles. Not only those twenty-five tattvams are discussed but also Akasa is talked about. Twenty-five principles and Akasa are based on Atma. Now in this sloka twenty-seven tattvas are there. Where is samkya philosophy here. There are further problem also. In twenty-five tattvam Akasa is included or not. Akasa is included. Panca bhutani means Akasa is included. In twenty-five tattvam Atma is also included. How can the Upanishad say twenty-five tattvam and Akasa are based on Atma. Therefore how can Atma support twenty-five. Can you avoid by saying twenty-five talk about Jivatma and adhistanam talk about Paramatma. Unfortunately samkya do not have the concept of Paramatma. This is the second dosha. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will go word for word analysis. Because of severality ca adhirekat and excess na there is no vedic support for samkya; sankyopasangrahat api in spite of the mention of the numbers in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.17; this is the running meaning nana bhavat means severalty; what Vyasacharya intends is their incapacity to form into five groups. Nana bhava means not being able to make in groups; na is the sadhyam the next word is cha which means and this is to add the second reason. Then adhirekat means excess. The significance of the word excess is if you go by samkya explanation it will talk of twenty-seven tattvam and there will be excess of two Akasa and atmanam; then the next word is na means there is no vedic support. Samkya darsanam na vaidhikam. His interpretation is against the vedic interpretation. samkyaha uasangrahat the numbers mentioned by the Vedas; vedic mention of panca panca number. Api means in spite of; joining these words we get the meaning in spite of vedic mention of number in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.7 you do not have vedic support. This is the analysis of the first sutra.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives further reasons also. first he says samkya's splitting of the words into three words is improper. Panca panca jana; our splitting is panca pancajanah. Adhi Sankaracharya says when you split panca panca jana panca as five-second panca as five and jana as tattvam. panca is numeral adjective. Second panca is also numeral adjective. Third is noun tattvam; samkya takes first adjective as qualifying second panca and make it twenty-five. Adhi Sankaracharya says adjective should qualify nouns alone and adjectives are dependent one and nouns are independent one. one dependent one cannot dependent upon another dependent one. Therefore if you split the first five should qualify jana and second panca jana will make only ten and not twenty-five. Opposite of upasarjanam is pradhanam. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 133

### **Topic 3; Sankhyopasangrahadhikaranam [Sutra 11-13]**

The five fold five [pancha panchajanah] does not refer to the twenty-five Samkyan categories.

#### **Sutra 1.4.11 [117]**

#### ***Na sankhyapasangrahadapi nanabhavadatirekaccha***

Even from the statement of the number [fivefold five i.e, twenty-five categories by the sruti it is] not [to be understood that the sruti refers to the pradhanam] on account of the differences [in the categories and the excess over the number of the samkyan categories.

This sutra discusses whether the twenty-five principles of the samkyan philosophy are admitted by the sruti.

We have completed sutra 1.4.11 of the first chapter fourth pada and Vyasacharya has refuted samkya approach through Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 4.4.17. Here the controversial portion as whether panca panca jana should be taken as three or two words. Samkya took panca panca to indicate samya tattvas and he wanted veda pramanam to his philosophy. He gave the reason also if taken as twenty-five tattvams Samkya has to divide into five group which is not available for grouping into five. If the first portion itself refers to twenty-five tattvams and adding Akasa and Atma totaling 27 the samkya interpretation is incorrect. I gave some more interpretation of Adhi Sankaracharya. The first argument that if panca panca janah is taken in this manner and panca and panca are taken the first panca is to be taken as adjective and it can qualify another noun only and the first panca cannot qualify for the second panca and it can qualify for the jana only and if it is taken as three words there will be two adjective and one noun and in that case there will be only ten and not 25 tattvams. To get twenty five the first panca should qualify the second panca which is grammatically incorrect and not possible. Hence samkya argument that the Upanishad talks of 25 tattvam is not correct.

Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives second argument also. If panca and panca are taken to mean twenty five the word jana the word referring to tattvam. It cannot be people and samkya is to interpret that the word represent tattvam. If it is taken as tattvam it can be taken as 25 tattvam assuming that first panca and second panca is twenty five. The I will ask you the question where is the word tattvam or principle occurring in the mantra for which samkya will have to answer the word jana means tattvam. Adhi Sankaracharya argument meant even if panca panca is taken as 25 the word jana is tattvam. It is too wild an imagination to fit it to your philosophy. Because of the two reasons panca panca jana cannot be taken as three words.

Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives two arguments in favour our interpretation. It should be taken as two words. The first word is panca and second is pancajanah and we have to form pancajana a compound word. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes by giving two arguments.

The first argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives is that from the study of swaras of the mantra we come to know that pancajana exists as a compound word in this mantra according to the rules of vedic mantra accent. Adhi Sankaracharya says when we apply a particular sutra pancajana is one word pancajana.

The second argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives to show that pancajana is compound word there is vaidhika prayoga sabda. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes taittiriya yajur veda mantra and rg veda mantra that is vedic usages to show that panca jana is a compound word. Therefore samkya splitting is acceptable to us.

### **Topic 3; Sankhyopasangrahadhikaranam [Sutra 11-13]**

The five fold five [pancha panchajanah] does not refer to the twenty-five Samkyan categories.

#### **Sutra 1.4.12 [118]**

#### ***Pranadayo vakyaseshat***

[The panchajanah] or the five people referred to are] the vital force etc., [as is seen] from the complementary passage.

The sutra is explanatory to Sutra 11

First we will do the general analysis. In the previous sutra we have concluded that panca jana sabda as compound word and now the question is what is the meaning of this compound word. We apply another panini sutra which is applicable to compound formation. According to the when a compound word is formed and this rule come into being when the first word of the compound is a number or a direction and when a compound word is formed. The compound word itself will become another noun and the number will lose its numeral significance.

The example given is sapta rishi. Seven rishi is the meaning. Sapta means a number; rishi means sages. Once you form a compound sapta rishi, the sapta rishi itself will become a noun another pathartha that is a particular group of rishies. Thus Vishista is a sapta rishi. Brigu is a sapta rishi. The word sapta has lost its significance. You may ask the question how many sapta rishis are there. And our answer will be seven sapta rishis are there. We will also say Visvamisra is not a sapta rishi.

Applying this rule pancajana is a new samjna a new noun referring to new padhartha. The word panca has no numerical significance. Panca panca jana means five padharthas are there. They are five karya padharthas are there. Now our discussion is if panca jana is a new padhartha what is that padhartha. Padhartha can be anything. Vyasacharya gives the answer in this sutra. He says that it refers to five padhartha mentioned in the very same mantra in the right context.

In the next mantra five organs are mentioned i.e, the next to the mantra which we discuss here i.e., 4.4.18 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The mantra reads as *pranasya pranamuta caksusascaksuruta srtrasya srotam manaso ye mano viduh; te nicikyurbrahma puranamagryam* the meaning of the mantra is those who know the vital breath [prana] of the

vital breath, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, kthe mind of the mind have realized the ancient, primordial Brahman. This panca refers to five organs such as prana, eye, ear, manah and annam; therefore Vyasacharya concludes that panca jana refers to five organs alone which are supported by Atma. The Atma is the substratum of panca jana.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis. Pranadayah means prana etc., are the five panca janas or the five pancajanah. Vakya seshat because of the next or latter mantra; prana caksur, manah and annam etc. The significance of the word pranadaya and vakyaseshat; pranah and adhi esam te panca janah pranadayah padharthah panca janah bhavanti. Prana means prana adhi means etc., this etc., is filled from the next mantra 4.4.18, which begins with pranasya prana etc., then vakya seshat is a compound word vakya is one word and seshat is another word which means because of the subsequent verse; vakya means section here in this context.

Sesha means the following left out portion; the final meaning is taken as the next mantra of the subsequent text. Because of the support of the subsequent text we come to know that the panca jana is but the five organs of the individual. There is a problem here. When you study the next mantra 4.4.18 purva paksha says we do not see five organs at all. If you look into the mantra there is a problem. Here only four items are mentioned prana, caksu, mana and srorta and how do you say panca pancajanah. There are only four pancajanah.

There are two versions of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. It occurs in two branches one is kanva saka and another is madhyantina saka. Of these two Adhi Sankaracharya has commented the kanva saka of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. For madyantina saka vidyaranya has written a commentary. Both are more or less the same except a few addition and deletion. Sometimes the two branches help us solve the problem. We go to madyantina saka 4.4.18 annam is included and in kanva saka annam is missing.

Then comes another question and if you go by madyantina saka you get five organs are mentioned. Fro this Vyasacharya gives an alternative method which we will read now.

### **Topic 3; Sankhyopasangrahadhikaranam [Sutra 11-13]**

The five fold five [pancha panchajanah] does not refer to the twenty-five Samkyan categories.

#### **Sutra 1.4.13 [119]**

#### ***Jyotishaikeshamasatyanne***

In the text of some [the Kanva recension] where food is not mentioned [the number five is made up] by light [mentioned in the previous verse].

The argument in support of Sutra 11 is continued.

Now I will give you general analysis. Here kanva saka only four panca janas are mentioned. Vyasacharya says look around a little bit more. He says you see the previous mantra. There we get one more thing that 4.4.16 which reads as *yasmadarvak samvatsaro'hobhah parivartate; taddeva jyotisam jyotirayurhopasatemrtam* the meaning of the mantra is below

which the year with its days revolves upon that immortal light of all lights the shining ones meditate as longevity.

In this mantra second line there is a reference to the word jyotih the tejas tattvam. Take jyotih from the previous mantra and another four from the subsequent mantra and thus five pancajanas are mentioned. This is the general analysis.

Now I will do the word for word analysis. Ekesham for some people the number is made up jyotisha by the light ane asati since food is not mentioned. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Ekesam means some people and he refers to those who follow kanva saka of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; the next word is jyotisah by the light the number is made by the light; with jyoti the number becomes five; this jyoti we get from the previous mantra 4.4.16 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The annam being not there jyoti of the previous manta is taken to make up panca jana. This is the word meaning.

Adhi Sankaracharya adds a few more notes, which I will give you here. I said previously that Adhi Sankaracharya refers to compound panca jana used elsewhere in Vedas. One is Taittiriya samhita panchanatva panca jananam the word panca jana sabda in the meaning of the celestials. Hence Adhi Sankaracharya says there is nothing wrong in taking panca panca jana as five types of heavenly celestials deva, pitru, gandharva, yaksa, raksa are the fivefold celestials of panca jana.

The same expression occurs in rg veda samhita also yad panca janyah visha; in his context the word panca jana is used as five types of human being. In this mantra panca pancajana means five types of human beings they are brahmana, ksatriya, vysya, sudra and nishada the type of people born out of mixed marriage. Panca jana means organs, celestials or human beings. Fivefold karya Prapancha is meant by panca panca janah. Thus this mantra does not support samkya philosophy. With this, this adhikaranam is also over.

We have completed 13<sup>th</sup> sutra. Now we will take up present this adhikaranam in technical format. Subject matter is the expression panca pancajana occurring in 4.4.17 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; samsaya, the controversy is whether this expression talks about tattvas of samkya philosophy or not; purva paksa and purva paksa namely samkya philosopher says does talk about samkya tattvas alone because panca panca repeated twice reveals twenty five tattvas and take jana as the third word; jana means tattvani; because of this view samkya philosopher says his philosophy has got the vedic support; Siddhanta says that this expression does not talk about twenty-five tattvas at all. And we say that the expression should be split into two words and this expression refers to fivefold karya Prapancha and not twenty-five tattvas indicated by the word pancajana. Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya gave enough reasons in support of their argument. The main purpose is over by the first sutra and the second and third are incidental sutras explaining our interpretation. Since this expression does not confine to tattvas and samkya is avaidhikam only it is stated. Samkya believes in veda pramanam but his teaching is not in harmony with vedic teaching and therefore Vedanta is correct and not samkya philosophy. Sangathi is that the adhikaranam occurs in the appropriate place only. Having completed we will enter the fourth adhikaranam.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 134

### **Topic 4; karanatvadhikaranam [Sutra 14-15]**

Brahman is the first cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.14 [120]**

#### ***Karanatvena chakasadishyu yathavyapadishtokteh***

Although there is a conflict of the Vedanta texts as regards the things created such as ether and so on, there is no such conflict with respect to Brahman as the First cause on account of His being represented in one text as described in other texts.

The doubt that may arise from sutra 13 that different srutis may draw different conclusions as to the cause of the universe is removed by this sutra.

In the preceding part of the work the proper definition of Brahman has been given. It has been shown that all the Vedanta texts have Brahman for their common topic. It has been proved also that there is no scriptural authority for the doctrine of the pradhana. But now the samkya raises a new objection.

First I will give a general introduction to this adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam also samkya philosopher is refuted. In the previous adhikaranam samkya wanted to take vedic support and Vyasacharya successfully refuted their argument. Here samkya has turned against and say to Vedantins that you also don't have vedic support. We said Brahman is the central theme of the Vedantic teaching in the second, third and fourth adhikaranams in the first pada. This jagat karanam Brahman that is revealed by Vedanta should be known for gaining liberation. Jagat karanam Brahma alone is consistently talked about in Vedanta. There is an expression samanvay. Now samkya philosopher is going to attack that your Brahman is never been consistently revealed as jagat karanam Brahman. He says that there is inconsistency with regard to jagat karanam and there are other things also mentioned as jagat karanam. Since there is no consistency he says Brahman cannot be taken as jagat karanam. Hence he says that you don't have the support of Vedas. Since veda pramanam is not supporting either, we have to go to tarka or logical support. Then he says that I am a better tarkavadi. Pradhanam alone will be established as jagat karanam and not Brahman as the jagat karanam. Material cause should always be material and material is achetanam and any amount of logic you use and achetana karana vada only will stand logical stand. Your support is veda pramanam and once you come to tarka he says I am strong and achetana karana vadha will be established. He want to prove that there is inconsistency with regard to jagat karanam Brahman. The vishaya vakyam is all the sristi vakyams dealing with creation are to be taken up for discussion.

The sriti vakyam kept in mind are; the first one is 2.1.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad which reads as *om Brahma vid apnoti Param, tadesa'bhyukta satyam jnanam anantam Brahma yo veda nihitam guhayam parame vyoman so'snute sarvan Kaman saha brahmana vipasciteti*. We

find from this mantra that from the Self sprang Akasa from Akasa the ari etc. This passage shows that the cause of creation is Atman.

The next example is 6.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *sadeva somyedamagra asi* before the world was manifest there was only existence one without a second. 1.4.7 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad starts as *taddhedam tarhyayakrtamasit*, which means that the universe was then unmanifested. It manifested itself only as name and form. 2.7.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad again reads as *asad-va idam agra asit* which means in the beginning was verily this non-existence. From that the existent was born. That created itself by itself. It is called the Self-made, or the well made. If you take all the five statements you will find five material causes are mentioned. First one says Brahman is jagat karanam. Second one says Atma is jagat karanam. Third one says sat is jagat karanam in Brihadharaynaka upanisad it says avyakrutam is jagat karanam and in the Taittiriya Upanishad the karanam is said to be asat. You talk about consistency and are you not ashamed so asks samkya philosopher. First two are chetana tattvam; third one we do not know chetanam or achetanam we are not sure; fourth one is achetana karanam and fifth one says nonexistence is the cause of the creation. Where is the question of consistency in the Upanishad. Then how can you call Brahman is jagat karanam. Now for inconsistency the samkya says viganam means opposite of samanvay or disharmony or disagreement for inconsistency with regard to jagat karanam. Therefore Brahman is not jagat karanam. Therefore that is not the subject matter of veda and therefore you come to tarka and I win says samkya philosophers. The entire first chapter of Brahma Sutra we heavily leaned on sastra pramanm and hence opponents think that we are weak in tarka. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. The answer that there is no inconsistency at all and there is no viganam or virodha. There is no asamanvaya. All sristi vakyam talk about Brahman only as jagat karanam. You got confused because the words are different but you should know that all the words refer to Brahman only. The first statement says Brahman is the karanam. Taittreya vakyam the word Atma is Brahman only. Atma cannot refer to Jivatma but it refers to Paramatma only. Jivatma is created only after. Jivatma came after sristi only and hence it means Paramatma before Paramatma remained even before creation. That Paramatma alone created the universe. So the creation process continued. Atma was there before creation means it is Paramatma only. Chandogya upanisad mantra says that sat refers to Brahman only because later in the discussion it says tat sathyam saha Atma. Tad sathyam means which tat the original cause and that sathyam is nothing but Atma. It does not say Brahman. Tad sathyam it is said but elsewhere it is said sathyam jnanam anantam Brahman it is said and from this it is derived sathyam is Brahman alone. Sat the jagat karanam is chetanam alone. Only samkya pradhanam cannot visualize because it is achetanatvad. My Brahman can visualize because it is chetanam. The avyakrutam is Brahman only and not prakriti. Not it is jada prakriti and avyakrutam is Brahman because if you study Upanishad says avyakrutam alone enters every body and experiences the world that means avyakrutam is chetanam Brahman alone. Avyakrutam means un-manifest and therefore Brahman is known as avyakrutam. Therefore Brahman alone is mentioned. Taittiriya Upanishad says asat means Brahman alone in which world is in potential form. Asat will be discussed in more detail. The word asat is used for Brahman because Brahman before creation was nbot available for vyavahara. When something is not available for vyavahara it is un-manifest form and it is not available 'as though'. The ghee is there in un-manifest form in milk. But he says the ghee is not there although he has milk. In the milk ghee is there in un-manifest form. It is there but since that ghee is not ready for vyavahara we say that ghee

is not there. So also the case with Brahman. There is no viganam and my philosophy is vaidhikam alone.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. The word karanatvena we will read twice. Yathan vyapadishta because of the mention of the same Brahman; karanatvena as the cause akasathisu with regard to space etc., na cha there is no inconsistency at all; here the word inconsistency is supplied additionally; karanatve that is the addition with regard to causal status of Brahman; sutra is because of the mention of the same Brahman as the cause with regard to space etc., with regard to the causal state of Brahman.

Karanatvena is to be read twice. First it is one word and the second time it is karanatva and na. Cha indicate the purva paksha nirakatka the negation by purva paksha. Akasathisu means with regard to the creation of the space etc., the creation is understood; siddhanti also agree with the statement Akasa etc. Brahman is the karanam; yatha vyapadista ukteh; it means the same entity. It means as in one Upanishad so in other Upanishad also; it means samanam the same; the same means the same Brahman pointed out in our examples as above. Ukteh means mentioned. Thus the first sutra refutes viganam.

#### **Topic 4; karanatvadhikaranam [Sutra 14-15]**

Brahman is the first cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.15 [121]**

#### ***Samakarshat***

On account of the connection [with passages treating of Brahman, non-existence does not mean absolute non-existence].

Some texts from the Taittiriya, the Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad are taken up for discussion.

We will do the general analysis. In this sutra Vyasacharya particularly deals with taittiriya vakyam asatva idam agra asit. Vyasacharya deals with this mantra taking the word asat Brahman appears to be far fetched. We can take sat as Brahman all right and how can I take 'asat' as Brahman. Vyasacharya says context supports my interpretation. He says do not take the statement out of context. When you take the statement out of context the statement is terrific. The Taittiriya Upanishad wanted to teach Brahman and later Brahman was revealed as Atma panca kosa vilaksana atma. Then in the sixth anuvaka the section of the same valli, Upanishad strongly warns that Brahman should not be taken as 'asat' and be taken as 'sat' only. From this it is very clear that Brahman is not existence at all. If you study further it is not non-existent at all. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 135

### **Topic 4; Karanatvadhikaranam [Sutra 14-15]**

Brahman is the first cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.15 [121]**

#### ***Samakarshat***

On account of the connection [with passages treating of Brahman, non-existence does not mean absolute non-existence].

Some texts from the Taittiriya, the Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad are taken up for discussion.

We do the general analysis of the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra the second sutra of this adhikaranam. Here samkya philosopher wants to say that Vedantins also does not have the support of veda pramanam. I may not have veda pramana support and you also don't have veda pramana support according to me. On the analysis of sruti vakya Brahman cannot be jagat upadana karanam. There is inconsistency in sruti vakyam. There is disagreement and inconsistency and he gave several sruti vakyas in support of his argument. This we discussed in the last class. In the first sutra Vyasacharya established that there is no viganam. Even though words are different, all of them represented only Brahman alone. Even the word asat is Brahman. Now purva paksa partially accepted Vyasacharya conclusion had difficulty in accepting asat as Brahman. This word occurs in Taittiriya Upanishad. To answer the doubt of purva paksa, Vyasacharya writes this sutra. Vyasacharya means that you have to arrive at the meaning of asat from the flow of the teaching and that will give you the context and the context will give the right meaning. This we saw in the last class. The very title is based on Brahman alone. It is also said that Brahman alone is Atma residing in the cave of the heart etc. Then the Upanishad talks about the recognition of jagat karanam Brahman through panca kosa vivekah. Then at the end of fifth anuvahda Upanishad said that Brahman should never be taken as 'asat'. And the Upanishad strongly condemns those people who take Brahman as 'asat' and in fact those who talk Brahman as asat, the Upanishad says that person is 'asat'. Then Upanishad talks about the creation. The student asks some doubt and once again jagat karanam Brahman is introduced. In the Taittiriya Upanishad jagat karanam is discussed throughout the Upanishad. Then it has positively criticized that this Brahman should not be taken as asat at all. From this it is very clear that the Upanishad confuses. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya argues if the sruti uses the word asat it must be in different meaning. Sruti has said that Brahman cannot be nonexistent. If the same Upanishad introduces asat, means asat is taken in different meaning. Previous negation is in the meaning of nonexistent and if that is so then it must be given a different meaning. So Adhi Sankaracharya says that asat means avyavakaram principle. Word asat has two meaning which is criticised in 5<sup>th</sup> anuvaka. The next is karanam avyakta tattvam in the 7<sup>th</sup> anuvaka. If you understand Brahman is the subject matter, 7<sup>th</sup> anuvaka also discusses Brahman alone. The flow supports that in seventh anuvaka asat means only the un-manifest Brahman alone. Some may argue that topic may have changed from first to seventh chapter. If you study the last sentence of 5<sup>th</sup> anuvaka, tad apy



sloko bhavati says that the next para talks about the same Brahman, which is talked in the earlier chapter. You cannot claim the seventh anuvaka talks differently. That asat cannot be non-existent is our conclusion from the flow of the topic.

Asatva idam agra asit it means was existing. If asat means non-existence before the creation nonexistence was in existent. It is contradiction. Because of the presence of asit the verb does not refer to nonexistence but it refers to the existence in un-manifest form. Here the ghee example is given, potential ghee is as though non-existence. This is the second argument. The verb asit indicates that the verb asat is not nonexistence.

In Chandogya upanisad 6.2.2 positively condemns nonexistence as jagat karanam. Some people claim nonexistence is jagat karanam but it cannot be and Upanishad clearly negates the nonexistence is jagat karanam. Thus we conclude the word asat means Brahman alone in un-manifest form. Thus the vedic support is there for us.

Now I will give you the word meaning. Samakasrsat because of reference to Brahman the word asat in Taittiriya Upanishad 3.7 does not mean non-existence. In this because of the reference to Brahman is sutra artha and the rest are in brackets. It is difficult to literally comment the sutra. Here Brahma is mentioned and you draw that Brahman and give that meaning for the word 'asat' or because of the reference to Brahman.

I will discuss one more topic before concluding the sutra. Vyasacharya discusses the consistency of jagat karanam Brahman. The consistency is that all Upanishad uniformly refer to Brahman although different names are used to denote Brahman. Now Adhi Sankaracharya introduces another purva paksa. Purva paksa is samkya philosopher himself. There may be consistency with regard to karanam Brahman. If you study the process of creation in the Upanishad there is differences with regard to the arrival of the creation. Karanam and karyam put together is called sristi. Since karanam part there is consistency but there is inconsistency with regard to karyam. Wherever there is viganam karanam goes away. He says the creation in any Upanishad. In some it is krama sristi and in some it is akrama sristi and in some other places it is vikrama sristi. There is gradation from subtle to gross creation. After the creation of bhuta Prapancha and then there is creation of boudhika Prapancha. It is beautifully graded creation. Three elements are mentioned in Chandogya upanisad. This is called krama sristi. In other Upanishads we find everything simultaneously appearing as in dream. Brahman became everything and there is no order at all. In some Upanishad the creation we find in reverse order. After boudhika sristi the Upanishad talks about bhuta sristi. This is the purva paksa introduced by Adhi Sankaracharya even though this topic is not there in the sutra. He gives two answers.

There is no inconsistency in karyam also. This is established in the second chapter of Brahma sutra 2.3.1 and Vyasacharya establishes in karyam also. The second answer Adhi Sankaracharya gives is that let us assume there is inconsistency with regard to the order of creation and even if there is inconsistency there is no defect at all. The Upanishad is not interested in the order of creation at all. Sruti is not serious about teaching the creation or the order of the creation because creation means dvaidam and sruti does not have the intention of teaching creation. The tatparyam is not in Dvaidam and not in sristi. In the beginning and end the Upanishad talks of Advaidam only. It begins with Advaidam and ends with Advaidam and in the middle Dvaidam comes as a passing phase. It negates sristi, as it is not a valid thing. What is negated later cannot be really there. Similarly repetition is karanam Brahman and not karyam Brahman. Even without sruti we know Dvaidam. There is no teaching needed

for dvaidam darsanam. Advaidam alone is new and we need Vedas to learn. For sristi jnanam no phalam is mentioned. If you see glorification sristi is never glorified. On the other hand sristi is condemned. Dvaidam sristi is condemned and finally logic also supports that karya Prapancha is mithya and Upanishad does not teach the mithya vasthu. Thus all the tatparya linga reveals sristou tatparya nasti. In maths class the teacher asked the student if one pencil costs fifty paise what will be the cost of fifty pencils. To this one student asked the cost of pencil is two rupees and not fifty paise. One should know the aim of the maths class is to know the arithmetics and not see the price of the pencil is right or wrong. In the same way in Vedanta what we are interested is the Brahma jnanam and not the incidental jnanam of the sristi. Tatparyam is Brahma jnanam and sruti is not interested in five elements or three elements etc. Sruti does not have any tatparyam in sristi. The sruti does not have tatparyam why introduce the sristi at all. For that our answer sristi is introduced as a means and not an end in itself. This topic is beautifully analysed in advaida prakaranam of Mandukya Upanishad. Sristi is not for establishing sristi but to reveal the adhistanam Brahman. When they want to build a floor we have the supporting bamboo. You introduce the bamboos for the setting of the floor and once the floor is set the bamboos are removed and you don't decorate it. You need bamboo for construction of the floor. Introduction of bamboo is adhyaropah and removal of bamboo is apavadah. In the same way introduction of sristi is adhyaropah and negation of sristi is apavadhah. If there is inconsistency in sristi it is not a defect in Advaida and it is only favourable to Advaidam. So Vedanta supports the Advaidam alone and not dvaidin samkya.

Now we will sum up the five factors. The subject matter is sristi vakyani. Jagat karana Brahma bodhaka vakyani is the vishaya. The doubt is whether there is consistency in revealing jagat karanam. Then purva paksha says there is inconsistency in Brahman status because several Upanishad uses several words. Siddhanta says that there is no inconsistency and it is 'seeming inconsistency' and all Upanishad reveal that chetanam is karanam. Vedanta alone talks of the 'Consciousness as the material cause' of the universe. Normally we think that matter is material cause and Vedanta alone has the unique teaching chetana jagat karanam. Not only words are differently used and in some Upanishad other words are used yet the adhistanam is Brahman whatever the word is used for jagat karanam. Sangathi is that this adhikaranam occurs in its appropriate place alone. We will see the next adhikaranam in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 136

### **Topic 5; Balakyadhikaranam [Sutra 16-18]**

He who is the maker of the sun, moon, etc., is Brahman and not prana or the individual soul.

#### **Sutra 1.4.16 [122]**

#### **Jagadvachitvat**

[He whose work is this is Brahman] because [the work] denotes the world.

A passage from the Kaushitaki Upanishad is now taken up for discussion.

Having refuted the samkya philosophy in the four adhikaranam, Vyasacharya shows that Brahman alone is subject matter of Vedanta. Now we enter the fifth adhikaranam and it consists of only three sutras and here Vyasacharya analyses a mantra from Kaushitaki Upanishad which belongs to rg veda. The mantra taken is from fourth chapter. The fourth chapter of the Upanishad is in the form of Gargya Ajata Satru samvadha. This samvadha is almost the repetition of Gargya Ajata Satru samvadha of Brihadharaynaka upanisadm second chapter. In this samvadha 19<sup>th</sup> mantra is taken for analysis.

The part of the mantra 19 taken up for discussion is *yo vai balaka etesam purusanam karta yasya vai tat karma*. Now we will see the background and the meaning of the mantra. The chapter begins with Gargya approaching Ajata Satru who has got another name Balaki. That is why the adhikaranam is known as Balakiadhikaranam. We had a similar adhikaranam before. There we analysed the third chapter of Kaushitaki Upanishad. {Pratardanadhikaranam} in both the places the adhikaranam is based on the name of the student. This Balaki was not only learned but had the half knowledge. He was arrogant also. An ignorant person there is no problem. Totally learned person also there is no problem. Balaki was not fully learned and he was arrogant. This Balaki went to Kasi raja. He told him that he would teach him Brahman. Ajata Satru had a problem. During Ajata Satru time Janaka maharaja was popular as wise jnani. Ajata Satru was feeling a bit. Therefore Ajata Satru says even before balaki started teaching raja asked his servants to give thousand cows to Balaki. Ajata Satru himself was a learned scholar. Unfortunately Balaki begins his teaching he introduces adhithya devata as Brahman for he did not know Nirgunam Brahman. He knew only limited Brahman and he thought all devata was Brahman. Balaki says I meditate adhithya Purusa as Brahman. Ajata Satru says adhithya is not total Brahman but he is a partial Brahman. Then balaki introduces many devatas and at the end of every devata introduction Ajata Satru says it is only soupadhika Brahman and karya Brahman and not Nirgunam Brahman. After ten or eleven devatas Balaki exhausted all devatas and he kept silence. And then Ajata Satru asked only that much he knew and raja says that he knew only karya Brahma and he did not know karana Brahman. The raja said that you wanted to teach Brahman but you have taught partial Brahman and not total Brahman. The Ajata Satru says that everything changed and he accepted Balaki as his sishya and he began teaching Balaki Brahma Vidya. A ksatriya accepted a brahmana as his sishya. The Ajata Satru says I shall teach you the real Brahman. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad both of them go together to a

sleeping person and they wake him up and there is an analysis of sleeping person and Brahman is taught in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and the same thing is repeated in Kaushitaki Upanishad. Just before going to sleeping person Ajata Satru gives an introductory statement and this introductory statement is the vishaya vakyam of this adhikaranam. This is the background to this adhikaranam.

What he says is yo vai balake saha vedi tavyah if you want to know Brahma you should know karanam Brahman and not karyam Brahman like adhithya devata etc., and what is the glory of karanam Brahman is not adhitya devata or chandra devata but karanam Brahman is the creator of all the devatas. He is adhi purusanam. Know the creator of adhithya devata and not adhithya devata. You should know that karanam Brahman whose creation is the entire universe. Karma means creation in this context. Etad means this prathyaksa jagat this visible universe or the objective universe. That jagat karana Paramatma you should know and that is Paramatma. Sarva devata karanam Brahman jagat karanam Brahman.

Now the question is what is controversy here. The problem is that the word Paramatma or Brahman is not mentioned in this mantra. Mantra uses the pronoun. Saha veditavyah. He is to be known and who is 'He'. That He is vaguely mentioned as Brahman and not distinctly. The word karma is also vague. The word etad is pronoun. The word saha is pronoun. The word karta is producer. So what is subject matter to be known is presented in this adhikaranam. Our conclusion is that saha means Paramatma alone; purva paksa will take other stand which we will see in due course. Here we will see siddhanta portion.

Now we will see general analysis of this sutra. Through this sutra Vyasacharya establish saha means jagat karanam Brahman. Karma means creation. Etad means this universe. You should know that Paramatma whose creation is this universe. Mantra talks about the creator of this universe alone and creator of universe means Brahman alone is the creator of universe and none else. So we conclude that the creator has to be Brahman.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis. Jagat vachitvat. Since the mantra refers to the universe Brahman is the object of knowledge. Here Brahman is the object of knowledge is not said in the sutra and therefore we have to supply within bracket. Now we will see the analysis of the words. Jagat means this universe and vachi means referring to. The word karma occurring in the vishaya vakyam is jagat vachi. Since the word creation refers to the universe the Upanishad is talking about the universe as the creation as the subject matter and if the creation is by somebody and that somebody has to be Brahman alone. Hence this refers to Brahman. Purva paksa argues that you have interpreted karma as creation. If the word karma is taken as creation then it refers to Brahman. Purva paksa argues in which dictionary you get the meaning of karma as Brahman. Karma means one is action; the second meaning is punya papa adhrisam. . Therefore the word karma means either action or adhrisam and therefore the mantra does not refer to Brahman. The word karma does not refer to creation and your interpretation is incorrect and wrong. This is the purva paksa. It is karma word analysis in this adhikaranam. Adhi Sankaracharya accept that the primary meaning of the word is action or punya papa adhrisam. But the problem is that this primary meaning does not fit in this context. Adhi Sankaracharya says I want to take the primary meaning but that meaning does not fit in. Before the word karma there is a pronoun etad. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question if the pronoun this is used it must refer to something referred to in this section. But Adhi Sankaracharya in the entire section the Upanishad has not talked about any action at all. Then etad karma will refer to specific action. If punya papa adhrisam is talked about, then etad can be taken for punya papa adhrisam. There is no adhrisam topic discussed

anywhere. Etat does not refer to any specific action or adhristam. Even the word etat cannot refer to devatas also because of the grammar problem. Therefore word etat cannot refer to purusas, any action, or any punya papa adhristam. Therefore the way out is that the word refers to anything that is in the front. What can be referred to by the pronoun without specifying any particular thing and Adhi Sankaracharya says that it can refer to the universe alone. 'This' mean without any specification it can refer to only objective universe. 'That' means without any previous reference it means Brahman only. Therefore karma should be interpreted as in the secondary meaning a product. Etat means this universe and karma means creation and universe is the creation of that person which is Paramatma. That Paramatma is Brahman you should know hey Balake. Suppose the mantra talks about the entire universe this creation includes everything. The first part of mantra says etesam purusanam karta. This means Paramatma is the cretor of adhithyadi devata. Next part of mantra says the creator of this universe and the creator of purusas and also the entire jagat. If Paramatma is presented as the entire universe why should it refer to the creator of purusas. The world includes purusas or devatas also. This is purva paksa. He says it is required because balaki has taken these purusas as Brahman and the teacher has to reveal Brahman and also make it clear that the purusas are not real Brahman but they are only kartas. They are separately mentioned because they have to be negated as not Brahman. With this the first sutra is over.

### **Topic 5; Balakyadhikaranam [Sutra 16-18]**

He who is the maker of the sun, moon, etc., is Brahman and not prana or the individual soul.

#### **Sutra 1.4.17 [123]**

#### ***Jivamukhya ranalinganneti chet tad vyakhyatam***

If it be said that on account of the inferential marks of the individual soul and the chief Prana [Brahman is] not [referred to by the word 'matter' in the passage quoted], [we reply] that has already been explained.

An objection to sutra 16 is raised and refuted; the objection has already been disposed of under 1.1.31 ibid.

We will do the general analysis of this sutra. Purva Paksi comes into the picture. The first portion is Purva Paksi portion and the second portion belongs to siddhanti.

There are two people who are going to object our conclusion. Upanishad uses a pronoun in this mantra. He is to be known. Who is that he? Purva Paksi says that when I read the latter portion of the mantra that I find clear references to jiva alone and not Paramatma. Bogta jiva is talked about here says the Purva Paksi. Secondly we meet with the term prana in a complementary passage; 'then he became one with the prana alone [Kaushitaki Upanishad IV.20] *so esa prana eva prajnatmedam sariram atmanam anupravista alomabhya anekhebyah* the word prana refers to the vital force. It is the conscious being that experiences the world. This refers to jivah. Gumte verb indicates bogta. Saha vedi tavyah refers to jivah. How will you fit it with vishaya vakyam. Purva paksa says I will mänge to fit it. This jiva is creator of adhithyati devata. This is well known. Thirdly the word prana is the maker of all the persons the person in the sun, the person in the moon etc. Jiva cannot create devata. How will you manage. Purva Paksi says that all devatas have come because of the punya karmas of jivahs. So we can say jiva is the creator of devata. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 137

### **Topic 5; Balakyadhikaranam [Sutra 16-18]**

He who is the maker of the sun, moon, etc., is Brahman and not prana or the individual soul.

#### **Sutra 1.4.17 [123]**

#### ***Jivamukhya ranalinganneti chet tad vyakhyatam***

If it be said that on account of the inferential marks of the individual soul and the chief Prana [Brahman is] not [referred to by the word 'matter' in the passage quoted], [we reply] that has already been explained.

An objection to sutra 16 is raised and refuted; the objection has already been disposed of under 1.1.31 *ibid.*

We are doing the general analysis of sutra 17, the second sutra of Balakiadhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya is analyzing the statement occurring in Kausitaki Upanishad 4.19. We should know that principle which is created with all devata and that which associated with this karma. The debate is what is that principle. In the first sutra Vyasacharya established that principle is Paramatma, which is the creator of all devatas and this karma. Now the question is 'this karma'. Since no karma is referred to any karma in the text, it is taken as this creation in the absence of no other noun being mentioned. The word karma also can etymologically mean creation. Product here is creation.

The principle associated with creation is Paramatma alone. When this conclusion was given in the first sutra, Purva paksa raises a question that I cannot accept saha as Paramatma because in the latter portion the Upanishad it mentions Jivatma. It is chetana tattvam which experiences the world is talked about and tht chetana tattvam is Jivatma alone. Since Jivatma is referred to in the latter portion the vishya vakya mantra should refer to jivah alone. How do you vive the meaning of the vishaya vakya, which is *yo vai balaka etesam purusanam karta, yasya vai tat karma, sa vai veditavya.* 4.19 of Kaushitaki Upanishad. Who is the creator of all the devatas and who is associated with the karma. This is the interpretation of purva paksa. He himself explains further that in his interpretation the following question comes. How can jiva be the creator of devata. Two answers are given in this regard. Jivah is creator of devatas because jiva alone becomes devatas by punya karma. How do you say jiva is the creator of devata. Jiva has to exhaust punya papa karma. Exhaustion of punya papa karma is possible only through sukha dukha anubhava. And sukha dukha anubhava requires the following things such as sense organs, a world to give sukha and dukha and third devatas to preside over sense organs. All the three are required for the karma exhaustion. That is why we saw in Bhagavad Gita 18. *adhistanam tatha karata karanam ca prthagvidham vividhas ca prthakcesta daivam cai 'va'tra pancamam* the meaning of the sloka is the seat of action and likewise, the agent, the instruments of various sorts, the many kinds of efforts and providence being the fifth.

All human transactions require not only sense organs etc., but also adhistana devatas also and only then we can experience the world and only when we experience the world we can exhaust the sukha and dukha. Bhagavan created the world because we have to exhaust the punya papa karma. If we did not have karma, Bhagavan would not have created the universe. I am responsible for Creation of the world and devatas are require for sukha and dukha anubhava and if devatas do not preside over sense organs would not function. Even devatas are meant for our sukha and dukha anubhava. Therefore jivah is responsible for the arrival of devata. Bogta eva bogha upakarananam karta. All the factors required for bogha and one of the factors is devata. This is the argument of purva paksa. The indirect creators of devata is jivah. According to Purva Paksi etat karma means punya papa karma. One should know that jiva who is the indirect creator of devata and who is associated with punya papa karma is jivatma. Purva paksa first part we have seen.

Now we will see the second Purva Paksi. When we analyse the latter part of mantra it talks about prana. Vishaya vakyam talks about prana and not Paramatma. How does Purva Paksi justifies this interpretation. He says prana is the principle which is the creator of all devatas. Why do you bring in Paramatma? He says prana at the samasti level means Hiranyagarbha. And Hiranyagarbha is none other than samasti devatas. Therefore Purva Paksi argues being samasti devata out of samasti only vyasti individual devatas came.

2.1.9 of Kathopanisad says *yatas codeti suryo astam yatra ca gacchati tam devah sarve arpitah tadu na atyeti hascana etat vai tat* and that from the sun rises and into which it merges, on that all the devatas depend and no one goes beyond, this is indeed that. And from Hiranyagarbha devas emerged and unto Hiranyagarbha devatas resolve. With that the principle alone is etat karma. One should know that prana who is the creator of all devata and who is associated with all actions that prana one should know.

And therefore prana is associated with all karma that prana one should know. Because of this reference of prana and jiva and vishaya vakyam talk about jiva and prana alone and not Paramatma. Vyasacharya says the answer has been already given. Vyasacharya refers to the previous portion and the same answer is given and that 1.1.28 of Brahma Sutra Patardadhikaranam. The same purva paksa comes in the previous sutra also.

The answer given there is three answers are given. One section cannot give anything. One section can concentrate on one topic alone. You cannot say one talks about many topics, Jivatma and prana etc. If there are many topic one will be registered and others not. One event cannot focus on two things. One will be focused and the other thing is implied. What is not focused is never registered and what is not registered is never remembered. Therefore there should be one topic and it should be Paramatma, Jivatma or prana.

Second argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives is once we have concluded that topic is only one and everything should be connected to the one topic only. The beginning and end should be one topic only. Balaki wanted to take about Brahman and not only that 4.1. Is upakrama and 4.20 is upasamhara and in the end it talks about the phalam of this knowledge as moksa. Form this we can conclude that subject matter is Brahman only. neither the jiva jnanam nor the prana jnanam can ever give moksa. Brahma jnanam alone can give moksa. This is the second argument.

Third argument is if the jiva or prana is taken as creator, they are not relative creator but not absolute creator. Hiranyagarbha is relative creator because he himself is created by

Paramatma. In fact Mundaka Upanishad begins with the birth of Hiranyagarbha. Jiva and Hiranyagarbha are creators but they are relative creators. The absolute creator is Paramatma alone.

The fourth argument is how do you account for jiva and Paramatma in that section. They occur in 4.20 of Kaushitaki Upanishad. This mentions or talk about jiva only. The word prana is used for Brahman also in certain context. III.i.4 of Mundaka Upanishad asserts *prano hyesa yah sarva bhutair vibhati vijanan vidvan bhavate nativadi arma krida Atma ratih kriyava nesa Brahma vidam varisthah* the meaning of the mantra is knowing Him – the Prana, reveling in all beings the wise man stops all the blabbering. Sporting in Self delighted in Self and doing acts [enjoined] this man is the best of those who know the Brahman.

In Vi.8.2 of Chandogya upanisad we find *pranamevopasrayate prana bandhanaam hi somya mana iti* it is said that when it [Brahman] fails to get a resting place anywhere, it surrenders itself to prana the vital force indicating prana is but Brahman. In Kenopanisad also there is a well-known mantra *srotrasya srotrati manaso mano yad vaco ha vacam sa u pranasya pranah* suggestive of preceptor the Brahman is the pranasya prana the life of life points out that prana is Brahman. Brahman is called here pranasya prana. Therefore prana reference can be taken as prana. Even jivah reference can be taken as Brahman because jiva has got both vachyartha and lakshyartha. Jivatma can refer to Jivatma or Paramatma. When we talk about jiva birth death cycle it is vachyartha jivah and when Adhi Sankaracharya says you are Brahman there jiva refers to lakshyartha. In some places jivah Brahma beda is there where there is vachyartha and jivah and Brahma abeda is there when lakshyartha is taken. This is the general analysis.

I will give you word for word analysis. Because of reference to jivah and main prana; Brahma is not the subject matter of 4.19. Of Kaushitaki Upanishad; na alone is there the rest we have to supply. Iti chet if it is argued thus; tad vakyadham it has been answered before. [in 1.1.31 Brahma Sutra]

The significance of the word is jiva mukhya prana linga; mukya prana means primary prana; in sastram sense organs are also called prana; in Mundaka Upanishad [III.i.8]says *sapta pranah prabhavanti tasmad saptarcisah samidhah sapta homah sapta ime loka yesu caranti prana guhasaya nihitah sapta sapta* from him are born seven prana-s the seven flames sevenfold fuel, the seven fold oblations, as also the seven worlds where the pranas move in the cave of living creatures seven and seven.

Since prana can refer to two things, panca prana and sense organs we should know which one is meant in what place. So when we say mukya prana we mean panca prana and when we say gauna prana we mean sense organs. Here Vyasacharya wants to make sure and hence mukya prana is mentioned. Linga means references to jivah and references to mukya prana. Tayoh lingam reference to jivah and reference to mukya prana. [Kaushitaki Upanishad IV.20] *so esa prana eva prajnatmedam sariram atmanam anupravista alomabhyah anekhebyah* the word prana refers to the vital force. It is the conscious being that experiences the world. Because of the reference to jiva and mukya prana na means Brahman is not the subject matter; up to this is purva paksha. Iti chet if this is the argument of purva paksha tat such an objection is negated. Now we go to the third sutra



## Topic 5; Balakyadhikaranam [Sutra 16-18]

He who is the maker of the sun, moon, etc., is Brahman and not prana or the individual soul.

### Sutra 1.4.18 [124]

#### *Anuvartham tu jaiminih prasnavyakhyanabhyamapi chaivameke*

But Jaimini thinks that [the refernce to the individual soul in the text] has another purpose on account of the question and the reply; moreover thus some also [the vajasanyasins] [read in their text or recension]

An argument in support of sutra 16 is given.

Now in this sutra further support is given to our conclusion. Here Jaimini gives the support. Vyasacharya is taking the help of his disciple. Jaimini acharya evam vathati. No doubt there are references to jiva and prana in this section. Even when jiva and prana is distinctly talked about is only to reveal Paramatma only. On is the waking a sleeping person. That person is shaken and woken up. Jivah did not wake up when called; where was the jivah lying dormant in sleep and from where does he come up when out of sleep. This deals with the adhara of jivah. What is the place jiva goes back in sleep and how he comes back when he gets up. Gargya did not know the answer and Ajata Satru gives the answer that jivatma merged with Paramatma in sleep and he comes back from Paramatma when woken up. Daily we come from Paramatma and we enter into Paramatma. Jivatma is talked and prana is discussed all not for their sake but for the sake of Paramatma it is asserted in the dialogue between Balaki and Ajata Satru in Kaushitaki Upanishad, which is repeated in Brihadharaynaka upanisad as well in the second chapter.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 138

### **Topic 5; Balakyadhikaranam [Sutra 16-18]**

He who is the maker of the sun, moon, etc., is Brahman and not prana or the individual soul.

#### **Sutra 1.4.18 [124]**

#### *Anuvartham tu jaiminih prasnavyakhyanabhyamapi chaivameke*

But Jaimini thinks that [the refernce to the individual soul in the text] has another purpose on account of the question and the reply; moreover thus some also [the vajasanayins] [read in their text or recension]

An argument in support of sutra 16 is given.

We are doing the general analysis of sutra 18 which is part of Balakyadhikaranam in which Kaushitaki Upanishad fourth chapter is being analysed. The central theme of the fourth chapter is Paramatma only from upasamhara and phala sruti that is the beginning and the end. The references to Jivatma is connected for which two answers are given and the other by Jaimini and both answers are all right depending upon the context. It is important because of the analysis but also the general rule to be followed while studying Vedanta. In all the Vedantic books the primary theme is Paramatma; what is the role of discussion of Jivatma; wherever Jivatma discussion occurs what is its role. This has to be carefully understood and the role will differ from context to context. The word Jivatma is referred in two different meaning. One context is when we take lakshyartha the implied meaning of the word Jivatma in which context Jivatma means Chaitanyam minus the mind Chidhabasa etc., in such a context Jivatma discussion is identical with Paramatma discussion. In lakshyartha point of view jivatma and Paramatma are identical. And therefore you can say Paramatma is the theme, which is nondifferent from Jivatma. The lakshyartha jivatma and Paramatma has got abeda sambanda and you can call it Jivatma or Paramatma and both words are interchangeably used.

In some other cases Jivatma is used in common meaning vachyartha where we take into account mind, bogta, karta punya papavan etc. Here Jivatma and Paramatma no more identical and their relationship is karya karana sambandha. In such a context Jivatma cannot be the theme of the section. Samsari cannot be theme of the section. In such places Jivatma is used as a means to reveal Paramatma. In vachyartha through Jivatma one realizes Paramatma. In the context of lakshyartha Jivatma topic is identical with Paramatma topic. In this sutra jaimni says when there is vachyartha Jivatma, Jivatma is used for revealing Paramatma. It is a means to an end. The means is Jivatma and Paramatma is the end. The central theme mean cannot be the central theme and end can only be central theme. Whether the first context or second context from the point of view of lakshyartha or vachyartha the main theme is Paramatma alone which is revealed by the means of Jivatma. Vachyartha context is used and two birds are introduced and Jivatma bird becomes the means to reveal the Paramatma bird. Then jaimini extends the same principle is used in Brihadharaynaka upanisad also second chapter.

There also vachyartha Jivatma has been taken and it used to reveal lakshyartha Paramatma. When a sleeping person is woken up, then Ajata Satru from where did Jivatma come and where did Jivatma go during sleep. Jivatma comes from Paramatma and Jivatma goes to Paramatma and therefore the definition is Paramatma is that karnam from which Jivatma comes and into which Jivatma goes and that support is called Paramatma. We take vachyartha or lakshyartha. In sleeping person example we see vachyartha only and we say Jivatma arises from Paramatma and Jivatma goes back to Paramatma.

The Upanishad uses the word vijñana maya Purusa to indicate vachyartha Purusa to indicate vachyartha Jivatma and here Jivatma is used as means to reveal Paramatma. The numbers are 2.1.16 [*sa hovaca jatasatruhm yatraisa etatsupto'bhudya esa vijñanamayah purusah kvatsa tadabhat kuta etadagaditi, tatu ha na mene gargyah* which means when this Self that is associated with the intellect was thus asleep where was it then? Whence did it come?

Gargya was not aware of that ]and 2.1.17 [*so hovacajatasatruh yatraisa etatsupto'bhudya esa vijñanamayah purusah tadesam prananam vijñanena vijñanamadaya ya eso'ntarhrdaya akasatasminchete; tant yada grhnatyatha hattatpurusah svapiti nama; tadgrhita eva prano bhavati, grhita vak, grhitam caksuh, grhitam srotam grhitam manah* when this Self that is associated with the intellect is thus asleep, it withdraws by its specialized knowledge the functions of the organs and lies in the supreme Self that is within the heart. When it withdraws the organs it has the name of svapiti. Then verily the nose is withdrawn, the organ of speech is withdrawn, the eye is withdrawn, the ear is withdrawn and the mind is withdrawn] of Brihadharaynaka upanisad wherein Jivatma is used not as identical with Paramatma but as a means to reveal Paramatma.

Now we will see the word for word analysis. In the sutra anyartham tu is there. Anyartham tu; tu however; jaiminih considers that the references to Jivatma anyartham is for another purpose; prasnavyakhyanabhyam which is proved by answer api cha moreover eke some other branches of veda also evam reveal thus. However jaimini considers that reference to Jivatma is for another purpose for question and answers some other part also reveals thus.

Now I will come to the significance of the words in the sutra. Anyartham means for another purpose. What jaimini says is jiva is discussed for the purpose of something else that is Paramatma bodhartham; in this context Jivatma has no important and it serves only as a means; tu is to indicate the interpretation of jaimini to be different from the interpretation of vyasacharya; Vyasacharya said Jivatma is Paramatma and jaimini says Jivatma is a means to reveal Paramatma. When lakshyartha is taken we have to take the first one and if we take vachyartha we have to take the second example is to be taken. Then jaimini means the jaimini disciple of Vyasacharya prasna vyakhyanabhyam this is proved by questions and answers occurring in the Upanishad; when jaimini refers to question and answers he refers to 4.18 and 4.19 of the second chapter of Kaushitaki Upanishad from where does Jivatma goes in sleep and where from he comes on waking is discussed; apicha moreover eke another branch of the veda also. He keeps in mind Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Jivatma takes rest in Paramatma while in sleep. Thus Jivatma is a means to reveal Paramatma. With this, this sutra and the adhikaranam is over.

Now we will sum up the adhikaranam. Subject matter is what is to be known by saha; samsaya whether it is Paramatma, Jivatma or pranah; purva paksa says Jivatma is the subject matter or another purva paksa says prana is the subject matter; siddhanti says that it refers to Paramatma alone is the subject mater and not Jivatma. If at all there is a reference to Jivatma

either it is identical with Paramatma or a means to realize Paramatma or ultimately Paramatma is to be known. The same is true with prana also. That means prana also has got vachyartham and lakshyartham. When lakshyartham prana is used it is identical with Paramatma and vachyartham prana is used and prana also becomes karyam to reveal karana Paramatma. With this the fourth factor is also over. The fifth factor we have a uniform answer that this adhikaranam occurs in the right pada and right adhyaya.

## **Topic 6; Vakyanvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

### **Sutra 1.4.19 [125]**

#### ***Vakyanvayat***

[the Self to be seen, to be seen, to be heard etc., is the Supreme Self] on account of the connected meaning of the sentences.

A passage from the Brihadharaynaka upanisad Mantra 4.5.6 is now taken up for discussion. Yajnavalkyamwants to take to sannyasa. He is already knowledgeable. It is vidvat sannyasa. When sannyasa is taken for knowledge it is vivida sannyasa and when sannyasa is taken after knowledge it is vidvat sannyasa. If Yajnavalkya has attained jnanam why should he take sannyasa at all. It is meant for nishtaratham and it is nididhasana pradhana sannyasah. He is no more interested in sravanam or mananam. He is the model example for vidvat sannyasa. He had two wives and he had some possessions also and before leaving he wanted to apportion the property and give them both. He wished to give the share to each. Maitreyi asked whether she would get amritatvam by taking the wealth. Yajnavalkya says no. if you have possession you can have comfortable life and comfort is an external condition and happiness is an internal condition. You can be comfortable but you need not be happy. Then maitreyi already sadhana chatustaya sambanna and comfort is not a must at the cost of amritatvam she said. She asked her husband that if you are happy to leave everything and take to sannyasa what is that which make him happiness by leaving the wealth. Then Yajnavalkya says that I am happy and he accepted his wife as his disciple. He addresses her as dear one. he begins then teaching. then comes 2.4.5 mantra of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. He say that you never love anything for others sake and everything is loved for one's own sake only. therefore everything else is conditionally loved and Atma alone is unconditionally loved he declares. Atma is the object of unconditional love and all others are conditional love and if they are not favourable I will push them like a hot potato even if it is god. When they suffer they do not love even god. Whatever is the object is a source of ananda. Yaha prema vishayah saha ananda swarupah. We find Atma is eternal source of ananda. Since Atma is ananda swarupa therefore Atma va arey drastavyah and that ananda swarupa Atma you should know. Not only that. by knowing that Atma everything else is known it is said. Eka Atma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. This is the mantra. Why should we discuss this in Brahma Sutra. We have to introduce confusion because non-existence of present confusion is not thoroughness. Even in future confusion should not arise. After fixing a pole, pole is shaken to check the pole is not shaking. So also one should nevet get confusion and it is for that purpose one is confused and the cause of confusion is cleared. This is also another shake up. The Upanishad uses the word Atma. The question is whether Atma refers Jivatma or Paramatma and through this adhikaranam we have to conclude that Paramatma alone is the subject matter of this

adhikaranam. this is the essence of the adhikaranam. Now I will enter into the general analysis of the first sutra. the trend of all the sentences occurring in this section reveal Paramatma; anvayah mean the movement one after the other leads to Brahman alone. From the direction and drift of the sentences we find that it leads to Brahman alone. For this Adhi Sankaracharya takes four sample sentences and then he studies. The first one is 2.4.3; 2.4.5 2.4.7 to 2.4.11., of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The teaching is that Atma jnanam, which will give amritatvam, vide 2.4.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Since maitreyi asked for amritatva prapti and Yajnavalkya teaches Atma jnanam then Paramatma jnanam alone is amritatvam. We have to conclude that the trend indicate that Paramatma alone is talked about in the mantra.

The Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 2.4.6 *atma va are drastavyah srotavyo mantavyo nididhyasitavyo; maitreyi atmano va are darsanena sravanena matya vijnanenedam sarvam viditam.*

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 139

### **Topic 6; Vakyanvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

#### **Sutra 1.4.19 [125]**

#### ***Vakyanvayat***

[The Self to be seen, to be seen, to be heard etc., is the Supreme Self] on account of the connected meaning of the sentences.

We see the general analysis of sutra 19 which is the first sutra of vakyanvayodhikranam and there we take Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 2.4.5. *Atma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. na va are sarvasya kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati, atmanas-tu kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati; atma va are drastavyah srotavyo mantavyo nididhyasitavyo; maitreyi atmano va are darsanena sravanena matya vijnanenedam sarvam viditam* The discussion what is conveyed by the word Atma whether it is Jivatma or Paramatma. The reason he gives is due to the trend in the significant statement occurring in the section. Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary mentions four places where it occurs to come to the conclusion.

First portion is 2.4.3 wherein Maitreyi asks Yajnavalkya to teach that knowledge with which she can gain moksa. What I will do with that property which will not give me immortality. Therefore this portion introduces the immortality giving jnanam. we know amrtitvatva prapti can be got only through Paramatma jnanam and not through Jivatma jnanam. *Sa hovaca maitreyi yenam namrta syam kimaham tena kuryam? Bhagavanveda tadeva me bruhiti* Maitreyi asks what shall I do with that money thorough which in I cannot be immortal and she asks tell me venerable sir of that alone which you know to be means of immortality

So, now I shall speak to you, the secret of all these things. *Vyakhyasyami te; vyacaksan asya tu me nididhyasvasva iti* [mantra 2.4.4 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad] : Listen to me with rapt attention. I shall tell you the secret of this great problem that you have posed before me; the question that you have put; the difficulty in the ascent on the part of people to become permanently happy, which is not possible by possession of wealth.”

Next is .2.4.6 of the Upanishad mantra reveals sarvatma bhava. It says Atma is everything. *brahma tam paradat yoanyatratmano brahma veda. ksatram tam paradat yo'anyatratmanah ksatram veda. lokas-tam paradur yo'anyatratmano lokan veda. devastam paradur ya'anyatratmano devan veda. bhutani tam paradur yo'anyatratmano bhutani veda, sarvam tam paradad yo'anyatratmano sarvam veda. idam brahma, idam ksatram, ime lokah, ime devah, imam bhutani, idam sarvam yad ayam atma.*

The essence of the mantra reveals that this Brahmana thisn ksatriya these worlds, these gods, these beings and this all are only the Self. You know anything as different from you that object will reject you or isolate you. Anyatra atmanah veda that object will reject you;

therefore if you don't want to be rejected by anything know yourself as myself. it is impossible the remedy for sense of rejection is sarvatma bhava and it is explicitly said in the final portion of the mantra saying that everything in the creation is Atma and this Atma cannot be Jivatma and you have to say that this is Paramatma alone.

The fourth instance Adhi Sankaracharya quotes is that Atma as jagat sristi sthithi laya karanam by giving three different examples. 2.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad *sa yathardraidhagnerabhyahitatprthagdhuma utniscaranti, evam va are'sya mahato bhutasya nisvasitam etad yadrgvedo yaur veda, samavedo'tharvangirasa itihasah puranam vidya upanisadah so'loka sutranyanuvya khyanani vyakhyanani asyaivaitani nisvasitani* as various kinds of smoke proceed from a fire kindled fwith damp fuel even so my dear the rg veda, yajur veda, sama veda, atharva veda, history, mythology, arts, Upanisads, verses, aphorisms, elucidations and the explanations are the breath [as it were' of this limitless Reality. They are [like] the breath of it alone.

And for sthithi karana the drum and sound coming from veena, the Upanishad denotes sankha and dundhubi drastandha. these examples are subtle example. This particular sound you cannot hear without hearing the general sound. You recognize then genral voice and then particular. Every specific existence depends upon general existence. Man existence pot existence and vishesha sabda depends upon samanya sabda. vishesha sabda cannot exist separate from samanya sabda. this is the tatparyam. In the same way vishesha satta cannot exist from samanya satta. Samanya satta is sthithi karana for vishesha satta. Brahman is samanya satta and vishesha satta means jagat. without Brahman nothing can exist. Thus Atma is said to be laya karanam. just as all rivers merge into samudra similarly all objects in creation resolve into Atma. This is called laya prakriya through samudra dristandha. All these three examples are given from 2.4.5 to 2.4.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. If Atma is jagat karanam that Atma can only be Paramatma and not Jivatma. This is the general analysis. Now I will give you word for word analysis.

Vakyanvayat from the trend of the statements in the section, the word Atma of Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.4.5 is to be understood as Paramatma. From the trend of the statement in the section is the meaning of the sutra and the rest the [word Atma] is supplied and it is to be understood as Paramatma.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. The word vakyam refers to all the statements of the sections. And anvayah means flow or the trend. The movement of one after another. This means the flow or direction. Vakyanam anvayah means the drift of the statement because of this trend we conclude that Atma this is the main sutra of this adhikaranam. now we will go to the next sutra. 19.33

>

## **Topic 6; Vakyanvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

### **Sutra 1.4.20 [126]**

### ***Pratijnasiddherlingamasmrthyah***

[The fact that the individual soul is taught as the object or realization is an] indicative mark which is proof of the proposition so Asmarathya thinks.

An argument in support of sutra 19 is given. The indication is that the individual soul is not different from Brahman, the ultimate cause of which it is a ray. Hence to know Brahman the cause is to know all that.

Vyasacharya answers a possible objection, which is in expected lines only. now we will do the general analysis. While establishing that Atma is dealing Paramatma only Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a significant statement revealing Atma refers to Paramatma alone. Now purva paksa quotes some statement that Atma refers to Jivatma alone. He gives three instances, which are 2.4.5, he says Yajnavalkya begins the mantra saying that nobody loves wife for wife's sake for one's own sake. One loves one for one's own sake. When Upanishad says one loves wife, purva paksa says for the sake of Self alone one loves wife and there is no question of wife, putra etc., the very fact a list of things of object of enjoyment or bogya vishaya the Self talked about must be bogta Atma alone. Bogtatma is Jivatma. This is the instance number one.

Next instance is 2.4.12 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. *sa yatha saindhava-khilya udake prasta udakam evanuviliyeta na hasya udgrahanayeva syat, yato yatas-tvadadita lavanam eva, evam va are idam mahad-bhutam anantam aparam. vijnana-ghana eva; etebhyo bhutebhyah samutthaya, tanyevanuvinasyati; na pretya sam jnasti, iti are bravimi, iti hovaca yajnavalkyah.* In this mantra Upanishad talks about vijnana gana Atma Chaitanyam, a Chaitanyam which rises along with the body and which resolves with the body. There is no life and no recognition of things after death. Jivatma Chaitanyam alone is active when body is alive and no more active when body is gone. it is anithya Chaitanyam and it cannot be Paramatma Chaitanyam but it is Jivatma Chaitanyam.

Next example is from 2.4.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad which reads as *Yatra hi dvaitam iva bhavati, tad itara itaram jighrati, tad itara itaram pasyati tad itara itaram srnoti, tad itara itaram abhivadati, tad itara itaram manute, tad itara itaram vijanati. yatra tv asya sarvam atmaivabhut, tat kena kam abhivadet, tat kena kam manvita, tat kena kam vijaniyat? yenedam sarvam vijanati, tam kena vijaniyat, vijnataram are kena vijaniyat iti* this refers to knower principle and pramata principle and purva paksa argues vijnatma is Jivatma the end of the mantra states upakrama upasamhara is Jivatma alone.

Purva paksa says that I will quote the same sutra and asks to explain the Jivatma reference in this section which is to be given by three different acharya. When Jivatma is talked about Paramatma is referred.

First Acharya Asnarathya [sutra 22], Audulomi [sutra 23] and Kasakritsna [sutra 24] support the Vyasacharya stand that the word Atma in the mantra refers to Paramatma alone. Then Vyasacharya will point out that sage Kasakritsna is the best explanation.

Asmarathya says eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena pratijna that is Paramatma vijnanena sarva vijnanena is the proposition of the sutra, which we have already established, in the last sutra. pratijna is the expression given here. If Paramatma vijnanena gives sarva vijnanam, then Paramatma vijnanam should lead to jiva vijnanam also. the the sage argues that this is



possible only under one condition that Jivatma should be nondifferent from Paramatma. Then only knowledge Paramatma should lead to Jivatma then Jivatma has to be nondifferent from Paramatma and since Jivatma is nondifferent from Paramatma in the place of Paramatma Jivatma can also be talked about. The Upanishad indiscriminately talks about Jivatma also where the topic is Paramatma. It is so because Upanishad wants to convey Jivatma can convey Jivatma is Paramatma because paramatma vijnanena pratijna is there. it is only an indicator of pratijna vakyam Paramatma vijnanena Jivatma vijnanena bhavati. This is the Asmarathya's method of justification.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Lingam mention of Jivatma in the place of Paramatma in 2.4.5 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is the evidence pratijna siddhe for the establishment of the proposition in the mantra. Asmarathyah the sage asmarathya considers so. In this when we give the meaning lingam the word evidence alone is the meaning lingam. Pratinja siddheh for establish of proposition; sage considers so we have to supply. Now we will go to the significance of the words.

Pratijna siddhe proposition eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena by knowing one Atma everything is known; 2.4.5 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; then siddhi means establishment; it is for the sake of chaturthi or you can take it as sashti vibaktih connected with lingam; next word is lingam means evidence proof clue etc., the clue is talking about Jivatma in the place of Paramatma is the clue that Jivatma is non-different from Paramatma. Asmarathyah is the name of the sage.

## **Topic 6; Vakyadvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

### **Sutra 1.4.21 [127]**

#### ***Utkramishyata evambhavadityaudulomih***

The initial statement identifies the individual soul with Brahman or the Supreme Self because the soul when it will depart [from the body] is such [i.e., one with the Supreme Self] thus Audulomi thinks.

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

We will do the general analysis and here Audulomi says that jivatma is 'would be Paramatma' only. the proof is 3.2.8 of Mundaka Upanishad *yatha nadyah syanda manah samudre 'stam gacchanti nama rupe vihaya tatha vidvan nama rupa vimuktah parat Param purusam upaiti divyam* the meaning of the mantra is as flowing rivers get themselves disappeared in the ocean losing their special names and distinct forms so the wise man free from all his identifications with names and forms goes unto the highest of the high – Supreme Divinity.

Audulomi takes the support of nadhi drastandha that every river is nothing but ocean for every rivers rushing towards ocean. Similarly Jivatma is Paramatma because Jivatma is to ultimately merge with Paramatma.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Audulomi says as follows. Jivatma is mentioned in the place of Paramatma because that will be the nature that Paramatma-hood will be the nature utkaamishyata which is going to transcend the nama rupa.

The significance of the words is utkrmishyata means transcending Jivatma; transcend varna ashrama limitation, nama rupa limitation; for the jiva who is going to transcend the nama rupa in future evam bhavati means this nature is going to come; that is Paramatma swarupat since transcending Jivatma is going to shed limitation and become Paramatma he calls himself Paramatma. Iti Audulomi so says Audulomi,

Also we read in srutis that serene being arising from this body appears in its own form as soon as it has approached the highest light Chandogya upanisad VIII.12.3

### **Topic 6; Vakyanvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

#### **Sutra 1.4.22 [128]**

#### ***Avasthiteriti kasakritsna***

[The initial statement is made] because [the Supreme Self] exists in the condition [of the individual Soul] so the sage Kasakritsna thinks

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

Kasakritsna rishi says Paramatma alone obtains in the form of Jivatma in the body and only nama beda na tu nami bedah. Unenclosed Atma is called Paramatma and the same Paramatma obtaining in the body is Jivatma. He takes Chandogya upanisad vakyam 6.2.3 *tadaiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tattejo'srjata tatteja aiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tadapo'srjata tasmadyatra kvaca 'socati svedate va purusastejasa eva tadadhyapo jayante* the meaning of the mantra is that existence decided I shall be many. I shall be born. He then created fire; that fire also decided I shall be many I shall be born; then fire produced water; that is why whenever or wherever a person mourns or perspires, he produces water. All the anupravesa sthuthi confirms the view that Paramatma alone is in the form of Jivatma. Paramatma thought let me create the body and let me myself enter the body and function as Jivatma. Paramatma himself assumed the name of Jivatma after having entered the body.

First I will give word for word analysis. Saint Kasakritsna says as follows. Since Paramatma alone remains in the form of Jivatma in the body; Jivatma is mentioned in the maitreyi Brahmanam in place of Paramatma. Avasthithi means remaining or residing; Paramatma is residing in the form of Jivatma we have to supply; so says kasakritsna. Adhi Sankaracharya will acknowledge and approve of the third justification which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 140

### **Topic 6; Vakyanvayodhikaranam [Sutra 19-22]**

The Atman to be seen through hearing etc., of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad II.4.5 and not Jivatma.

#### **Sutra 1.4.22 [128]**

#### ***Avasthiteriti kasakritsnah***

[The initial statement is made] because [the Supreme Self] exists in the condition [of the individual Soul] so the sage Kasakritsna thinks

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

We have completed all the four sutras of vakyanvidhadhikaranam. Through this Vyasacharya has established that Atma talked about in Brihadharaynaka upanisad is Paramatma alone and not Jivatma. The question came if Paramatma is centra theme of this Brahmanam why it started with Jivatma in the beginning, in the middle and the end and we have to justify and three sages justified as to why we conclude that Atma referred to therein related to Paramatma and not Jivatma in the three sutras 20 to 22. of the three justifications Adhi Sankaracharya considers Kasakritsna's justification best.

While dealing with why should Jivatma be introduced is the question. Asmarathya said Jivatma introduction is meant to support prtinja vakyam. Pratinja is eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena which means eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena and sarva includes Jivatma also. this is possible under one condition that Paramatma vijnanam Jivatma vijnanam is possible only if Jivatma is nondifferent from Paramatma. Therefore the Upanishad wants to convey Jivatma is nondifferent from Paramatma. Hence in the place of Paramatma Jivatma is discussed to show Jivatma is nondifferent from Paramatma. Adhi Sankaracharya says we are not happy with this justification because the pratijna is eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam. Sruti says Paramatma is karanam and Jivatma is karyam is pratijna. That is why in example mirth karanam and pot is karyam has been explained. If we extend this pratijna principle if you say what will amount to Paramatma vijnanena and Jivatma vijnanam and it will become Paramatma will become karanam and Jivatma will become karyam and therefore when asmarathya says what is in his hind is karya Jivatma is nondiffernt from karana Jivatma. Therefore Paramatma is karanam and Jivatma will be taken as karyam. And then jivatma and Paramatma will have karya karana sambandha, which we do not want. We want non-difference not in total identity and karya karana sambandha is not absolute aikyam but partial aikyam and therefore we don't accept this justification. When we say that Asmarathya followers argue why don't you take Jivatma as karyam and Paramatma as karanam as we have several sruti statement to show that Jivatma is karyam and Paramatma is karanam. III.i.2 of Taittiriya Upanishad says *imani bhutani jayante yen jatani jivanti yat pratyantya bhisamvisanti tad-vijijnasasva tad brahmeti sa tapo'tapyato sa tapas taptva* which means which means crave to know well that from which these beings are born; that by which, having been born, that by which, having been born these beings live and continue to exist;

and that into which, when departing they all enter. Here in this mantra bhutani means Jivatma living being is the contention of Asmarathya and hence he opines Jivatma is karanam and Paramatma as karyam. Thus in Brigu valli it is made very clear Jivatmas are born out of Paramatma.

Similarly II.i.1 of Mundakopanisad says *tad etat satyam yatha suditat pavakad visphulingah sahasrasah prabhavante sarupah tatha'ksarad vividhah somya bhavah prajayante tatra vaivapi-yanti* which again means this is the truth; as from the flaming fire thousands of sparks, similar to its form [nature] issue forth; so from the Immortal [Brahman] diverse [manifold] beings [jivas] originate and they find their way back into it. this mantra also confirms Jivatmas are born out of Paramatma as the thousands of sparks originate from the flaming fire. Therefore Asmarathya followers argue Paramatma is karyam and Jivatma is karyam. That is the question again. For that our answer is jivatma and Paramatma has got karya karana sambandha only with regard to the sariram and from swarupa drishtya there is no sambandha but jivatma and Paramatma is aikyam and not that one is born out of the other. Since jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is taught in Vedanta, we should not talk of jivatma and Paramatma sambandha. And if jivatma and Paramatma is identical we cannot say Paramatma vijnanena Jivatma vijnanam. But we should say Paramatma vijnanam eva Jivatma vijnanam. It is not that one knowledge leads to the other knowledge but one knowledge itself is the other knowledge. eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam cannot be used for Jivatma vijnanam. Prapancha you can say Paramatma vijnanena Prapancha vijnanam. When you talk of Jivatma you should say Paramatma vijnanena Jivatma vijnanam because Jivatma and Paramatma have no sambandha and Paramatma is itself is Jivatma so says Kasakritsna. It is see that while Asmarathya talks of partial identity of jivatma and Paramatma and kasakritsna talks of total identity of jivatma and Paramatma. Hence Asmarathya's contention is not acceptable and Kasakritsna's argument is acceptable to us. Audulomi says Jivatma is talked of Paramatma is because Jivatma is a would be Paramatma once the Jivatma gains Self-knowledge. Here future participle is used. Adhi Sankaracharya says that he is not happy because Jivatma is going to become Paramatma which means Jivatma is not Paramatma now. Therefore you will become Paramatma. First defect is Jivatma is not Paramatma now and secondly Jivatma will become Paramatma in the next state. Jivatma is in a lower state and it will reach in higher state a Paramatma. Higher and lower state belongs not to the Consciousness but it refers to the thinking. Ignorant state of mind is called lower state of Consciousness and wise state of mind is figuratively called higher state of Consciousness. This is not acceptable to us because Consciousness is nirvakaratvad. There is no lower and higher state of Consciousness. Then there is time factor is involved for Jivatma to become Paramatma. Vedanta says that you are now Paramatma alone. Whether you like it or not or whether you are pure or impure, you are Paramatma. The second justification also is not acceptable. In the first argument the aikyam is partial and in the second justification aikyam is a future event. Therefore both are not acceptable to us. Kasakritsna's justification the aikyam is total and immortal. Avasthithe means Paramatma alone dwells in the body as Jivatma. Adhi Sankaracharya votes for Kasakritsniya matham. Purva paksa quoted an in-between mantra where the Upanishad talked about temporary Consciousness. This has a reference to 2.vi.12 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that says *sa yatha saindhavakhitya udake prasta udakamevanuvithyete na hasyodgrahanayeva syat, yato yotastvadaditaiavanameva. Evam va ara idam mahadbhutamanantamaparam vijnanaghana eva. Etebhyobhutebhyah samutthaya tanyevanu vinasyatt, nba pretya samjnastityare bravimiti hovaca Yajnavalkya* the meaning of this mantra is as a lump of salt thrown into water only dissolves into the water, and none can at all pick it up. But from whichever part one taken the water; it has only a saline taste. Even so my dear, this great endless infinite reality is only homogeneous

intelligence. On account of these elements [the Self] stands out [separately] and as soon as these are destroyed, [its separate existence] is also destroyed. After attaining [isolation] it has no [particular] Consciousness. He asked the question when Upanishad talks of temporary Consciousness how do you justify the temporary Consciousness quoting the above Brihadharaynaka upanishad mantra. Maitreyi got confused as per this statement. Yajnavalkya does not resolve the confusion. He said things are clear but you are confused. Adhi Sankaracharya points out Consciousness is permanent and when he talks about temporary Consciousness, he talks of manifest Consciousness or pratibimba Consciousness which rises in jagrat swapna and resolves in Sushupti. The prajna, the Consciousness does the transaction and is subject to arrival and departure and for the non-transactional Consciousness there is no question of up and down or the coming and going. Therefore, Chidhabasa is but the manifestation of Paramatma only. Hence we can call it an avatharam of Paramatma and therefore the Upanishad talks about Chidhabasa Consciousness.

Finally Adhi Sankaracharya justifies the last quotation given by purva paksa. 2.4.14.of Brihadharaynaka upanishad that talks about knower Jivatma when the topic is Paramatma.the mantra reads as *Yatra hi dvaitam iva bhavati, tad itara itaram jighrati, tad itara itaram pasyati tad itara itaram srnoti, tad itara itaram abhivadati, tad itara itaram manute, tad itara itaram vijanati. yatra tv asya sarvam atmaivabhut, tat kena kam abhivadet, tat kena kam manvita, tat kena kam vijaniyat? yenedam sarvam vijanati, tam kena vijaniyat, vijnataram are kena vijaniyat iti.*the meaning of the mantra is Where there is an object of knowledge, well, naturally it can be known. Where there is something other than the eye, the eye can see. Where there is something outside the nose, the nose can smell is true. Where the sound is outside the ear, the ear can hear the sound. Where the spoken word is outside the speech itself, one can speak about something. Where the thought is different from the object that is thought, it is possible to think. Where the object of understanding is different from understanding, it is possible to understand that object.

Here also the answer is the same. Paramatma alone is manifesting as Paramatma. Paramatma alone conditioned by upadhi prajna the vijnata, tajasa the vijnata and prajna the vijnata and who is manifesting is the turiyam appearing as santa prajnah, bahish prajnah and ganaprajnah. This Brahmanam talks about Paramatma alone. This adkm is also over.

The subject matter here what is the meaning of Atma occurring in 2.4.5 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad? The doubt is does the word Atma refer to Jivatma or Paramatma. Third factor is purva paksa says Atma means Jivatma only because in the proximity husband, wife, children are there; near them Jivatma alone is there and not Paramatma. This is flow of the text support.. If at all if there is reason is that Paramatma alone is in the form of Jivatma we say. The sangathi is that this adhikaranam is in its appropriate place. Now we will enter the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

## **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

### **Sutra 1.4.23 [129]**

***Prakritischa pratijna drishtantanuparodhat***

[Brahman is] the material cause also on account of [this view] not being in conflict with the proposition and the illustration [quoted in the sruti]

This sutra states that Brahman is the efficient as well as the material cause of the universe.

This is slightly big adhikaranam with five sutras. This is the penultimate adhikaranam the central topic of the first chapter is samanvayadyaya to show that Upanishads reveal Brahman as unique object to be known. The unique object means something, which cannot be known by any other pramanam. He establishes that Brahman is the central theme of Vedanta. Thus Vedanta becomes a unique pramanam for the unique subject of Brahman. Therefore if one wants Brahma jnanam one has to resort to Vedanta jnanam and it is choiceless. If a person wants to gain moksa he should gain Brahma jnanam. if he wants to gain Brahma jnanam he should come to Vedanta sastra. This is the background of samanvaya adhyaya. We can say Brahman is the subject matter of Brahma Sutra also. Vyasacharya begins the chapter with the definition of Brahman and he concludes the chapter with the definition of Brahman. The actual teaching begins from the second sutra and Brahman is jagat karanam Brahma. The teaching concludes in 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the fourth chapter. Here Vyasacharya repeats Brahma laksanam and here also he says jagat karanam Brahma. This can be taken for all purposes the repetition of second adhikaranam of pradhama pada. Even though it is a repetition he wants to clarify certain points. Brahman has been defined as jagat karanam. The natural question that comes to mind is nimitta karanam or upadana karanam. From common sense point of view we know it is material and upadana karanam. nimitta karanam is distinct. Therefore the question that will arise in the mind is if Brahman is karanam whether it is nimittam or upadanam. Also we know if Brahman is nimitta karanam it cannot be upadana karanam and if it is upadana karanam it cannot be nimitta karanam. Either way Advaidam cannot be established, from our common experience we find mittam and upadanam are always different. When there is such a question whether Brahman is nimittam or upadanam and majority takes it as nimitta karanam. Brahman being a chetana tattvam it should be taken as nimitta karanam and he alone plans and executes creation. we have one set of people saying Brahman is only nimitta karanam saying god is only intelligent cause. There is another group of people saying that Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam, which means upadana karanam. nimitta karanam can never be sristi sthithi laya karanam. nimitta karanam means he is intelligent karanam alone. Carpenter is only nimitta karanam alone. Nimitta karanam is only sristi karanam. Sristi sthithi laya karanam is upadana karanam. Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam. These people accept Brahman as upadana karanam and there is no talk about nimitta karanam. One group says Brahman is nimitta karanam matram and another group says Brahman is upadana karanam matram. But Vyasacharya says that Brahman is both nimitta and upadana karanam of creation. he is both material and intelligent cause of creation. Vyasacharya will focus on Brahman as upadana karanam. God is the material cause, which is emphasized in Vedanta. the entire Karma Kanda we have worshipped god as intelligent cause. We have prayed god as sristi kartaa. Hence Vedanta has to take god as upadana karanam, when we take god as intelligent cause we add to plurality and we do not eliminate plurality. Previously Jiva and jagat was there and now by taking Isvara as upadana karanam we have added to the plurality and now we have jiva, jagat and Isvara are there. When I see Brahman, as nimitta karanam moksa is not possible. For moksa we want Brahman as upadana karanam and the entire creation is karyam. The entire karyam is not possible without the Brahman as the karanam. this is the second karanam. Through this we gain advaida siddhi.

Third reason is as upadana karanam is unique to Vedanta. nyaya and other systems have already accepted as nimitta karanam. Paramatma as upadana karanam is unique teaching of Vedanta. Material cause is matter. Consciousness god as material cause is unique to Vedanta/ Consciousness god is the material cause is unique to Vedanta darsanam and therefore Vyasacharya wants to show it is nimittam also. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 141

### **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.23 [129]**

#### ***Prakritischa pratijna drishtantanuparodhat***

[Brahman is] the material cause also on account of [this view] not being in conflict with the proposition and the illustration [quoted in the sruti]

This sutra states that Brahman is the efficient as well as the material cause of the universe.

I am giving you the general analysis of this adhikaranam and I have said that this is the final adhikaranam for practical purposes. Vyasacharya wants to tally the upakrama and upasamhara the beginning and the end that the Vedanta sastra is Brahma Vidya. Just as prava bagha is karma vidya, the Vedanta relates to Brahma Vidya. When we talk about Brahman, there is a confusion as whether Brahman is nimitta karanam or upadana karanam and Vyasacharya here establishes that Brahman is both nimitta and upadana karanam of the whole creation. Janmadhi adhikaranam the jagat karanatvam has been revealed but here Vyasacharya gives some more support for jagat karanatvam of Brahman for the whole creation. In the last class I said Brahman is nimitta and upadana karanam but we focus Brahman is upadana karanam because nimitta karanam Brahman has been focused in the purva bagha. The second reason is that by knowing Brahman as nimitta karanam duality is not resolved and therefore moksha is impossible. When I know Brahman, as nimitta karanam, Brahman stands separate from the product just as potter is different from pot; goldsmith is different from ornaments etc. if God is taken as nimitta karanam we will conclude God is different and such a God is called tatasta Isvara and tatasta Isvara who is away from the creation. By knowing tatasta Isvara I don't resolve duality and duality-based bhayam will be there. nimitta karanam Isvara cannot remove fear and even if fear is removed it is temporary. For removal of duality Brahman should be the upadana karanam and then there is cause for duality and duality caused fear. Ananyatva siddharthan beda akarartham brahmana jagat upadana karanatva avasya varthate. This will be discussed elaborately in arambanadhikaranam. Therefore also it is said that Brahman is upadana karanam. The third reason for taking Brahman as upadana karanam makes Vedanta a unique sastra. Brahman happens to be chetana tattvam or conscious principle and in Vedanta alone the conscious principle is material cause and in all other systems the matter alone is material cause. Conscious being an intelligent cause all darsanam will accept and there is no problem, all other darsanams accept Brahman as nimitta karanam but Vedanta alone takes Brahman as the upadana karanam and thereby asserts Brahman is non-different from the entire creation. Out of six darsanams four of them hold that matter is material cause and Vedanta alone says Consciousness is the material cause. As regards Purva Mimamsa there is no question of cause because they say world was as before and there is no cause for the world to come into being. In Sanskrit it is called chetana karana vadha. This has been discussed in Janmadhiadhikaranam.



This adhikaranam Brahman is nimitta karanam and upadana karanam and thereto focus is on upadana karanam.

Now I will do the general analysis of the first sutra. here Vyasacharya emphasizes that Brahman is upadana karanam or material cause of creation and he gives two arguments. First is the proposition given by the Upanishad Brahman is upadana karanam. The pratijna is *eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena* the knowledge of everything is knowledge of one thing and on analysis we find that this is possible under one condition is *karana vijnanenda sarva karya vijnanam bhavati* and here again which karanam you should know and that is *upadana karana vijnanena sarva karyam bhavati*. Therefore eka upadana karana vijnanen aneka karya vijnana bhavati. If *Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati*. If we join these two we can conclude that *Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati*. This is a powerful reason to establish Advaidam. Where is the pratijna given. In three Upanishad this pratijna we find. First one from Mundaka Upanishad in which the very question by the student itself is *kasmin na bhagavo vijnate sarvam-idam vijnatam bhavatiiti*; this mean what is that, having known which all these become known? [I.3 of Mundaka Upanishad]

We find the same pratijna occurs in Chandogya upanisad 6.1.3 *yenasrtam srutam bhavatyamatam matamajijnatam vijnatamiti katham nu bhagavah sa adeso bhavatiiti*. The meaning of the mantra is that teaching by which what is never heard becomes heard, what is never thought of becomes thought of, what is never known becomes known? The essence is *eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam*.

Third is Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.4.5. in fact this vakyam we have seen in the previous adhikaranam. *Atma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. na va are sarvasya kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati, atmanas-tu kamaya sarvam priyam bhavati; atma va are drastavyah srotavyo mantavyo nididhyasitavyo; maitreyi atmano va are darsanena sravanena matya vijnanenedam sarvam veditam* The discussion what is conveyed by the word Atma whether it is Jivatma or Paramatma. The reason he gives is due to the trend in the significant statement occurring in the section. Here also *Atma vijnanena sarva vijnanenam bhavati* is established. All these pratijnas emphasise the fact that Paramatma is material cause of creation.

The same view alone Krishna reemphasizes in Bhagavad Gita *yaj jnatva na punar moham evam yasyasti pandava yena bhutany asesena draksyasy dimany atho mayi* when though has known it, thou shall not fall again into this confusion. For by him thou shall see all existences without exception in the Self, then in life. Once you know this nothing need be known is *eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati*.

We don't want to say maya is material cause of creation and then it will be *maya vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati*. Then the knowledge will be *maya knowledge*. then Brahman will become a product of maya. if *Brahma n* is not a product *maya vijnanena Brahma vijnanam na bhavati*. Maya as material cause is said in some places for some purpose. In certain context we do say *maya is upadana karanam* it is for certain cause only.

The second reason Vyasacharya gives is because of the examples given by the sruti. Refer to 1.1.7 of Mundaka Upanishad which reads as *yathorna nabhib srjate grhnate ca yatha prthivyam osadhayah sambhavanti yatha satah purnat kesalomani tatha 'ksarat sambhavatitha visvam* as the spider projects and withdraws itself the web, as the herbs and plants sprout out from the earth as hairs grow on the head and body of man so from the Imperishable Being comes out the universe. The example given is material cause example.

Spider is material cause of the word; earth material cause of plants and our body is the material cause of the hair.

Then 6.1 of Chandogya upanisad *yatha somyaikena mrtpindena sarvam mrnmayam vijnatam syadvacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam mrttikatyeva satyam* the meaning of the mantra is it is like this; by knowing a single lump of earth you know all objects made of earth all changes are mere words, in name only. But earth is the reality. The clay pot example is given which reveals the material cause only. Brahman is comparable to the clay. Not that the clay is ultimate truth and clay like Brahman is the ultimate truth.

Then in 6.1.5 of Chandogya upanisad the gold example is given which again is the example for material cause. *Yatha saomyaikena lohamanina sarvam lohamayam vijnatam syadvacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam lohamityeva satyam*.

Third example is in 6.1.6 of Chandogya upanisad *yatha somyaikena nakhanikrntanena sarvam karsnayasam vijnatam syadvacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam krshnayasamityeva satyamevam somya sa adesso bhavati* kristnayatha means iron and various products of the iron and iron is material cause and three example indicate Brahman is the material cause.

In Brihadharaynaka upanisad three examples are given one is fire smoke example to show Brahman is sristi karanam and dundhubi example for sthithi karanam and finally all the rivers merging into ocean is given example for laya karanam the Upanishad points out Brahman is sristi sthithi laya karanam which means upadana karanam. Sristi karana means nimitta karana, Mantra 2.4.8 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad for sthithi karanam; 2.4.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad for laya karanam and 2.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad for Sristi karanam. [these mantras and their meanings are given in the earlier adhikaranam in detail] this is the general analysis. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Prakritih cha the Brahman is to be known as material cause also; pratijna dristanta anuparodhat since it is in accordance with the proposition and the illustration. This the general meaning.

Prakritih means the material cause as opposed to vikriti the product. Material cause is prakrti because it is available to make various products. Gold is available for making many products. The next word is cha mean also; Brahman is material cause also means it is not only nimitta karanam but also upadana karanam or in addition to being the intelligent cause. Pratijna proposition which means a beginning statement which requires a future elaboration. In all the above statement is eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena pratijna. The Vyasacharya keeps in mind Chandogya upanisad, Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantras. In all the three Upanisads there are so many examples which we have already elaborated above. All these illustrations give the material cause alone. nuparodah means violation or contradiction; a-nuparoda means non contradiction. Or in accordance or is in agreement. Acceptance of Brahman as the material cause is in accordance with pratijna and Dristanta of the Upanishad. if you don't accept pratijna as also dristanta will be violated. So accept Brahman as the material cause.

Now further reasons are given in the following sutras.

## **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

**Sutra 1.4.24 [130]**

***Abhidhyopadesacca***

On account of the statement of will or reflection [to create on the part of the Supreme Self it is the material cause.

An argument in support of sutra 23 is given ‘He wished or though may I be many, may I grow forth’. In this text the desire and reflection indicate that Brahman is the efficient cause.

I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. Here the vedic statement of Brahman visualization also supports my conclusion. The Upanishad talks about the sristi pratijna in several places. Before creation Brahman visualized. Before creation he visualized and this Vyasacharya calls it dhyanam. Such vast creation required purna dhyanam and not casual dhyanam. Now how does the bhagavan’s Vyasacharya’s conclusion. Baghusyam, which means let me, multiply into plurality. He did not say let me produce many things. He did not think of some material to make creation. Here bhagavan is material cause which multiplied into plurality. Carpenter does not multiply into furniture. Multiply means transorms into furniture. Since Bhagavan thought over that visualization indicates the Brahman is the intelligent cause also. Bhagavan’s desire is intelligent cause and bhagavans multiplication is the material cause. This we see in II.vi.3 of *Taittiriya Upanishad* the mantra reads as *so kamayat; bahu syam prjayeyeti sa tapo’tapyata, sa tapas, taptva, idagm sarvamasrjata yadidam kim ca, tat srstva tadeva nupravisat tadeva nupravisya sacca tyacca bhavat niruktam cani-rukataam ca, nilayanam cani layanam ca, vijnanam cavi jnanam ca satyam canrtam ca satyam abhavat, yadidam kim ca, tat satyam itya caksate tadapy esa sloko bhavati* the meaning of the mantra is He desired. “I shall become many and be born. He performed Tapas. Having performed Tapas, he created all this whatever [we see]. Having created it, He entered into it. Having entered it, He became the manifest and the un-manifest; the defined and the undefined; the housed and the houseless; knowledge and ignorance; truth and falsehood; and all this whatsoever that exists. Therefore it is called Existence.

The same idea is expressed differently in 6.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad as *tadaiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tattejo’srjata tatteja aiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tadapo’srjata taskadyatra kvaca socati svedate va purusastejasa eva tadadhyapo jayante* here the meaning is That Existence decided ‘I shall be many. I shall be born’ he then created fire; that fire also decided ‘I shall be many. I shall be born;/ then fire produced water; that is why whenever or wherever a person mourns or perspires, he produces water. *Tadaiksata* indicates intelligent cause and *bahusyam praayeye* indicates the material cause. Our focus is on bahusyam indicating the material cause.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Abidhya upadesat cha because of the vedic statement of visualization also Brahman is to be known as the intelligent cause and material cause. Now I will come to the significance of the words. Abhidhyopadesat is a compound word abidhya means comprehensive meditation; in fact anyone before creating anything one has to visualize what he want to do; dhya means total meditation; upadesah means vedic statement. anena iti upadesah abidhyopadesah vedic statement of visualization. Cha means also in addition to reasons given in the previous sutra this reason also should be taken. We will go to the next sutra which gives further support.

## Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

### Sutra 1.4.25[131]

#### *Sakshaccobhayamnanat*

And because the sruti states that both [the origin and the dissolution of the universe] have Brahman for their material cause.

The argument in support of sutra 23 is continued.

I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. here Vyasacharya points out that Brahman is presented as sristi karanam and laya karanam also in many places. Sthithi is also mentioned but we do not stress this. As we have seen before nimitta karanam can be sristi matra karanam and it can never be laya karanam. karpenter is only sristi karanam and not laya karanam. This does not happen. When you destroy something it does not go to the creator. Sristi karanam means it is nimitta karanam and upadana karanam. once you say sristi karanam, material cause alone can be sristi and laya karanam. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes 1.9.1 of Chandogya upanisad. *Asya lokasya ka gatirityakasa iti hovaca sarvani ha va imani bhutanyakasadeva samutpadyanta akasam pratyastam yantyakaso hyevaibhyo jyayanakasah parayanam* what is the end of this earth? Pravahana said 'space, for everything that exists arises from space and also goes back into space. Space is superior to everything. Space is the highest goal. this is a difficult quotation because here Brahman name is not mentioned. Now I have to prove Akasa is Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes this because we have already proved Akasa is Brahman. why cannot Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Brigu valli quotation III.i.3 *yato va imani bhutani jayante, en jatani jivanti yat prayantya bhisamvisanti, tad vijijnasasya tad brahmeti so tapo'tapyata, sa tapas taptva*. The meaning of the mantra is to him he again said 'crave to know well that from which these beings are born; that by which having been born, these beings live and continue to exist; and that into which when departing they all enter. That is Brahman. It is clear and direct. Adhi Sankaracharya did not quote this for two reasons. This is vishya vakyam for janmadhikaranam. Second reason is Vyasacharya talks about sristi and laya karanam and here sristi sthithi laya karanams are mentioned.

There is another example in II.1.1 of Mundaka Upanishad that reads as *tad etat satyam yatha sudptat visphulingah sahasrasah prabhavante sarupah tatha'ksarad vividhah somya bhavah prajayante tatra caivapi yanti* this is the truth; as from the flaming fire thousands of sparks, similar to its form[nature] issue forth; so from the Immortal Brahman O my beloved youth, diverse manifold beings [jivas] originate and they find their way back into it. again the word aksaram comes and this quotation we can take. The idea is Brahman is sristi laya karanam is possible if it is upadana karanam.

Now we will come to upadana karanam. cha sakshat ubhayamnanat; explicit mention of both origination and dissolution Brahman is the material cause. This is the running meaning.

The significance of the word is sakshat means direct; the next word is uphaya amnam uphaya means both; Adhi Sankaracharya takes it as both sristi and layam; or sristi karanatvam and laya karanatvam; amnaya means mention; a special word used for vedic statement

mentioned for both origination and resolution. Sruti statement is Chandogya upanishad and Mundaka Upanishad. more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 142

### **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.25[131]**

#### ***Sakshaccobhayamnanat***

And because the sruti states that both [the origin and the dissolution of the universe] have Brahman for their material cause.

The argument in support of sutra 23 is continued.

We have completed sutra 25 relating to the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. the topic of the first chapter that all Upanisads reveal Consciousness as the very cause of the universe that is both intelligent cause and material cause of the world. this was indicated in the janmadhikaranam and the same topic is repeated for the purpose of conclusion. Even though Brahman is intelligent cause and material cause Vyasacharya wants to focus the material cause aspect. He uses the expression prakriti cha. The very adhikaranam is called prakrtiadhikaranam. He gives various reasons for his conclusion. Vyasacharya wants to give two more reasons for his conclusion.

### **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

#### **Sutra 1.4.26[132]**

#### ***Atmakriteh parinamat***

[Brahman is the material cause of the world] because it created itself by undergoing modification.

The argument in support of Sutra 23 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis. Vyasacharya keeps a particular Upanishad in his mind. that is II.vii.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad that reads as *azad-va idam agra asit tato vai ajayata, tad atmanagm svayam akuruta, tasmad tat sukrtam ucyata iti* the mening of the stotra is in the beginning was verily this non-existence. From that the existent was born. That created 'Itself' by 'Itself'. Therefore, It is called Self-made, or the well made.

In this mantra third line is focused *tad atmanam svayam akuruta* Brahman created itself. Since the Upanishad says Brahman created itself means Brahman is the creator and Upanishad also says Brahman created itself from this we get the idea that Brahman is object of creation also. this means Brahman is the creater as alos the created. This is the significance

of the mantra and it is a statement of Self creation. through this Upanishad points out Brahman is created and creator and to put it in another language Brahman is cause and Brahman is the effect. The Upanishad also reveals the identity of the cause and the effect. Vyasacharya argument is cause and effect is identical under only one condition is when the cause happens to the material cause. Because you know material cause and effect are substantially the same. Clay and pot are cause and effect are essentially the same and the difference between them is *avastha bedah na tu vasthu bedah* there is difference in the condition that is one is un-manifest condition and the other is in manifest condition but we find that the substance is one and the same. Upanishad says Brahman was in the un-manifest form before creation and when Brahman is differentiated and takes the manifest form, we call it the universe. But the in essence Brahman is the very stuff of the very universe.

If this sentence is clear to any who is not able to make out the meaning sruti is more explicit in another place, which is in the same Taittiriya Upanishad II. Vi.3 that reads as *niruktam cani-rukatam ca, nilayanam cani layanam ca, vijnanam cavi jnanam ca, satyam canrtam ca satyam abhavat, yadidam kim ca, tat satyam itya caksate, tadapy-esa sloke bhavati* the meaning of the mantra portion is 'he became the manifest and the un-manifest, the defined and the undefined; the housed and the houseless; knowledge and the ignorance; truth and the falsehood, and all this whatsoever that exists. Therefore it is called Existence. The Upanishad uses the expression that Brahman itself transformed itself into universe. It is the concrete and moving, chetanam and achetanam universe. Vyasacharya argument if the Upanishad says Brahman transformed into universe is possible under only one condition only when the Brahman is material cause and intelligent cause can never become the effect. Carpenter never becomes the furniture or potter can never become the pot. In the beginning stage we says god created the world and in the next stage we say god became the world. The first sentence is talking about the identity of cause and effect and second sentence talks of the transformation of cause and effect both the sentence support our conclusion that Brahman is material cause of the universe.

Now we will do word for word analysis. Atmakrite parinamat because of the Self creation through transformation Brahma is both intelligent cause and material cause of the creation. now we will see the significance of the words. Atma kritih means Self creation and Vyasacharya uses the word ingeniously to indicate the created and creator; or the Self creation and when he uses the word Self creation he remembers sruti mantra of Taittiriya Upanishad. Brahman created Itself is Atma creation. Next word is parinamat is from the word parinama that is transformation or becoming. Here Vyasacharya keeps in mind the words *satyam canrtam ca satyam abhavat* occurring in the mantra II.vii.3 of Taittiriya Upanishad. First sathyam refers to vyavaharika sathyam and anritam is Pratibasika sathyam and third sathyam means paramarthika sathyam, which means paramarthika sathyam, became vyavaharika sathyam and pratibasika sathyam. That is indicated by the word abhavat the modification. Now Adhi Sankaracharya discusses a few points in this sutra. in the sruti statement *tad atmanam swayam akurutat* is there that is Brahman created itself by itself. Adhi Sankaracharya indicates here when Brahman says Brahman creates itself means Brahman created itself through transformation and for this transformation Brahman did not require any other intelligent cause *swayam* means itself transformed and significance of this word *swayam* is Brahman is intelligent cause also. the second point to be noted is this. Vyasacharya uses the expression *parinamat*. Brahman created the world through transformation.. this will disturb us. We have analysed elsewhere Brahman is not *parinama upadana karanam* and it is *vivartha karanam*. Since Brahman creates itself through 'apparent transformation' and that is why I told you elsewhere when we talk about creation we teach at

three level. For the first level student we say that **God created the world** this is for **mandha adhikari**. Then we say that the **God became the world** and this is **madhyama adhikari** and if the person becomes good then as part of final teaching we say **God appears as the world;** and this is for the **Uttama adhikari**. *First one empasises the nimitta karanam and the second one emphasizes upadana karanam and the third one reveals the vivartha karanam only at the third level Brahma sathya jagan mithya becomes very clear.*

Adhi Sankaracharya says that this one sutra can be taken as two sutras. If you split the sutra into two sutras [Atmakriteh and Parinamat] you read as ‘because of the identity of the cause and effect’ Brahman is the material cause of the world and the second sutra will mean because of the transformation Brahman is the material cause of the universe.

## **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

### **Sutra 1.4.27[133]**

And because [Brahman] is called the source

The argument in support of sutra 23 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. first Vyasacharya established Brahman is the material cause of the universe on the basis of the Upanishad. one word Upanishad uses is the word yonih. Yoni is the womb of the mother in which the child is conceived and the child is born. the word yoni has got two meaning one is womb of the mother and the other is the material cause of the universe. If the physical baby is to be formed, food is required for the formation of the baby’s body outside and it is actually born. Outside, annam becomes the material cause only when the baby is born. Before birth mother gives the food to the baby. All these indicate that the womb or the mother represents the material cause of an object. Brahman as the nimitta karanam is symbolized as the father and maya is symbolized as the mother.

This is indicated in sloka 14.4 of Bhagavad Gita as *sarva yonisu kaunteya murtayah sanbhavanti yah tasam Brahma mahad yonir aham bijapradah pita* the meaning of the sloka is whatever are produced in any wombs whatsoever, great Brahma is their womb and I am the Father who casts the seed. Here Krishna very clearly says Brahman is the father and maya is the mother.

Brahman is called bhutanam yonih indicative of the material cause of the universe in 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad as *yat tad adresyam agrahyam agotram avarnam acaksuh srotram tad apani padam niyam vibhum sarvagatam susuksam tad avyayam yad **bhuta yonim** pari pasyanti dhirah*. While signifying the various characteristics of Brahman the creator, the Upanishad calls it bhuta yonim, which means the Source of all creation. Thus Brahman as material cause is established in this mantra also.

Then in the same Mundaka Upanishad 3.1.3 reads as *yada pasyah pasyate rukma varnam kartaram isam purusam **Brahma yonim** tada vidvan punya papa vidhuya niranjanah paramam samyam upaiti* the meaning of the mantra is when the seer realizes the Self effulgent Supreme being ruler, maker and source of the creator even – then that wise on



shaking off all deeds of merits and demerits becomes stainless and attains the Supreme state of Equipoise. Brahma yonim indicates Brahman as the source of all creation or the material cause of the creation.

This is the general analysis and we will go to the word for word analysis. Hiyate Brahman is said to be yonisha source also that is the material cause also; hi therefore Brahman is the material cause of the creation.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya adds a few more points in this context. In the definition of Brahman given in the Brigu valli III.i.2 reads as *tam hovaca yato va imani bhutani jayante yat jatani jivanti, yat prayantya bhisamvisanti, tad vijijnasasya, tad brahmeti, sa tapo tapyata, sa tapas taptva*. The meaning of the mantra is 'crave to know well that from which these beings are born; that by which having been born, these beings live and continue to exist and that into which, when departing, they all enter that is Brahman. An analysis of the word yathah will show that Brahman is the material cause of the universe'. The next point Adhi Sankaracharya discusses is that samkya philosophers may raise an objection as to how can conscious Brahman be the cause of the creation. inert matter alone can be the material cause and how can the Consciousness be the material cause and there is no example to show that Consciousness is the material cause. We quote the example that the spider is the material cause of the web, the sentient being is the material cause of the hair and the nail. The samkya philosopher says that they are not right example. Spider produces the web, which is a matter, and it says inert cause alone produces inert web; so also hair and nail alone produces the material and how can you take it the example that Consciousness produces the materials. For this objection Adhi Sankaracharya says that the examples become important only when we prove something through logic and here we give our example not to prove anything but to assimilate the Upanisadic teaching through the example. Therefore we should that the example is a means of assimilating the scripture. Primarily we arrive at the meaning through the scriptures and not through the examples. Then they say that you don't use logic and example not to prove anything but you use it to understand the scriptures only. at least you use the logic to support the scripture. Your logic even does not support the scriptures. You try to understand it through the scripture that the Consciousness is the material cause of the creation. But it is not supported by logic. We divided logic into two first we are not using it for proving but at least it must be supporting logic, for this Adhi Sankaracharya says that first we negated the idea of proving logic. Now samkya philosopher says that the example should be supporting logic for the example. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says that the first chapter does not deal with supporting logic at all and for this purpose we have the second chapter exclusively for that purpose. We shall discuss the matter when we discuss the next chapter.

With this prakriti adhikaranam is over. now we will present it in our language. Subject matter is Brahman. doubt is whether Brahman is upadana karanam also or not. There is no controversy in accepting it as nimitta karanam. Purva Paksi says Brahman is nimitta karanam and not upadana karanam. our conclusion is Brahman is upadana karanam also. sangathi means appropriateness of the position of the adhikaranam and this is in appropriate position.

## **Topic 7; Prakrtyadhikaranam [Sutra 23-27]**

Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause.

### **Sutra 1.4.28[134]**

***Yetena sarve vyakhyata vyakhyatah***

By this all [the doctrines concerning the origin of the world which are opposed to the Vedanta texts] are explained.

The argument is concluded in this Sutra.

This is the final adhikaranam of the fourth section and also the first chapter also. until now Vyasacharya had shown that Brahman the chetanam is material cause of the creation. chetana karana vadha is established. While establishing chetana karana vadha he had to refute all the achetana karana vadha all those who claimed the matter as material cause of the creation. there are many philosophers are achetana karana vadhi the matter is the material cause. Vyasacharya did not refute all the system and that is samkya philosopher who is prominent achetana karya vadhi. Having elaborated samkya achetana vadhi Vyasacharya says having refuted one I have refuted all the other achetana karana vadhis. He has refuted samkyas pradhanam and nyaya's paramanu. This is the general analysis.

I will give the word for word analysis. Etena by refuting samkya philosopher all other achetana karana vadhis vyakhyata are answered or refuted. Vyakhyatad is repeated to show the end of the chapter. With this samanvaya chapter is over. vishaya is the entire Vedanta samsaya whether Vedanta chetana karana vadha or achetana karana vadha. Purva Paksi says achetnana karana vadha and siddhanti has proved it is chetana karana vadha.

First three adhikaranam seeming supported samkya philosophy and Vyasacharya negated them. The next four adhikaranam Vyasacharya re-establishes Brahman as the subject matter of Vedanta and it is jneya Brahma adhikaranam and lastly Vyasacharya refutes all the other philosophies. With this, this chapter is over. the next chapter we will take in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 143

### **Summary of the 1<sup>st</sup> chapter**

We have completed the I chapter of Brahma sutra known as samanvaya adhyaya. In this chapter, vyasacharya wants to present a systematic teaching of Brahman knowledge with the help of Vedantic pramanam. Therefore we should remember Vedantic teaching is not a philosophy of vyasacharya. The condition to be a philosophy should be a speculative teaching invented by human being unaided by any scriptures. The moment the scripture comes it no more can be called philosophy. It is a speculative system of teaching presented by Vedantic. It is a teaching extracted from Vedantic scripture. Therefore even though the teaching has come from vyasa it is not a pouruseya teaching it is apouruseya darasanam being based on apouruseya Vedanta pramana, the uniqueness of Brahma sutra serve as a thread to make a garland out of adhi sankaracharya statements.

Vyasacharya teaching is thread to teach the essential teaching of Vedanta. Using a method of analysis of mimamsas makes this essential teaching. That is why it is called utara mimamsa. Sutrani. Applying the principle of upakrami shad linga vichara did this mimamsa. Then you arrive at the central teaching of Vedanta. We have to arrive at the central teaching because it is not explicit.

Vedanta contains dvaita vakyas, vishistadvaita vakyas and advaita vakyas and each one interpret in their own matter. There are advaita, vishistadvaita and dvaita srutis etc., jivatma isvara beda, jiva isvara abeda and there are confusions and therefore we need an analysis. This method of teaching is called here samanvaya a technical word meaning consistency. We want to find the consistent teaching of Vedanta. This we call tatparya nirnayah. All this helps us arrive the central teaching of the Vedanta.

This process of arriving the central teaching is called sravanam, sravanam means hearing. Sravanam takes place in spite of you. It is active participation in the analysis of Vedanta with guidance of acharya. Through this mimamsa what is the teaching we arrive at. We come to know Vedanta is independent pramanam, which reveals the unique subject matter called Brahman. Just as Veda purva reveal the unique subject called dharma. That Brahman that is jagat karanam Brahma is the subject matter of the Vedanta.

This is a unique teaching because all other system of philosophy do not accept Brahman as jagat karanam. They accept the achetana vastu as jagat karanam. Vedanta alone says bhagavan alone is the material cause. Here Vedanta reveals Brahman alone became the whole universe and he is the material cause of the world which other systems of philosophies are not able to digest. Every snake every monkey becomes worshipful because of the fact that bhagavan has manifested all. God is the material cause is a unique thing in Vedanta.

With the knowledge of Brahman alone one gets liberation and by knowing this jagat karanam Brahma alone one get moksha. Brahma jnanam is not one of the means of liberation but it is the only means of liberation. Vedantic study is not the one of the means of Brahma jnanam Vedanta is the only means of Brahma jnanam. Vedanta is an independent and unique pramanam. Vedanta deals with Brahman alone and nothing else. Knowledge of Brahman

alone gives liberation and Vedanta vichara alone will give that knowledge. Aveda vid tam brahanta na manute one who does not study cannot gain moksa.

Vyasacharya advice is better study Vedanta and gains Brahma jnanam and gets liberated. The text is called Brahma sutra and that is why i don't say atma jnanam. Brahma jnanam is Brahma jnanam only when Brahman is known as 'i'. When Brahman is known anything other than me it will be reduced to an object of creation and an object can never be Brahman it cannot be Brahman because sruti says so. Whatever you objectify is not Brahman. All object falls within time and space and it does not deserve the status Brahman. Brahman is beyond time and space. Brahma jnanam is Brahma jnanam only when i know Brahman. Brahma jnanam is jivatma and paramatma aikya jnanam.

While establishing this siddhanta chetana Brahman jagat upadana karanam is the siddhanta or primary teaching and it called chetana karana vadha. While vyasacharya establishes the chetana karana vadha incidentally he refuted achetana karana vadha briefly. Primarily samkya achetana karana vadha was refuted.

First chapter focused on the establishment chetana karana vadha and also refuted the purva paksa of achetana karana vadha. These two were primarily done in the previous samanvaya adhyaya. There was another purva paksa called purva mimamsa purva paksa who claimed that karma is the theme of Vedanta and not Brahman. This purva paksa Vyasacharya did not refute and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya took the task of refuting the purva mimamsa in the fourth sutra of tattu samanvayad. He refuted Purva Mimamsa by way of commenting on one word 'tu'. In tattu samanvayad adhikaranam, samkya purva paksa was refuted by Vyasacharya in the sutras. This is the essence of samanvaya adhyaya.

If all these have been done why there is the need for the other three chapters. First chapter is enough for the uttama adhikaris; they are convinced and happy also and the commentators write maximum for the first chapter. If you go by the commentary wise we have one third of the Brahma sutra. If some are not convinced and unsatisfied they must be helped.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 1			
Classes: 143 to 169 = 2-1-1 to 2-1-37			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
143	2	Chap-2: Introduction	
144	4	2 . 1 . 1 and 2 . 1 . 2	135 and 136
145	7	2 . 1 . 2 and 2 . 1 . 3	136 and 137
146	12	2 . 1 . 3 and 2 . 1 . 4	137 and 138
147	15	2 . 1 . 4 to 2 . 1 . 6	138 to 140
148	19	2 . 1 . 6	140
149	21	2 . 1 . 6 and 2 . 1 . 7	140 and 141
150	26	2 . 1 . 7 and 2 . 1 . 8	141 and 142
151	30	2 . 1 . 8 to 2 . 1 . 10	142 to 144
152	34	2 . 1 . 10 and 2 . 1 . 11	144 and 145
153	37	2 . 1 . 11 and 2 . 1 . 12	145 and 146
154	40	2 . 1 . 12 to 2 . 1 . 14	146 to 148
155	43	2 . 1 . 14	148
156	47	2 . 1 . 14	148
157	52	2 . 1 . 14	148
158	56	2 . 1 . 14 to 2 . 1 . 16	148 to 150
159	60	2 . 1 . 16 and 2 . 1 . 17	150 and 151
160	64	2 . 1 . 17 and 2 . 1 . 18	151 and 152
161	68	2 . 1 . 18 to 2 . 1 . 20	152 to 154
162	72	2 . 1 . 20 to 2 . 1 . 22	154 to 156
163	76	2 . 1 . 22 to 2 . 1 . 25	156 to 159
164	82	2 . 1 . 25 and 2 . 1 . 26	159 and 160
165	85	2 . 1 . 26 and 2 . 1 . 27	160 and 161
166	88	2 . 1 . 27 to 2 . 1 . 30	161 to 164
167	93	2 . 1 . 30 to 2 . 1 . 32	164 to 166
168	97	2 . 1 . 32 to 2 . 1 . 34	166 to 168
169	101	2 . 1 . 34 to 2 . 1 . 37	168 to 171
	104		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 1

Class: 143

The purpose of the second chapter does not have any new job at all. It gives only clarity and conviction to the teaching. This is done by two methods the first one is defending Vedantic teaching or reinforcing Vedantic teaching by answering all the possible objections. The objection alone weakens our knowledge. The objections may primarily come from my own buddhi and therefore some people claim you don't think. That cannot be the solution,

Thinking alone make you a human being. Else you will become an animal. Why you want to go to animal janma. I cannot stop thinking and if thinking creates problem stop the problem, by more thinking. Then there are purva paksas like other intellectuals capable of spinning their own teaching. We have to reinforce our siddhanta of chetana Brahma jagat karanam and also we should remove the objections from purva paksas. Objections can arise from three different ways.

First type of objection is sruti virodha dosha. Some one can say your teaching is not in line with Vedantic teaching. it is like teaching that jivatma and Paramatma aikyam and it is against sruti saying that your teaching against sruti itself.

Then the second objection can be in the form of smriti virodha dosha. In tradition we accept smriti also is valid source of knowledge and it has got pramanyam and validity being based on sruti. The teaching should not contradict smriti. Four philosophy samkya, yoga nyaya and vaiseshika are called smriti. Normally we call then other systems of philosophy and speaking they are also called smriti because their authors of those systems are vaidhikas. Kapila, Pathanjali, jaimini and kanadha munis are the authors of the other four systems of philosophies. They are rishis, they are asthikas, and their teachings are in keeping with Veda pramanam.

Anything based on Veda is called smriti. Brahma Sutra itself is a form of smriti only. it is in keeping with smriti. Samkya accepts and borrows Veda and so his is called samkya smriti. There are so many smritis including manu smriti. All of them are based on one vedic source and they should not contradict each other. If they contradict smriti themselves will become weak and the very sruti will become weak. The very validity of Veda will become invalid if we allow the contradiction amongst various smritis.

Third task is objection based on reasoning and logic should be removed. Buddhi always favours reasoning. Even that person who says logic is a problem and therefore give up for him even the rejection of logic is based on the logic. Some say greatest problem is thinking. But he forgets that the very dropping of logic is based on the logic alone. If I say I am guru, you are sishya, and you will accept. When Galileo established sun is the central and not the earth he had to be punished by the church. Because of the pain of accepting it, his intellect will not accept which the intellect thinks illogical.

When you think Vedanta is illogical and you cannot accept Vedanta. for strengthening the siddhanta you have remove the contradictions. Since contradictions are resolved in this chapter it is called the second innings of the one-day match. Therefore the first chapter is first

innings and the second innings we have to defend the purva paksa who is stronger. This is reinforcement of siddhanta.

We have got one more job in second chapter and that is weakening of the purva paksa by showing that whatever objections you raised in our teaching and you should say that all these defects are there in your purva paksa. This is weakening of the purva paksa. Strengthening of siddhanta and weakening of siddhanta is our job in the second chapter. This is done in not only second chapter but also the other two chapters. The second chapter shows that all other darsanams have full of defects. If the first chapter is equivalent of sravanam the second chapter is called equivalent of mananam. Therefore the approach is slightly different. In the first chapter we wanted to extract the teaching from Vedanta.

Every adhikaranam had a sruti vakyam taken from ten Upanisads. The aim was to extract the teaching. in the second chapter we don't extract the teaching. We don't have the vishaya vakyam in the adhikaranam. That is why I did not give you the chart for the second chapter. The second chapter is primarily answering the objections from others. if at all we require a vishaya vakyam I will point out well in advance. The second chapter also has got four padas.

The first pada concentrates on smriti nyaya virodha pariharah. The refutations of objections with the help of sruti and smriti are the essence of the second chapter. This is the topic of the first pada. With this pada we will enter the first adhikaranam of the first pada in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 144

### **Topic 1 Smrityadhikaranam [Sutras 1-2]**

#### **Refutation of smritis not based on srutis**

Sutra II.1.1. [135]

*Smrityanavakasadoshaprasanga iti chet na anyasmrityanavakasadoshaprasangat*

If it be objected that [from the doctrine of Brahman being the cause of the world] there would result the defect of there being no room for certain smritis [we say] no. a dbec` [by the rejection of the doctrine] there would result the defect of want of room for some other smriti.

The conclusion arrived at in chapter I section IV that Brahman is the cause of the world is corroborated by smritis other than samkya. The earliest and most orthodox of these smritis is the smriti written by Manu.

In the last class I pointed out that the second chapter is primarily meant to give clarity to the teaching that has been established in the first chapter by negating between Vedantic teaching and other factors.

Other factors are three seen to be three and they are; one is Self contradiction doubt; second are the doubts or contradiction regarding the Vedantic teaching with other smriti grandhas and the asthika darsanas like samkya, nyaya, yoga and other darsanas; and thirdly the weaknesses regarding the seeming contradictions with tarka and nyaya etc. but if we see the contradiction then our knowledge will be weak and therefore we have to get the contradictions should be removed and this is done in all the four padas of the second chapters. Therefore this chapter is called smriti nyaya virodha parihara and the same forms the topic of the first pada.

Here Vyasacharya resolves nyaya and smriti virodha. When you say smriti, the four asthika darsanas are kept in mind, these four smritis are kept in mind. all darsanas believe in Veda pramanam. First I will give you a general analysis of the first adhikaranam.

Vyasacharya resolves smriti Vedanta virodha the contradiction between Vedanta and smriti. The word smriti has got a wide meaning here and this is primarily samkya smriti is kept in mind even though all the four smriti can be taken together. The essence of this adhikaranam is samkya smriti virodha pariharah.

Now I will come to the general analysis of the first sutra. The first sutra the first portion is purva paksa portion and the second portion relates to siddhanta. Through the first chapter it was established that chetana karana vadha says purva paksa. Brahma karana vadha and Consciousness is the material cause of creation. In addition, purva paksa says if you establish this teaching it will be contradictory to the samkya darsanam Brahma is the material cause of the creation. if there is a contradiction between samkya and Vedanta, it should be resolved for they should live together. Vedanta and samkya smriti should not have contradiction and if



there is one then the samkya smriti will become redundant. Redundence of samkya smriti is not happy news to us as it is a smriti grandha. You may reject Buddhism since it is outside the smriti and outside the scope of Vedantic darsanams. But you cannot do that with other darsanams. You should interpret smriti in such a manner as to accommodate samkya smriti but you have not done this properly. you reject achetana karana vadha and accept the chetana karana vadha, you reject one of the systems based on smriti grandha which is not proper. These are the arguments from the samkya vadhas.

For this answer is given in this sutra. Vyasacharya says what I can do. There are unavoidable in life because suppose I interpret Veda in such a way to accommodate samkya smriti, then I should establish achetana karana vadha. I should compromise in such a way that samkya smriti is also should be accommodated which is possible only when I accept achetana karana vadha. For the accommodation of samkya smriti if I accept achetana akarana vadhas there are some other smritis like manu, nyaya yoga etc., which talk about chetana karana vadha will become redundant and rejected. So the problem is not solved by achetana karana vadha interpretation. Then the problem will remain. Then I can take manusmriti is accepted then samkya smriti will be rejected. If accept achetana vadha, manu smriti etc., will be rejected. If the defect of rejection is common to both you cannot charge me with wrong interpretation. since the problem of defect is common how can you charge me with the defect. When two systems have similar defect one has no right to criticize the other system. Therefore you have no right to charge me.

Then comes the next question if either case we have to reject some smriti why did you choose to reject samkya smriti by taking to chetana karana vadha for which our answer is when I take to chetana karana vadha I reject only samkya smriti whereas when I take to achetana karana vadha not only manusmriti is rejected, in fact the very Veda will get rejected and it will be like cutting the tree in which I am seated. Therefore, I have to reject the one, the samkya smriti that does not stick to the vada. First, I will give you the running meaning of the sutra.

Smrityanavakasa doshah [if chetana karana vadha is accepted] the defect of redundancy of smritis like samkya will arise – chet - if it is argued thus na it is not so; anyasmrityanavakasadoshaprasangat – this is one word because there will be redundancy of other smriti like manu smriti if achetana karana vadha is accepted. This is the running meaning.

Smrityanavakasa doshah this is a compound word consisting of four words. Smriti, na, anavakasa and doshah; this refers to samkya smriti in particular and all achetana karana vadha smriti in general; anavakasa means non validity, or no scope; doshah the defect of smriti anavakasa doshah; the defect in the form of redundancy of samkya smriti. Our view is even if it is smriti if it is against Veda, we cannot accept it even if it belongs to smriti. Samkya feels that all should be accommodated. Dosah is according to samkya and we do not think it is a dosha. There is a possibility of defect in the form of samkya smriti; chet if this argument is made by you – na, there is no such defect and this also is a similar compound with five words, there is one additional word ‘anya’ this means other smritis that belong to the chetana karana vadha and which accepts chetanam Brahman alone is jagat karanam. If I accommodate samkya smriti naturally I will be displacing manu smriti and if you accommodate manu smriti you have to accommodate the samya smriti.

Now the samkya philosopher comes once again. He says that I will find out a method of accommodation. If you accept samkya smriti through achetana karana vadha, then the manu smriti will become redundant is your argument. Now samkya says that I will give you a solution thereby you can accept achetana karana vadha without manu smriti getting redundant or rejected. Manu smriti deals with Karma Kanda as also jnana kanda. It talks about manushya dharma, varnasrama dharma, Purusa dharma, sannyasa dharma, and so on. It also talks about philosophy. You interpret achetana vadha is right then samkya also will be accepted and manu smriti will not be totally rejected and only the philosophical portion will be rejected by accepting the dharma portion. What you should do is reject the philosophical portion of Manusmriti and accept the one dealing with dharma etc. but this you cannot do other way round, you cannot say for philosophy you follow manu and for way of life you take samkya smriti. Samkya smriti does not talk about dharma etc. and therefore if you reject samkya smriti, the entire samkya smriti will get be lost and if you reject manu smriti the entire manusmriti will not go away. This is a peculiar argument. when you reject the samkya smriti is totally rejected; it will of no use. Samkya smriti does not have anything other than philosophy. in manu smriti there is both philosophy and way of life and if you reject philosophy, the dharma portion will be there. When one is niravakasma and the other is savakasa, niravakasa stands better to hold. Savakasa is manu and samkya is niravakasa. Therefore, samkya smriti is to accept is their contention. Now we say that there is another rule. Between an invalid philosophy and valid philosophy valid one must be accepted. here samkya smriti goes against Veda teaching and therefore it is apramanam. but on the other hand manu smriti is within the ambit of Veda teaching and therefore it is pramanam. Hence between samkya smriti and manusmriti, manusmriti can be accepted and samkya can be rejected. While smriti is to get validity from sruti how can it contradict the Veda that gets support. Since sruti teaching is more powerful and since samkya smriti is contradicting it is apramanam. manu smriti accepts sruti and therefore chetana karana vadha is to be accepted. We also say that the first rule is valid both are pramanam. Niravakasa pramanam and savakasa pramanam should be there for us follow this rule. Here there is one pramanam and another is apramanam. Hence this cannot be accepted. pasu himsa is one vidhi in Veda. Ahimsa vidhi also is there. Now when himsa vidhi is there can we reject himsa vidhi taking to ahimsa vidhi occurring elsewhere in Veda itself. Here both are vedha vidhi. We cannot apply the pramana vidhi. We have to find out savakasa and niravakasa vidhi. Yaha himsa is niravakasa vidhi and this law cannot be applied anywhere. It is in the yaga context and if you do not accept in yaga context it will not be applicable anywhere. But ahimsa vidhi will be there in other context except yaga context and therefore ahimsa vidhi is savakasa vidhi and between savakasa and niravakasa, there is no himsa in yaga is the argument and this is quoted by Adhi Sankaracharya in his Gita bashyam. Arujuna rejecting ahimsa vidhi is not a dosha. Yuddhe himsa is niravakasa vidhi. So we say don't apply savakasa niravakasa vidhi and this does not apply and you should apply pramana and apramana and reject the one, which is apramanam.

### **Topic 1 Smrityadhikaranam [Sutras 1-2]**

#### **Refutation of smritis not based on srutis**

Sutra 2. [136]

*Itaresham chanupalabdheh*

And there being no mention [in the scriptures] of others [i.e. the effects of the pradhanam accordint to the samkya system] [the samkya system cannot be authoritative].

An argument in support of Sutra 1 is given.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. here a second argument is given in support of chetana karana vadha acceptance or rejection of achetana karana vadha. The controversy is chetana karanam or achetana karanam. Vyasacharya says let us forget the controversy of the karana field. Let us in the field of karya Prapancha that is closer to sruti. Then we will extend it to karya field also. When we see the sristi prakriya introducing the terms, which are not in keeping with the sruti.

They introduce Achetana mahat tattvam but sruti starts with Akasa sristi, sooksha sristi etc. Also Samkya introduces a peculiar mahat, tattvam, an ahankara tattvam, which are against sruti. From that ahankara tattvam alone emerges panca bhuta sristi says samkya philosophy. Between the original cause and the panca bhuta it introduces mahat and ahankara for which there is no pramanam at all. There is no apourushya aor pourusheya pramanam there is no sruti support also and that mahat and ahankara are unproved categories and therefore in the context of karya Prapancha is against Veda and extending that to karanam also it is against Veda. Since it is valid for karya Prapancha, it is valid in the field of karana Prapancha also.

Now we will see the word for word analysis. Anupalapde because of nonperception itaresham cah like mahat and ahankara also; there is no defect of smriti virodha. The significance of the words is itaresham other categories of samkya philosophy belonging to mahat and ahankara; anupalabdheh means non-perception; not perceptible to sense organs. Mahat and ahankara are not acceptable to sruti. How can I accept a philosophy that takes to imagination? Hence I can easily reject the samkya philosophy. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 145

### **Topic 1 Smrityadhikaranam [Sutras 1-2]**

#### **Refutation of smritis not based on srutis**

#### **Sutra 2. [136]**

#### ***Itaresham chanupalabdheh***

And there being no mention [in the scriptures] of others [i.e. the effects of the pradhanam accordint to the samkya system] [the samkya system cannot be authoritative].

An argument in support of Sutra 1 is given.

We have completed the 2n sutra of first adhikaranam vyavaharika answers the objections raised by samkya philosophers. The Vedantic teaching contradicts samkya smriti. By contradicting the samkya smriti, we contradict the Vedas as well because samkya also belongs to a system based on sruti and Vedas. By rejecting the samkya smriti we do hurt Vedas as well. It is the argument of the samkya philosophers. But what we argue is that between Vedas and samkya darsanam based on smriti, we have to necessirly support Veda and reject samkya because samkya philosophy is contradicting Veda itself. Vyasacharya answer was there was no other way that we have got two types of smriti one near the vedic teaching and the other away from vedic smriti. One talks of Atma ekatvam and jagat mithyatvam and the other talking of Atma bahutvam and jagat sathyatvam. Therefore certainly one has to be rejected. Samkya and allied smritis had to be rejected because they went against the vedic teachings. In whichever aspect it contradicts Vedas we will reject and if samkya is contradicted it is not a dosha at all. Samkya smriti is more against Vedas not only with regard to karanam as also karya Prapancha also there is diversion. We are ready to accept the aspects which do not contradict the Vedas if the view of the siddhantins. Talking about sristi samkya introduced certain principle, which had no vedic support at all as said before. Whenever a philosophy introduces a category it should have some pramanam or the other or it should be supported by Veda pramanam. We accept swarga kija even though it is apourusheya. Mahat and ahankara are not available for apourusheya or pourusheya. They are not available for pancha pramanam or Veda pramanam. Swarga is apourusheya Veda pramana gocharam and hence we accept swarga loka. If you introduce any category with no pramana support and every one will become a philosopher and there is will be no vyavastha or support for such a system. mahat and ahankara are karyams but they belong to the apramana category. There is no pramanam as envisaged by samkya in the Vedas is the argument of Vedantins. Why mahat and ahankara is not supported by Veda. Mahat ahankara sruti pramanyam asit. This is the counter question raised by samkya philosopher. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says that you have followed the first chapter of the Brahma Sutra. We have already discussed before in 1.4.1 of Brahma Sutra whether the word mahat or Avyaktam etc., refers to samkya or different category. We have established that words are different but the meaning is different. Ahankara and mahat have got entirely different meaning under Vedanta while the meaning of the same words are entirely different with the one we have and the interpretation of ours is having the support of the Vedas themselves. Samkya ahankara is

the cause of five elements. In Vedanta five elements have come from Brahman itself and thereafter wards comes the ahankara from five elements themselves. Our ahankara is after five elements and their ahankara has come before five elements. This is one point.

Another point is this purva paksha somehow wants to validate the samkya smriti and wants to accommodate samkya philosophy and we have shown that samkya philosophy is against Veda. As such when we rejected the samkya smriti, they talk about the glory of the founder of the samkya system the Kapila Muni. When the philosophy does stand the scrutiny you drop it and talk about the author. He is a well-known rishi etc., and how can you reject a philosophy of a Maha Purusa. he says that you cannot doubt Kapila as Veda accepts Kapila muni as Svetasvara Upanishad he is much talk about. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says the word Kapila occurs in Veda and it has noting to do with Kapila the Kapila mentioned in Veda refers to Hiranyagarbha born out of Isvara. So Kapila does not have vedic support. What Manu has taught is a tonic to humanity. Now he says Kapila is supported by smriti pramanam. Kapila is greatly glorified as avatara of Vishnu. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says that avatara Kapila is different from samkya Kapila because the very teaching of avatara Kapila is different from samkya Kapila. This is evident from Bhagavatam. There Atma ekatvam is taught there but samkya Kapila teaches Atma ekatvam. He also teaches jagan mithyatvam by giving swapna dristanta. Even though objects are not there we do see them in dream and similar even though duality is not there we see maya avidya. avatara Kapila Atma eka jagan mithyatva vadhi and samkya Kapila is Atma bahutva jagan sathyatva vadhi. Samkya means wisdom. Even though they use the word for wisdom their wisdom means Atma anekatvam jagan sathyatvam and the samkya of Bhagavad Gita is different from samkya of Veda. The word samkya is same but the meaning as per samkya philosophy and Vedanta are different. Now they come out with the argument that Kapila is a siddha purusa. among the siddha I am Kapila so is glorified is Kapila. How can you reject the philosophy of siddha purusa is their argument. Adhi Sankaracharya says how did Kapila become siddha and how did he become a great person and this he did so only by following the vedic powers. When he has derived the powers from Veda, and having derived the powers from Veda how he negate the Veda itself from which he has gained the vedic powers. A power with lesser power he can no longer be given that glory as he deserved. Having derived powers from Veda how can he get the capacity to reject Veda from where he has derived the powers. Kanada also is given the title of sarvajna can I accept omniscience for both of them. If both are sarvajna how can there be deadly contradiction be between them nyaya and samkya. We cannot accept because of these reasons. You may not accept vedic and smriti support and at least do you believe in logic. Yes with limitation is our answer. samkya is clearly established on tarka foundation. Even if you don't accept I because of other reasons, you should accept on tarka basis. Then Adhi Sankaracharya says that in the next pada of second chapter I would analyse how much logical is samkya philosophy. and then I will negate that samkya is sruti, tarka vriuttanja. Therefore samkya smriti is not acceptable. Our tradition is not based on personality and none is greater than Veda. The title of muni etc., we are not going to blindly follow them. Even avatara is not bigger than Veda. The best example being Buddha himself. Even Buddha is said to be an avatara and we will not accept Buddha as avatara and we will negate Buddha also. never fall for personality cult. Krishna is accepted not because of avatara but because he respects Veda. It should not contradict sruti, yukti and anubhava day-to-day experience. Every traditional experience should pass the Veda text. If there are modern acharyas also, we give credence to them only when they follow Vedas. We lose Veda because so-called maha Purusa never followed Veda seriously. The person has become bigger than Veda and it is a worst calamity for the spiritual growth of India. That is why we say scripture should be learnt from those who have studied Veda. Reading other literatures

other than Veda, you will be in trouble and will not conform to the standards suggested by the Veda. Krishna generally follows Veda. Gradually karma will take to moksa, siddha suddhi, go to guru, jnana prapti and then achieve moksa. In the case of samkya majority of the people do not follow the primary teaching according to Veda. Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya do not accept the personality cult.

I have taught you dharma and until you learnt dharma sishta acharya would be your dharma that is sishya will follow the right and wrong of the guru. Guru says the sishya don't follow me in all respects as I am likely to commit mistakes. May be dharma, may be Bishma. Personality is guidelines up to a particular limit and sooner or later sastra should be your guidelines. Even with regard to dharma sastra, we don't believe in personality and take to sastra pramanam only. This is taught even by dharma sastra as also in the sastras. What is important is sastram is our support and that alone protects us and not the personality. That which protects humanity is sastram. There afterwards after liberation it is said that you should leave sastram also. First hold on to god; god will give you guru and guru will give you sastram and sastram will give you 'ourselves'. With this the first adhikaranam is over.

Since Upanisadic statements are analysed vishyah etc is not evident. Still the entire second chapter, the vishayah of all adhikaranam has got one subject matter. the samanvaya done in the first chapter is the subject matter here here. Brahman is the second chapter was proved in the first chapter that is the subject matter of the second chapter. Then the samsaya is whether the consistency is clearly established or not. Samanvaya siddha va or asiddha va. That is the question. Then purva paksha says samanvaya is asiddha. It is not clearly established. His reason is because of the virodhad. Virodhadnis contradiction is whether it is with sruti, or tarka or samkya. It changes from adhikaranam to adhikaranam. but what is common in all is some contradiction purva paksha will talk about. Siddhanta will say samanvaya is established being there is contradiction at all. Sangathi is a standard answer that the adhikaranam is in appropriate position of the second chapter. I will not deal with it in every adhikaranam.

## **Topic 2 yogapratyuktyadhikaranam [Sutras 3]**

### **Refutation of yoga**

#### **Sutra 3. [137]**

#### ***Etena yogah gratyuktah***

By this the yoga philosophy is [also] refuted

The yoga philosophy of Patanjali is refuted here. Yoga is called 'sasvara samya'

This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra known as yogapratyuktyadhikaranam. This is refutation of yoga philosophy. Now I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam. yoga philosophy is very close to Samkya philosophy. and they are called by a separate name because they have added new product to it. they are Samkya philosophy does not accept Isvara tattvam. they accept jiva they accept jagat and they do not accept Isvara. in Vedanta we reject Isvara from Paramarthika dristi. We accept it from vyavaharika dristi. In the empirical world of transaction we accept Isvara. Isvara is different and jiva is different. I need the grace of the Lord to protect me. In Vedanta vyavaharika Isvara is accepted and Isvara is as real as world. in Samkya philosophy they talk about jiva and Purusa and do not accept

Isvara. they say Isvara is not required and everything will happen. Matter and Consciousness are enough and matter will naturally evolve. It is very close to Darwinism. When one accept natural creation, Bhagavan became redundant. This is samkya philosophy. more about it I will discuss in second pada. Yoga said that the matter cannot evolve by itself without underlying principle. So prakriti Isvara and tattvam were introduced by the yoga. Yoga created Isvara. this is yoga philosophy. the second feature is ashtanga yoga discipline; practical discipline for sahdana. These are the two additional features. Rest are the same as samkya. That is why we call it samkya yoga. Hence Vyasacharya says since I had already rejected samkya I need not refute yoga separately because of the same reason.

Now I will come to the word meaning. etena ]by the refutation of samkya] yoga smriti also is negated or refuted. In this Adhi Sankaracharya adds a few points. One is even though philosophically we reject yoga and samkya ashtanga yoga discipline is a useful practice for integrating the personality and therefore we don't hesitate to borrow this idea. Therefore ashtanga yoga as practical discipline is acceptable to us. They say Purusa is asanga Chaitanyam. They say prakriti is trigunatmika yes. Thus ashtanga yoga is acceptable to us and we should know the role of ashtanga yoga. This we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 146

### **Topic 2 yogapratyuktyadhikaranam [Sutras 3]**

#### **Refutation of yoga**

#### **Sutra 3. [137]**

#### ***Etena yogah gratyuktah***

By this the yoga philosophy is [also] refuted

The yoga philosophy of Patanjali is refuted here. Yoga is called ‘sasvara samya’

We have completed the third sutra and second adhikaranam of this pada. Vyasacharya has pointed out in the two adhikaranams that Vedanta does not have any contradiction with samkya and yoga smriti. Where there is some contradiction we should reject and it is better to contradict samkya and yoga rather than contradicting Veda. Contradiction of yoga and samkya cannot be taken as defect in Vedantic teaching. Vedanta is not afraid of greater teachers like Kapila and Patanjali. We are interested in sastra pramanam alone. Adhi Sankaracharya says when we reject samkya and yoga philosophy or system we reject only those aspects contradictory to Vedantic teachings. The aspect that is in line with Vedanta we are ready to borrow. Both define Purusa as asanga Chaitanyam. We have no difficulty to accept this aspect. Prakriti has three gunas also is noncontradictory and we don't mind accepting. All smritis are partially acceptable those which are non-contradictory to Vedanta or logic. We do borrow ideas from them. Among them the four smritis the most important from which borrow most is samkya and yoga. In nyaya and vaisheshika we don't borrow much. But the Vyasacharya accept the fact that samkya and yoga are useful in several aspects. Hence both are called those smritis, which are heavily used by Vedantic acharyas. The Vedanta does not rely upon Whereas byaya and vaisheshikas. After glorifying samkya and yoga Adhi Sankaracharya gives a warning. Since from both are borrowed heavily we should know clearly what to be borrowed and what to be rejected. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says we should be extra careful in studying samkya and yoga and reject unacceptable portions. We borrow two things from samkya and yoga. One set of ideas, which are borrowed, are noncontradictory ideas. Similarly pranayama. Yama, niyama, asana etc., are accepted and borrowed from samkya yoga. Next item borrowed are nonessential features. They are for conveying certain ideas. That is samkya sristi prakriya. It is contradictory to Veda prakriya. Really speaking we should not borrow this. As this is borrowed by puranas, manusmriti and Gita, we do not contradict them. The ashtadha prakriti said in 7<sup>th</sup> chapter belongs to samkya darsanam. the question will come why do we borrow the contradictory portion. Sristi prakriya is not essential for Vedanta because we negate them ultimately. Sristi prakriya is adhyaropa and we negate the whole sristi. Since it is a negatable portion we accept it temporarily. It is non-essential feature. Adhi Sankaracharya wants we should be extra careful in this regard. In Veda and Gita samkya means Vedanta darsanam. when we use yoga it is not Patanjali meditation but vedic meditation. In spite of clear-cut warning both samkya and yoga we have borrowed some of the nonessential features. One such is nirvikalpa samadhi. According to us nirvikalpa samadhi is one of the optional methods for siddha



samadhanam. For this sadhana prapti nirvikalpa samadhi is an optional means., many present nirvikalpa samadhi as means of Advaidic jnanam and the knowledge is confined by Advaidic experience. According to them sravana jnanam is compelled through Advaidic experience and Advaidic experience is not possible without nirvikalpaka samadhi. It is the most prevalent view now and they justify logically. They say in the waking state, we have savikalpaka avastha there is division of subject, object and instrument and the triputi is there in the waking state. It is dvaidic avastha. In dvaidic avastha the Advaidic jnanam you get is theoretical and therefore For the Advaidic to become an experience the division must go and it goes only in nirvikalpaka samadhi. In sleep also the divisions go away but he is asleep. But in nirvikalpaka samadhi one is awake and division is gone and it is Advaidic experience and without Advaidic experience advaidic jnanam is incomplete. Suppose we assume that nirvikalpaka samadhi gives Advaidic experience confirming the Advaidic knowledge. The expounder is patanjali and he in his ashtanga yoga deals with nirvikalpaka samadhi as his prime topic. Yoga means siddha vritti nirodhah cessation of all thoughts, a thought less state; therefore siddha vritti yoga is yoga and culminating in nirvikalpaka samadhi. One remains in one's swarupam in that state. During that state he enjoys the wisdom. Yoga concentrates on nirvikalpaka samadhi as its central theme. If Patanjali is expounder of nirvikalpaka samadhi would he have experienced the nirvikalpaka samadhi. He should have been nirvikalpaka samadhi and nirvikalpaka samadhi is Advaidic experience and Patanjali is greatest Advaidic in the world having experienced the nirvikalpaka samadhi. Patanjali is exponent of a philosophy, which talks about Dvaidam, and he says atmas are many. He says the world is real. Atma is real and atmas are many. Nirvikalpaka samadhi, which he has expounded, has neither helped him to gain Advaidic knowledge nor the confirmation of Advaidic knowledge. From this it is clear nirvikalpaka samadhi can neither give Advaidic knowledge nor Advaidic experience. Adhi Sankaracharya says that I don't want you to insist upon yoga and samkya philosophy. If you find useful you follow. But always remember Advaidic jnanam comes from Vedanta vichara neither samkya nor ashtanga yoga. If it is useful to Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi you can use it and attain jnanam through vichara and gain moksha. Nirvikalpaka samadhi is given more important than what is said by Adhi Sankaracharya. These ashtanga yoga biographies are coming out and people can conclude that only ashtanga yoga alone will give nirvikalpaka samadhi. It is a nonessential feature. You should have sufficient health and you should have values with nothing to do yoga sastra and you should do Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam for gaining jnanam and moksha ultimately. People give overemphasis for ashtanga yoga and nirvikalpaka samadhi. With this second adhikaranam is over. now we will go to third adhikaranam.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 4. [138]**

***Na vilakshanatvadasya tathatvam cha sabdat***

[the objector says that] Brahman cannot be the cause of the world because [the world is of a different nature [from Brahman] and its being so [different from Brahma] [is known] from the sruti.

It is the third adhikaranam consisting eight sutras and it is called vilakshanatvadhikarnaam. Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. Previously samkya and yoga smriti were refuted. Here it will be established that there is no tarka virodha. Now we have to refute the illegality pointed out by the various darsanams. Tarka virodha as charged by the samkya philosophers.

Why should we discuss logicality and illogicality in Vedanta. When logic has no access in the field of reality when logic deals with objective world why should we talk about logic here. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is required unlike in Karma Kanda. in Karma Kanda emphasis is action and not knowledge. we require sufficient knowledge of performing yaga. I require minimum knowledge and I should concentration in doing the yaga etc. here we are supposed to gain swarga loka. It is anustana pradhana. but Vedanta is jnana pradhanam. we have nothing to do but we are required to know something. Jnanam puts an end to all the karmas. where knowledge and understanding becomes important we have to resolve seeming contradiction. They are seeming contradiction because Vedanta talks something which is already evident. It does not introduce a mysterious Brahman. Vedanta points that ever evident I the conscious being is Brahman. since it reveals an evident Brahman we have got conclusion about the 'I'. regarding the I, which is already evident I have several conclusions. I am different from body and mind. I also meditate I experience nirvikalpaka samadhi etc. one is sastra revealed conclusion and another is independently formed conclusion. As long as there is contradictory conclusions, that Atma is akarta but Atma is bokta; etc. and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says since we have contradictory conclusion logic is necessary to find out which is right and which is wrong. The ultimate clarity is the intellectual process. Even nirvikalpaka samadhi seems to have produced wrong conclusion. That is why tarka is required. Mananam alone gives ultimate reality. Sravanam Mananam gives final knowledge and nididyanam is neither for knowledge nor for confirmation and nididyanam is only to eliminate my habitual problem. we get upset and we have problem. Vedantic knowledge is for the elimination of the habitual problem. tarka virodha is parihara. That is why it is included in Brahma Sutra. Samkya philosopher argues that material cause has got a nature which is similar to the effect. To put it in another language material cause and material effect have got similar nature. It is sa laksanyam in Sanskrit. Samana laksanasya bhavah sa laksanam. he proves it by analyzing any number of product. If it is a golden ornament the material cause will be gold alone. Gold alone produces golden ornaments. When the human beings get children, they get human children alone. We don't get animal children. Not only human beings human children and even their nature are hereditary. Even the disease becomes hereditary. Wood produces wooden furniture. Extending this logic the material cause of the universe should be necessarily matter alone and then alone sa laksanya niyama is vindicated. Not only it should be material and whatever feature we see should be there in the world. one is tamo guna [inertia feature] rajo guna [activity feature] and sattva guna [knowledge feature].since sattva guna tamo gunas are there material have the features and prakriti fulfills the condition. Prakriti is matter world is matter. prakriti is trigunamaka matter is trigunatmaka. Prakriti and Prapancha has got sa laksanyam. Your Brahman is totally vilaksanam Prapancha. prapancha is trigunam Brahman is agunam; Prapancha is achetanam and Brahman is chetanam; Brahman is nirvikaram and Prapancha is savikaram. It is impossible for any strength of imagination karya karana sambanda na sambavathi and therefore all of you change from Vedanta to samkya is the Samkya philosopher's view. More we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 147

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 4. [138]**

***Na vilakshanatvadasya tathatvam cha sabdat***

[the objector says that] Brahman cannot be the cause of the world because [the world is of a different nature [from Brahman] and its being so [different from Brahma] [is known] from the sruti.

There are eight sutras in this adhikaranam. the first and the second express the pp [objection] and the others express the true doctrine siddhanta.

We do the general analysis of third andhakaranam with eight sutras. Here Vyasacharya refutes samkya's charge against Advaitam. It is that Vedantic teaching is against logic. This logic is talked about the theme of the first chapter jagat karanam Brahman especially chetanam Brahman upadana karanam Brahman. It is tarka virodha according to samkya philosophers. The general law is called karya karana yoho salaksana niyamah. When we say karya karana yoho karya upadana karya yoho salkasana niyamah, which means law of similarity. The status of possessing common features means similarity between the material cause and the effect that is the products. Samkya philosopher establishes that material cause and the products are of similar nature. Gold produced the golden ornaments. If the material cause has a mixture of copper the ornaments also has the mixture of copper. In you extend to human beings the children happens to be human beings. This is our anubhava and experience and it is logical that the material cause alone manifests itself as the effect. In fact cause and effects are not substances but the same substance in different avastha. Between vasthu and the product there is similarity. Thus salaksanya niyama is experientially and also logically proved. If this law is accepted samkya sristi alone follow this particular law and vedabta sristi does not follow the law. Samkya talks of savikara prakriti as the material cause. The features are it is jadam, it is savikaram according to sakmya philosopher. The nature of prakriti is also savikaram and jadam and therefore the sristi also has the same characteristics. The pradhanam and Prapancha have got salaksanyam the similarity of features. In fact in every aspect prakriti and pradhanam are synonymous in samkya. Vedanta says jagat karanam is Brahman. that is how we started Brahma Sutra. Vyasacharya claimed sruti support for the Brahman being the jagat karanam and upakaranam. They have no salaksanyam and vilaksanyam alone. Their dissimilarity is clear that Brahman is nirvikaram Prapancha is savikaram; Brahman is nirvikalpam and Prapancha is savikalpam; Brahman is chetanam and Prapancha is achetanam; Brahman is Nirgunam and Prapancha is sagunam; they are so widely different that we have to conclude that the world is not product of Brahman but it is Brahma vilaksanam. This is the anumanam jagat na chetana karyam it is not a product of Consciousness or Brahman because chetana vilaksanatvad being dissimilar to chetana vasthu. It is achetanatvad or jadatvad. Vyapti is yat yad vilaksanam tad tat karyam na bhavati. If x is

dissimilar to x cannot be a product of y. I am a human being dissimilar to cow and I cannot be a product of cow. This is the purva paksa contention. The first two sutras are purva paksa sutras. The answer will come later. The purva paksa is samkya philosophers.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Na; world is not a product of Brahman; asya vilaksanatvad because of its dissimilar nature; tatadvamca and that dissimilarity; sabdad is proved by sruti statement. Now we will go the significance of each word. Word na means na Brahma karyam world is not a product of Brahman. it is a product of prakriti or pradhanam. asya means Prapanchasya jagatah for this world vilaksanatvad there is dissimilarity from Brahman; all dissimilarities explained in the last para. Whatever is dissimilar to another, it cannot be product of the other. Tatadvamca and the dissimilarity is supported by sabda pramana itself. He need not quote sabda pramana. Dissimilarity is very clear and it is pratyaksa siddham. Brahman is Consciousness and inert world is dissimilar to Brahman and yet samkya philosopher says that world is achetanam. The difference in nature is also known from the statement of sruti 'Brahma became intelligence as well as non-intelligence [world] as stated in 2.6.3 of Taittiriya Upanishad *vijnanam cha avijnanam cha abhavat*. The world is non-sentient and it is very clearly supported by sruti. Samkya says the part to show that world is inert and the material cause is matter only.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 5. [139]**

#### ***Abihimanaivyapadesastu viseshanugatibhyam***

But the reference is to the presiding deities [of the organs] on account of the special characterization and also from the fact of deity so presiding.

This sutra meets an objection to sutra 4. The word 'tu' [but] discards the doubts raised.

First we will do the general analysis. Here samkya continues with his purva paksa. in this sutra samkya is answering a possible objection to his statement. he is expecting an objection Vedanta ekadesi. He imagines an objection from Advaidin and even if you raise such a question I have the answer. he says that salaksanya niyama is not violated because the world is also chetanam only. this is a possible objection from advaidin. There is nothing called inert in creation and everything is chetanam. In some sentiency is more and in some less. Human beings are more aware, animals are less aware and plants much less aware. In this way the sentiency varies in degree only. this objectionist says that this is supported by Veda pramana itself. Brahman created Agni tattvam by visualizing Agni tattvam he created Agni; then Agni visualized what should be the next creation; Agni visualized and Agni is to visualize next creation then Agni created jalam. That jala tattvam visualized and created earth principle. Sruti talks of Agni tattvam and jala tattvam and from this it is clear they are chetanam only. The creation born out of five elements also are chetanam. Stone is chetanam; desk is chetanam. The difference between body and desk is one is more chetanam and the other is less Chaitanyam. It is like waking man and sleeping man. The entire creation is chetanam. Where is the violation of salaksanyam. This is the argument of objectionist to the samkya philosopher. Samkya says to the objectionist; the objection is not given in the sutra. The

answer is jagat is achetanam only; sruti itself has said vijnananca avijnananca. There is no question of chetanatvam of elements and elemental. What is all about the visualization statement the achetana vasthu visualizing the sristi? Samkya says Veda is pramanam and what you should know is that Agni is chetanam and what you should take is the lakshyartha of Agni and lakshyartha of Agni is Agni devata, which is adhistanam. It is also supported by the Upanishad itself, which talks about ekah devata. Sruti does not support Agni is chetanam and Agni is achetanam only. Samkya quotes some more sruti vakyams occurring in Kaushitaki Upanisad 2.14 which says 'the deities contending with each other for who was the best' all the deities recognized the pre-eminence in prana' and 1.2.4 Aitereya Upanishad that says Agni having become speech entered the mouth that shows that each organ is connected with its own presiding deity. the Chandogya Upanishad upanisad also show the existence of such presiding deity. The fire thought and produced water and so on. This indicates that the inanimate objects may be called god-having reference to its presiding deity. Behind the inert Surya Surya devata has entered. Behind inert chandra, chandra devata has entered; we are not praying to inert Surya and who will pray to inert Surya. Therefore Upanishad talks about the entry of devatas in every organ, which are inert, and therefore we have anustana devatas. One is Upanishad itself uses the word devata; there is a specification by using the expression devata Agni is inert fire and sentient devata and inert Agni is visible and sentient Agni devata is invisible. The specification supports that Agni means devata. There is inherent devata is there in every creation. for vaidhikas everything is worship-able. we do namaskarams to Ganga river and it not the river but the Ganga deity Ganga goddess. There is inert creation and sentient devata and therefore you should accept inert creation and sentient devata.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Tu means but; abhimani vyapadesah means reference to the presiding deity; it is to be understood in relevant cases. Visheshanu gathiphyam because of such specification in the sruti and because of the inherence means pervasion; of the presiding deity. First word is tu is the refutation of purva paksa; purva paksa is eka desa vadhi and Samkya philosopher is negating; abhimani vyapadesah it means abhimani devata presiding devata; and vyapadesat means reference; the reference here is vedic reference in the context of the Veda says water thought of or fire thought of etc., it refers to the respective deity. Vishesha anugathipyam it is compound word vishesha and anugathih this means specification Veda itself uses the word devata in such context; either immediately before or after devata is used to indicate Agni devata is chetanam and Agni is achetanam. Then the next word is anugathi is inherence of devata in every inert object revealed by sruti itself. Our organs are inert accepted by samkya; then Upanishad says every organ has got respective devatas are present. All organs including devata go away at the time of death as revealed by the sruti. Because of these reasons objectionist plea is wrong. This achetana Prapancha must be created by chetanam Brahma. This is the contention. Now we have to go to siddhanta.

The essence of this adhikaranam as told by swamiji.

In this sutra subject matter is the world. samsaya doubt is whether the world is sentient or insentient. Purva paksa says world is sentient. Siddhanta says the world is insentient is siddhanta. Who is the Purva Paksi here and what is his intention. Here purva paksa is misguided Vedantins. Because he says world is sentient for real one will not say so. the intention is good when he says world is sentient. The intention is good by saying world is sentient, he says sentient Brahman is the cause of the world without violating salaksanya niyama. Since his goal is noble he is wise. The end is noble and so he is Vedanta. who is the siddhanti and he is samkya philosopher. Purva paksa is unreal Vedantins. By establishing the

world is insentient he want to show that insentient prakriti is karanam without violating salaksanya niyama. Siddhanta says the world is inert. That is the essence of the sutra.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 6. [140]**

***Drishyate tu***

But it [such organization of life from matter] is also seen

Objection raised in sutras 4 and 5 are now refuted.

First we will do the general analysis though which samkya Vyasacharya refutes. Purva paksa is cause and effect must be similar and in Advaita this rule is violated and in samkya this rule is not violated. In Vedanta it is violated because cause is chetanam and effect is achetanam. In samkya both are achetanam. So tarka supports us. We have three answers at different level. I will enumerate the answers briefly.

We say salaksanya niyama is acceptable to us. Similarity between cause and effect is acceptable to us and it is not violated in Vedanta. this answer is given by Adhi Sankaracharya. Next salaksanya niyama is acceptable to us and it is not applicable to Vedanta. this is answer number two. There is no question of violation and Vyasacharya himself later in the Arambanadhikaranam gives this answer. The third answer is the salaksana niyama is not acceptable to us. Third answer is given by Vyasacharya in this sutra.

Answer number one is salaksanya niyama is acceptable to us and it is not violated by Vedanta as stated by Adhi Sankaracharya. Adhi Sankaracharya asks a question to samkya. You say cause and effect should be similar. When you talk about salaksanyam do you mean absolute similarity or partial similarity? Adhi Sankaracharya asks this to Kapila. Suppose samkya says absolute salaksanyam identical in all features, then the problem cause and effect will not be called cause and effect at all and it will be cause only and how you will call it an effect. There will not be two thing and cause will be effect and effect will be cause. Adhyantika salaksanyam even samkya cannot talk about. There will be some common features and there cannot be absolute commonness. If you accept some feature I can show between Brahman and creation there will be salaksanyam. How it is so? That we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 148

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 6. [140]**

***Drishyate tu***

But it [such organization of life from matter] is also seen

Objection raised in sutras 4 and 5 are now refuted.

We do the general analysis of the third sutra of third adhikaranam. in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya refutes logical contradiction in samanvaya of the first chapter and logic there is a contradiction which means samanvaya is illogical. This is the charge give by other systems of philosophies. In first two sutras samkya pointed out the contradiction that between material cause and effect there must be similarity in features that we see in anubhava. there is common feature between cause and effect and that is material cause and effect. This is called salaksanya niyama. Samkya charge that this nyaya is violated in Vedantic theory of creation and it is done so in samkya theory of creation. Here cause is prakriti and world the effect there are many salaksanyam. Both are material in nature and both are savikaram and savikalpam etc. in Vedanta Brahman is the upadana karanam and world is the product and we see more of vilaksanyam than of salaksanyam. Vyasacharya gives the answer from third sutra. I gave three answers. First we accept salaksanya niyama and we establish that it is not violated in Vedanta. salaksanyam is law of similarity between cause and effect. Second we accept the salaksanya niyama and it is not applicable in the law of creation. the third is salaksanya is not acceptable to us. First Adhi Sankaracharya gives one. Second one is answered in another adhikaranam. Vyasacharya gives the third reply in this sutra.

The cause is Brahman and effect is Brahman. Between them there is salaksanyam is there are not. When you say similarity should be absolute or certain features are common is our question to Samkya philosopher. If cause and effect are absolute, there is no need two separate words of cause and effect need not be there. Father and son are same in all respect there will not be father and son and there will be one person only. For this samkya will say that there are similar in certain respect and in certain respect difference is there. prakriti is avyaktam and Prapancha is vyaktam. Therefore salaksanya niyama means there are some similarities and sometime it is more and sometimes it is more. Sometimes it is so close and we will say son is exactly looking like son etc. the world has got five features.

Drg drsya viveka sloka 20 reads as *asti bhati priyam rupam nama cetyamsa pancakam adya trayam Brahma nipam jagat rupam tato dvayam* the meaning of the sloka is every einty has give aspects which are it is it shines, it is dear, its name and form; the first three belong to the Reality and the latter two to the world. asti is existence; bati it is evident; priyam rupam it is a source of joy; mame and form; sat chit ananda nama and rupa five features; three are

borrowed from Brahman only. In certain object existence alone is evident and in certain existence Consciousness are evident closer to Brahman and in the case of jivan mukta existence Consciousness and ananda are evident and so Brahman is similar to sat aspect and sat chit aspect or sat chit ananda aspect. So you cannot say there is no violation of salaksanya niyama. This is the first answer.

Second is more important answer. I said salaksanya niyama we accept but it is not relevant to the Vedantic creation. it is not applicable. The reason is this that Upanishad does mention karana karya sambandha which between world and Brahman and it is in the beginning stage of adhyaropa prakarana stage or sristi stage alone. Later in apavada prakarana the Upanishad itself negates karana karya sambandha. Therefore ultimately speaking Brahman is not a karanam at all. For this we have three supports and the first is sruti support. *Anyatra dharmad anyatra adharmad krita kritat anyatra bhutac-ca bhavyac ca yat tat pasyasi tad vada* that which thou seest as other than virtue and vice – as right and ‘unright’ as other than cause and effect as other than past and future tell me that. tad etat Brahma apurvam anantaram and abashyam that means that sruti tells that Brahman is not a karanam; because since Brahman is nirvikaram without any change it cannot become modified to become the effect and Brahman is not subject to change it can not become a product of the world; logic supports as that to become a material cause it has to modify to become an effect and it cannot become a product. Brahman is not a karanam and in intermediary stage it is cause means it is karanam ‘as though’ it is vivartha upadana karanam and it is said to be a cause for certain purposes. When you say a person is a lion and not that he is a lion in full sense of the term and he has the courage of a lion or he is a member of the club. How can be called a lion. Some samanya dharma is there and similarly Brahman is karanam because there is some similarity in karanam. When you study that, we should know what are the similarity and what are the dissimilarity not to be applied. When you say that he is pillar of the organization means without him the organization cannot survive and it should not be taken that he is pillar made of cement and mortar. We should know where we should take the comparison and where we should not take it. if we say Brahman has karana karya sambandha means what aspect we should take and what we should not take. Salsaksanya niyama we should take and this rule is not applicable. Between rope and snake salaksanya niyama is not applicable. Rope is vivartha upadana karanam. in arambanadhikaranam it is said that an effect cannot exist separate from the cause and therefore effect is independently existent mithya and cause is independent existing sathyam. Sathya mithya sambandha alone is indicated as karana karya sambandha and don’t extend karya and karana too much and don’t ask too many question as to sristi and karana karya sambandha means you should note one amsa that Brahma sathya jagan mithya and world cannot exist separate from Brahman. Brahman is eternally sathyam and world is eternally mithya; then why do call it karya and karana and we call so because karyam cannot exist separate from karanam and world cannot exist separate from Brahman and karyam is born means world is born don’t talk about those things and we are not interested.. Karana karya sambandha means sathya mithya sambdandha. Pot is only a nama rupa. Similarly world is only a nama rupa. Clay is only substance and so also Brahman is only a substance and the world is but a nama rupa. Therefore vivartha karana karya sambanda salaksanya niyama nasti and parinama karya karana sambandha asit and when salaksanya niyama is real it is applicable and when it is ‘as though’ salaksanya niyama is not applicable. This we will discuss in Arambandadhikaranam. This is the second answer.

In the first two answers we accepted the salaksanya niyama and in the third answer we say that the salaksanya niyama we don’t accept. In the first two cases we accepted the salaksanya niyama temporarily and gave our answer; and in the third answer we totally negate the



salaksanya niyama outright. He says you cannot talk about similarity between cause and effect comes out of Chaitanyam Brahman. Your argument is chetanam can produce chetanam only; achetanam can produce achetanam; chetanam cannot produce achetanam and achetanam cannot produce chetanam. Vyasacharya says this rule is violated in our experience. It is violated both ways. From Chaitanyam achetanam is created and from achetanam Chaitanyam is created. Of course we require only the first one chetanat achetana sristi is to be explained. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example and he says from inert cow dung you see the worms coming. Here we find achetana cow dung we see chetana worms. This is an example for achetana chetana sristi. Then there is another example. Rope snake example is ready in hand. Rajju is achetanam and sarpa is chetanam. Don't say sarpa is unreal and then I will say world is unreal.

Similarly from chetana achetana sristi is also possible and for this sruti gives an example. It is seen in 1.1.7 of Mundaka Upanishad *yatharna nabhih srjate grhnate ca yatha prthivyam asadhyah sambhayanti yatha satah purusat kesalomani tatha 'ksarat sambhavatiha visvam* the meaning of this sloka is as the spider projects and withdraws [unot itself] the web as the herbs and plants sprout from the earth, as hairs grow on the head and body of men so from the Imperishable Being comes out the universe. From the body of a living hair comes; so also nails are born. hair and nails are achetanam. It comes from chetana human being. This is our daily experience. For this Samkya philosopher gives a reply. He says that your example I don't accept. He says the hair and nails are born out of body, which is a matter. hair and nails are also matter. from material body material nail and hair have come. both are material and both are jadam only. for this Adhi Sankaracharya gives an answer. if you say body is also inert and hair is also inert bring a blade I will test on you. How can you say body is inert and body is chetana matter and hari is achetana matter. this is experienced by us. How deos body becomes chetana is a different issue. Don't you agree that body is chetana matter and hair is achetana matter. there is big difference between chetana matter and achetana matter. between chetana matter and achetana matter there is no salaksanya niyama at all and there is big vilaksanyam and even then they have karana karya sambandha. Adhi Sankaracharya argues all the transactions are possible because of the difference between chetana matter and achetana matter. your Body Mind Complex is chetana matter and it employs achetana matter the chair. If the chair is chetanam, the chair will feel uncomfortable you being seated for a long and time and will adjust itself and then you will be in trouble. Think of a situation if the dress becomes chetanam and you have to take care that dress does not strip away from you. Bogya Prapancha beda itself is because chetana matter and achetana matter vilaksanyam only. and therefore there is a big difference between chetana and achetana matter and even then it has karana karya sambandha. this is the third answer given in this sutra. now I will come to word for word analysis.

Tu` but drishyate the dissimilarity between cause and effect is seen. This is the meaning of the sutra. the significance of the word is tu means the rejection of samkya purva paksa; drishyate means the violation of the rule is experienced directly. Violation of salaksanya niyama between karya and karana and the rule held by Samkya philosopher is experienced. When Vyasacharya says experienced he does not say where. It is experienced in hair and nail. Otherwise you can never cut the hair or the nail. It is pratyaksa pramana to negate the samkya salaksanya niyama. So Brahman can happily be jagat karanam. in chetana Brahman becoming achetana jagat karana is established in samanvaya adhyaya. Samanvaya established is stabilized without being shaken by any argument. with this the third sutra of this adhikaranam is over.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 149

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 6. [140]**

***Drishyate tu***

But it [such organization of life from matter] is also seen

Objection is raised in sutras 4 and 5 are now refuted.

We have just completed sutra 6 of second chapter. Vyasacharya here establishes that there is no defect of contradiction that is no defect in the form of contradiction in Vedanta teaching. Vedantic teaching is free from the defect in the form of contradiction. The teaching has been established in the first chapter. The samanvaya has been established in the firsts chapter. That samanvaya is the subject matter of the whole second chapter. The analysis here is whether the samanvaya is endowed with contradiction or whether it is without the definition of contradiction. Samsaya is contradiction here. Is there is contradiction defect is there or not is the question. Purva paksa says that in samanvaya there is contradiction and we say that in samanvaya there is no contradiction. What is the difference in different adhikaranam. in each adhikaranam the purva paksa will raise a particular type of contradiction. The internal differences in particular contradiction will be pointed out and in another adhikaranam it will be another type of contradiction. In some it will be smriti virodha secondary scriptural differences. In certain adhikaranam it will be sruti virodha. This will be the purva paksa's argument. we have to resolve seeming contradiction. And finally it will be about logical contradiction posed by samkya philosopher. Virodha parihara adhyaya. Now we see the third adhikaranam. first we saw samkya sruti virodha parihara. In second we saw yoga virodha parihara. They were negated in the first two adhikaranam. now we have entered the third adhikaranam named vilaksanadhikaranam. It has eight sutras. Now Vyasacharya sees the refutation of the charge of logical contradiction. It is imputed to Vedanta or Advaitam by different systems of philosophy. the logical argument given by the purva paksa will have their own set of logical defects. We should note when we do the one parihara will not satisfy all the people. We have to individually negate their charges. Here samkya philosophers give the charges of logical defect alone. For charging Vedantins he used an important nyaya karya karana yogo salaksanya nyaya and this is upheld only in samkya philosophy. in samkya philosophy karanam is prakriti and karyam is Prapancha. so salaksanya niyama in not upheld by Vedanta. Karanam is Brahman and karyam is Prapancha. Vyasacharya refuted that in these sutras. Now we are going to assume Vedantins has indicated that Brahman the Chaitanyam alone is jagat karanam and Vyasacharya has proved that prakriti cannot be the material cause of the creation. once we establish this Brahman is material cause in these sutras now Samkya philosopher will come with further arguments in the following sutras in the same adhikaranam. the world cannot come out of Brahman is their argument. I will now give some general notes as to why people have difficulty in accepting Vedanta. why other

darsanams are not able to accept Vedanta. to talk about creation out of Brahma the basic question that arises is was this creation present in Brahman before origination. The samkya asks Vedantins. Samkya wants to show that we would be in trouble. Suppose we say that world was not there and if Brahman has created the world afresh means this vadha is called asat karya vadha. [This topic is elaborately discussed in Mandukya Upanishad II and III chapter]. If you say the world was nonexistence before creation samkya says the fresh world is created or armabavadha. The basic law of conservation of matter will be refuted. The law of conservation of matter is that matter cannot be created or the matter cannot be destroyed. Asat karya vadha cannot be accepted for this simple reason. To avoid this problem if we accept if the world did exist in Brahman in potential or un-manifest form you call it maya or any name and you have to accept matter before creation. in which case Advaidin has got another problem. Before creation he accept Brahman and the world also. chetanam Brahman and achetanam Prapancha in potential form and how Advaidin will accommodate dvidam; how it will accommodate the world which is a matter and according to samkya, Advaidin will not be able accommodate this potential universe. Now the question is whether the potential world is different from Brahman you enter into duality if potential world is accepted, as identical Brahman will be achetanam like potential world like the potential matter and to avoid this problem if you say potential world is part of Brahman and that potential world comes into existence. There is no advaida hani in this proposal. But part of Brahman cannot be there because Brahman is part of Brahman. This answer will not satisfy me says samkya. If Advaidin accepts the world as part of Brahman, then Brahman is endowed with parts. Then Samkya philosopher counters that you very clearly say that Brahman is nirvakalpam Brahman is niravayavam and Brahman is without parts and how can you say now that the potential world is part of part-less Brahman. if you say that the potential world is not there and then they would ask how the world came out of nothing. Therefore your creation theory is wrong is what is kept in mind when Samkya philosophers attack advaidic philosophy. if you say world is sat then there is problem and if we say asat also there is some problem with no third possibility. You think that there are no possibility sat and asat and as long as you have only two possibility then there will be difficulty with cosmology and only solution is the third possibility and world is neither sat nor sat but is is mithya. Samkya does not accept mithya; yoga does not accept mithya; vaiseshika Purva Mimamsa vishistadvaida dvidin do not accept mithya and they are not able to assimilate Advaida and they have to understand Brahman and also the concept of mithya. Advaidin answers the world was existence in Brahman potentially. That potential world alone comes to manifestation and we only say the un-manifest world comes to manifest form. it was existent in Brahman. if you accept the world in Brahman will you not get into problem of dvidam. In one place you say Brahman is without part and another place you say world was part of Brahman of the part-less Brahman. For this we say world was part of Brahman and still Brahman is part-less. When we say the 'world' is part of Brahman we mean it is mithya part of Brahman and it is as good as not a part of Brahman. It is in Brahman but you should take it 'as though' it is; for the world is mithya, which means it is of lesser order of reality. Mirror reflection is seen but you don't count it as a second thing. Dream experience is like real but you don't count it as reality. It is like swapna or dream. When we give swapna example, the example has got a limited application. If an example can be totally applied the example will be equal to original. Swapna example has got limited application. Their problem is that they extend the example. Swapna can be experienced but it should not be counted. But the vishistadvaidins count and if unreal elephant is seen swapna, then they should have seen the real elephant in waking. So they say the unreal swapna world is not possible without seeing a real world. we should take the example for the example sake and it should not be extended further. When you say man is pillar of the organization I want to extend this much that as the pillar collapses the building

collapses so the person is important. In the same manner we should take the world and the creation also. Brahma sathyam jagat mithya. Brahmas jagat karanam and in Brahman un-manifest mithya world and manifest mithya world becomes un-manifest mithya world. This mithya world expands and contracts and the whole mithya world rests on Brahman. it is neither sat karya vadha nor it is asatkarya vadha. It is ajati vadhah and no understanding this Samkya philosopher is going to go against Advaidins. Keeping this in view, if you read the sutra you can understand clearly. The whole problem is acceptance and non-acceptance of mithya sristi.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 7. [141]**

*Asaditi chet na pratishedhamatratvat*

If it be said [that the world, the effect, would then be] non-existent [before its origination or creation], [we say] no, because it is a mere negation [without any basis]

An objection to sutra 6 is raised and refuted.

First we will do general analysis of this sutra. There are two parts first is purva paksa and from iti chenna it is siddhanta. Purva paksa is Samkya philosopher. He says o! vedantin if you refute my philosophy you will end as asat karya vadha. You say Brahman is jagat karanam and world arise out of Brahman and you say Brahman is suddha chetana tattvam and you say from that Chaitanyam Brahman achetanam jagat is originated. He argues like this as he does not accept the mithya concept. He takes suddha Brahman is jagat karanam and if you say that from that Brahma world has come then you indirectly say that nonexistent world arises out of Brahman. Before sristi achetanam jagat would be nonexistent in your philosophy. According to him he accept pradhanam is jagat karanam, which is achetanam. In pradhanam world can be potentially there. Before creation the world cannot be there in Brahman and as such you have to become an asatkarya vadhi is the argument of Samkya philosopher to the Advaidins. Before creation you have to accept world is non-existent in Brahman. this is the purva paksa part. now siddhantins says na you cannot argue like that. Your statement is negation of the world without validity. Now Advaidin asks a question to samkya. According to Advaida philosophy the conclusion is negation of the world in Brahma before sristi. If world is accepted before creation then enter dvaidam. When you mention the negation of the world what type of world you ask? Is it sat world or asat world or mithya world negation. Then Advaidins say that the world before sristi cannot be negated. If the world is sat, it can never be negated. Advaidin does not negate asat world before creation. asat world means nonexistent world. it is already nonexistent and why should it be negated. The third possibility is mithya world and Advaidin does not negate the mithya world before creation because Advaidins accept that there was a mithya world before creation. only note he adds is that there is a mithya world in potential form. in fact mithya world is called maya. Before creation mithya world was there in Brahman in the name of maya in potential form and therefore whenever I say Brahman is jagat karanam I mean Brahman plus maya is jagat karanam. Maya here is potential universe. Where is asat karya vadha. No. Samkya will ask that Brahman plus maya is jagat karanam. Advaidins say yes. Then he will say that

Brahman plus maya is jagat karanam, and then he will say you are Dvaidam. Advaidin will have a big smile. In Advaidic mathematic one plus one is equal to one. Brahman plus maya is Brahman only. Maya is lower order of reality. One person says dream world came to out of waker. From one angle dream world came out of waker because arrival of dream world cannot be taken as arrival of anything. Negation of sriti before srist has no validity and we should accept this as maya. more in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 150

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

Sutra 7. [141]

#### ***Asaditi chet na pratishedhamatratvat***

If it be said [that the world, the effect, would then be] non-existent [before its origination or creation], [we say] no, because it is a mere negation [without any basis]

An objection to sutra 6 is raised and refuted.

We are in the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra of third adhikaranam. here samkya philosopher tries to point out in Vedantic teaching of creation. We pointed out that samkya theory of creation is inappropriate and said that Brahman alone is the cause of creation. if you take in this way, Samkya philosopher says that it would involve some logical problem. he raises some logical questions and suggests certain answers. He says that those answers would not be logically satisfactory. The question he raises is as to whether the creation potentially existed in Nirgunam Brahman or not. If the creation existed you will have the problem of advaida hani the existent Brahman and existent world. The acceptance of the existence of the world before creation is called sat karya vadha. If you become a sat karya vadhi and accept the potential world you will become a sat karya vadhi and you have to give up this to be remain an Advaidin. Then you have another alternative you will be a satkarya vadha although he does not know that there is another third choice. Asat karya vadha is that the world was not existent in Brahman and there is no problem of dvaidam. That is the charge he gives in this sutra. Advaidins problem is that neither he can say he is an asat karya vahdi or sat karya vadhi. Accepting and taking shelter as sat karya vadha and world was nonexistent before creation and the origination of non existent world is against the scientific theory of the law of conservation theory. The matter cannot originate out of nothing. Energy cannot originate from nothing. Samkya philosopher dubs ua as asat karya vadhi. I don't say the world is potentially non-existent. We also don't say world is existent before creation. Then our answer is that the world is as though existent before creation and therefore it does not come under existent category also and also it comes under non-existent category also. Now also it is seemingly existent; before creation the world was seemingly existent; now also the world is seemingly existent. You say world is seemingly existent before creation; seemingly existent after creation. What is the difference between the world is 'seemingly existent' before creation and world is 'seemingly existent' after creation. For that we answer before the world is 'seemingly existent' in unmanifest form and after creation the world is 'seemingly existent' in manifest form. Final point is after sristi since the mithya Prapancha is vyaktam or manifest vyakta mithya Prapancha is manifest so we talk about creation in addition to Brahman not because it is sathyam but because it is vyaktam. Before creation it is mithya only and we cannot talk about mithya Prapancha because it is avyaktam. Before it was avyakta mithya and it is now vyakta mithya. Since mithya Prapancha is avyaktam we need not talk about it and hence we say

Brahman is cause of creation. what we should have said Brahman plus avyakta mithya Prapancha but what is avyaktam we don't say. It is like that we don't say milk has got potential butter. Milk having butter in potential form is a fact we know and we see and hence we do not explicitly say the fact. What is avyaktam we don't talk about. When we see clay we don't say we see clay and potential pot in it. this potential mithya Prapancha will neither come under sat or asat and you cannot allege me that I have become an asat karya vadha in my approach. You should not asat karya vadha a term relates to samkya philosophy; asat karya vadha belongs to nyaya philosophy and mithya Prapancha belongs to advaيدا philosophy. Cosmology is the study of origin of creation of the world. we have three cosmological theories of sat karya vadha of nyaya philosophy; asat karya vadha of samkya philosophy and mithya Prapancha of advaيدا philosophy. All these three should be in your fingertips to enjoy the class. I have elaborately discussed in Mandukya karika third chapter. This topic will come repeatedly later also. Vyasacharya wants to teach Vedanta. Not only he want to teach but also he wants to show the difference between the samkya, nyaya and Vedanta. There is one difference in the theory of creation. All believe many atmas are there. there are so many other differences also and in Brahma Sutra Vyasacharya focuses one difference that is cosmological difference, difference in the theory of cosmological difference. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Asat the universe must be nonexistent before its creation; itichet if it is argued that; na it is not so; pratishedha matratvat because of your statement is a mere negation without validity. Mere negation is in the sutra the rest of the words is supplied by us. Universe must be nonexistent before creation, if it is argued so it is not so because your statement is mere negation without validity.

Now we will take the word and see its significance. Sat means nonexistent; what is nonexistent is jagat asat; world is nonexistent before its creation; this essentially means asat karya vadha. Who tell whom is samkya philosopher says Vedanta vadha is asat karya vadha. Why he concludes like that is because in his mind that there are two theories are possible sat and asat karya vadha and Vedantins have negated sat karya vadha and therefore you have to come to asat karya vadha. It is alleged asat karya vadha. Up to this purva paksa. Iti chet na; if such an allegation is made by samkya philosopher we don't accept it. If it is alleged it is not so. Pratishedha matratvat it is a mere negation of the world; it means it is only alleged negation of the world and we have no proof and we accept the world and we have not done so. There is no evidence for the negation of the world. We accept the world. We accept the mithya world. Adhi Sankaracharya feels the vagueness of this sutra and he says that if you don't understand the significance of the sutra don't worry and we will thoroughly analyse this in detail in arambanadhikaranam. The word analysis is over. We will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 8. [142]**

### *Apitau tadvatprasangadasamanjasam*

On account of the consequence that at the time of pralaya or great dissolution [the cause becomes] like that [i.e., like the effect], the doctrine maintained hitherto [that Brahman is the cause of the universe] is absurd.

A plausible objection against Brahman being the cause of the world raised here.

This is a purva paksa sutra. one is kevala purva paksa sutra and kevala Vedanta sutra and also misra sutra which has purva paksa and answer from Vedanta as well. In Vedantic teaching the misra sutra will have iti chenna. It will have both purva paksa portion and Vedanta portion as well. Here it is a typical example of visvato muhatvam of the sutra. The significance of the sutra one and the same sutra we can interpret differently by looking at it in different ways. For this sutra purva paksa is going to impute four dosham on Vedanta. We have to understand four doshas and we have to negate each one of them separately.

First I will give you the general analysis. Here samkya is purva paksa who is going to charge Advaita in the context of pralayam.

First dosha he says is during pralyam all jivas will have to merge into Brahman, as according to you Brahman is jagat karanam. Jivas are full of doshas which means the defects punya papa etc. if they don't have punya papa dosha they will be Isvara. they are full of punya papa and others as well. When jivas merge into Brahman, all the punya papa dosha will pollute Brahman, at the time of pralyam Brahman will get polluted. Brahman is nithya suddhah and Brahman is supposed to be nithya suddhah. In pralayam Brahman will become asuddhah with merger of jivas with punya papa.

The second dosha he says is to avoid the first problem is that you have to say that at the time of pralayam not only jiva merges into Brahman and all the punya papa doshas also will merge into Brahman and Brahman will not have any asuddha or impurity and this must be your answer to avoid my charges. If you say so there will be a problem. The problem will be if all punya papa also resolve all jivas will get liberated in pralayam without studying Vedanta. Then there will be no more jagat and re-creation will not be there. Neither the world will come nor jivas will come. When punya papa gets resolved jivas, jagat will not emerge after pralayam.. There will no more creation. Even with no punya papa the creation will come; this we have to assume for the next creation will be without any punya papa. Samkya says if you say so there will be another problem. If all jivas and jagat will be reborn without punya papa and the \problem will be that even liberated people will be born again and liberation will not have any meaning. We say a liberated person is not reborn because he does not have any punya papa, and suppose you change your philosophy and jivas will be reborn even without punya papa then even the jivan muktas will be reborn again without punya papa and then the mukti will not have any useful meaning. This is the third dosah alleged to by purva paksa.

The fourth dosha he points out is that to avoid the problem you the advaitin may give this reason. In pralaya kala jiva does not merge into Brahman. Jivas continue to have their individuality and punya papa will continue with Jivas. Then, you say that during pralayam Jivatma does not merge into Brahman. The last answer you have to give is that during pralayam jivas do not merge into Brahman. this possible answer also is not right because and samkya counters that if jivas do not merge into Brahman during pralayam also what will not be difference between sristi, sthithi and pralayam because during sristi the jivas enjoy their



individuality and during pralayam also they enjoy the individuality and if the distinction of karyam continue in pralayam and you cannot distinguish between sthithi and pralayam. Therefore that answer also does not stand to reason. Therefore our conclusion is that there are four defects and whatever the reason you may give is not proper. This is the general analysis of the sutra. now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Tatvatprasangad since Brahman becomes impure like the world apitau at the time of pralaya or the great dissolution; asamanjasam Vedantic teaching is improper; this is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of each word. apitau means at the time of dissolution; tadvat prasangat the word tatvat alone is interpreted differently and prasangat is also interpreted differently; the first interpretation is asuddhi dosa prasangat means at the time of pralayam when karya Prapancha merges into Brahman just as karya Prapancha is impure when it gets merged with Brahman, Brahman will get the impurities of the karya Prapancha; the possible answer is you have to say that all punya papa also dissolved into Brahman and if such an answer is given tatvat prasangat tatvat means karana Brahmavad prasangat means punya papa apava prasangat; it means when karya Prapancha totally dissolves into Brahman punya papa also merges into Brahman and jivas also gets merged into Brahman, totally like even the potential punya papa and that is the dosah the problem will be the punar utpatti will not be there and there will be no future creation. if punya papa are absent creation cannot come again and without punya papa creation comes even the liberated persons will be reborn and the liberation will have no meaing. Tadvad means sthithi vad prasangat means vibaga prasangat suppose to avoid all problems you say that jivas do not merge into Brahman at the time of pralayam also as in the case of sthithi jiva will be different from Brahman and karya karana distinction will continue as at the time of creation. more in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 151

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 8. [142]**

#### ***Apitau tadvatprasangadasamanjasam***

On account of the consequence that at the time of pralaya or great dissolution [the cause becomes] like that [i.e., like the effect], the doctrine maintained hitherto [that Brahman is the cause of the universe] is absurd.

A plausible objection against Brahman being the cause of the world raised here.

We had just completed the 8<sup>th</sup> sutra of the first pada. The entire sutra is purva paksha sutra and samkya pointing various logical fallacies in chetana Brahma karana vadha. Some of the fallacies were pointed out in the last class. Since someone complained last class was very difficult to follow I will summarise the last class briefly.

Samkya is taking the case of pralayam. All agree that pralayam is nothing but the effect merging into karanam. in Vedantic teaching karyam is the world and karanam is Brahman. In pralayam world must be merging into Brahman. incidentally the world is full of impurities and since it includes jiva and it includes karmas and punya papa are also included. Brahman according to Vedanta is pure including karma impurities. At the time of pralayam impure world merges into pure Brahman. Samkya philosopher says when impure world merges with Brahman there are three possibilities can be there. there are logical fallacies. First is when the impure world merges into pure Brahman both become impure. It is because impurities of world may be dominating the purity of Brahman.

When the pure and impure merge together, both become pure; Brahman and the world get pure at the time of pralayam. Third possibilities when impure world merges into pure Brahman both remain as they are retaining their individuality the Brahman remain pure and the world remaining impure as it is without any change. You cannot think of the fourth possibility. Whatever possibility you take you are in trouble says Samkya philosopher. What are the logical fallacies? When pure and impure merge both become impure. Samkya philosopher says if Vedantins admits the first possibility he will have problem and he says Brahman becomes impure because of association with the world and Brahma becomes impure mean it contradicts your statement that Brahman is nithya suddham. We have to say then Brahman was pure. To avoid the problem Vedantins has to say the second possibility. When Brahman and impure jiva merge together both become pure. Then samkya philosopher says here also you will be in trouble and it means world becomes pure then it means world is free from all impurities including karma impurities and world will become free from karma and all jivas will become free from karma at the time of pralyam and if all jivas become free from at the time of karma then jiva will not have karma for punar janma and all will become

free and then all will become free. Suppose you say even with karma all jivas will be reborn, then the jnanis will also be reborn then also jnanam will become redundant. Both become free means karma will not be there and then the fresh creation will not be there. to avoid both the problems, Vedantins has to vote for third possibility that is at the time of pralayam when the impure world merges into pure Brahman, both remain as they are and without losing individuality. The third possibility we vote for then what happens is you will have another problem. during problem also both retain their individuality Brahman remain pure and world remain impure and how can you call that as pralayam at all. In sristi also world keeps its individuality and in pralayam also the world keeps its individuality; and Brahman is Brahman in sristi and also in pralayam also Brahman is Brahman and the world is world; then what is the difference between sristi and pralayam? The fallacy is that there will be distinction between sristi and laya. All possibilities are fallacious and you cannot explain pralayam and therefore it is asamanjasam that Vedantic teaching on creation is improper. This is the purva paksa. now we have to give the siddhanta. We will read the next sutra.

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 9. [143]**

***Na tu drshtantabhavat***

The objection raised in sutra 8 is refuted

By the word 'tu' [but] the possibility of the objection is set aside.

First we will do a general analysis. These are the important portions of vedantic cosmology that is asat karyavadha and sat karya vadha.

What is our answer. Samkya philosopher said at the time of pralayam the world merges into Brahman and you are not able to explain that merger. Vedanta is not capable of explaining merger of world into Brahman is defective according to samkya. The answer is Vedantins ask samkya Samkya philosopher that you talk of merger of world into Brahman as though there is a merger. You think that Brahman and world are physically merging as the river going a long way to merge with the ocean. You have a wrong notion in this regard. River merging into ocean we can conceive of because river originates thousands of miles away and ocean is somewhere and river merges ultimately. So you think world is somewhere and it goes and merges with Brahman. this is not so. World was never away from Brahman for it to merge into Brahman there is no question of world merging into Brahman and therefore I need not explain the merger. Where is the need to explain or not explain a nonexistent merger of the world into Brahman. world is always located in Brahman either in un-manifest form or manifest form. if you have to understand this very clearly we have an example to convey this to you. When we say pot merges into clay please tell me where is the merger. Can you say clay merges into clay? You cannot say there is only 'one clay' and where is the question of clay merging with clay.

Can you say the pot nama rupa merges into clay? Pot nama rupa merges into clay can you say. This we cannot accept. Nama rupa merging with clay as though nama rupa is somewhere

else and it decided to come to the clay with a view to merge. Nama rupa merges into clay because nama rupas are located in the clay in only. Before creation of pot the pot nama rupa was located in clay in lump form. Sphere is nothing but the potential aspect of all geometrical forms. Pot nama rupa was in potential form before pot came into existence and takes the manifest form when the pot is made. Pot nama rupa exist after the creation of pot also. nama rupa need not merge and it is ever in the clay in manifest or un-manifest form. Then where is the question of explaining the merger? The pot is created means the potential pot has become the manifest pot; when the pot is broken, the pot loses its name and form and it becomes one with clay. So the cycle of pot making and breaking and then pot making and clay becoming the pot and the pot becoming the clay is a cycle. The nama rupa always exist in manifest or un-manifest form. Nama rupa always is there in the clay. In the same way the entire world is located in Brahman either in manifest or un-manifest form. There is no question of world merging into Brahman at the time of pralaya and in fact the manifest world becomes un-manifest at the time of pralayam and un-manifest world becomes manifest at the time of creation. Therefore there is no difficulty in explaining pralayam and creation. Un-manifest jivas becomes manifest jiva at the time creation. Manifest jiva and the world become un-manifest at the time of pralaya. For the so-called merging of pot into clay and for clay becoming a pot we have an example. Refer to 6.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad. Here it is stated that we are born again and again till we overcome our ignorance and attain Self-Knowledge. Death, for an ignorant person, is not liberation; it is like going into deep sleep. And when you are reborn it is as if you are waking up. You die again and again, and again and again you are reborn. This goes on until you attain Self-Knowledge. Once you know the Self you are free and free from birth and death.

The entire world resolve into Brahman and when jiva wakes up the entire world comes into being. if you say the world never merges with Brahman then how do you differentiate sristi and pralayam. World is never away from Brahman. How do you explain creation and resolution? When you say world is located in Brahman, it is figuratively said that the world has merged into Brahman. But the world is supposed to have merged with Brahman when world is in un-manifest form and we use the expression merger and when the world is unmanifest it is not perceptible and it is taken as though merged into Brahman. at the time of pralyam world takes the un-manifest form and it is not visible to us and we know that whatever is invisible is taken as 'as though' nonexistent. During creation also world is located in Brahman only. But it is in the manifest form. but during pralaya the world is again located in Brahman only but now it is in an un-manifest form which is invisible to us. When the world is in manifest form, we are able to see the individuality. Clay is common both in sristi and sthithi kale and nama rupa is there in un-manifest form in resolution and it is manifest form in sristi. We don't normally don't say the clay as the namarupa pot dominates. World in sritti kala also the world is in manifest form and world is there in sthithi kala also it is in manifest form but in pralaya kale world is in un-manifest form, in sristi kale the un-manifest form or the mama rupa plays a dominant form and we call it a pot and when in pralaya or resolution we say clay is there because the clay dominates while the pot nama rupa is not seen by us. Now also Brahman is there and Brahman is overshadowed by nama rupas. In pralaya kale nama rupa is overshadowed by Brahman with nama rupa missing whether it is sristi or layam, nama rupa is there and in sristi it is in manifest form and in pralaya it is in un-manifest form but one thing we should note that in both states the adhistanam is Brahman alone. When it is manifest form we are able to experience and when it is in un-manifest form it is invisible and it is not available for experience.

Where is the question of merger. If you say the world is always located in Brahma whether it is sristi sthithi or laya will not impurity of the world taint adhistanam Brahman. world is always in Brahman then will not Brahman become impure because of the associationship. That also is not there because it is like asking the question will not the pot taint the clay or will not wave polluting the ocean. If world is always in Brahman will not Brahman become impure due to association. That is not there it is like asking the question taint the clay. Will not the wave taint the water. It is like asking such a question. There is no question of polluting the Brahman. Effect do not exist as separate entity to pollute the cause. Pot cannot affect clay because pot does not exist separate from clay. World cannot affect Brahman because world cannot remain separate from Brahma. Mithya world cannot affect sathyam Brahman. Mithya snake cannot affect the sathyam rope. Mithya fire in the dream cannot burn the sathyam waker. Dream rain does not wet the sathyam waker. Sathyam Brahman is there and mithya world is there. there is no question of dvaidam and mithya cannot counted along with sathyam Brahman

In the case of jnani because of his knowledge his karmas are destroyed and his karma does not go to potential condition. Jnani's karma is burnt or destroyed. Ajnani's kama goes to potential form and there is rebirth.

Now we will come to the word analysis. Na tu Vedantic teaching is never improper; dristantabhavat; there are examples to validate. We will see the significance of the words. Tu is in the meaning of emphasis. Na means not na eva means never. Dristantabhavat dristanta means example bhava means availability; there is no question of merging into clay. Pot was pot is and pot will be. Sleep example is given to show that whatever has gone to un-manifest form in pralaya is prone to become manifest in creation. Chandogya upanisad gives an example that a lion goes to sleep and it gets up as lion. There is no merger and world is in manifest and un-manifest condition. Mithya world cannot pollute Brahman. Samkya charged logical invalidity and Vedantins defended. Defending Vedanta was done in sutra 9. Now in the 10<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya instead of defending he offends and he accuses that the logical fallacies are there in samkya philosophy. Therefore now Vedantins charges samkya with all logical fallacies. How does Vedantins hit samkya. Now let us see how samkya will explain pralayam that is karyam merging with karanam. now Vedantins ask what is your definition of pralayam. He says that world resolving into prakriti is pralaym. Now he asks how will you explain world merging into the prakriti. According to Samkya philosopher is prakriti is free from sabda sparsa etc. he says world is sabdadhi rahitam. When sabdadi sahitam world merges with sabdadi rahitam prakriti three possibilities will take place. One is both will become sabdadi rahitam; or both will become sabdadi sahitam and or both will maintain their individuality. Vedantins says whatever be the option you take you will have the problem and all the problems you charged me will be your problem. This we will do in the next class.

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 152

**Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 152

**Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 152

**Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**



## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 153

### **Topic 3 Na vilakshanatvadhikaranam [Sutras 4-11]**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 11. [145]**

***Tarkapratishtanadapi anyathanumeyamiti chet evamapyanirmoksha prasangah***

If it be said that in consequence of the non-finality of reasoning we must frame our conclusions otherwise; [we reply that] thus also there would result non-release

Objections raised in Sutra 4 and 8 are further refuted.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. this sutra is \in the form of a dialogue between samkya and Vedantins. First part is Vedantins's statement and the second part if samkya's statement and the third part is Vedantins's statement. in the first part Vedantin says that samkya's statement is invalid and you cannot charge advaidin's view logical contradiction at all. For this samkya's reply is that he says that improper logic is invalid and proper logic is valid. And therefore through proper logic I can charge with logical contradictions. And therefore I will charge you Vedantins with logical contradiction with proper logic. This is samkya's argument for which Vedantins reply. Even if you use proper logic it is not free from invalidity defect. What is the idea behind the statement? The idea is with regard to then worldly matter we can talk of improper or proper logic. Improper logic is invalid and proper logic is valid with regard to the loukika vishayah. When it comes to the reality or Brahman or sarva adhistanam we say the improper as also the proper logic also invalid for the proper logic has no access to the spiritual matters. We can talk about two types of eyes, it will be invalid and with proper eyes if you read, the reading will be valid. With regarding to the writing on the board, we will say the reading with the improper eyes is invalid and reading with proper eye is valid. But with regard to Brahman improper and proper eyes will be invalid as `Brahman is not accessible for the proper or improper eyes both. In the same way tarka is valid or invalid and neither proper nor improper logic can have any access to Vedanta. since logic is invalid, the samkya's answer is by improper logic it will be invalid and through another logic or by proper logic I can establish logical contradiction of Vedanta. I can charge you with logical contradiction. Evam api means Vedantins says even if you use proper logic anirmoksa prasangah; moksa means freedom from invalidity and anir moksa means freedom from invalidity is not there even you use proper logic. Still it continues be invalid and here it means the logic. Even the proper logic is not free from invalidity. Vedanta is not available within the range of logic for logic to sit in judgement. The inconclusiveness of logic is arrived at by particular reasoning. An idea is logically derived by a philosopher with lot of effort. And that philosopher is a great logician arrive at some conclusion by logic but after some time some new philosopher will come and they will demolish the previous conclusions and they are greater logician and they will conclude something different and they will say they are the founders of truth until the previous conclusion is changed by new

conclusion. The cause of the creation can never be arrived at my pure logic. There are certain topics in the world, which are inaccessible to logic. And a logician should know what are the fields where the logic can work. They are beyond logic. Having known that it is beyond logic intelligent logician will not break his brain in applying logic in such field. If that invalid logic is used in the field, which can get over doubtful conclusions. By using logic in the field, the conclusion will be a question mark and you won't get doubtless knowledge. A knowledge is a knowledge only when it is doubt free. That is why we have two-system samkya, which is propounded by Kapila who is one of the best logicians at that time. And by using tarka he has arrived at a conclusion that prakriti is jagat karanam. on the other side we have Kanada muni and he is also known as sarvajnah and siddhah and he also would have used the best and proper logic. But Kanada arrived at the atomic theory and he said the cause of creation is paramanah and he refuted Kapila muni. I cannot say one is superior both are munis and both are sarvajnah. From this it is clear that tarka cannot claim the jagat karanam. both the minis are sarvajnah. If both are sarvajnah how do they contradict each other both using perfect logic. One rejects the other but what we find is advaidin alone use the proper logic. This is the first interpretation of this sutra.

Now I will give you the second interpretation. It is in the form of a dialogue. First let us come to the Vedantins statement. Since logic is invalid, prakriti cannot be logically proved as jagat karanam because logic is invalid. It means prakriti can be inferred as jagat karanam through proper logic. Samkya says improper logic may be invalid and through proper logic prakriti can be inferred as jagat karanam. If argued thus, still, there is no freedom from samsara. Still there is no freedom from samsara; it means that you may use proper logic and may arrive at prakriti as jagat karanam but still the knowledge will be doubtful knowledge only. It is so because Kanada muni has concluded the paramanu as jagat karanam using the same proper knowledge. Therefore your confusion will be to accept Kapila or Kanada Muni. We cannot accept either because they both are mutually against each other. If you use the logic, you may get knowledge and that knowledge will not give you liberation. Never use logic to arrive at paramanau, never use logic to arrive at prakriti, never use logic to find fault with Vedanta; then comes the last question. The logicians may ask if you conclude that tarka is invalid why do you accept tarka in your reaching. Why should Manus smriti mention tarka as important tool in its philosophy? you yourself talk about sruti, anubhava, logic etc., if logic is invalid. In fact Brahma Sutra itself is called nyaya pradanam. For that our answer is tarka as independent source of knowledge is not acceptable with regard to jagat karanam; what we say is tarka backed by sastra collecting data from sastra do tarka and without sastra independent is dry logic and I will not work. Collect data from sastra and use tarka. Nyayicka and vaiseshika collect data from world and use tarka, which is not acceptable to us. Source of data decides it is dry or proper logic. Thus Vedantins alone is right and Vedantins uses tarka properly.

#### **Topic 4 Sishtaparigrahadhikaranam**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 12. [146]**

***Etena sishtaparigraha api vyakhtatah***

By the [i.e., by the arguments against the Samkyas] [those other theories] not accepted by the wise or competent persons are explained or refuted.

Other views or theories not accepted by the Vedas are refuted.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. This is called adhidesa sutram. It means extension of the previous one to this particular sutra. In the previous adhikaranam we refuted samkya philosopher both in offensive and defensive manner. Samkya cannot use logic to criticize us and we also said that samkya's conclusion prakriti as jagat karanam also we negated their philosophy. we also said depending on logic by samkya is also invalid. Who is the vaiseshika philosopher? He is the one who also says that the cause of the universe is matter only. By using salaksanya niyama, he says that Brahman is cannot jagat karanam and matter alone is jagat karanam. he says jada karanam is not prakriti but jagat karanam is atom or parmanus. His main contention is that karanam is jadam. Vedanta says the defects found in samkya are there in vaiseshika also. they use things to arrive at something which is beyond logic.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Yetena by this sishta pargrahaha api other system unrecognized by the wise like nyaya, and vaiseshika also vyakyatat are refuted. The significance of the words is etena means samkya philosopher also has used defective logic as a tool in a field where logic should to be used; a wrong tool has been used by samkya. Vaiseshika also used logic as tool and the mistake is common to both and both have used improper tools. Then sishta aparigraha is the name for nyaya and vaiseshika philosophy. you will understand this only when you know about the six systems of philosophies. Samkya and yoga, nyaya and vaiseshika and purva and utara mimamsaka/ first pair says chetanam is jagat karanam; nyaya and vaiseshika also says achetanam is jagat karanam but achetana paramanu is jagat karanam; what is common to both is that both says achetanam is jagat karanam. they are achetana karana vadha; the second common feature is all the four use logic as primary instruments of knowledge; the uniqueness of the last pair is that we don't use tarka as primary instrument. we argue and establish that by argument you reach no where and dismiss tarka. By doing so we negate all the four philosophies. Purva and utara mimamsaka are Veda pramana and others are tarka pradhana. first two pairs arrive at wrong conclusion and we find that samkya yoga pair has got some conclusions closer to yoga. Because of that many vaidhikas borrow ideas from samkya yoga. Samkya yoga pair is partially accepted by vaidhikas and it is called sishta parigraha pair. Krishna himself borrows samkya sristi. As far as yoga is concerned by us we talk about ashtanga yoga etc. nyaya vaiseshika is not only wrong but it does not have even some conclusions acceptable to us. It is not even partially borrowed by advaidins. The next adhikaranam we will see the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 154

### **Topic 4 Sishtaparigrahadhikaranam**

**Brahman can be the cause of the universe although it is of a contrary nature from the universe**

**Sutra 12. [146]**

#### ***Etena sishtaparigraha api vyakhtatah***

By the [i.e., by the arguments against the Samkyas] [those other theories] not accepted by the wise or competent persons are explained or refuted.

Other views or theories not accepted by the Vedas are refuted.

While studying the second chapter of Brahma Sutra we should remember two systems one is known as samkya yoga system, nyaya vaiseshika system and Purva Mimamsaka and utara mimamsaka system. Between the first and second, there are several dissimilarities and main is that samkya system adopts sat karya vadha and the second as asat karya vadha system. This topic is discussed in detail in second, third and fourth chapter of Mandukya karika. In spite of differences they have one common point of agreement and both are achetana karya vadhis, which means both say that matter alone is material cause of the universe unlike Vedantins that Consciousness is the material cause of the universe. Samkya yoga system claims achetana prakriti is the main cause and nyaya vaiseshika says that paramanu is the material cause of the universe. Both are against chetana karana vadha. Both heavily criticize Vedanta, which falls under chetana karana vadha. In criticizing Vedantins, both of them join together. In spite of differences between samkya and nyaya vaiseshika they criticize and criticism is tarka virodha. Joining together they get some advantage and at the same time we also have come advantage. I can refute by giving the same arguments to negate both samkya and yoga as also nyaya vaiseshika systems. Before going further just to consolidate the four adhikaranams I want to point out that in the first adhikaranam Vyasacharya refuted samkya philosophers; second adhikaranam was yoga philosophy refutation by pointing out that yoga philosophy is similar to samkya and there is no need to refute yoga separately. In the third adhikaranam. samkya yoga refuted through logical discussion. Nyaya vaiseshika was refuted as was done in the case of samkya yoga system. This is presented as smriti virodha as also tarka virodha pariharah. Even though all of them were negated and samkya system is called sishta parigraha system and nyaya vaiseshika system is called sishta aparigraha system. Samkya yoga is popular even today is because of the limited blessings of vedantins alone because of the close affinity between samkya yoga and advaiddam. Nyaya vaiseshika far away from Vedanta and it is far less required than samkya system. Even nyaya vaiseshika system we don't reject fully but we do borrow whatever good it has. With this fourth adhikaranam is over sruti virodha and tarka virodha pariharah is over.

### **Topic 5 Bhoktrapattyadhikaranam**

**The distinctions of enjoyer and enjoyed do not oppose unity.**

**Sutra 14. [148]**

***Bhoktrapatteravibhagascet syallokavat***

If it be said [that if Brahma be the cause and then] on account of [the objects of enjoyment] turning into the enjoyer non-distinction [between the enjoyer and the objects enjoyed] would result. We reply that such distinction may exist nevertheless as is experienced commonly in the world.

Another objection based on reasoning is raised against Brahma being the cause and refuted.

Having refuted nyaya vaiseshika system and Vyasacharya comes back to samkya system which comes with another dosha on Vedanta. it is pratyaksa virodha dosha. Here pratyaksa virodha parihara is done in one sutra.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. They say that in the world we clearly see a distinction between the subject and object bokta and bogyam one being chetana and the other being achetana. It is pratyaksa siddham. In samkya yoga system it is very clearly brought out. They say Purusa is bokta chetana tattvam is boktru tattvam and prakriti is modified to become the Prapancha and the modified prakriti is the bogya tattvam. this is clearly brought out in Bhagavad Gita verses 13.19 and 20 which read as *prakritim purusam cai'va viddhy anadi ubhav api vikarams ca gunama cai 'ca viddhi prakritisambhavan karya karana kartrive hetuh prakrtir ucyate purusah sukhaduhkhanam bhoktrive hetur ucyate* that reads as know thou that prakriti [nature] and Purusa [soul] are both beginningless; and know also that the forms and modes are born of prakriti [nature]. Nature is said to be cause and effect, instrument and agent [ness] and the soul is said to be cause concerning the experience of pleasure and pain. Samkya jumps with joy on seeing Bhagavad Gita statement. in the Purusa prakriti are eternal and eternally real and eternally distinct and both are anadi. Samkya yoga has justified and validated the boktru and bogya vivadha. But you don't accept that the two principles are there in the sristi. you don't say matter is cause of the world and you say chetana boktru has come from chetanam Brahman and achetana bogyam also has come out of Brahman. but we do not accept that view. For both cause is chetanam. Because of this approach the difference between bokta and bogya is not very clear because both of them under your system are born out of Brahman. this view we do not accept is the Samkya philosopher's view. Therefore Brahma rupena bokta and bogyam will become indistinguishable. Bokta is equal to Brahman and bogya is equal to Brahman and bokta is equal to Brahman it becomes. This cannot be acceptable. This indistinguishability of subject and object is the problem in Vedanta. it is a problem because it is pratyaksa virodha because pratyaksa pramanam shows chetana achetana vibhagah and in Vedanta this chetana achetana are vibhagah is not distinct. For this we give two answers one for unintelligent samkya and after wards a very serious and important answer is given in the next adhikaranam for an advanced student.

The first reply is comparable to vishistadvaida reply and second one is Advaida approach. The answer given is this and even there may be one karanam there can be differences in karyams, products. Just because karyams have distinction, still they can have one common cause. All ornaments are different but gold is one. Nama beda is there earrings and the chains etc., are nama beda but the cause here is the gold. Names are different forms are different and even functions are different; but still they have one karanam. ocean, bubble and froth are different one is different from the other and still they are born out of one common

cause of samudrah. In the same way Brahman is one cause and the entire creations are different and they are various effects of Brahman. all are essentially Brahman bokta and bogyam Brahman and bokta bogya vibhaga can be there. this is the answer/

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Boktrapanteh since subject that is bokta becomes identical with object avibagah there will be no distinction between the subject and the object. This is purva paksha samkya yoga's charge. Now Vedantins answers chet if this is the objection it is not valid; syat means subject object distinction will be there. lokavat as seen in the world. Now we will the significance of the words. Bhoktrapatteh is bokta becomes bogyam and bogyam will become bokta being both are Brahman because of the absence of bokta bogya differences. Avibhagah become identical in Vedantic teaching; chet if this charge is imputed on Vedantic teaching syat means what they say is not is. What is objected by samkya is not there. They say vibhaga abhava means vibhaga is there in Advaidam. Here we don't make distinction between vishistadvaidam and Advaidam. Lokavat means as seen in the world. with this bohoktrapattyadhikaranam is over. here vishistadvaida advaida difference we need bother. This will be taken up in the next adhikaranam.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 155

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 14. [148]**

***tadananyatvamarambhanasabdadibhyah***

The non-difference of them [i.e., if cause and effect] is shown here.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. this is a big adhikaranam consisting seven sutras. It is a very important adhikaranam. this is called arambanadhikarnam. This is very significant because it answers pratyaksa virodha dosha posed by samkya and vaiseshika,

The purva paksa have pratyaksa pramanam, which goes against advaidic teachings. This is the purva paksa that comes to even the nonprofessionals because beda is seen everywhere whn plurality is rampant in the world. The pratyaksa pramana is supposed to be the eldest pramana as any other pramanam depends upon the pratyaksam. Anumanam, upamanam, arthapatti, anupalapti and even Veda to function you should have pratyaksa pramanam. In the absence of pratyaksa pramana, nothing can be proved. So they ask how do you get the courage that you can negate the pratyaksam. What is the parihara, which we will see in brief. The most significant word in advaidam is sadananyatvam. This is the main topic in Brahma Sutra. when we talk about chetana karana vadha you should have understanding of this term. Achetana jagat is karyam. Between Brahman and jagat between chetanam Brahman and achetanam jagat there is karana karya sambandha the scripture says. When we go deep into the scripture, we find that we are not very serious about karana karya sambandha, it is only taken as intermediary stage, and it is a temporary stand taken. Why we are not serious about is due to the fact Brahman cannot be karanam really speaking because any karanam should undergo change.

On an analysis, we find that Brahman cannot be karanam at all. To be a karanam one should be subject to modification and subject to time and since Brahman is beyond time and modification, Brahman cannot be karanam at all. It is pointed out in Upanishad also. it is neither karanam nor karyam. All the sruti statements directly point out that Brahman cannot be karanam. We cannot establish world as karyam also. When we try to prove world as karyam we miserably fail to do it. That is why we have sat karya vadha and asat karya vadha. Mandukya Upanishad discusses this aspect in detail. World can therefore, never be proved to be a karyam. If world is not a karyam and Brahman cannot be karyanam and then how can there be karana karya sambandha between Brahman and the world. when this being so, why should Upanishad talk about the world being product of Brahman. for that our answer is we talk about karana karya sambandha and we say the meaning is different. We say that the man is a lion, we should to take the word lion literally and we should take it as the man is like a lion in bravery. this is called gauna prayoga. Here Brahman is as though karanam and world is as though karyam. What is the common feature between Brahman and any karyam? We find that karanam alone is substantial and this belongs to karanam alone. When we say

Brahman is karanam means Brahman is the substance of the creation. World is karyam means that it is not a substance and it is only a name and form. Name and form does not have substantiality of their own. Karanam is substantial and karyam is not substantial. Similarly Brahman is the substance of the world creation and world is not substantial.

The second point is since karanam is substantial and karyam is non-substantial the karyam cannot exist independently and it depends upon karanam for its existence. Karanam can exist independently. Whatever can independently exist is called sathyam and whatever cannot exist independently is called mithya. So we conclude Brahman is sathyam and jagan mithya and this is the idea we derive from karana karya sambandha. once we arrive at this, we have to forget about karana karya sambandha. since we have to forget all other feature, then don't ask how mithya Prapancha came to existence. We say Brahman is eternally there and mithya Prapancha is ever there from the very beginning. Sathyam Brahman is anadhi and mithya prapancha is also anadhi and one is sathyam and another is mithya and don't have an idea that the mithya prapancha came from Sathyam Brahman. This is amply supported by the sruti. Mithya Prapancha will be eternally there either in manifest or un-manifest form. this never comes from Brahma. This Vyasacharyam supports with sruti quotation. This is supported by 6.1 of Chandogya Upanishad. three examples are given here one is clay, next is gold and iron are given. Here gold, iron and clay are termed as sathyam. All the products like pot, ornament or iron products are vacharambanam vikarah namadeyam which means they are karyam and Upanishad says vikarah namadeyam and a product is but a mere name, a verbal existence and what is the name. Your tongue initiates any product, it exists only in your tongue, and it does not exist outside. It does not have substantial existence and its existence is confined to name and form. therefore the karyam the products are called mithya. Thus we conclude that sathya mithya sambandha between world and Brahman is conveyed. There is no other significance of karyam and karanam. all the sruti statements have conveyed the idea that Brahma sathyam jagan mithya. There is Brahman alone all over and the world is but only made and form. how do you explain boktru bogya sambandha. we say that there is only one adhistanam Brahman and it is on this adhistanam Brahman boktru and bogya rest for their survival. It is finally confirmed that bokta as also bogyam are Brahman as their adhistanam. With this background we will do the word for word analysis.

Tad ananyatvam its non-difference from Brahman; it means Prapanchasya is understood arambana sabdadityah from the statements like vacharambanam vikaro namadeyam Chandogya upanisad 6.1. now we will see the significance of the words. Tad ananyatvam is compound word of tat and ananyatvam; tad means sathyam Brahman; ananyatvam means non-difference; we supply karya Prapanchasya - of the world from Brahman or nondifference from Brahman is tad ananyatvam; here we mean sathyam mithya sambandha. is independent existence; tad ananyatvam alone brings the truth of sathyam mithya sambandham. Avagamyate means understood; sathya mithya sambandha is not explicitly stated in this sutra but we should understand the meaning in the context of the sutra. what is implicit in the Upanishad is they have not invented sathya mithyatvam. But it is already there. arambana sabda indicates the entire statement. since it is a sutra Vyasacharya does not want to quote the entire sentence; so world arambanam indicates the whole sentence. Sabda adhithya means the other similar sentences. Nena nanaci kincana is another quotation from sruti which is quoted by Adhi Sankaracharya. Even now plurality is not there and their existence should not be counted. If the world is not counted means world must be mithya. Kaivalya Upanishad says *na bhumi-<sup>ap</sup>o vahnir asti na canilo me 'sti na cambaram ca evam veditva paramatma rupam guhasayam niskalam advitiam* the meaning of this mantra is for me there is neither earth nor water nor fire nor air nor ether. Thus realising the nature of the Paramatman the on



who is the cavity of the heart, who is without parts without a second the witness of all beyond both existence and non-existence one attains the very nature of the Paramatman. If the Upanishad should negate the world it is only by the means of mithya and hence the relationship between world and Brahma is sathyam mithya sambandah. Sathyam Brahma is eternal and mithya world is also eternal and mithya world cannot stand on its own. Now he brings a purva paksa who is a beda beda vadha which existed in those days. Beda beda vadha has been propounded by many acharyas bodayanacharya, Batruprapancha acharya and they talked of beda beda vadha. Vishistadvaidam which is propounded to very close to beda beda vadha only. Adhi Sankaracharya never discusses vishistadvaidam because it did not exist in his time. but he discussed about beda beda vadha being very close to vishistadvaidam. First we will see what is their argument. they say you study the same Chandogya upanisad vakya 6.2.4 that reads as *yatha somyaikena mrtpindena sarvam mrnmayamvijnatam syadvacarambhanam vikaro namadheyam mrttiketyena satyam*, the meaning of the mantra is it is like this; by knowing a single lump of earth you know all objects made of earth/ all changes are mere words, in name only. But earth is the reality. In other words, it says if you know a single thing made of earth for instance a pot, then you know all things made of earth. How? The word 'pot' is merely a name; the real object is earth. Earth may assume different names and forms, but it remains the same earth. To understand and the world sruti gives the gold and ornament example. Also gives iron and iron product example. In the entire example gold, the cause is modified to become the ornaments. They argue the gold actually changes or get modifies to become the ornament. It is not superimposition it is not unreal appearance and Brahman itself has modified itself to be universe and all the beda beda vadha are Brahma parinama vadha and karana parinama. In this regard, they give another example of a tree to understand this aspect better. They give the example a big tree and the say that various parts of the tree modifies itself to many branches, and out of the branches evolves the leaves; out of that evolves the flowers; out of that evolves the fruits and all these products are evolved from one tree. Similarly from one Brahman, all the creations have evolved themselves to be the universe. Karyam karana akarena parinamate ekam karanam aneka karyam parinamate.

The next point they derive from this is since the leaves etc., are the products of one tree they can be looked upon as part of the tree and all the products become various parts of the one cause that is the tree, the whole. Thus not only tree is a cause and the tree is also the whole and the branches are not only karyam but they also are the limbs or the parts of the tree and not they have karana karya sambandha sambandha they have avayava avayavi sambandha the part and whole sambandha.

The next point they derive is that if you understand this way you can see Advaidam and Dvaidam. From the standpoint the whole it is Advaidam and from the standpoint of branches it is anekam and eka aneka sambandha is there dvaidam advaidam sristi we see. One is Brahman and many are the creation; when the cause is one that is Brahman, we see Advaidam and when we see various creations as branches and leaves of one tree are seen, we see dvaidam in the creation. dvaidam is correct and Advaidam is also to be accepted. Don't be uniform dvaidam and don't be uniform advaidam and be beda vishista abeda.

When you look at the tree and branches, you see equally real which is karanam and which is advaidam; dvaidam avayava karyam is also real and therefore one should accept both the Brahman as also the jagat as reality and why should you call one as real and the other as unreal, which disturbs me says the purva paksa. advaidam is sathyam and Dvaidam also is sathyam is the fourth point.

They say that Vyasacharya teaches this teaching alone by saying sadananyatvam, the part cannot exist separate from the tree. Hands, legs, and finger cannot exist separate from the whole, the person. sadananyatvam means part whole sambandha and part does not exist separate from the whole. It is not sathyam mithya sambandha. Being part of the whole, both the part and the whole are real. It is not real and unreal as projected by the advaidins. God is non-dual. The dualistic world exists as part of the non-dual god. Not only that he says this particular approach is supported by the sruti also. sruti clearly talks about advaidam. Sruti talks about Dvaidam also. Everywhere Dvaidam is there/ even the part whole idea is mentioned in the sruti. They talk about gataha srutis are the ones that reconciles Dvaidam and Advaidam. The entire Antaryami Brahmanam is seen as gataha sruti, Bhagavan is treated as the whole, and the entire world is seen as the part. India is one country and all the states are the parts. Both are real so quotes beda abeda vadhi.

He also says the entire Karma Kanda is also acceptable in the beda abeda darsanam. if you are interested in abeda you can go to jnana kanda and if you are interested in both you can follow Karma Kanda as also jnana kanda. if you reject dvaidam, then Karma Kanda is rejected; if you reject Advaidam then you reject jnana kanda; if accept both and take to beda abeda you accept both Karma Kanda as also the jnana kanda. the rejection of Karma Kanda by advaidin and the rejection of jnana kanda by dvaidin tantamount to rejecting the part of the Veda itself which is seen as contrary to scriptural teaching. vishistadvaidins validate the whole Veda. The whole Veda is valued by us only and they say that Dvaidin and advaidins mutilate Veda argues vishistadvaidins.

Lastly he says if you reject Dvaidam and hold on to Advaidam only you do another injustice and you reject the pratyaksa pramanam which is most powerful pramanam because all other pramanams depend upon the pratyaksa pramanam. Even for Vedanta pramanam to operate you need pratyaksa pramanam. Since it is clearly revealed and whatever is clearly revealed is to be accepted as sathyam and only the philosophy that accepts the world as sathyam, which is available for pratyaksam, is the real philosophy. Because of all the reasons, beda abeda vadhi recommends the relationship between Brahman and universe as beda abeda vadha in stead of rejecting one as unreal and accepting the other as real. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 156

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 14. [148]**

#### ***Tadananyatvamarambhanasabdadibhyah***

The non-difference of them [i.e., if cause and effect] is shown here.

I analyse the Acharya's bashyam of purva paksha raised by beda abeda vadhi. Imagine the samkya philosopher, yoga and vaiseshika philosopher stand in front and Vyasacharya stand here with Adhi Sankaracharya behind him and a beda abeda vadhi or vishistadvaida vadhi. Both Ramanujacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya follow Vyasacharya. All except Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya and Ramanuja argue that the world is a product of matter and Vyasacharya claim that the world is not a product of matter and claims the world is a product of Consciousness. He is alone is chetana karya vadhi. Therefore, Vyasacharya says jagat is Brahma karyam bhavati the world is a product of Brahman. The next question is when you say Brahman is a product of Brahman. What is the significance is the question. Here Vyasacharya redefines Brahma karyatvam as Brahma ananyatvam. By saying the world as product of Brahman and what we say is that the world is not far away from Brahman.

Now the discussion is between two sishyas Adhi Sankaracharya and Ramanujacharya and Vyasacharya and one is abeda vadha and the other is beda vadha. Both agree Brahman is jagat karanam. World is non different from Brahman also both of them agree. Now the problem starts when they take up what is the significance of the world non-different from Brahman. Brahma ananyatvam is like our snake, which is not away from rope or non-different from rope. Alternatively, technically it is rajju vivarthatvam. That means world is of lesser order of reality. That is world enjoys the degree of lesser order than Brahman. Hence world is not separate from Brahman exactly like dream is not separate from waker and snake is non different from rope. Interpreting in this manner, they say that the world is mithya. It is interpretation of sadanatyam by Advaidin. Beda abeda vadhi says no sadananyatvam does not mean sad vivarthatvam but it means world is part of Brahman or sad visheshanatvam or take it as an attribute of Brahman because part cannot exist separate from the whole and attribute cannot remain separate from the substance. World is part or property of Brahman either way the world is taken as part or world is taken as property and the world is as real as Brahman. Part is as real as whole; branch is as real as the tree; my fingers are part of me are as real as me. World is not of lesser order of reality and it is as real as Brahman. Property is as real as substance and the red colour of the cloth is as real as the cloth; property cannot remain separate from the substance but the property and substance are equal order of reality. Similarly the world if taken as the part of Brahman, it the part of the whole Brahman and if the world is taken as an attribute of Brahman, the attribute cannot remain separate from Brahman. Therefore, we cannot say that the world is of lesser order of reality. World should

be taken as sathyam only. There is one Brahman as part of non duality and the world with bedas are part of Brahman. So they are called beda abeda vada. We have sruti support both in favour of Advaidam as also Dvaidam. Dvaidam is as a part of Advaidam. Antaryami Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is seen to supporting the beda abeda vadha. Dvaidam and Advaidam have been reconciled. Not only world is part of Brahman but also jivah too is part of Brahman. This view has the support of Bhagavad Gita sloka 15.7 which reads as *mamai 'va' mso jivaloke jivabhutah sanatanah manahsasthani 'ndriyani prakritisthani harsati* the meaning of the mantra is a fragment [or fraction] of My own Self, having become a living soul, eternal, in the world of life, draws to itself the sense of which the mind is the sixth, that rest in nature. Jiva is also part of Brahman and jagat is also part of Brahman and Brahman is nondual Advaidam. When the part is real and the whole is real has been confirmed by sathyasya sathyam pranavai sathyam tesamesa sathyam in 2.1.20 of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad.. Lord is also sathyam and Lord is defined as sathyasya sathyam and not mithya Prapanchasya sathyam. In this everything will become valid Karma Kanda taking about karma is valid and jnana kanda is valid and prathyaksa anubhava of duality also will be met and this is the poser of purva paksa in the form of vishistadvaidam and beda abeda vadhi of the times of Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya.

Now comes the turn of the Vedantins to defend himself against beda abeda vadhis. Three will be eleven sruti contradictions and nine are brought out here and two elsewhere in beda abeda vadhi.

*Nirvikara sruti virodhah.* What do the beda abeda vadhi says. They compare Brahman to a tree and the branches etc., evolve and they are true and part of the tree. Similar from Brahman jagat the world evolves and they say the branches are part of the tree so the various creations are part of Brahman; they say Brahman is real so also the various creations and the jagat are real. We say that tree can evolve into braches leaves etc., because the tree is subject to modification. Tree can produce real branches, real fruits, real leaves etc by undergoing parinama or modification. In parinama vadha cause and effect are equally real and you cannot extend that theory to Brahman for Brahman cannot undergo any modification to evolve into the real world, which means the same order of reality. Advaidin quotes a sruti statement in 1.ii.18 of Kathopanisad that reads as *na jayate mriyate va vipascit nayam kutascin-na babhuva kascit, ajo nityah sasvato 'yam purano na hanyate hanyamane sarire.* The meaning of the mantra is 'the intelligent Atman is not born, nor does he die; he did not spring from anything and nothing sprang from him; this unborn, eternal, everlasting, ancient is not slain even when the body is destroyed. You cannot talk about Brahma parinama vadha is not acceptable because Brahmanah nirvikaratvad.

Then beda abeda vadhi asks how do you say that parinama vadha is not acceptable when the sruti gives three examples in Chandogya upanisad. First example is the clay modifying into pot; the second example is the gold modifying to become ornaments and the third is the iron modifying to become various utensils. The Brahma parinama vadhi argues that all the three examples talks of the cause modifying to become the creation. He argues that rope snake example is your own you Advaidins and sruti gives the examples of pot, ornaments and the utensils where the parinama or modification theory is talked about. All supports the parinama vadha only. If the modification is not there, the potter need not do anything. So is also the case of gold and iron. The three examples prove the Brahma parinama vadha only. Adhi Sankaracharya says you say all the three are parinami and so Brahman is also parinami. Adhi Sankaracharya says all the three examples are achetana vasthu only. Clay, gold and iron is all achetana karanam and will you accept Brahman is achetanam. For that the purva paksa

answers that even though karanam is achetanam and that part of the example you do not take and that is not intended by the sruti. Stru declares Brahman is chetanam and hence achetanatva part of the example you should not take it. Adhi Sankaracharya says that sruti says Brahman is nirvikaram; since Brahman nirvikaram from the example don't take changing part of the example. Accept BrahmaIn as karanam and it should be vivartha karanam even though examples are parinami karanam because it is sruti vriuddham. Brahma parinama vadha is not correct and tree evolving etc., is all right and the same is not applicable to Brahman.

The second dosha is *Niravayavatva sruti virodhah*. In Brahma parinama or beda abeda vadha that is the world and jiva are taken as the organs of Brahman. Similar they say beda or division are part of Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says sruti very clearly says Brahman is niravayavam.

In Mandukya Upanishad 3.Karika 7 reads as *na kasasya ghotakaso vikara vrttyavan yatha naiva tmanah sada jiva vikara vayavau tatha* the meaning of the karika is the space in a pot is neither an evolved effect nor a part of the All pervading space, so too the individualized ego [Jiva] is neither evolved from nor is it a part of the spirits i.e., Supreme Self. The Akasa does not have the part and the whole and Brahman is compared to Akasa and Brahman does not have part and the whole.

In Mundaka Upanishad mantra II.ii.9 reads as *Hiranmaye pare kose virajam Brahma nishkalam tac-chubhram jyotih tad yadatma vido viduh* the meaning of the mantra is the stainless indivisible Brahman, the pure, the light of all lights is in the innermost sheath of the golden hue – the highest. That is what then knower of the Atman know. Brahman is said to be nishkalam.

The third one is *nithyatva sruti virodhah*. When the world and jiva are beda is taken as part of Brahman we say Brahman is savayavam endowed with avayavam or limbs then Brahman will become anithyam because there is a law *yad yad savayavam tad tad anithyam*. Look at the world anything they are savayavam and they are anithyam. Akasa is also subject to birth and therefore subject to death. Even Akasa has sooksmavayavam. Akasa is expanding and from this it is very clear Akasa is savayavam. You cannot say let Brahman be anithyam because sruti says Brahman is nithyam. In support of nithyatvam there is a sruti support in 1.3.18 of Kathopanisad *na jayate mriyate va vipascit nayam kutascin-na babhuva kascit ajo nityah sasvato'yam purano na hanyate hanyamane sarire* the intelligent Atman is not born, nor does He die. He did not spring from anything and nothing sprang from him. The unborn, eternal everlasting, ancient, is not slain even when the body is destroyed.

The next one is *sathyatva sruti virodhah*. One clay alone has modified and has become earthenware or parts and they are but name initiated by your tongue and the Upanishad makes a very important statement clay alone is reality by which sruti wants to point out karanam eva sathyam. If sruti karanam eva sathyam what happens. If I say this person is intelligent, the other person is taken as not being not intelligent. Then if I say this person alone is intelligent I exclude the other person. Here karanam eva sathyam beens karyam is mithya. Karyam is only a namadeyam and it has only verbal existence. When it talks about atman, the Upanishad says tad sathyam that one the karanam Brahman is sathyam and Upanishad positively exphasises indirectly telling that the world is mithya. 6.8.1 is at the level of example and 6.8.7 of Chandogya upanisad is drastanta level. Here sruti makes it clear that we see all these forms before us. They are constantly changing. But that which we cannot see,

which is the essence of everything does not change. And that is our real identity. ‘that thou art’- this is the final message that Vedanta has to give. That Self, that essence. That pure spirit, is your real identity. Therefore this will be contradicted if the world is taken as sathyam

Fifth one *dvaidam nisheda sruti virodhah*. If dvaidam and Advaidam have got equal status the sruti will give respect to both because both of them are sathyam. avayavam is as sacred as avayavi and if Dvaidam and Advaidam are same the sruti should have equal regard to both. But sruti ignores Dvaidam in different ways. One method sruti uses is wherever Advaidam jnanam comes sruti says whoever does have that knowledge will be liberated. Whereas dvaidam jnanam topic comes, sruti does not provide any benefit. Wherever there is sruti sthithi topic comes the sruti does not mention any prayojanam which indicates that dvaidam is of lesser order of reality. Not only for dvaidam jnanam prayojanam is not given but sruti criticizes those who have the leaning to Dvaidam. 2.1.11 of Kathopanisad reads as *manasaivedam aptavayam neha nanasti kincana mrtyoh sa mrtyum gacchati ya iha naneva pasyati* the meaning of the matra is ‘by intuitive mind indeed one perceives that many do not exist at all; one who perceives many as existing He goes from death to death’. If Dvaidam is as real as Advaidam, why should one have fear and get into mrtyu by seeing truth. In II.4.7 of Taittiriya Upanishad reads as *udaram antaram kurute, m, atha tasya bhayam bhavati tat tveva bhayam viduso manvanasya tadapy-esa sloko bhavati* when however, this makes even the slightest distinction to Brahman, then there is danger for him. That very same Brahman Himself becomes the source of fear for him who makes a difference and who reflects not. Even little bit difference a person feels, even part whole difference one feels he will have the fear. If a person says Brahman different and I am different and if one has beda between himself and god, he does not know. Upanishad uses derogatory words that he is devanam pasuh. Sruti negates plurality explicitly. It is the most powerful vakyam. If Advaidam as also Dvaidam is real and then sruti should to negate both but sruti with vehemence negates Dvaidam. *Neha nanasti kincana* 2.1.11 of Kathopanisad. There is no duality at all it is said in Kathopanisad. The very definition of truth is that which cannot be negated; anything that is negated cannot claim to be sathyam. 1.1.23-24 of Kaivalya Upanishad upanisad says *na bhumi apo na ca vahnir asti na canilo me'sti na cambaram ca, evam veditva paramatma rupam guhasayam niskalam advitiam* the meaning of the mantra is for me there is neither earth nor water nor fire, nor air nor ether. Thus realizing the nature of the Paramatman - the one who is in the cavity of the heart who is without parts, without second, the witness of all beyond both existence and non-existence one attains the very nature of the Paramatman. Plurality is not there. Still more is neti neti vakyam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. By negating duality, the Upanishad negates Dvaidam. If the world is taken as part of Brahman, dvaidam niveda sruti virodhah will come. Thereby abeda or advaidam is established positively.

Next is *sarva vijnana sruti nishedah*. If Advaidam and Dvaidam and if Brahman and the world are equally real then by knowing one others cannot be known because others independently as separate entity and what exist as separate entity cannot be known by knowing one. If beda is nithya, then eka vijnanena sarva nijnanam is possible. This aspect of by knowing a single lump of earth you know all objects made of earth. All changes are mere words, in name only. But earth is the reality. It is extended that if you know a single thing made of earth for instance, a pot then you know all things made of earth. The word pot is merely a name. The real object is earth. It is like this. By knowing a single lump of gold you know all objects made of gold. All changes are mere words in name only. So also is the case with Brahman. All the creation are but name with Brahman alone being the reality which is the adhistanam for all the products seen in the entire world including jivas.

Next is *aikya sruti virodhah*. If the world is taken as part of Brahman and Brahman is the whole, then jiva can never be identical with Brahman. Sruti says you are Brahman. Partness is only mithya. You are identical sruti 6.8.7 of Chandogya upanisad says that which is the subtlest of all is the Self of all this. It is the truth. It is the Self. 'That thou are' here again it is emphatically made clear that Self alone is Brahman showing that Brahman is non-different from jivah or the entire Prapancha. Any beda vakyam is against the truth is established here.

Next is *jnana sadhanatva sruti virodhah*. If the world is as real as Brahman, then jivah is also like that and sariram is real; punya papa is real and then samsara also will be real. The sathyam cannot be destroyed by jnanam. Sathya vastu cannot be negated by knowledge. If the snake is real it cannot be negated by knowledge. Only rope snake can be negated and not the real snake. If the world and the problems are sathyam, then no amount of knowledge can remove such worldly problems. 2.1.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad categorically declares that *Brahmavid apnoti Param tad esabhyukta satyam jnanam anantam Brahma* that says the knower of Brahman attains the Supreme. And adds that he who knows Brahman as the real as knowledge and as the Infinite as placed in the transcendental space within the secret cavern enjoys all desires along with the attainment of Brahman the all pervading. With mere knowledge, the problems go means problems are mithya in nature.

Next one is *tatkara drastanta sruti virodhah*. In Chandogya upanisad 6.16 a story is given. Suppose a person is accused of stealing something and he is brought to the kings' court. He says that I have not stolen and we have to find out whether the statement is right or wrong. The person is asked to hold a burning rod. If his statement is false the fire will burn his hand; if the statement is false his hand will be burnt. Truth will insulate the person and still worse not only his hand will be burnt and he will be arrested also. If he tells the truth and having said so, *tat tvam asi* is a factual statement and will liberate you the Upanishad says *tat tvam asi* is a fact. *Abeda* is a fact. Then *beda* must be taken as mithya. Nine sruti virodhah have been pointed out. Rest we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 157

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 14. [148]**

#### ***Tadananyatvamarambhanasabdadibhyah***

The non-difference of them [i.e., if cause and effect] is shown here.

Now we analyse the interpretation of the word tad ananyatvam occurring in sutra 14. Two interpretations are possible one is as given by Advaidins abeda vadhi and the other one given by beda abeda vadhi or the Vishistadvaidin. According to Advaidins tad ananyatvam means when world is non-different from Brahman means Vyasacharya intends to say that the world is mithya and Brahman is sathyam. And according to this approach the world will enjoy lesser order of reality compared to Brahman is called mithyam. But according to beda abeda vadhi tad ananyatvam means the world is part of Brahman and being a part it cannot exist separate from Brahman the whole. It is like that our limb cannot exist separate from our body the whole. So also, the world is part of Brahman and the world cannot exist separate from Brahman, which is the whole. This means world is part of Brahman. According to this interpretation, Brahman and world enjoy same order of reality. Sathyam Brahman is here called avayavam. Adhi Sankaracharya looks into beda abeda vadh and say if you have this approach you will have several problems. In his commentary. He talks of many sruti virodha and I said two more we can add to that even though he has not explicitly mentioned here.

Asangatva sruti virodhah. The Upanishad points out that Brahman is asangah. This occurs in 4.3.15 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad declares *asangohyayam purusah* which means that Atma is unaffected by whatever it sees in that dream state for this person is so attached. That Purusa after enjoying and wandering in the dream state and merely witnessing the results of good and evil, remains in a state of profound sleep and again hastens back in the reverse way to its previous condition. If the world is taken as part of Brahman and the world has got the same degree of reality all the guna doshas, which belongs to, the world also will become an integral part of Brahman and Brahman will become sangah. It is like if there is some problem in Kerala, we cannot say that there is no problem in India for kerala is part of India and any problem anywhere will be the problem of India the whole country. Similarly if the world is part of Brahman as of any state in India, the problems of the world will be problem of Brahman. Similarly if there is a wound in finger, I cannot say I am not affected. From this it is very clear if the world is taken as integral part of Brahman all the samsara will belong to Brahman which will contradict Brahmanah asangatvam.

The last one is the corollary of the previous one. Nirvishesha sruti virodhah. All the sruti statements and nirvishesha statement those sruti that declares as nishkalam and is without attributes all declare are free from attributes and the most popular statement is presented in 3.8.8 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad that reads as *sa hovaca etadvat tadaksaram gargi Brahmana abhtvadanti asthulam ananvahrasmadiringham, alohitam, ssnehamacchayam,*



*atamo'vayvanakasam asangamarasam agandhamacaksuskam asrotram avagamano'-tejaskam apranamamukham amatram, anantaram, abahyam, na tadasnati kincana, na tadasnati kascana.* Here Brahman has been defined as it is neither gross nor subtle, neither short nor long, not glowing [like fire] nor moist [like water], neither reflection nor darkness, neither air nor space. It is unattached. It is without taste or odour without eyes, without ears, without tongue, without mind. It is non-effulgent without vital breath, without mouth. It is without measure, without interior or exterior. It does not consume anything nor is it consumed by anyone. Twenty-three items are said and all of them are negated.

The definition of Brahman vividly explained in 3.8.8 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is repeated in a brief format in 1.iii.15 of Kathopanisad that reads as *asabdham asparsam arupam avyayam tatha rasam nityam agandhavat ca yat; anadya nontam mahatah Param dhruvam nicavya tan mrtyu mukhat pramucyate.* The meaning of the mantra in brief is that 'He who has realized that [Atman] which is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay and also without taste, without smell, without beginning, without end, beyond the Mahat [great] eternal and unchanging, is freed from the jaws of death'.

If the world is taken as part of Brahman, then Brahman will have all the problems, we should take world as lower order of reality, and all that lower order has will not go for the higher order of reality that is Brahman. Thereafter wards, the beda abeda vadhi does not leave and says that he can also point out many sruti virodha in Advaidam also. Adhi Sankaracharya takes a few prominent sruti virodhas pointed out by beda abeda vadh. First one he points out is drastanta sruti virodhah which I had hinted before. Upanishad gives three examples the clay, gold and iron in Chandogya upanisad. Beda abeda vadh says in all of them karana parinama vadha has been talked about and from this we should assume Brahman modification and therefore you cannot say the world is superimposed on Brahman but actually the modification on Brahman has taken place. Advaidins say that the example should be taken to the extent possible and it should not be extended further. Here in the examples, all the three are achetana or jada vasthu. Since jada drastanta is given, you cannot say Brahman is jadam as revealed by Veda Brahman is chetanam. You should not take parinama modification part of example should not be taken because Brahman is nirvikara and from the drastanta we have to take karana karya aspect and we should not jada or parinama aspect. If you take karana karya aspect it will only mean adhistana adhyasa sambandha. So drastanta sruti virodha is not there.

The next charge is karanatva sruti virodha. He says that Brahman is Nirgunam and sathyam and Brahman can be karanam for anything. Therefore, according to you Brahman is karya karana vilaksanam. You also say the world is really speaking is not a karyam and the world is eternally existing in vyakta or avyakata rupena. According to Advaidam sathyam Brahman cannot produce mithya Prapancha. Sathyam Brahman is not karanam. Therefore no karana karya sambandha is possible between sathyam Brahman and mithya Prapancha. That being so, how would you explain in which Brahman is presented as karanam. The second sutra of Brahma sutra itself Brahma karanatva has been brought out. . Actually speaking we do not say that sathyam Brahman produces mithya Prapancha. The mechanism is like this. Mithya Prapancha always exists and during pralayam also mithya Prapancha exists. Sathyam Brahman need not produce and sathyam Brahman cannot produce mithya Prapancha because mithya Prapancha ever exists even during the pralaya kale in avyakta form. The world was there in un-manifest form and comes into manifest form in sristi kalam. When it is vyakta rupam it is called Prapancha and when the world is in avyakta rupam it is called maya and the world is mithya. Maya is mithya. The very same world in avyakta rupam is called mithya.

Between maya and Prapancha there is only vasthu beda one being in manifest form and the other in un-manifest form. It is exactly like ice and water. The Advaidin says avyakta maya alone becomes vyakta Prapancha alone goes back to avyakta maya avastha. Really speaking avyakta maya is the seed of the universe which is mithya. What is really the karanam is maya. Prakriti is another name for maya. During pralaya maya is there in avyakta form. Maya is mithya and mithya is nondifferent from sathyam. Karanatvam status of maya is seen in Brahman, maya evolves itself into Prapancha. Karanatvam of maya is transferred to Brahman until the teaching is over. Brahman is karanam means Brahman is sathya adhistanam of the mithya maya which is karanam. Brahman is sathya adhistanam of mithya maya which is the karanam for all the karya Prapancha. Therefore until the real Brahman is revealed Brahman is told as karanam.

The next sruti virodha as pointed out by beda abeda vadhi is that Veda purva which reveals Dvaidam and which talks about Dvaidam will prove to be invalid if a person talks about Advaidam Brahma sathyan jagan mithya etc. It will falsify Veda. How can you falsify Veda? This is not acceptable. Adhi Sankaracharya strongly criticize that the purva paksa is bouddha in disguise. Now Adhi Sankaracharya gives the reply. If you say that for Advaidin Karma Kanda becomes apramanam and he knows Brahma sathyam jagan mithya. For those Advaidin Karma Kanda has become apramanam we say it is perfectly all right. For the jivan mukta Karma Kanda is apramanam and even though it is apramanam for jnanis but for all the others Karma Kanda is very much valid and pramanam. In fact, throughout the Veda, it is like that. Any portion of the Veda is relevant for total humanity. A particular portion of Veda is relevant for particular portion of humanity alone. Putrakameshti yaga is relevant for only those who have no children. It is irrelevant for the people who have children. In the same way all the karma anushtanam prescribed for brahmachari is not relevant for grahasthas. Similarly, the rites prescribed for grahastha are not relevant for brahmachari and sannyasis. What is prescribed for sannyasins are not relevant for grahasthas and brahmacharis. Therefore, Adhi Sankaracharya's contention is that any part of Veda is relevant for some and not relevant for others. In the same way, any yaga for getting copious rain is not relevant for Brahmaputra region where there is a need to stop rain. However, the yaga for getting rain is relevant for Tamil Nadu. Those people who have deha abhimana, karma kanda is pramanam. It is pramanam for ajnanis. For jnani who have claimed apramani swarupam Karma Kanda is not relevant to them. Even though jnanis and ajnanis live together, Karma Kanda is relevant for ajnanis and jnana kanda is relevant for jnanis. Vedas become aveda for advaidins and jnanis who have gained jivan mukta status.

The next sruti virodha is pratyaksa pramana virodhah. You talk of Advaidam etc., but I don't see advaidam any time. On the other hand, sense organs etc. Reveal Dvaidam only and being everything is pratyaksam. We don't say pratyaksa is relevant from the standpoint of deha abhimana. From the angle of visva the waker, the pratyaksa pramanam is relevant as long as one is in the waking state. One who is identified with dream sariram or for tajjasa, who is in dream world, the dream sense organs are pramanam and if he is traveling he will use dream sense organs and for tajjasa swapna pratyaksam is relevant. But for the prajna the pratyaksa of the waking as also the pratyaksa of the dream state are not at all relevant to him when the person is deep sleep. That is why Advaidin says as long as you do Vyavahara in the world you operate with the body, the world is pramanam and world also is real. All the things that exist in the world are real in Vyavahara state and it is called vyavaharika pramanyam. Advaida vakyam is pramanam only when you raise yourself to the advaida status and cross over from Vyavahara status to the Paramarthika status when you forget the body and identify

with Brahman the adhistanam. From deha abhimana dristi Dvaidam is sathyam and deha abhimana rahita dristi Dvaidam is mithya and Brahman is sathyam.

You say that Brahman alone is sathyam and the whole world is mithya superimposed on Brahman. The whole Prapancha is mithya or adhyasa. If that were true what about Vedanta sastra is mithya or sathyam. For that we say anything other than Brahman is mithya. Even Isvara is seen as mithya. What about sastra? Sastram is also mithya. Then he asks how can mithya sastra reveal sathyam. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives two answers. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a Chandogya upanisad vakyam when a person is doing a kama karma and in between he sleeps, suppose he sees a dream and in the dream a woman comes then sastra says that kama karma is blessed. [5.2.8 of Chandogya upanisad] the ritual will be successful. The success of the karma is done in jagrat avastha and success should belong to jagrat Prapancha. This jagrat Prapancha phalam is revealed in swapna which is mithya. A mithya swapna is able to reveal sathyam karma phalam. If you say wrong you negate sruti.

Then 3.2.4 of aitereya Upanishad. Suppose in swapna a person sees a dark person. Not only the person is dark and his teeth are also dark. That swapna indicates maranam. Jagrat maranam soochakam. That person will die soon. Jagrat maranam is revealed by mithya maranam. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives another example. We have got alphabetical letters. They are sabda only. We know sabda has not form. But what we have done for the sake of communication for every sound we have written a form. Ekaika sabdasya abhi a form is attributed to every letter and this form does not belong to the sound. A form is only imagined superimposed akarah, which does not belong to the sound. Now our question is whether akarah is sathyam or mithya. Since sound does not have any akarah, all the attributes attached to the word is mithya rekastram. Even though rekaksaram is mithya it is able to reveal sathyam sabdah which is beyond our imagination. On one sound there is superimposition of many forms. All of them are mithya and all of them reveal my word sound parinama vadha which is sathyam. There is no problem at all. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 158

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 14. [148]**

#### ***Tadananyatvamarambhanasabdadibhyah***

The non-difference of them [i.e., if cause and effect] is shown here.

We analyse until now the important word tadananyatvam and this word is interpreted by Advaidins as 'tad adhyatatvam' that the world is mithya and superimposed on Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya critically analyses the interpretation of beda abeda vadh and they say the world is as real as Brahman. Now Adhi Sankaracharya has indirectly analysed vishistadvaida system also which is close to beda abeda vadh. In addition, Adhi Sankaracharya points out several sruti contradictions between beda abeda vadh and even though talks about the draw backs of vishistadvaidin and staunch vishistadvaidin never agree with the strong criticisms of advaidin. While samkya, nyaya vaiseshika etc., philosophy is confined to books, vishistadvaidam is a live religion even today. Therefore you should remember all the arguments have not convinced the vishistadvaidin and vishistadvaidin has become more vehement about advaidam., the debate between Advaidam and vishistadvaidam continue as to which has the full support of sruti/sutra and anubhava. Both the system have been parallely coming hand in hand and none is able to come to a final decision. Both the system bring out sruti support etc., how to break the tie and find out a tie breaker between vishistadvaidam and Advaidam. Both claim that their lords have certified their own system. Which one am I to accept? Unfortunately, we cannot accept both. It means I have not understood either. The basic tenets between the two systems are different. In Advaidam, vishistadvaidam and Advaidam all the three are based on Vedanta sampradhaya and are supported by sruti, yukti and anubhava. Advaidam says world is different from Brahman and is as real as Brahman; vishistadvaidam says world is part of Brahman and is as real as Brahman; Advaidam says world is supported by Brahman and it is less real than Brahman. Since the fundamental tenets are different, the acceptance of one results in the rejection of the other two. What is the tiebreaker? All the three are live systems. Everything Advaidin does Advaidin does and everything Advaidin does the vishistadvaidin does. The tiebreaker is your own intellect. In the case of every human being his intellect alone can be the guiding factor. All pramanams can support, sruti can give its data, anubhava can give its data; logic can give its data; each data has to be processed by the intellect and it is the intellect that has to decide what system you decide to choose among the three systems that are live systems. My intellect has to be convinced. Your life is governed by your buddhi. All our sastras say never be the intellectual slave of either Sankara or Ramanuja or Madhva or any religious leader. Be independent in your intellect and be intellectually honest. An intelligent human being is guided by any one's intellect. If it is a question of achara intellect need not be used. You need not go by your intellect. Go by what your acharya says. Which madham should be your Kula guru. Follow that Matham to be your Kula guru. Even the vocabulary, you choose what your acharya says. You can follow traditions in all other matters but in teaching you go by your

own intellect and ask the question which once convinces you. After all the agreement you come to the conclusion that vishistadvaïdam is good and acceptable and if you are convinced of that you can go by what your intellect says. In such cases, the view of Advaidin's attitude towards any one for accepting any other system will be that he does not look upon Dvaïdam and vishistadvaïdam are opposed to Advaidam. On the other hand Advaidin claims that Dvaïdam and vishistadvaïdam are only the promoters of Advaidam. They are the means to come to Advaidam even though he rejects both of them as the end, he accept both as means to the end called Advaidam. In the vision of Advaidam all the seekers are categorized at three levels. Mandha adhikari, madhyama adhikari and uttama adhikari. One is good student, next is better student and third category is the best student. According to Advaidam Dvaïdam is the only means for the conversion of mandha adhikari to madhyama adhikari and vishistadvaïdam is only compulsory means for converting madhyama adhikari to uttama adhikarai. Dvaïdam and vishistadvaïdam beautifully convert the mandha and madhyama adhikari to uttama adhikari and uttama adhikari will have such an intellect will without any protest or any resistance will appreciate the teachings of Advaidam. Vishistadvaïdam and Dvaïdam will bring every seeker of sagunam Brahman to the platform of Nirgunam Brahman ultimately. Sagunam is rejected as an end but it is accommodated as means and one may follow Sagunam as vishistadvaïdins do and come ultimately to Nirgunam Brahman as advaidin. Whereas for Dvaïdins and vishistadvaïdins reject Advaidam totally. The means is also Sagunam Brahman, end is also Sagunam Brahman, and therefore Advaidam in the form of Nirgunam Brahman is totally rejected. But for Advaidin both are accepted as Sagunam Brahman is only the means. If somebody says I accept vishistadvaïdam or I accept Dvaïdam, Advaidins will say it is wonderful and advaidin will not reject and continue vishistadvaïdam and advaidins will say that one day he would come to Advaidam if not in this janma but in the future janma. Therefore *tadananyatvam* you take *tadavayavatvam* it is o.k. This idea Gauda Pada brings out in his Mandukya Karika no 16 that eads as *Asramas trividha hina Madhya motkrsto drstayah upasano 'padisteyam tadartha manu kampaya*. The meaning of the karika is 'on the basis of different degrees of intellectual capabilities such as the lower, the middle and the higher, life itself can be divided into three stages; the scripture out of compassion and consideration has taught this method of worship or discipline for the benefit of those who are not yet enlightened.' Ultimately one has to come to Advaidam it is stated. With this we conclude arambana sutram. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 15. [149]**

***Bhave chopalabdheh***

And [because] only on the existence [of the cause] [the effect] is experienced.

The argument began in Sutra 14 as to how it follows that the effect [world] is inseparable from its material cause, Brahman is continued.

The following sutras also convey the same idea that Brahman is karanam, the world is karyam, and the world the karyam is non-different from karanam Brahman. This is the topic discussed in this and the following sutras. Now Vyasacharya gives further supporting argument, now I will give general analysis.

Here Vyasacharya gives further supporting argument/ he says karyam the effect is non-different from karanam the cause. If karanam and karyam were two separate entity you would have experienced them separately and experienced one even without the other like clip and clock. You can experience the clip without the watch and the watch without the clip. We know of the two one is different from the other. When you come to the pot and clay, we say pot is non-separate from clay. We can never talk about an independent existence of the pot. If pot can independently exist even after the removal of the clay, the pot 'is' the 'is-ness' of the pot belongs to the clay. The pot cannot separate from the clay. You cannot have a separate perception of the pot; this means whenever you perceive whether you like it or not you perceive the clay; pot perception presupposes clay perception. Since the existence of the pot and the perception of the pot are possible only in the existence and the perception of the clay and we conclude that the pot is non-separate from the clay. Try to look at the wave without the perception of the ocean. Both the existence and perception are dependent on existence and perception of the clay. This is the argument given here.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Upalabdheh because of the existence; and because of the existence and perception of the effect only during he existence and perception of the cause and the effect is non-separate from the cause. Now I will gie you the significance of the word. Bhava during the existence; only during he existence of the cause the effect exists. Only during the existence of the clay the pot exists; you have to add one more karana upalabdou eva only during he existence of the cause the effect can exist. Cha is a conjunction joining these two; upalabdheh you supply karyasya upalabdheh and also karyasya bhava only during he existence of the cause the effect exists because of these two karyam is non-separate from karanam.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary has got another reading for this sutra. The other reading is bhavad ca upalabhdeh. First I will give general analysis of the reading. Vyasacharya says the non-separateness of the effect from the cause is proved by the pratyaksa pramanam itself. Pot is never separate from clay. Cloth is never separate from thread. Wave is never separate from water. Because pratyaksa pramanam itself this idea is proved. You don't require sastra or anumana pramanam. Now you look at the word for word analysis. Bhavad because of the evidence upalabdeh of the evidence of pratyaksa pramanam cha also then complete the effect is non-different from the cause. That is why Vedanta says to perceive that the world you have to perceive the Brahman. Whether you like it or not you all the time perceive Brahman. We perceive Brahman is proved when ever you see a thing two things happen. When you see a clip you come to know of the awareness of the clip and then you talk about the existence of the clip; the awareness belongs to Brahman and the existence belongs to Brahman. The awareness and existence are sat and chit are Brahma darsanam and nama and rupa are the world darsanam. We see Brahman all the time. Nama rupa Prapancha is not separate from Brahman. Experience the world without the sat can chit. It is never possible. Pratyaksa pramanam proves that world is non separate from Brahman.

## **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 16. [150]**

***Sattvaccavarasya***

And on account of the posterior [i.e. The effect which comes after the cause] existing [as the cause before creation]

The argument began in Sutra 14 is continued.

First we will do a general analysis. Here Vyasacharya once again goes to sruti pramanam to prove that world is non-separate from Brahman. We refute that world is not a product of matter and world is non-different from Brahman. Now scripture accept the world existed before its creation. The world did not exist in manifest form but it existed in avyakruta rupam or in un-manifest form or invisible form. Upanishad accept the law of conservation of energy and the matter can never be destroyed even by the god. And the scriptures are very clear that Brahman was karanam for the creation before sristi. Brahman the cause and the world in un-manifest form existed before creation. Brahman and the world existed before. Instead of enumerating two, Upanishad enumerates only Brahman. What is the significance of this? If you analyse you can arrive at that before sristi the world was existence non-separate from Brahman. Therefore Upanishad says world was existent in the form of Brahman. Pot existed before in the form of clay which means it was nondifferent from clay. When we say that world was nonseparate from Brahman before creation from, that we conclude that world is non separate from Brahman after creation, now also. This is the general analysis.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Cha means moreover; attvat because of the existence avarasya of the effect; in the form of the cause before the creation the effect is non-separate from the cause. Now we will see the significance of the word. Sattvat because of the existence; avarasta means karya Prapancha; effect is seen as avaram the later. Effect is called avaram because the effect comes later. This is backed by two sruti statement Chandogya upanisad 6.2.1 and Aitereya Upanishad 1.1.1. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 159

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 16. [150]**

#### ***Sattvaccavarasya***

And on account of the posterior [i.e. The effect which comes after the cause] existing [as the cause before creation]

The argument began in Sutra 14 is continued.

In the second chapter of Brahma Sutra known as avirodha adhyaya Vyasacharya defends the teaching already presented in the chapter I through samanvaya. By defends we mean that this teaching does not contradict any pramanam. This establishment of pramana virodha abhava is defended. Various purva paksa tried to point out various virodhas and we tried to establish that there is no pramana virodha. By way of this first Vyasacharya established the Vedantic does not contradict any sruti pramanam. In this samkya, yoga, nyaya and vaiseshika sruti were taken, parihara was done, and yukti virodha parihara was negated. After smriti virodha yukti virodha parihara Vyasacharya has entered into pratyaksa virodha parihara. This is being done in 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and also in the 6<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. We are in the middle of the sixth adhikaranam. As a part of pratyaksa virodha parihara Vyasacharya discusses the status of the world according to Vedantic teachings. Here he says that the world is Brahma karyam. It enjoys the status of being the product of Brahman. Jagatah Brahma karyatvam varthate. This Brahma karyatva status Vyasacharya refines by pointing out that Brahma karyatvam is Brahma ananyatvam. It means that the world is non-separate from Brahman. In Sanskrit it is called ananyatvam. Vishistadvaidin, Advaidin, and Advaidin define this differently. For vishistadvaidin will interpret the non-separateness as the world is part of Brahman; it means the property or the part of Brahman. But in Advaidin nonseparateness means superimposition which is unique approach of Advaidin. In fact, if Adhi Sankaracharya wrote adhyasa bashyam and the source for adhyasa abashyam is arambanadhikaranam. Therefore we will not bother about differences between vishistadvaidin and Advaidin. We will use a common word acceptable to both is non-separateness. The proof to show that the world is nonseparate from Brahman is given in sutra 14 of this chapter. The scripture presents the world as nama rupa only. Once the world is given nama rupa status, it gets the nama rupa status. In the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya gives out own experience. The experience is that a product is non-separate from its cause. We experience non-separateness of furniture from the wood. The non-separateness from cause and effect is our experience. On the above analogy, Brahman is the cause and world is the effect and world, the effect is non-separate from Brahma the cause. Now the third proof is given in the 16<sup>th</sup> sutra. Here once again Vyasacharya gives the sruti support itself. The world is non-separate from Brahman. Sruti talks about the world before creation. If we understand the status of the world before creation and we can extend the idea after creation also. The sruti vakyam taken into account *sadeva somyedamagra asidekamevadvitiyam* which means this world as we see it with its names and



forms was only existence one without second. The concept of nonexistence is added only to make it clear what is meant by existence. Mantra 1.1.1 of Aitareya Upanishad says *om Atma va idameka evagra asit nanyat kincana misat*. The meaning of the mantra is in the beginning verily Atman [Self] alone was this [the Universe] nothing else active whatsoever. 1.4.10 of Brihadaranyaka upanishad says *Brahma va idamagra asit, tadatmanamevavet aham Brahmasmiti* which means this Self was verily Brahman at first. It knew only itself as 'I am Brahman' because of that it became the entire universe. This is the status of the world before sristi. Idam asit means the world was there. Agre means sristeh purvam. The world was existent before creation. Bhagavan never produces the world. It is said here that the world was in existence before the creation. How was the world existent before creation? Ad eva asit world was existent in the form of Brahman. The world was existent in the form of Atma. Here we have to note that the Upanishad does not say that the world was in existent in Brahman. We should not say world was in Brahman but we should say the world was Brahman. The world is also nominative case and Brahman also in nominative case and both are in samanadhikaranyam. Both have the same case ending. Vyasacharya wants to confirm that before creation world was Brahman. Before creation ornaments were gold. Then Vyasacharya says that before creation world was Brahman should be understood as before creation the world was non-separate from Brahman. Thus, all the sristi vakyam reveals non-separate ness of the world from Brahman. Samanadhikaranyam reveals ananyatvam. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

The sutras has got three words sattvat, cha and avarasya; sat and cha`. Because of the existence of the world in the form of Brahman, the world is non-separate from Brahman. The significance of the words is sattvat, cha and avarasya. Sattvat means sattva sravanat; because of the mention of the existence of the world in the sruti. The Upanishad says idam agre asit, which means the world, was existent before. The word Brahma indicates not only the world was existent but also asat karya vadha is negated. The second part to be focused the world existed as Brahman indicators non-separateness of world from Brahman. Then cha is a conjunction because two reasons were given and now one more reason is given. The next word is avarasya, which means later one or inferior one. In this context we should take it as karyam for the product is always later. Further product is inferior to the cause. Up to this, we saw in the previous class.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives another interpretation to the same sutra. The effect also enjoys eternal existence just as the cause enjoys eternal existence. On enquiry, we see the effect also enjoys eternal existence. This idea is repeated in Bhagavad Gita sloka 8.18 which reads as *avyaktad vyaktayah sarvah prabhavanty aharahame ratryagame praliyante tatrai 'va'vyaktasamjnake* the meaning of the mantra is this very same multitude of existences arising again and again merges helplessly at the coming of night and streams forth into being at the coming of the day. This periodic emergence and dissolution of all existences does not affect the Lord of all existence. The same idea is seen in sloka 28 of II chapter of Bhagavad Gita that reads as *avyaktadini bhutani vyaktamadyani bharata avyaktanidhanany eva tatra ka paridevana* the meaning of the mantra is beings are un-manifest in the middles and un-manifest again their ends. What is there in this for lamentation? He insists the creation exist always. Sristi sthithi laya are accepted in keeping with the confusion of the people. World was there before in un-manifest form; and now it is in manifest form and will be in un-manifest form in future. So never ask why Bhagavan created the world because Bhagavan never created the world. World is eternally existent either in avyakta or vyakta rupa. Brahman is also eternally existent..the world enjoys eternal existent. We study the relationship between the Brahman and world. We have another information, which we have

to apply here. We know the existence is only one from sruti, yukti anubhava pramanam. Brahman enjoys eternal existence; world enjoys eternal existence. There is no pramanam to prove plurality of existence. There is no pramanam, which reveals the plurality of existence. Keeping this information since the existence is one and since Brahman is eternally existence and world is eternally existence and we conclude that world share the existence of the Brahman. This shared existence is possible only if the world is non-separate from Brahman. Two brothers lie down. Both are covered by blanket. Blanket is only one. It is possible only if two brothers in separate room or separate cot and we know that blanket is one and both lie together is proved by the covered-ness and one blanket. Both have existence, both share the existence, and to share the existence they must be non-separate. Moreover, because of the existence in the form of the cause because of the eternal existence of the effect, the effect is non-separate from the cause. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 17. [151]**

*Asadyapadesanneti chet na dharmantarena akyaseshat*

If it be said that on account of [the effect] being described as that which is not [the effect does] not [exist before creation] we reply 'not so' because the term 'that which is not' denotes another characteristic or attribute [as is seen] from the latter part of the text.

The argument that the world had no existence before creation is refuted.

We will do the general analysis of this sutra. In the previous sutra, we analysed that the world was existent in the form of Brahman before creation. From that statement we derived two ideas that before creation the world was existent and the world was non-separate from Brahman. Of the two ideas we now focus upon the first idea. The world was existent before creation which means the effect was in existence before production. This approach is called sat karya vadha. We had discussed this in Mandukya Karika. Sat karya vadha is effect was existent before creation. This is not accepted by nyaya vaiseshika philosopher. They say that the effect does not exist before its creation. This theory is called asat karya vadha. In the previous discussion Vyasacharya has said the world is in existence before creation. Nyaya philosopher is extremely disturbed and nyaya vaiseshika philosopher pose the question. They say that the world was not existent before creation. In support of this he quotes sruti vakyam. The objection has sruti pramanam also. He quotes II.7.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad *asad va idam agra asit tato vai sad ajayata tad atmanagm svayam akuruta tastmat tat sukrtam ucyata iti* with the meaning 'in the beginning was verily this nonexistence, from that the existent was born. That created itself by Itself. Therefore, it is called the Self-made or the Well-made. The world was non existence before creation. Naiyayika says when the world was nonexistence where is the question of non-separateness of Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya says asat does not mean nonexistence. The word asat here is used from different standpoint. The word asat means only 'as though' nonexistence. As though nonexistent means potentially existent and un-manifestly existent. When a thing is potentially existent, it does not have any utility at all. Avyavaharyatvad is potentially existent thing. For example in all waterfall electricity is potentially existent and as long as electricity is existent what is the use to us unless we have hydro electric projects. The potentially existent electricity should be made useful by having a

hydroelectric project and in the absence of any project; the electricity potential is no use to us. Similar when milk is there ghee is potentially there. We say milk is there but we do not say ghee is there. So also, in the case of clay pot is potentially there but we say clay is there and we do not say pot is there. To put it in another language the pot is potentially there which we call it 'as though' pot is existent. Potentially existent world is termed as though existent. Asat means potentially existent. Purva paksa asks the question why do you interpret potentially existent and why do not you say it is not existent. For this Vyasacharya says that the latter statements support my interpretation that asat is potentially existent. Adhi Sankaracharya says patiently study the Upanishad. Tad atmanam svayam ahruta this is the statement. Asat was there before creation; that asat transformed itself into the world. Tad atmanam itself ahruta transformed itself into the world by itself; Adhi Sankaracharya says that if asat means nonexistent how can nonexistence transforms itself to something. Abhava cannot do any job much less transformation of itself and if it is to transform itself, it has to be potentially existent to transform itself into manifest world. Therefore asat means not nonexistent but potentially existent. This is the general analysis and the word for word analysis we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 160

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 17. [151]**

***Asadvyapadesanneti chet na dharmantarena akyaseshat***

If it be said that on account of [the effect] being described as that which is not [the effect does] not [exist before creation] we reply 'not so' because the term 'that which is not' denotes another characteristic or attribute [as is seen] from the latter part of the text.

The argument that the world had no existence before creation is refuted.

We see the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra which is a part of arambanadhikaranam which gives the karana karya sambandha between jagat and Brahman. The significance that is revealed in this adhikaranam is that karana karya sambandha means karya karana anyatvam that karya does not exist separate from karanam. We karya is adhyasam and karanam is adhistanam. Satya anrita sambandha is also extracted from anyatva sambandha is presented in his introduction as adhyasa bashyam. While establishing this anyatva sambandha Vyasacharya uses a sruti statement 16 that the world existed before creation but before creation also the world is non-different from Brahman. Anyatvam is not only sristi and this state continued before sristi and the anyatvam existed before sristi should be extended after sristi. Both before sristi and after sristi the world existed in Brahman. Before sristi it was in un-manifest form and after sristi the world exist in manifest form. The difference in manifestation and un-manifestation and in both condition the world is non-different from Brahman. One is the world existed and it existed it was non-different from Brahman. When this idea was revealed the nyaya philosopher got disturbed. He forgot the primary discussion the world is non-different from Brahman. The world was existent before sristi and the existence was non different from Brahman. When we say that the world existed before sristi is called sat karya vadha. The sat karya vadha is a red raf for nyaya philosopher because he is a asat karya vadhi. For him before creation the world was nonexistent. So he asks why when the world is nonexistent before creation why talk of whether the world was potentially existent in Brahman. For this he quotes a statement asat va idam agra asit. On this sruti statement, Vyasacharya gives the answer in sutra 17. I will give you the meaning of the word and the significance of the sutra.

Asat vyapadesat because of the expression asat in 2.7 of Taittiriya Upanishad that is brahmananda valli. The effect is nonexistent before the creation; itichet if it is argued thus; na it is not so; dharmantarena the expression asat is used in Taittiriya Upanishad from another standpoint. Vakya seshat this is evident from the following portion of Taittiriya Upanishad 2.7. This is the running meaning of the sutra.

The significance of the word is asat vyapadesat vyapadesa means expression, statement etc. The expression asat; it means because of the expression asat. This is the quotation of nyaya philosopher. This occurs in Taittiriya Upanishad. The conclusion he arrives at is na it means

negation; the question is what is negated by naiyayika philosopher is that he negates the world before creation; naiyayika negates because in the previous sutra Vyasacharya used the word saying that world existed before sristi. Up to this is purva paksa. Iti chet is siddhanta statement. If nyaya says such an argument Vedantins say that he negates naiyayika argument; he negates because he says dharmantarena it means to complete the idea you complete and say asat expression is given from another standpoint; word asat can be taken from two standpoint; naiyayika standpoint should not be taken and another standpoint should be taken. Normal standpoint is asat means nonexistent. Normally the word sat and asat are used from the standpoint of existent. Naiyayika unfortunately takes the normal meaning and translate asat as nonexistent. Adhi Sankaracharya says that the word sat does not denote the existent at all and the word sat means 'as though' existent which means 'potentially existent' before sristi. It is from the standpoint of manifestation and unmanifestation; sat means manifest universe and asat means un-manifest universe. Why say un-manifest universe is asat? For this Adhi Sankaracharya says the Upanishad uses the word asat because any un-manifest thing is not useful to us. What is not available for transaction purposes. A child in womb is not taken for census purposes but immediately one hour afterward if when the child is born it is taken for census purposes. This indicates un-manifest state of the baby before birth and manifest state of baby after birth. Then comes the word vakya seshat. I said asat can either indicate a non-existent thing or un-manifest thing. Naiyayika took nonexistent meaning and we have taken un-manifest thing. Now naiyayika may ask when both meanings are possible why cannot you take the popular first meaning. So Vyasacharya says that the context demands the second meaning that is determined vakya seshat the latter statement in Taittiriya Upanishad tad atmanam svayam ahruta. There tad atmanam svayam ahruta that asat transformed itself into the universe. From this we understand if the asat is nonexistent how can nonexistent entity can transform itself into universe. Our standpoint is that the un-manifest universe before sristi got transformed itself into manifest universe. Therefore the world was existent before sristi and it was non-different from Brahman also.

## **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 18. [152]**

***Yukteh sabdantaracca***

From reasoning and from another sruti text [the same is clear. This relation between cause and effect is established].

That the effect exists before its origination and is non-different from the cause follows from reasoning and from a further scriptural or another text of the Vedas.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya negates the asat karya vadha of nyaya philosopher. In the previous sutra itself Vyasacharya negated asat karya vadha with sruti pramana. Now in this sutra asat karya vadha is logically negated. Adhi Sankaracharya considers this a very significant sutra. Negation of nyaya philosopher is a difficult job. Only when all the five darsanams are negated the Vedanta can get the medal. Any darsana negation is important. Adhi Sankaracharya writes a very elaborate bashyam on this sutra.

To understand the negation you should know what is meant by *asat karya vadha*. This I discussed elaborately in *Mandukya Karika*. *Asat karya vadha* is any effect is nonexistent before its production. Thought is nonexistent before it is produced. *Sat karya vadha* is any effect is existent before its production. *Nyaya naiyayika* philosophers give out *Asat karyavadha* and *Vedantins* negates *asat karya vadha* and joins *sat karya vadha*. By *asat karya vadha* negation we accept *sat karya vadha* and then we negate *sat karya vadha* and we talk about *adhyasa vadha* or *ajadi vadha* is sued. Our present job is negation of *asat karyavadha* and establishment of *sat karya vadha*. There are six arguments to negate the *asat karyavadha*.

*Visesha karana upadanat* is the first argument. Now we ask the question before the pot is created whether the pot existed in the clay or not. We say that pot existed in the clay in the potential form and the potter brings the potential form into existent thing. However, the *naiyayika* argues that the butter did not exist in the milk and it is freshly created product. We say that if you say if the butter did not exist in milk, whether it existed in the sand, wood, milk or water. In all of them, the butter is uniformly nonexistent. Why should a person go to milk to create butter? If you can produce butter from milk in which butter is nonexistent, why cannot you churn oil, sand or anything other than the milk? Even though butter is nonexistent in all the things including butter as per the views of the *naiyayika*, philosophers why we choose milk to churn out butter. There is some specialty in milk to give butter by churning and that special quality we call it potential existence of butter in milk in un-manifest form. In that *karanam* some specialty is there and that specialty we call potential existent. When I want oil, I go to the oilseed where alone the oil is there in potential form. This we call *visesha karanam*. Specific cause we take for specific effect. Specific effect exists in potential form in the specific cause. *Adhi Sankaracharya* has not presented in this exact form. Now you say that the nonexistent pot is born out of clay because of the operation of the potter. Similarly nonexistent butter is born out of milk. This argument is purely grammatical argument. The pot originates is the sentence. *Adhi Sankaracharya* asks the question and any sentence should have the subject and verb should be there. Subject can be openly mentioned or otherwise. Verb represent a *kriya* and it requires a *karta*. *Adhi Sankaracharya* says my dear *naiyayika* the statement is nonexistent pot originates. Subject is nonexistent pot. If you say a nonexistent pot means it does not exist which means the subject of the sentence is nonexistent. When nonexistent pot is the subject, the subject is nonexistent. My question is when the subject itself is nonexistent how can there be origination an action. How can there be an action without a subject which is nonexistent.

Then comes the third argument which takes to definition of origination accordint to *naiyayika*. A particular definition of creation is negated here. The pot was nonexistent and it did not enjoy the existence. When the potter creates a pot a new mechanism takes place. That is the pot was originally nonexistent. When the pot started doing something, nonexistent pot became an existent pot. The clay is existent. He says the caly has the existence all the time even before. At the time of potters' operation the nonexistent pot because of the association of *karana satta* the nonexistent pot gets existence. All because of the association with *karanam*. Then *Adhi Sankaracharya* calls the *naiyayika* as fool and he asks you say at the time of potters operation the nonexistent pot gets associated with existent clay. How can a nonexistent port get associationship with the existent clay and because of the association the nonexistent pot get existence. Any association is possible between tow existent things. Between two existent thing *sambanda* is possible. But *sambanda* between one nonexistent thing and another existent thing is not possible. This is the third argument.

Next is teasing argument. Naiyayika says karyam was nonexistent before and came to existence later. Before its production there was nonexistent pot only. Adhi Sankaracharya says in this idea you connect with nonexistent pot with the past time. Now the pot is existent. Purva kala sambanda abhavad. Any sambandha relation is possible only between two existent things either in the past, now or later. The pot was nonexistent is itself is wrong.

Now we will go to the fifth reason. In sat karya vadha we say that the butter is existent in potential form. So we do the operation with the milk. The churning process is called karaka vyaparah. It is operation in the cause. It is operation in the cause in which the milk is potentially existent. By that operation the un-manifest product comes to manifestation; unmanifest nama rupa in the clay takes the manifest nama rupa. Adhi Sankaracharya asks in asat karyavadha there is no operation on the milk because the milk does not contain butter the nonexistent thing. As the churning the sand is utterly useless to get milk, so also it should be that milk churning should not give butter. The naiyayika may say that the nonexistent becomes existent with the help of the operation. How can there be any operation on the nonexistent pot. Operation on the clay is useless and operation on nonexistent clay is useless.

Fifth and final argument is that the universe exists in potential form non-different from Brahman. Only if world is there non-different from Brahman can be Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati. In asat karyavadha the cause is different and karanam is also a new product and how can the nonexistent karanam give effect to the existent karyam just by any operation. In karana karyam is not in potential form. Kaya is a new product. If karanam and karyam are different, by karana jnanam karya jnanam is not possible. Because of the six reasons, asat karyavadha is not correct and we conclude that world existed in un-manifest form and manifest form after creation. In both the cases the world remained non-different from Brahman.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 161

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 18. [152]**

#### ***Yukteh sabdantaracca***

From reasoning and from another sruti text [the same is clear. This relation between cause and effect is established].

That the effect exists before its origination and is non-different from the cause follows from reasoning and from a further scriptural or another text of the Vedas.

We now see the 18<sup>th</sup> sutra occurring in arambanadhikaranam. It is primarily clarifying karana karya sambandha obtaining between the universe and Brahman pointing out that karana karya sambandha is ananyatva sambandha. We have seen this as sathya mithya sambandha or adhyasa adhistana sambandha. While doing so Vyasacharya has taken a diversion in which he negates the asat karyavadha of nyaya and naiyayika philosophers. Asat karyavadha means the effect does not remain in the cause before production and since the effect is not there in the cause, the effect is new production. According to asat karyavadha new substance is created and that is why asat karyavadha is called aramba vadha. Adhi Sankaracharya strongly condemns the asat karyavadha and he gives six main reasons in his bashyam against asat karyavadha's views. Because the word yukteh means reasoning, because of the reasoning the asat karyavadha does not stand scrutiny. Adhi Sankaracharya also discusses one more technical topic. The topic is that asat karyavadha points out that pot is a new substance created and he says that pot comes to existence as a new substance and hence asat karyavadha accepts that there are two distinct substances the causal substance clay and the new thing created pot. But Advaidins say that the cause and effect are one and the same, asat karyavadha says that cause and effect are two one old substance clay and new substance created is in the form of pot. Only one is in un-manifest and the other is un-manifest substance. We say that before production the substance is in un-manifest form and after production, the things come to manifest form and the change from un-manifest to manifest form we call as sristi or production. This is advaidin's point of view. But asat karyavadha says that there are two substances one before production in the form of clay and the other new substance created in the form of pot. He calls the cause as karana dravyam, which was there before production and he calls the pot as karya dravyam, which came to existence after the operation of production, and therefore he accepts karana dravyam and karya dravyam and clay, is different substance and pot is a new different substance. He calls karana dravyam as avayava dravyam and calls karya dravyam avayavi dravyam. I mention the names that Adhi Sankaracharya uses these names in his commentary. Since naiyayika uses two substances naturally, he has to talk about their relationship. In our vision, there is only one dravyam and we have no relationship at all. In Advaida we need not talk about relationship at all. In nyaya philosophy there is samavaya philosophy or in English we call it inference. Avayava avayavi dravya madhye samavaya sambandha is naiyayika concept. Adhi Sankaracharya in his



commentary heavily criticizes this samavaya sambandha and he calls it most illogical concept of logicians. It shakes the foundation of nyaya philosophy. Every darsanam has a foundation stone. The foundation stone of Advaita is adhyasa. All the other people try to attach the adhyasa. For vishistadvaitam the foundation stone is parallel to samavaya apritak siddhi. Adhi Sankaracharya says that there is no logical support for samavaya. With this yukteh part of the sutra is over.

The second part of the sutra is the negation of asat karyavadha by the sruti. Naiyayika introduced a sruti quotation in his argument in sutra 14. He points out that the world was nonexistent before creation. Asatva idamagra asit is the quoted sruti. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes another sruti quotation 6.2.1 of Chandogya upanishad. Here Upanishad clearly says that this world was existent even before sristi. Having said this much Veda visualizes the naiyayika philosopher coming later. Veda says taddeha ahuh idam agra asit which means that some people think asat eva idam agra asit that the world was nonexistent before sristi. Veda quotes nyaya philosopher as purva paksa and Veda itself answers that how can the people have such a philosophy and the Upanishad says that it is not true and never say that the world was nonexistent before and the world was existent before. Then we will not blame Bhagavan also. Bhagavan never created the world. The world was and the world is. Sruti itself change the word from 'asat to sat'. Chandogya Upanishad says the world was not asat before and was sat only. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now I will take up word for word analysis.

Yukteh from reasoning ca sanda antarata and other sruti statements then complete the sentence the existence of the effect before the creation and its non-separateness from the cause are established. Now we will see the significance of the words. Yuketh means reasoning and by reasoning we mean the six reasons I discussed in the last class; sabdantarata means by other statements; when you say another statement you must have one statement in mind; another with regard to what; naiyayika quotation asat eva idam agra asit is a confusing quotation which was seemingly supporting naiyayika. This I mentioned in the previous sutra. It is a confusing statement and because it is confusing sruti makes it clear sadeva soumya idam agra asti iti Chandogya upanishad vakyam. General vague sruti statement should be understood with clear sruti statement. Thus it refers to sruti pramanam. Cha is the conjunction just the combination between yukti and sruti pramanam. Because of sruti and yukti pramana asat karyavadha is untenable and our vadha alone is correct. More about asat karyavadha we find in Ghata bashyam of Brihadharaynaka upanishad. The statement is naiva iha kincana idam agra asit of Brihadharaynaka upanishad. The difference between naiyayika and sunya vadha is this. Before creation the effect is not there but the cause is there whereas sunyavadhi says before effect as also the cause was not there. Naiva eva kincana agre asit. Sruti seems to support both naiyayika and Buddha. So Adhi Sankaracharya wrote a big bashyam on this topic. He take the example of pot in this bashyam. Ghata dristanta bashyam. Here asat karyavadha is negated more elaborately then here. Now we will go to the next sutra,

## **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 19 [153]**

***Patavacca***

And like a piece of cloth

An example in support of sutra 17 is presented.

I will give you the general analysis on this sutra. Here Adhi Sankaracharya comes back to the main discussion that an effect is not a new product and the effect is non-different from the cause which itself is manifesting itself. Nothing is created. Brahman alone appears it is said. If effect is non-different from the cause why give two separate names. Why use two words karanam and karyam. If one substance is there why use two separate words. We say that superficial differences are there we do agree. One is in the very appearance. And differences in measurement are there. In karanam it is in un-manifest form and clarity is not therein the form. When the baby is small we cannot say how it will look like when grown up. Karanam aspastam karyam spastam. Spasta aspasta rupa superficial differences are there. Similarly second difference is parinama beda the measurement. Seed is small dot but the karyam the tree is very big. It stretches and extends. The difference in measurement is second superficial difference. Alpa mahatva bedah vartate although both are of same substance. The person is one and the same although he undergoes changes from baby to an old man. Vyasacharya gives cloth example. Cloth has got two states vestitha patah folded cloth and vistita patah means unfolded cloth. Are there differences between the folded and unfolded cloth. He says there are superficial differences and not real difference. When folded you know what type of fabric it is. Spastatvam and aspastatvam is there and this you know when it is stretched out. The second difference is parinama beda the measurement differences. Folded one is smaller and unfolded cloth has got larger measurement. Folded cloth has got limited parinama. Even though parinama beda is there we know both are one cloth only. In the same way Brahman alone is world and world alone is Brahman. Folded world is Brahman and expanded Brahman alone is the world. In pralya kala I fold and in sriti kalam I unfold. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

I will give the word for word analysis. Patavat just as the unfolded cloth is non-different from the folded cloth cha so also the effect is non-different from the cause. Interestingly Adhi Sankaracharya makes point. Because of the superficial differences, when the baby is small it is your child and when grown it is not your child. In fifth year it is your baby and in 50<sup>th</sup> year it is not your baby. So Adhi Sankaracharya says to naiyayika not to take the difference seriously. Patavat means like a cloth. When Vyasacharya says like a cloth unfolded and folded forms. Cha means conjunction so also karyam and karanam are essentially one.

## **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 20 [154]**

### ***Yatha cha pranadi***

And as in the case of the different pranas or vital airs

Another illustration in support of sutra 17 is given.

Here the Vyasacharya's aim is to show that the effect is non-different from Brahman He gives another example and as the karanam is in potential form ti cannot do all the functions and karyam can do all the functions. The functional differences re also superficial only. Lump clay cannot be used for carrying water. But when clay is made as pot it can be used to carry

water. Thus function is there in karyam but it is not there in karanam. If you see in terms of function or utility, the shocking discovery is Brahman is not useful for anything but the world has got maximum utility. Vyasacharya shows the functional differences being essentially one. He gives the example of panca pranas. Nirutta and anirutta avasthas are discussed. It is unrestrained state or operational state. Even though prana is the same, in nirutta avastha its function is minimal. When one is in meditation, the heartbeat etc., is minimal. In the case of animal, when it goes into hibernation they appear to be dead and after six months of severe winter gets life and be active. They are barely alive and it is the function of nirutta prana. When the very same prana is activated after nirvikalpaka samadhi the prana becomes fully operational and its function is sarva vidha vyaparah. Even though functional differences are there pranah ekah and Brahman is like nirutta prana and world is anirutta prana.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Yatha pranadi like unrestrained pranas are non-different from restrained prana. So also the effect is non-different from the cause. The difference from the previous sutra and this sutra is in the previous sutra parimana beda is shown and here superficial beda is shown on functional basis. In spite of superficial differences, the substance is the same. With this arambana adhikaranam topic is over. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 162

### **Topic 6 Arambanadhikaranam [sutras 14-20]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 20 [154]**

#### ***Yatha cha pranadi***

And as in the case of the different pranas or vital airs

Another illustration in support of sutra 17 is given.

We have completed the sixth adhikaranam. Yet there is an alternative reading of the 20<sup>th</sup> sutra also. It can be read as pranadih. There is no difference in the final meaning whether pranadi or pranadih. There is no difference in the final meaning.

The significance of this adhikaranam is that the karana karya sambandha obtaining between Brahman and jagat is clarified in the form of adhyasa adhistana sambandha.

From this it is clear that Brahma parinama vadha is acceptable as an intermediary level of teaching. Brahma vivartha vadha is the ultimate teaching. We give three statements; the statement number one is God creates the world statement number two is God becomes the world; the third statement is the God appears as the world. The first one is for mandha adhikari; the second one is for madhyama adhikari and the third one is for uttama adhikari; in the first one we see Brahman as the nimitta karanam; in the second we see Brahman as parinama upadana karanam and in the third statement one we see Brahman as the vivartha upadana karanam. In the first one Brahman and world are equally real it is called dvaidam and in the second one also Brahman and the world are equally real and it is called vishistadvaidam and the third one Brahman is more real than the world which we call Advaidam. Whether we take the Brahma parinama or vivartha vadha the same purva paksa is negated in both the vadhas purva paksa being pratyaksa virodhah have been negated. . There can be empirical plurality and the adhistanam is one and the same. The doubt in all the adhikaranam is samanvaya is established or not or whether it is valid or not aor whether it is acceptable or not; purva paksa uniformly argue samanvaya asiddhah; the reason is uniform virodhah because of contradiction. It will be either sruti virodha, or smriti virodha or yukti virodha or pratyaksa virodha. Siddhanta will say samanvaya siddhah. Samanvaya siddhah avirodhah is the argument of the siddhantins. Argument. Noncontradiction is established nu the siddhantins.

### **Topic 7 Iaravyapadesadhikaranam [Sutra 21-23]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 21[155]**

### ***Iaravyapadesaddhitakaranadidoshaprasaktih***

I will introduce this adhikaranam. It is a small adhikaranam with three sutras, here also there is a general objection to the Vedantic teaching. They say Vedantic teaching seem to be most funny and absurd teaching. To show the seeming absurdity of teaching he brings four main features of the Vedanta and show how funny it is. We will take those four statements which he presents to show the absurdity. You say Brahman is the creator of the world of problems ahiveivika, Adhyatma, adhi boudhika problems. The commentators say the hells are also part of the problems. Then the Body Mind Complex problems janma, mrithyu jara problems. We can say that general Brahman is the creator of all the problems.

Second statement is that the Vedanta accepts the problems and talks about the moksa and liberation. Jiva experiences the world of problems

Third main teaching of Vedanta is Brahma and jiva aikyam quoting the support of sruti statements. This is the third statement, which is acceptable to Vedanta.

The fourth statement is Brahman creates problem; jiva experiences the problems jiva and Brahman are identical. Hence Brahman creates problems for itself. Purva paksa asks can there be anything more absurd than this. Why create problems for oneself. No one deliberately create problems for oneself. Problems can be due to some conditions. I may be forced to do some action, as I am the control of someone. Or out of ignorance a person may create problems for oneself. Or out of limited power one may create problem for oneself. Many people want to get out of some habits but may not be in a position to get out of it. What about Brahman. Brahman is swatantram Brahma; Brahma is sarvasaktiman how can the independent omniscient and omnipotent Brahman create problem for oneself. There is something serious about it. They say prakriti should be the cause is purva paksa's view. This is the essence of the first sutra.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. *Iaravyapadesat* because of the oneness of jiva with Brahman *hita akaranadi doshaprasaktih* there is a possibility of defects like causing harm to oneself. The first word is *itara vyapadesat* the word itara means jivah; in this context, jiva refers to jiva aikyam. That means oneness with Brahman. *Vyapadesat* means teaching; because of the teaching that Brahman jivah aikya *pratibadanat*. This much alone is given by purva paksa here. Absurdity comes in the next part of the sutra. It causes harms to oneself that is Brahman itself. Isvara is causing harms to itself. Brahman creates problem. Brahman himself as jiva suffers. It is ridiculous. You describe Brahman as sarvajnam yet why should he suffer and such a thing is absurd in Vedantic teaching. Brahman is injuring himself. Ahita karanam dosha is pointed out here by the purva paksa. Itara vypadesat the teaching of the aikyam you said. It is tat tvam asi. Vyapadesat refers to the maha vakyam. Siddhanta's reply is in the next sutra.

### **Topic 7 Iaravyapadesadhikaranam [Sutra 21-23]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 22[156]**

### ***Adhikam to bhedanirdesat***

But [Brahman, the creator is] something more [than the individual soul] on account of the statement in the srutis of difference between the individual soul [and Brahma]

The objection raised in sutra 21 is refuted.

I will give you the general analysis of the sutras. Vedantins says that your statement is all right. If you look at superficially, you are correct. If you study properly then you will know that you are wrong.

Statement number one is Brahman creates the world of problems Adhideivika, Adhibootha and Adhyatmika problems. Further, the jiva experiences the worldly problems. Now Advaidins ask the question the first and second statements are accepted totally in which levels of reality. We have many of realities such as Paramarthika, vyavaharika, pratipasika, etc. As long you don't know this there will be problems. The first two problems are vyavaharika level. Jiva experiences the problems and this is also vyavaharika problems. From Paramarthika there is no problems at all. Neither creates nor jiva is the experiencer of the problems. You have made two statements from vyavaharika angle. The third statement is jiva Brahma aikyam and Advaidin should be careful that jiva Brahma aikyam is a fact at Paramarthika level which you have unfortunately mixed up with vyavaharika level. In keeping with first and second statement, my statement would be is that jiva is different from Brahman because Brahma is sarvajna and jiva is alpajna; Brahman has sattva pradhana upadhi jiva is rajo pradhana upadhi. The fourth statement is that we cannot say Brahman is creating problem for itself only when Brahman and jiva are identical. Brahman and jiva are different from vyavaharika level and therefore Brahman never suffers and they are poles apart from vyavaharika dristi and jiva suffers the problems of his own making dur to punya papa karma. The mistake is mixing up of the degrees of reality. And therefore let us know that Brahman is superior to jiva and jiva is inferior to Brahman. When we talk about vishistadvaidam and Dvaidam we talk at the level of vyavaharika plane and join with them. I am a wave of who am a part of you and I am not part of the whole so Adhi Sankaracharya says in one of his sloka. Wave belongs to the ocean and ocean does not belong to me. When you come to the Paramarthika there is no part or the whole Adhi Sankaracharya firmly refutes in Mandukya Upanishad says that you are Brahman yourself. Thus he says there is no absurdity in the statement. Now we will go to word for word analysis.

Tu indeed; adhikam that superior Brahman is the cause of the universe; beda nirdesat because of the sruti's mention of its difference [Brahman's] from the jiva. This is the running meaning; the word tu indicates the negation of the purva paksa of absurdity given in the previous sutra. Adhikam means superior it means superior Brahman; that means jiva is inferior in the context of creation. Never talk about jivatma and Paramatma aikyam when you talk at vyavaharika plane. Therefore superior Brahman creates and superior Brahman does not suffer. The inferior jiva alone suffers and inferior jiva never creates. The creator is different from jiva and the creator and sufferer are different and where is the question of absurdity. Beda nirdesat means because of the sruti's mention of jiva Brahma beda Chandogya upanisad Mantra 8.7.1 says Brahman is the goal to be achieved and you are the sadhaka. Then question will come what do you say? Sometimes you say jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. Then you say in sometimes call Jivatma Paramatma beda. What exactly you want to say? Here you say *bedanirdesat*. In some places, you talk of *aikya nirdesat*. Whenever you talk of jiva aikya beda, you are at the vyavaharika level and whenever you talk

of aikyam you are at the Paramarthika plane. The very goal of Vedanta study is aimed at raising the jiva from the vyavaharika level to the Paramarthika level. From vyavaharika plane jiva is sufferer and Isvara is the creator. This is from vyavaharika dristya. Form Paramarthika there is no beda at all. Hence, there is no absurdity in my teaching. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class 163

### **Topic 7, Iaravyapadesadhikaranam [Sutra 21-23]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 22[156]**

#### ***Adhikam to bhedanirdesat***

But [Brahman, the creator is] something more [than the individual soul] on account of the statement in the srutis of difference between the individual soul [and Brahma]

The objection raised in sutra 21 is refuted.

Here Vyasacharya answers the general objection given to the Vedantic teaching as to the problems by accepting Brahman and jivah are identical. Why should Brahman creates the world and suffer all problems in the form of jivah is the first question raised by the purva paksa. Brahman can avoid because Brahman is sarvajnan. This purva paksa calls ti hita aharati dhosa. It causes harms to Brahman himself. Here ahita harana adhi dosha which I will explain now. Adhi means etc. What do we mean by etc. First creating the world problem is the first defect, why should Brahman create aging, the body that is prone to sickness; why should Brahman choose to enter and identify with that body? Is the second dosha? At least after seeing the problem Brahman can choose to come out of it. Even after seeing that the body has got all problem why should he continue to be with that body without getting out of it. Brahman seems to continue is the third dosha. Brahman forgets that I am sresponsible for the whole dristi and how can that Brahman his own creation. Therefore dismarana dosha. Finally, delusion and confusion caused by sarira abhimana dosha is there. Another dosha is seeing one particular body is problematic why cannot Brahman replace that with another body. All these thing Brahman could have done when Brahman is jagat karanam. Then something is wrong in jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. Why not all these doshas be removed being Brahman as omniscience, omnipotent and omnipresence.

For that our answer is once we come to creation, we should look at the creation at vyavaharika plane. From Paramarthika distya there is Brahman and jivha. Aikyam. Brahman in vyavaharika dristi is called Isvara. Brahman's name at bome is Brahman. Brahman when he comes to office the body, he is called Isvara. Isvara is the creator, Isvara is karma phala dada, jivah is alpajnah, and he is sufferer of all the karmas. Thus tere is n o absurdity as claimed by the purva paksa.

### **Topic 7, Iaravyapadesadhikaranam [Sutra 21-23]**

**The world [effect] is non-different from Brahman [the cause].**

**Sutra 23[157]**



### ***Asmadvacca tadanupapattih***

And because the case is similar to that of stories, etc., [produced from the same earth], the objection raised is untenable.

The objection raised in stura 21 is further refuted.

In the previous sutra we pointed out jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is from Paramarthika standpoint and Jivatma Paramatma beda is from vyavaharika dristi. One Brahman appears as vyavaharika jvah and vyavaharika Isvara. One Advaidam Brahman appears as alpajna jiva and sarvajna Isvara and jada Prapancha. Jiva jagat Isvara is there in vyavaharika plane. Ekata eva Brahmanah appear differently as jiva, Isvara jagat. All the three are three extremes. Three are widely different is jiva with limitations, Isvara the sarva saktiman, omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent; jagat the achetana vasthu but the adhistanam of all the three is but one Brahman. It is not impossible in the world we see such examples. The example Vyasacharya gives is this. One earth appears in the form of worthless stones; the very same earth appears as precious stone the diamonds and gems, vajra rupena, etc., the diamond also is carbon and the coal is also carbon because some structural change one is costly jewell and the other is carcoal. Similarly, jiva is worthless one and Isvara the costly one. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; asmadvat as in the case of ordinary and precious stones tad anupapattih the objections are unreasonable. The first word is asmadvat is a precious stone like diamond etc., vat means like that; one earth appears like manifold stones ordinary and precious; cha Adhi Sankaracharya takes the word cha as an indication of further supportive causes. We have other supportive causes in support of one Brahma appearing different things like jiva, jagat and Isvara. First one is pratyaksa anubhava. Whether Brahman can appear or not cannot be decided by logic. You should not take the worldly example. Take sastra pramanam. Then another mantra is 2.2.12 of Kathopanisad even though he remains as one Brahman he himself appears as small bacteria and Hiranyagarbha the greatest. If Brahman is actually divides itself into three you can ask how can this be possible more so when Brahman is indivisible; but here Brahman apparently appears in many forms just as the rope apparently appears as the snake. Here neither the snake wishes to appear as the snake not it changes itself into a snake for the time being but the snake appearance is solely due to the ignorance of the beholder the jiva. How can this change in appearance be blamed on the rope; so also Brahman appears as in many forms not because Brahman changes himself but due to the ignorance of the beholder or experiencer of Brahman? The third reason is swapnavad sambhavat. In swapna we divide ourselves into many without actually diving ourselves. We ourselves become subject object we get angry etc. The three additional support is indicated in the word cha. Tad anupapattih dosha anupapattih anupapattih means it is not possible; the defect mentioned by Purva Paksi is not there and it is not possible. With this the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. Now we enter the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

### **Topic 8, Upasamharadursanadhikaranam [Sutra 24-25]**

**Brahman is the cause of the world.**

**Sutra 23[157]**

***Upasamharadarsananneti chenna kshiravatddhi***

An objection that materials are necessary for the creation of the world is refuted.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with two sutras only. Here another general objection is answered. Specific objections were answered in the earlier sutras. Now general objections given by anyone is answered. In Vedanta Brahman is said to be jagat karanam. What type of karanam is Brahmanam. Is it material cause or upadana karanam. It is this aspect of Vedanta which is objected and answered by Vyasacharya. Here purva paksa assumes that Brahman is upadana karanam and raises an objection. In the 25<sup>th</sup> sutra purva paksa takes Brahmaa as nimitta karanam and we answer both of them. Now we will see the general introduction to this sutra. In the first sutra purva paksa assumes Brahman is upadana karanam and raises an objection and in 28<sup>th</sup> sutra purva paksa assumes Brahman as nimitta karanam and purva paksa raises an objection.

Now we will enter the general analysis of this sutra. Purva Paksi says that let us assume that Brahman is the upadana karanam and he says that normally that no material ever becomes a product by itself and it requires many accessories to become a product. Among the accessories a carpenter is required and also the instrument are involved in the material wood to become a product the furniture. If you say Brahman is the material and how can that Brahman without agent and without instrument made use of by the agent make a product. Upasamhara means conclusion but here it is used in the meaning of employment of accessories. Upasamhara means taking to resorting to something to get something done. The material becomes a product after employment of accessories. Vyasacharya answers by giving an example. He categorises the material cause into two types. One is which does not have intrinsic or natural capacity to become a particular product wood, cotton or gold etc. One has to produce that particular effort to convert the material into a product. Another material cause has the intrinsic capacity to become a product. The milk becomes curd and a person need not know the chemical changes that convert the milk into curd. You don't require skill and extraordinary knowledge to convert milk into curd. The addition of something is not your conversion but you induce the conversion sakti for the milk to convert it into curd. The transformation sakti to become curd is already there in the milk, we need not do anything except adding a portion of curd in the milk, and the milk automatically becomes curd after some time. Similarly, Brahman has that extraordinary and natural power to convert himself into jagat and that power we call in Vedantic language as Maya sakti. Therefore, do not take Brahman like wood or gold and compare it with the milk. Then there is another problem. When an example is given, the perverted brain will quote the example to places where it is not applicable. Every example has some thing uncommon to the original. He is a lion means there is some sadharmiyam and vaidharmiyam. In majesty, he is like a lion; this is called sadharmiyam. Vaidharmiyam is he does not have manes. He walks on the four. Where the milk example should be extended to mention the swabhavika sakti or the intrinsic sakti the milk has to convert itself into milk. In the case of milk even though the intrinsic sakti is there we use some external inducement to activate or induce the sakti to convert itself into curd. Here an inducer is required to activate the power. In the case of Brahman, the intrinsic power is there and you need not do anything to induce Brahman to convert itself into jagat. However, Brahman does not require anyone induce to convert himself into jagat. When Brahman converts into universe and it is not parinami karanam and it is vivartha karanam. There you require something to induce to convert the intrinsic power to become jagat. That intrinsic power of Brahman we call as maya. In the case of the milk also the milk has got the intrinsic power to convert itself into curd but it requires an inducer to help the milk to convert

itself to curd. Thus you do not extend the example. What is common to both milk and Brahman is that both have got the power which we call maya sakti. This view is expressed in II.K-12 of Mandukya Upanishad that reads as *kaplayaty-atmana''tmanam Atma devah sva mayaya sa eva budhyate bhedan-iti vedanta – niscayah* the definition of this karika is this the definition conclusion of the Vedantic philosophy that the Atman, the Self luminous, through the power of its own delusion [maya] imagines in itself by itself all the objects, and its individual existences both in the world outside and within. It alone is the knower of the objects so created. This is the first sutra tasmāt Brahman is upadana karanam and he does not require no agent or no instrument and because of the intrinsic power transform himself into the universe.

Upasamhara darsanat because of our observation of the employment of accessories for creation; na Brahman is not the material cause; up to this is purva paksa objection; it chet if this is the objection na it is not valid; kshiravat because it is possible as in the case of milk; upasamhara darsanat is the first word; the employment of accessories; karaga prayogah; accessories means carpenter and the chisel hammer etc., are require for the wood to convert itself into furniture. This is the pratyaksa anubhava. Na means because of the experience of ours na means Brahman cannot automatically become creation without somebody working on Brahman. They are not available. Therefore Brahman cannot be material cause. Iti chet if this objection is raised by purva paksa and the objection does not stand scrutiny because you keep in mind one type of material cause and you don't keep the milk example; here nobody need work. Your argument is invalid as in the case of milk. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 8 Pasamharadursanadhikaranam [Sutra 24-25]**

**Brahman is the cause of the world.**

**Sutra 25[159]**

### ***Devadivadapi loke***

[the case of Brahman creating the world is like that of gods and other beings in the world in ordinary experience.

The argument in support of sutra 24 is brought forward.

First we will do the general analysis. Here purva paksa attacks the nimitta karanam of Brahman. He let us assume that he is the creator of the world. Purva paksa argues the creator, skill are not sufficient for creation and he requires the material to create the world. Where will he find the material? You say that there is no second thing other than Brahman. Vyasacharya answers that other than the gold ornaments and furniture and also the milk and the curd Vyasacharya gives the examples of God and the Rishis, when the rishi or deva create something, at sankalpa matram without going for any material. We know from the puranas that Visvamitra created trisanku without any source materials, so to say. So also devas create bodies without any material. We have got the upanisadic example of spider and it make the web without any material or instrument. So Brahman is upadana karanam Brahman nimitta karanam. Brahman is seemingly born as creation without really becoming the creation and such upadana karanam is called vivarth upadana karanam. **When a cause is seemingly becomes an effect and without really becoming an effect is called vivartha upadana**

**karanam. When the cause really becomes the effect, it is called parinami upadana karanam. Really becoming something else is parinama karanatvam.**

Vivarta karanatvam is without destroying itself remaining as it, it seemingly becomes something else. That is how the intellect should assimilate. Parinama karanatvam and nityatvam cannot coexist; but parinama karanatvam and vivarta karanatvam and nityatvam can coexist, when the cause is a vivarta karanam the product is of lesser the order of reality. When the karanam is of parinama karanam, the product is of the same order of reality. Curd and milk have the same order of reality because it parinama karanatvam.

But vivarta karanam is of higher order and the karyam is of lesser order of reality. For this swapna loka is given as the best example. You become a river in the dream without becoming a river; you become a mountain without becoming a mountain. This is given by the Upanishad itself. Brahma vivarta karanam can have nityatvam anityatvam simultaneously.

Now Vedantins gives a counter question to the purva paksa. He asks the purva paksa why do find fault with my teaching. He says that I cannot accept your Brahman as nityatvam and karanatvam. Nityatvam and karanatvam cannot go together. Now Vedantins accepts that Brahman cannot be nityatvam and karanatvam cannot go together as claimed by the samkya philosophers. Now samkya and nyaya vaiseshika philosophers are happy that Vyasacharya is in receptive mood to accept what the purva paksa's views. Now Vyasacharya asks the purva paksa what is their view of the pradhanam with regard to the creation. They say that Brahman is not the karanam but pradhanam is the jagat karanam.

Then Vyasacharya asks him whether his pradhanam is nityam or anityam. This terrible samkya yoga philosopher says that the pradhanam is nityam and it is also jagat karanam and that their pradhanam is nityam and adds that pradhanam is nitya karanam. Vyasacharya asks purva paksa how can the pradhanam have nityatvam and karanatvam while you object when I say that our Brahman has nityatvam and karanatvam. How can the pradhanam can have nityatvam and karanatvam while Brahman cannot have nityatvam and karanatvam it is like an employee is dismissed for not being a graduate and appoint another employee who is not a graduate. It is the height of fanaticism. When samkya and yoga are dismissed, the nyaya vaiseshika comes and you should follow me. He comes and tells that anuh is the jagat karanam. Then Vedantins asks the question whether the paramanu is nitya or anitya. He says paramanu is nityam. Nyaya vaiseshika's paramanu is also nityam and jagat karanam and how can they criticize Vedantins when they say Brahman is nityam and jagat karanam. Therefore we say whatever your answer, whatever be the reason with which you take pradhanam and paramanu is nityam and karanam and with the same reason we can accept Brahman's nityatvam and karanatvam of jagat sristi. As all the three cases enjoy the same status. Samkya says pradhanam is nityam and jagat karanam; nyaya vaiseshika says paramanu is nityam and jagat karanam; Vedantins say Brahman is nityam and jagat karanam. Either all the three must be equally right or all the three must be equally wrong since all the three enjoy the same status of nityatvam and karanatvam we say if all the three are equal we should vote for Brahman, alone which is supported by Vedic teachings alone. But pradhanam and paramanu have no support from the Vedas. Since Brahman has srotatvam, the vedic support, Brahman alone enjoys the nityatvam and karanatvam of jagat creation. Brahman can be abinna nimitta upadana karanam. There is no logical objection when nityatvam and karanatvam are together.

Lokah means pramanam through which we come to know about a thing. The word loka should be translated as mentioned in the scriptures. Finally Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary give a supporting sruti statement also. He says that ultimate support is sruti statement that Brahman is nimitta and upadana karanam without any accessory. 6.8 of Svetasvatara Upanishad says *na tasya karyam karanam ca vidyate, na tat samas capy adhikasa ca arsyate parasya saktir vividhaiva sruyate svabhavikijnana bala kriya ca* the meaning of the mantra is there is no action and no organ of his to be found. There is not seen his equal or his better. His high power revealed is various indeed. The working of his intelligence and strength is inherent. [in him]. This statement is Brahman produces a creation without any material, accessory and even without a factory. Brahman does not have a factory and even Akasa is not born. Therefore, Akasa itself is not born and Brahman exists even before origination of the Akasa. Spider example is oorna nabi dristanta. With this sutra number 25 is over and this adhikaranam is also over. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 164

### **Topic 9 Kritsna prasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 26[160]**

***Kritsna prasaktir niravayavatvasabdakopo va***

Either the consequences of the entire [Brahma undergoing change has to be accepted or else a violation of the texts declaring Brahman to be without parts [if Brahman is the material cause of the world.

An objection that Brahma is not the material cause of the world is raised in the sutra.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam. This has four sutras and this adhikaranam is very important in which vivartha karana vadha is established especially one of the most important teachings is vivartha karana vadha. In the previous adhikaranam we established Brahman is nimitta karanam and upadana karanam in general. Here we will establish that Brahman is vivartha karanam if vivartha karana vadha is understood, all the purva paksha will become redundant and absurd. This is meant to give conviction of vivartha karana vadha. If it is not known or accepted, avirodha adhyaya becomes important. In spite of elaborate commentary none accept the vivartha karana vadha which indicates any amount of study of avirodha adhyaya and in spite of the study people do not understand this. One of the corner stones of the teaching is vivartha karana vadha sthapanam. I will give you the particular teaching in a gist in different models. I will discuss Vyasa's teachings in different formats.

In the previous adhikaranam we said Brahman is the material cause and we gave the example of milk and curd. We have to study this adhikaranam from the standpoint of a person who does not know vivartha karanam or who does not accept vivartha karanam and in his mind he only knows the milk example. He extends the example further and his conclusion creates the problem. When the milk is the cause for producing the curd the milk has to destroy 'itself'. Upadana karanam destroys itself when it produces an effect. Seeds destroy themselves in the production of trees. Suppose the milk goes on producing curd and the milk continues to remain as it is, then the problem of milk buying everyday will not be there. Now purva paksha makes an important law. *Yatra yatra upadana karanam tatra tatra anityatvam*. Whenever a thing is a material cause, it is perishable and destructible and only by destroying itself it produces its effect. Karanatvam and nityatvam can never coexist the extension of previous law. Wherever karanatvam is there, nityatvam is not there. yad yad karanam yad tad anityam. Karanatvam and nityatvam are opposite attributes. These are the arguments of the purva paksha. therefore he says these are opposite attributes they cannot coexist in one substance. If there is karanatvam, it cannot have the attribute of nityam; if it is nityam it cannot have the karanatvam. All the samkya, yoga and visheshika say that your teaching is fundamentally illogical and defective. You say Brahman is nityam and karanam. nityatvam and karanatvam cannot coexist in one substance. Therefore, if you say Brahman is nityam and karanatvam, you fundamentally violate the important law that nityatvam and karanatvam

cannot coexist in one substance as enumerated above. Samanvayah asiddhah. The samanya established nithyam Brahma jagat karanam is your teaching in your first chapter. Purva paksa contention is that our teaching that Brahman is nithyam and karanam violates Advaitic teaching in the first chapter Brahman is jagat karanam in which case according to the law nithyam and karanatvam cannot go together, Brahman is nithyam and karanam does not hold water. This is the purva paksa's objection. Now our answer is that you should accept the basic agreement that we have. If you do not accept, the basic agreement there will be problem. You should know we discuss the problem of jagat karanam and not the cause of curd whether milk destroys itself to become curd or otherwise. This is the purva paksa.

We discuss the cause of space; time and we are in the field of cosmology. We know that with regard to the cause of universe perception and logic will not work which we have already agreed upon. If you take logic and perception, you will end up with sat karya vadha or asat karyavadha which we have discussed and negated the both in Mandukya Upanishad especially third and fourth chapter. Jagat karana vishaye pratyaksam and anumanyasya anumamanam. Adhideivam has logically proved that logic is defective. And it does not work with regard to jagat karana vishaya. There are things, which are beyond pratyaksam, and anumanam and we call this apourusheya vishayah. These things we have already agreed upon and there is no need to discuss here. Since pratyaksa and anumana is not acceptable, we have to depend upon only Vedas. All those which are beyond perception and logic, have to go to Veda and sruti pramanam only. **It is nicely said where physics ends metaphysics begins.** Therefore, whatever Veda teaches is the conclusion and we cannot question the conclusions of the Vedas. For science, the ultimate pramanam is sense organs. In the apourusheya vishaya Veda sastra is final and this has been accepted by the purva paksa that is nyaya, vaiseshika and samkya etc. now we should see what Vedas says about jagat karanam. Just as sense organs report is final in science, Veda reporting is final in spiritual matters. Veda says Brahman is both nithyam and karanam. for this there is sruti support in various Upanisads and Bhagavad Gita. Not only Brahman is nityam but also Brahman is karanam. Brahman can be both nithyam and karanam and never question the conclusion/ all logic should be used not to question the conclusion but it should be used to understand the conclusion, assimilate the condition but never question the conclusion. The mistake committed by the samkya is that samkya questions the conclusions of the Vedas. Vedantins says use logic to assimilate the condition given by the Vedas. How can I digest the conclusion that Brahman is nithyam and karanam. When you say Brahman is karanam it is upadana karanam, Brahman has become the universe. It is sruti statement number one. When you say Brahman has become the creation, it means Brahman has destroyed himself to become the creation. However, the second statement says that Brahman has not become the creation. if it becomes the creation the Brahman will destroy itself. Second statement is that Brahman has not become the creation. How are we reconciling these two statements? It has become the universe so Brahman is karanam. When Brahman has become creation means Brahman has destroyed itself to become creation. Second statement says Brahman is eternal which means Brahman has not become the creation. So Brahman has not become the creation because it is eternal.

This has been done by acharyas who studied the seemingly contradictory statement. Brahman has become the world without becoming the world. we will go in the right direction is proved by sruti itself. Ajaya mano without becoming the world bahudaya jayate it has become the world. Bhagavad Gita says *ajo 'pi sann avayayatma bhutanam Isvara 'pisan prakrtim svam adhisthaya sambhavamy atmamayay* the emanign of this sloka is though [ I am] unborn, and My Self [is] imperishable; though [ I am] the Lord of all creatures, yet establishing Myself in my own nature, I come into [empiric] being through My power [Maya]. Without being born, I

am born; ajah means without being born. How can I reconcile only in one way that Brahman is seemingly born apparently born as creation without really becoming creation and such upadana karanam is called vivartha karanam. When a cause seemingly becomes an effect without really becoming the effect, it is called vivartha karanam and when it really becomes an effect, it is called parinama Upadana karanam. Really becoming something else is parinama karanam. Without destroying itself remaining as it is, seemingly becoming something else is vivartha karanam. That is how intellect should assimilate. Whenever a cause is of vivartha karanam the product is of lesser order of reality. Parnami karanam and karyam has the same order of reality. Vivartha karanam vivartha karyam is one is higher order of reality and the other is lower order of reality. The Upanishad itself gives the swapna example. You become a river in dream without becoming a mountain. You become Brahma vivartha karanam and it can have nithyatvam also simultaneously. Here Vedantins counter questions the purva paksa. He asks samkya and nyaya vysesika philosophers. I am not able to accept your Brahman both as nithyam and karanam. One Brahman cannot be both nithyam and karanam also. This is your conclusion. I ask you what is the jagat karanam according to you. Vyasacharya asks the yoga philosophers. He has come to my point. Then Vyasacharya asks is your pradhanam is nithyam or anithyam. Samkya yoga philosopher says pradhanam is nithyam and jagat karanam. so nithya pradhanam is jagat karanam he says. When I say nithyam Brahman is jagat karanam and he says that how can Brahman be nithyam and karanam. but pradhanam is nithyam and karanam. when samkya and yoga are dismissed then nyaya vaiseshika comes and says you should follow me. Vedantins asks what is your jagat karanam. He says anuh jagat karanam. Then Vedantins asks the question is your paramanu nithyam or anithyam va. Here paramanu also both nithyam and karanam. Whatever be the reason you accept paramanu and pradhanam, you can accept Brahman also in the same manner.

As all the three cases enjoy the same status. Samkya says pradhanam is nithyam and jagat karanam; nyaya vaiseshika says paramanu is nithyam and jagat karanam; Vedantins say Brahman is nithyam and jagat karanam. Either all the three must be equally right or all the three must be equally wrong since all the three enjoy the same status of nithyatvam and karanatvam we say if all the three are equal we should vote for Brahman, alone which is supported by Vedic teachings alone. But pradhanam and paramanu have no support from the Vedas. Since Brahman has sroutattvam, the vedic support, Brahman alone enjoys the nithyatvam and karanatvam of jagat creation. Brahman can be abinna nimitta upadana karanam. There is no logical objection when nithyatvam and karanatvam are together. The same idea we will give in different format, which we will see in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 165

### **Topic 9 Kritsna prasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 26[160]**

***Kritsna prasaktir niravayavatvasabdakopo va***

Either the consequences of the entire [Brahma undergoing change has to accepted or else a violation of the texts declaring Brahman to be without parts [if Brahman is the material cause of the world.

An objection that Brahma is not the material cause of the world is raised in the sutra.

We have entered into the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam which is known as Kritsna prasaktya adhikaranam and this can be presented in two format of which the first one I mentioned in the last class. Parinami karanam and nithyatvam cannot coexist whereas vivartha karanam and nithyam can coexist and only thing we should note is that in the case of vivartha karanam the product will be lesser order of reality. If vivartha karanam is Paramarthika sathyam the vivartha karyam will be vyavaharika sathyam. Brahman is vkam` karya Prapancha is of lower order vyavaharika sathyam. The waker if Paramarthika sathyam and dream is parthipasika sathyam. It is based on this important principle Adhi Sankaracharya has written Brahma sathyam jagan mithya, which means lower order of reality. If the world is real, then Brahman is 'super real'. If swapna is real, then we will say jagrat is super is real and if jagrat is super real and Brahman will be maha super real. We are particular the order of reality differs. They are Paramarthika vyavaharika and pratipasika. There are two sathyams and one anritam which have been accepted by the sastra. this concept is not there in any of the eleven darsanams. This is the first format. The purva paksa says that if the entire Brahma becomes the world, then no Brahman will remain distinct fro the world and that if a part of Brahman becomes thew rodl, the scriptural text which declare Brahman to be without parts will be violated.

Now I will come to the second format of the same adhikaranam. In this format the purva paksa happens to be samkya philosophers and behind them line up the other purva paksas too. Instead of asking the question whether Brahman is savayvam va niravayavam, is whether Brahman is partless or with parts. Let us assume Brahman is partless or niravayavam. If Brahman is partless, to create the universe the total Brahman has to undergo a change to produce the universe. Unfortunately, samkya philosophers are not aware or accept the vivartha upadana karanam. Therefore, samklya's mind is fixed at parinami karanam alone. If Brahman has parts, one part of Brahman changes while the other part will be changeless. You cannot take the partial modification to be possible in the case of Brahma because Brahman has no parts. It is not like milk becoming curd. You cannot say that the top portion becomes milk and the other part becomes curd.

In the case of Brahman you cannot use part to become world and the other parts to be as it is. Till the whole Brahman become the world there is no question of Brahman is presented now.

When Brahman is not there but what is available is the world then there is no Brahman and when Brahman is not, there where is question of Brahma jnanam and when Brahma jnanam is not there where is the question of liberation or moksa. If there is no jnanam or moksa where is the question of pramanam? If Brahma jnanam is not there, there is no sastram, no karma yoga and no Brahma Sutra sastram. If Brahman is not there, there is jnanam and moksa. To solve the problem samkya give another suggestion. He says Brahman is savayavam. If you accept Brahman as savayavam your problem is not solved and you will have other problems. Savayavam means Brahman has parts. One part of Brahman will be in tact and the other part will be destroyed and world will be created.

Let the World be part of Brahman and another changeless part of Brahman be changeless. We know that Nirvikara Brahman and the jnanam of nirvikara Brahman will you moksa. This is the possible argument Advaidin may forward a possible solution in which Brahman is accepted as savayavam and consequently a part Brahman of Brahman be destroying itself becomes the universe and other part being one which is nirvikara, you can gain the Brahma jnanam and gain moksa. The samkya philosophers also suggest this possibility. This way samkya has pointed out that the solution of the universe emerging from the part of Brahman is untenable. To give this solution Advaidin has to accept Brahman as savayavam that is Brahman has parts. Samkya philosopher says that you cannot accept Brahman is savayavam because you have said that Brahman is niravayavam. In fact, that is one of the arguments you have given when you negated the concept of vishistadvaidam. If you accept the Brahma is without parts and yet the material cause of the universe, then we have to admit that the entire Brahma becomes modified into ue. Hence there will be nom Brahma left. The Brahma jnanam is not possible and moksa is not possible in the absence of Brahma. When Brahma jnanam is not there, sastra pramanam also will not be there. There is karma etc. Now Advaidins will give his answer. on the contrary, if it is said that a portion of Brahman only becomes the universe, then we will have to accept that Brahman is made of parts which is denied by the scriptural texts. 'he who is without pats, without actions, tranquil, without fault, without taint [Svetasvara Upanishad 6.19]; that heavenly person is without body, and he is both within and without not produced [Mundaka Upanishad 2.1.2] that great being is endless unlimited consisting of nothing but knowledge [Brihadaranyaka upanisad 2.4.12] he is to be described by 'neti neti' [Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.9.26] it is neither coarse nor fine [Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.8.8] all these passages deny the existence of parts or distinction in Brahman. Whatever has form or parts is perishable and so Brahman will become perishable or non-eternal if the concept of part Brahman is accepted.

Now siddhanti gives his answer. When you ask the question whether Brahman is savayavam or niravayavam and whether is from Paramarthika or vyavaharika dristi. We should not mix the orders of reality and Advaida will be enjoyable only if we do not mix up the degree of reality. As you talk of sristi. it must be from vyavaharika dristi alone and form vyavaharika dsiste Brahman is savayavam only. From the empirical angle, Brahman is savayavam. Brahman has two amsas one is chetana amsa and the other is achetana amsa,, sakti amsa, maya saksi para prakriti etc. once you look Brahman from vyavaharika dristi, generally with maya Brahman is Isvara. it is the modified Brahman with maya creates the world. when I say the world is born out of Brahman, it should be understood that it is with maya sakti the world is created. The sakti or maya is part of Brahman and it is savayvam Brahman. the original Brahman the chetanam Brahman continues to be in tact and when we talk about Brahma jnanam we talk of nirvikara amsa rupa the chaitanya rupa or changeless Brahman. once we realize that nirvikara chaitanya swarupam Brahman, we gain liberation. we say Brahman is niravayavam from Paramarthika dristi from whose standpoint of Paramarthika dristya maya

part of Brahman is not there. if there is no maya amsa there is no modification and there is creation; there is no creation; there is Brahma jnanam; there is no liberation. Paramarthika distya there is no maya, there is no sadhana, and there is no srusti etc. from Paramarthika Brahman is not karanam also. all the creation and that follows the creation are from vyavaharika point of view only. therefore there is no contradiction in accepting savayavatvam and niravayatvam one from Paramarthika angle and other the creation etc., from vyavaharika angle. We boldly admit we are vishistadvaidins from vyavaharika angle. Once we shift to Paramarthika angle we are in Advaidam. This is the important teaching conveyed in this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the first sutra. the whole sutra is purva paksha sutra. the first part establishes the dosha if we take Brahman is partless and there will be total transformation and the Brahman will not be available. Second point is if Brahman is accepted as savayavam it will contradict the statement of niravayavam. Now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Kritsnapasaktih if Brahman is the cause there is the possibility of the total transformation of Brahman. va or niravayatva sabda kopah the contradiction sruti statement which reveals partlessness of Brahman. the significance of the words is krsitsnaparsaktih means total and by the world total samkya implies total transformation will come if you accept Brahman as niravayavam. The whole Brahman will destroy itself when you accept niravayavam. After destruction, Brahman will not be there and will be followed by absence of Brahman etc. this is the objection number one.

Then niravayatvam means partlessness of Brahman; sabda means sruti statements that reveals partlessness of Brahman.[given above].this is the violation of sruti statement when you claim Brahman is savayavam. Thus two doshas if you assume two niravayam and savayavam samkya has separated Purusa from prakriti. Neither prakriti nor Purusa get disturbed when the creation takes place. All systems accept more than one.

## **Topic 9 Kritsnaprasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 27[16]**

***Srutestu sabdamulatvat***

But [this is not so] on account of scriptural passages and on account of [Brahman] resting on scriptures [only]

The objection raised in sutra 25 is refuted.

Our answer to purva paksha is this. You ask how Brahmam is jagat karanam and our answer and Brahman being savayavam Brahma and maya amsa; the jada amsa ebocems creation and chetana amsa is ever in tact. To accept savayavatvam of Brahmam I have sruti support. The whole creation is seen to be part of Brahman. Brahman is beyond time and space. below Brahman time functions; Brahman is above time. I have got inferior and superior nature in me so says Gita. Brahman niravayam and it has got sruti support. Thus Brahman niravayam is supported by sruti. Brahman is nithyam too. How can you accept Brahman as niravayam

and savayavam. How can opposite attributes be found in one substance? How do you say Brahman is savayavam and niravayavam. Surti is pramanm for us and based on that we accept the both. Then purva paksa asks even if sruti says how can we assimilate this because of the logical contradiction. Buddhi refuses to accept and it can accept only the fact. That is why we have interpret it properly. Adhi Sankaracharya says there is only one method in which you can accept both savayavam and niravayavam and it can be accepted the lower and higher order of reality. Savayavam and niravayavam both sruti talks about Paramarthika is nirvishesam and savayavam is vyavaharika angle. In your mind let Paramarthika be in your mind and keeping it at the back you transact the business from vyavaharika dristi. As even go on doing the transaction let at the back you be fixed on aham Brahma asmi this is based on sruti. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 166

### **Topic 9 Kritsnaprasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 27[161]**

#### ***Srutestu sabdamulatvat***

But [this is not so] on account of scriptural passages and on account of [Brahman] resting on scriptures [only]

The objection raised in sutra 25 is refuted.

In this adhikaranam purva paksa presents a problem in Vedantic teaching in the 26<sup>th</sup> sutra. He asks a question whether Brahman is savayavam or niravayavam is endowed with part or partless. Purva paksa pointed out in the previous sutra either way you will have problem. if you accept it as Savayavam Brahman will become perishable and anithyam being of parts. Our answer Brahman is both savayavam and niravayavam. We have sruti pramanam. In samkya philosophy, prakriti is independent entity but in Advaidam, sakti is integral part of Brahman. It is 'maya part' of Brahman undergoes changes to form the entire creation. All the panca pootham Sookshma Sariram Sthoola Sariram all are modification of prakriti or achetana amsa of Brahman, even after the arrival of jiva jagat, the chetana amsa of Brahman continue to the same and is available for realization of gaining moksa. With the help savayavam amsa of Brahman which is otherwise known as Brahman is behind the formation of the entire creation. in Bhagavad Gita sloka 10.42 Krishna says *vistabhya'ham idam krisnam ekamsena sthito jagat* which means I support this entire universe pervading it with a single fraction of Myself. Rg Veda *pado asya visva bhutani tripad asyamrtam* divi X.90.3 th Purusa sukta makes out that all this is only a description of His greatness, the Purusa himself is much greater than this. Therefore Brahman is savayavam sruti support there. Brahman is niravayavam for which sruti support is there. Brahman is nishkalam it is said in Chandogya upanisad. In many Upanisads niravayavatvam has been declared. How can Brahma be both savayavam and niravayavam be in one locus. Is it not illogical. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says that savayavatvam is of lower order of reality and it is part of Brahman but the same as Brahman. it is called mithya or it can be called vyavaharika sathyam. Vyavaharika sathyam is equal to mithya. It is avidhya kalpitam. Sakti part of Brahman is mithya. Prakriti part of Brahman is mithya. Savayavam status is also mithya. Isvara status is also vyavaharika status or mithya. Because of that creation has come and this creation is also other wise known as mithyam. So also dvida janya samsara is also mithya. Ultimately when I say I am liberated means the event of liberation is also mithya. From vyavaharika angle the creation, jiva, jagat, samsara and even the act of liberation and Isvara are mithya. But from Paramarthika angle niravayavatvam is sathyam. Jagat karanatvam api nasti and isvaratvam nasti.

Now we will see word for word analysis. 'tu' means the objection is not valid; sruteh because there are sruti statements revealing the partial transformation at vyavaharika level; sabda

mulatvad and because there are sruti statements [revealing the partlessness niravayavatvam] at Paramarthika level. therefore there is no contradiction.

The first word is sruteh because of the sruti statement; here the word srteh is used because there are sruti statements to show the niravayavatvam of Brahman. padah asya visva bhutani a part of Brahman maya part of Brahman is the whole creation. Three quarters are above creation and it is Brahma amsam. It is figurative use. The word tu indicates the negation of purva paksa objection. Sabda mulatvat means sruti pramanam. The final meaning is because of sruti pramanam. It talks of niravayavatvam of Brahman it is indicated in sruti pramanam. Mundaka Upanishad 2.29 is kept in mind in this regard. For Advaidin vyavaharika and Paramarthika beda becomes extremely important. In avidya avastha only karya karana beda, sadhaka sadhya beda etc., is there but once you gain knowledge all the bedas disappears and niravayavatvam is clear to the jnani with jnanam. in vidya avastha ekatvam is very clear. Paramarthika dristya Advaidam and vyavaharika dristya vishistadvaidam or Dvaidam is there.

## **Topic 9, Kritsnaprasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 28[162]**

***Atmani chaivam vichitrascha hi***

An because in the individual soul also [as in gods, magicians, in dreams] various [creation exists]. Similarly [with Brahman also]

The objection raised in Sutra 26 is further refuted by an illustration.

In this sutra Vyasacharya points out two order of reality are possible and it is not an unknown thing to us. vivartha upadana karanam is possible and is very much acceptable. God has given the example of swapna. Here waker does not change the vyavaharika status and without losing his status he projects a swapna Prapancha. I use nidra sakti and for jagrat I use the maya sakti. Individual power is nidra sakti and total power is called maya sakti. My creator status is real but the richness status governed by swapna status is unreal. With regard to swapna Prapancha I am the creator or I am the Isvara. swapna Prapancha is real at the level of dream and until I wake up swapna Prapancha is very much valid for swapna thirst can satisfy swapna hunger. It has the subjective reality. In it sown plane it has reality. My creative power is so much I can create everything including all jivarasis and other things. I create without undergoing any changes, without any help from anyone. The waker is Isvara in producing an apparent waking world. if ordinary jivah can create an apparent world and why cannot Isvara can create an apparent world. vyavaharika and Paramatma beda the subjective reality is an example to understand the absolute reality of Brahman. now I will give you word for word analysis.

Vichitrah manifold creation; is known or experienced atmani in the case of Jivatma in the form of dream and in the case of magician in the form of magical products. Hi therefore evam a similar creation is possible in the case of Brahman also.

Atmani means in the Self and here by using the word atmani it is individual Jivatma; atmani nidraya a world of lower order of reality compared to devas etc. cha indicates other example such as magicians or siddha Purusa. even means similar creation is possible for Brahman.vyavaharika Prapancha and patibasika swapna. Vichitrah cha manifold creation;in the waking I am limited by money. For dream the sakti is numerous.Adhi Sankaracharya need not give any sruti support. Whenever you see unreal it is always said it is swapna. For the swapna to be unreal you don't require sruti pramanam.

## Topic 9, Kritsnaprasaktyadhikaranam [Sutra 26-29]

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 29[163]**

***svapakshadohacca***

and on account of the opponent's own view being subject to these very objections.

The objection raised in Sutra 26 is further refuted

Adhi Sankaracharya defended the Vedantic teachings against samkya and nyaya philosophers. If Brahman is nithyam it cannot be karanam and if Brahman is karanam it cannot be nithyam this is the arguments of the samkya and nyaya philosophers. To produce karyam, the karanam will get modified. Hence karanatvam and karyam cannot coexist. This was defended by us and we said it can be nithyam and karanam and only thing we said vivartha karanam and karyam can coexist.

Having defended ourselves, now Vyasacharya attacks his opponents. He asks what is the problem according to you. He says prakriti and not Brahman is the karanam. he asks the question is you prakriti is nithyam or karyam. Now he says my prakriti is nithyam and karanam and Vyasacharya asks how can you charge me with the same arguments. If there is no contradiction between prakriti being nithyam and karanam, so also Brahman can be nithyam and karanam. now we can say that we have sruti support which you opponents don't have. My teaching has got sruti yukti which you don't have. Then we go to the nyaya philosophers. Then we ask the same question and he says paramanu is the karanam. then we ask the question whether paramanu anithyam or karanam. as both prakriti and paramanu are nithyam and karanam, why should you againt Brahman which we say karanam and nithyam. vivartha karanam and nithya karanam you should accept and not stick to their views which is non-different from advaidins' views. It is also added that if pradhanam of samkya is capable of partition then it follows that the pradhanam cannot be eternal as contended by the samkya that Brahman cannot be eternal being a karanam for world creation. in the same way when one atom combines with another atom it must enter into combinations with its whole extent with another. It cannot enter into partial contact with antoehr. There will be entire interpretations. Hence there could be no further increase in the size. The compound of the tow atoms would not occupy more space than one atom. The result of the conjunction whould be a mere atom. But if you hold that the atom enters into the combination with a part only, that would go against the assumption of the atom having no parts. This being the case the opponents points of view cannot be acceptable because Advaidin's Brahman as karanam and nithyam has the sruti support in abundance.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. *Swapaksa doshat* in their own systems their objections are not valid. The significance of the word is their own that is the very people criticizing the Advaidm; they are four systems like samkya, nyaya, vaiseshika and yoga. We say neither paramanu nor prakriti is karanam and nithyam but we say Brahma is karanam and nithyam and this argument has got sruti support while others do not have sruti support. The order difference is not found any of the other system except in Advaidam. With this adhikaranam is over.

This discussion of order of reality especially miraj water or rope snake etc., relates to kyadhi vadha. It is about the status of rope snake. This itself is a very big discussion. It is kyati vadha or cognition of snake. In what category it comes, what is the status of perception and what is the status of cognized object or the rope snake and dream. Each philosopher has got his own theory. Five theories of error is there and vishistadvoid introduced their own theory. For them rope snake is as real as rope snake. There is no agreement between vishistadvoidam and advaidam. Advaidin's approach is anivachaniya kyati which is called two orders of reality. Vishistadvoidam approach is called sat kyatih means according to them rope snake is as real as rope itself. In rope snake we have no agreement and how can we have agreement on universal creation. vishistadvoidam does not accept adhyasa bashym. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 10, Sarvopetadhikaranam[Sutra 30-31]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 30[164]**

***Sarvopeta cha taddarsanat***

And [Brahman is] endowed with all powers because it is seen from the scriptures

The objection in sutra 26 is being further refuted.

This is the tenth adhikaranam with two sutras. I will give you general analysis of the sutra/ we know Brahman has got ananta saktih. That ananta sakti is called maya. or prakriti and because of that Brahman beomces sarva saktiman Isvara. the maya respible for ananta saksi is of lower order of reality and hence Brahman is Advaidam and therefore it cannot be counted. It is like mirror image and we will talk about it but maya when it has entered into Brahman with lower order of reality. Because of this Brahman can create everything. Once Brahman enjoys this status and we use the term Isvara but we don't use the word till to day. It is beyond the means of human knowledge and the entire thing is given in sruti statements. Vyasacharya only keeps the thread and the flowers. Vyasacharya arranges and bundles them. Upanishad reveals the fact that Brahman has got ananta sakti. So the prakriti creates the entire universe. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 167

### **Topic 10, Sarvopetadhikaranam[Sutra 30-31]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 30 [164]**

#### ***Sarvopeta cha taddarsanat***

And [Brahman is] endowed with all powers because it is seen from the scriptures

The objection in sutra 26 is being further refuted.

We are in the 10<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. this is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. The theme of the adhikaranam is to point out Brahman has all the resources to produce the creation. it has iccha, kriya and jnana sakti in itself and this sakti alone we call it as maya sakti and it is not a separate factor and hence we do not call it a separate entity. A person has hearing power, worrying power, talking power etc. but I do not separately enumerate them because it is not separate entity but it is part of him. Sakti means power and power does not exist from the powerful and therefore you don't count powerful and power as two entity. When I call power, I don't call power non-different from Brahman, hence Brahman has all the power, and when we see Brahman with power as Isvara. Brahman itself is called Isvara and Isvara is Brahman with power. In Brahma Sutra we do not use Isvara and we consistently use Isvara to indicate Brahman. sarva saktimad Brahman is Isvara alone.

Now we will do the general analysis of this adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya makes the statement that Brahman has got all the powers. That is why some people call it ananta representing ananta sakti. Ananta is coiled serpent and anything coiled has potential power. Kundalini is coiled power. Coil represents un-manifest power. Ananta sakti is behind the creation. The only pramanam to talk about Brahman is sruti being apouruseya vishaya. Brahman has all the qualities as per the sruti statement. Brahman is free from all the qualities here again it is sruti pramanam. When we Brahman have all the 'quality' and he has not qualities. When we say Brahman has all quality means it is Isvara with power and when we say Brahman has no quality nirgunah means it is Brahman with no maya sakti. Brahman has all the sakti from sruti pramanam. This is the essence of the first sutra. There are several and Adhi Sankaracharya quotes all actions, all powers of actions are in Brahman [Chandogya upanisad 3.14.4] *sarvakarma sarvakamah sarvagandhah sarvarasah sarvamidamabhyatto vakyanadara esa ma atmantarhrdaya etadbrahmaitamitah pretyabhisambhavitasmitya syadaddha na vicikitsastiti ha smaha sandilyah sandilyah iti caturdash khandah*. The meaning of the mantra is he who is the sole creator, whose desires are the desires of all, whose odours are the odours of all, whose tastes are the tastes of all, who is everywhere who has not sense organs and who is free from desires – he is my Self and is in my heart. He is no other than Brahman. When I leave this body, I shall attain him. He who firmly believes this has not doubt in this mind. [He will surely attain Brahman] this is what Sandilya has said. Svetasvara Upanishad mantra 6.8 reads as *na tasya karyam karanam ca vidyate, na tat samas capy adhikas ca drsyate parasya saktir nividhaiva srusyate*

*svabhavikijnana-bala-briya ca* there is no action and no organ of his to be found. There is not seen his equal or his better. His high power is revealed various; indeed the working of his intelligence and strength is inherent [in him]. *Parasya saktir nividhaiva srutyate svabhavikijnana bala briya* the power of Brahman is Supreme, infinite etc. not only it is great in terms of intensity as also variety also. the power of any person will have on power or few powers only but in the has of Brahman he has manifold power and in each power Brahman has got the gold medals. In each one of them, he is the best. Brahman did not undergo any training for that but in the case of jiva, one has to acquire the power but Brahman has got inherent power. Now we will word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover, sarvopeta endowed with all powers; tad darsanat because of the sruti revelation of such nature; this is the running meaning. sarvopeta is a compound sarva and upeta and here sarva means sarva saktih; ananta sakti consisting of iccha, kriya and jnana sakti. Normally sarvajnah and sarva sakti we separately enumerate and here both are included because jnanam is also a sakti and it includes the strength and skill that are required to produce anything. Upetat means endowed with all the sakti. Vyasacharya refers to here is Brahman. para devata in Chandogya upanisad means Brahman and para devata in Sanskrit is feminine gender. Cha is a conjunction. Taddarsanat means indicates the omnipotence of Brahman is revealed by sruti. Because of sruti revelation alone, we conclude Brahman is omnipotent and we have other pramanam to come to know of this.

## **Topic 10, Sarvopetadhikaranam[Sutra 30-31]**

**Brahman is the material cause of the universe though He is without parts.**

**Sutra 31 [165]**

***Vikaranatvanneti chet taduktam***

If it be said that because [Brahman] is devoid of organs, [it is] not [able to create], [we replay that] this has already been explained.

Another objection to Brahman being the cause of the world is refuted.

This sutra consists of a purva paksha and siddhanta portion. Someone raises an objection and answer is given in the latter portion of the sutra. first we will do the general analysis. He says normally we know every power is associated with one organ. If I have running power it is associated with leg and if I have singing power it is with the help of mouth. Every sakti should have an organ. a blind person does not have seeing faculty. You describe Brahman has no karanam. formless is god. Brahman has no instrument and how can Brahman have power without instrument. No doubt Brahman does not have any organ. but Brahman has got maya sakti in which all the faculties are hidden. Maya sakti has got all the multipurpose instrument. if jiva can create an instrument with multi-purpose use maya has got all the organs. Then we say Brahman has maya, the second objection is with maya Brahman will not be Nirgunam Brahman but Brahman is Sagunam Brahman with all qualities. Then we say Brahman is nirvisesham only. Vyasacharya says that he has answered this question earlier. Brahman is both nirvisesham and savishesham. Nirvisesham if without any property and savishesham is with property. Then our answer is Paramarthika dristya it is nirvisesham and from vyavaharika dristya it is with all attributes. When we talk of creation etc., we take only

Sagunam Brahman and we don't think of Nirgunam Brahman. that savishesam Brahma from vyavaharika angle Brahman has got all the powers.

Being without organs na Brahman is not have powers. Iti chet if this is the objection tad uktam it has been answered. Vikaranatvad Brahma is without any organs; the praman in purva paksa mind is Brihadharaynaka upanisad III.8.8 and svetasvara mantra 6.8 mundakopanisad 1.1.5. from these we come to kow Brahman has not powers. Na means Brahman does not have all the powers.since Brahman is not omnipotent, Brahman cannot create universe. Iti chet means if such an objection is realised by purva paksa. tad uktam tad means tasya uttaram answer to such an objection is given. [Sutra 27] organ lessness is from Paramarthika and vyavaharika dristi Brahma is not omnipotent. Brahman is not sarvajna from Paramarthika distya.

## **Topic 11. Prayojanatvadhikaranam[Sutra 32-33]**

**Final end of creation.**

**Sutra 31 [165]**

***Na Prayojanavattvat***

[Brahman is] not [the creator of the universe] on account of [every activity] having a motive.

Another objection to Brahman being the cause of the world is raised.

This is the 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with two sutras. The theme of this adhikaranam is that why should Brahman create this world at all when no purpose need be served to Brahman. Brahman is fully satisfied and purnah should create the world. Any activity is born of desire. And Brahman being purnah what desire does he want to fulfill by creating this world. if the creation comes it is due to the desire of Brahman which is against sruti statement. What is the purpose of the creation? all the activities of human beings need not be backed by desire and there are many activities for which you cannot talk about desire. The rule that every action is backed by desire is negated by siddhantis.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. this is purva paksa sutra. the answer will be in the next sutra. purva paksa says that Brahman is all contentment all purnah. Since Brahman has no expectation, Brahman has no purpose to be served by the creation. every activity should have a motive. Sarvam karyam prayojanavad. Even illiterate person will not do any activity without expecting a result. If there is an action without a motive, that action comes from one a mentally deranged person. a sane person should have an activity with the result in view. Brahman does not have any result in view of creation. so Brahman cannot be the author of creation.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Na Brahman is not the cause of the creation. Brahman is not the creator. The creation presupposes a purpose. This is the purva paksa sutra. na means Brahman is not the creator. Prayojanavattvat it means endowed with a motive or purpose for the creation. Brahman cannot think of somebody else benefit also. The purpose is another word for desire. Only desire is followed by a purpose. Brahman does not have any desire or purpose. Prayojatvat means creation. since every action is based on kama, desireless Brahman cannot be the creator because creation presupposes desire. Any action need not be

backed by any desire or purpose. This is the argument of the siddhantis. Any jivan mukta works without expecting any result or desire. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 168

### **Topic 11. Prayojanatvadhikaranam[Sutra 32-33]**

**Final end of creation.**

**Sutra 31 [165]**

***Na Prayojanavattvat***

[Brahman is] not [the creator of the universe] on account of [every activity] having a motive.

Another objection to Brahman being the cause of the world is raised.

We are in the 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with two sutras of which we have completed the first sutra which happens to be purva paksa sutra. purva paksa is a general objection from all philosophers that Isvara cannot be the cause of creation the reason being any action that too any deliberate and serious action will have desire and purpose behind the action. I expect the result before the action and such expectation is called the purpose. Result is one after the action takes place and projected phalam is called the purpose. If desire and purpose are not there, the actor must be insane. The case of creation is an action a huge action of producing the very universe itself. The action comes from a sane person Bhagavan. If creation is an action originating from a sane person you must talk about the purpose. Unfortunately, the way you define Isvara is such you cannot attribute any desire or purpose being Isvara is purnah. The ever-fulfilled god cannot have kama or purpose which is expected karma phalam. Why did Bhagavan, create the world? Brahman has not created the world with no purpose and hence samkya says that pradhanam created the world.

Siddhanti can give two answers. One answer is given in the Brahma Sutra. The question is whether Bhagavan has got desire or purpose for the creation of this universe. Our answer is that Bhagavan did have a desire and purpose. This view is supported by the sruti. Loka sangrah is the purpose; the welfare of jiva and the world is the purpose of creation. we talk about twofold welfare. First reasons is that all karmas are to be exhausted by reaping the fruits of past karmas and the second purpose is to gain liberation are stated to be purpose of the creation of the world by Isvara. Thus karma exhaustion and moksa prapti is purpose and aim of the Bhagavan to create this universe with pleasure and pain. Two questions come out of this answer. Two questions follow are if Bhagavan does the job of creation with some purpose, then that Brahman becomes automatically a samsari. Not ordinary but a maha samsari with world full of problems/ on the other hand liberation or moksa is defined as renunciation of all the desires by the srutis. Bhagavan himself becomes a maha samsari by cultivating a desire to create and executing the job of creation. For this question siddhanti answers that when you say kama is samsara, we divide the kama into two types. They are suddha kama and asuddha kama. Suddha kama is non-binding desire and it is not born out of ajnanam or apurnatvam. Asuddha kama is binding and born out of desire and ajnanam and apurnatvam. they are binding kamas. Krishna tells in III.22 of Bhagavad Gita name *partha'sti kartavyam trisu lokesu himcana na'navaptam avaptavyam varta eva ca karmani* it means there is not formme any work in the three worlds, which has to be done, nor anything

to be obtained which has not been obtained; yet, I am engaged in work. Life of god and life of the world are not opposed to each other. I have to nothing to accomplish still I keep doing and it is not from apurnatvam and such kamas are born out of compassion and such kamas do not bind me and that is why it is called suddha kama. Iccha sakti becomes the alankara when it is suddha kama in the case of Isvara. You have desires and let that not be binding on you. Bhagavan has kama and it is loka sangrah.

When I ask about the purpose of creation you say it is meant for well-being if the jivah. If the karma exhaustion is the cause, then I will ask what is the purpose of first creation when you will not find any karma phalam. Then we say we do not accept the first creation at all and therefore we need not answer the question. How can we talk about Bhagavan producing the creation? The purpose of the Lord is to create thing for the exhaustion of the karma phalam of all the jivas. Bhagavan has nothing to gain or lose by the creation of the universe and it is done to help jivas to exhaust the karma phalam and to gain liberation.

Vyasacharya gives another answer, which is given in the next sutra.

## **Topic 11. Prayojanatvadhikaranam[Sutra 32-33]**

**Final end of creation.**

**Sutra 33 [167]**

***Lokavattu lilakaivalyam***

But [Brahman's creative activity] is more sport, such as is seen in the world [or ordinary life]

The objection raised in Sutra 32 is replied to.

The second answer is that we question purva pakshi's assumption itself. The assumption is that every action coming from a sane person should have a purpose. Vedantins say that there is no rule as such. We don't say all actions need not have a purpose. There are actions whose purpose we cannot talk about. They are two types of actions. One is nishprayojana seshta. Such activities arising out of an individual for which nobody including the individual can attribute any reason. We do have some actions without seeking any phalam. you may hum a song without any purpose and do hum without any aim or purpose. Swbhaviga seshta are those which are natural. The heart beat comes under this category. Nishprayojana and swabhaviga seshta happens in the normal course. In the case of minor seshta, it is an effortless thing. In the case of minor thing we can take it as seshta. Can we take the entire creation is just a seshta of god. A seshta for one person may be small and for another person it may be a great job. The world appears to be a very difficult` task for human being but for sarva saktiman Isvara it is a game, it is a fun and it is a joke and it is past time. leela means there is no particular purpose and it is fun for Bhagavan. It is as effortless as breathing of a person. more so for god such an action is very easy and effortless job.. another answer given in Mandukya karika is Bhagavan does not have any kama and creation is like breathing in and breathing out; breathing in is sristi and breathing out is pralaya. Mandukya Karika No. 9 reads as *Bhogartham srstir-ity anye kridartham-iti capare, devasyaisa svabhavo'Yam-aptakamasya ka sprha*; the meaning of this karika is others think that the world is being created for the purpose of God's enjoyments, while still others attribute it to a mere play of the Lord; But it is the very nature of the effulgent being, the Atman; for what desire is possible for Him

whose desires are always in a state of perfect fulfillment? Both the actions are as normal as our breathing. Like winking, it is natural for the Lord to create and destroy the world for the Bhagavan. That is called leela here.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Tu the objection is not valid; leela kaivalyam the creation is a mere sport or joke or fun or past time for Brahman; lokavat as seen in the world. the significance of the word is lokavat is the example loka means the world and in this world we see the violation of your law that every action should have the purpose as we do many action which are purposeless. Tu; is meant for negation of Purva Pakshi. So the objection is invalid; leela kaivalyam it is kevala leela means mere sports and there is no other motive is there. it is absolutely sport and there is no iota of any other intention. From this only we get Krishna Leela, Sakti Leela etc., leela is an action which has no purpose and you should not ask any question.

## **Topic 12. Vaisamyanaighryadhikaranam[34-35]**

**Final end of creation.**

**Sutra 34 [168]**

***Vaishamyanaighrinye na sapekshatvat tatha hi darsayati***

The accusation that Brahman is partial and cruel in His creation of the world is removed.

This is a small adhikaranam with three sutras. The central theme of this adhikaranam is answering a very important doubt based on the previous adhikaranam. There it was stated that the creation was a sport of the Bhagavan. However, when we see lot of problems in the creation when jivas are seriously suffering, separation, mental agony etc., and you say that this is a game of Bhagavan and our respect for Bhagavan is terribly affected. What is sport for one has become suffering for others and we may even conclude that Bhagavan is a sadist injuring others and enjoying that sport? No jiva enjoys and all the jivas are suffering while Bhagavan alone enjoy the creation. Two doshas are mention here one is partiality and cruelty. Who will accept Bhagavan as a kind hearted soul. Even some may say Bhagavan is unworthy of pujas etc.

Here it is said that disparity and impartiality among jivas in the world are not caused by Bhagavan's cruelty and impartiality and therefore Bhagavan is neither partial nor cruel as painted by the Purva Pakshi.

Now we will see the general analysis of this sutra. in the sutra Vyasacharya says Brahman does not have partiality and cruelty. The doubt comes because in the previous adhikaranam it was said that it was the sport of Bhagavan to create the world etc. if he want to create the universe. Lord being omniscient and omnipotent why did he not create all children are born rich, with all pleasures and with good parents etc., some are born poor, and some are born poor. Partiality is one dosha. It is called vaisamyam, which means partiality with respect to jivas. Why should young people die? Many think that Bhagavan is partial. The second dosha is that there some people get everything going fine; the creation is fine; having done the sristi he does the samhara of the whole creation which is another painful experience. Partiality is at the time of sristi and cruelty is at the time of nairghrinyam. The person who is not compassionate is called naighrinyah. Why should Bhagavan create the world with all

differences and suffer cruelty. Vyasacharya says Bhagavan is not cruel and partial and both are not because of the will of Lord and if he does that, Bhagavan will be cruel. The cause is different. Karma sapekshatvat jiva's karma is responsible for all the differences. Sristi is caused by karma and Bhagavan' Bhagavan is samanya karanam and karma is vishesha karanam. if a criminal goes to the jail for any crime, it is the judge responsible or the law book is responsible for his punishment. Law is jadam and law book is not responsible for the act of punishment. We say both are responsible. It is so, in the case of Bhagavan also. in the sastra they give another example. The rain is required, rain is samanya karanam, and after rain, alone all plants grow. The rain being uniform why different crops are raised and the seeds are responsible for different plants that grow. Rain is samanya karanam and the seed is vishesha karanam therefore there is no partiality or cruelty. This we come to know from sastram. Punya is responsible for higher janma and papa is responsible for lower janma. The combination of the both is responsible for manushya janma and one should not blame god for that. Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra III.2.13 reads as *punyo vai punyena karmana bhavati papah papena* a man becomes virtuous by the virtuous deeds and sinful by his sinful acts. If you take Gita sloka 14.18 ,reads as *urdhvam gacchanti sattvastha madhye tisthanti rajasah jagghanyagunavrttistha adho gacchanti tamasah* the meaning of the mantra is those who are established in goodness rise upwards; the passionate remain in the middle [regions] the dull steeped in the lower occurrences of the modes sink downwards. The Lord makes him whom He wishes to lead up from these worlds do a good action. The Lord makes Him whom he wishes to lead down do a bad action [ Kaushitaki Upanishad mantra III.8]. If I have a healthy body and have all wealth etc., it is on account of previous punya karma and therefore Bhagavan is impartial and He is non-cruel. Details in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 169

### **Topic 12. Vaisamyanaighryadhikaranam[34-35]**

**Final end of the creation.**

**Sutra 34 [168]**

***Vaishamyanaighrinye na sapekshatvat tatha hi darsayati***

The accusation that Brahman is partial and cruel in His creation of the world is removed.

The previous and this adhikaranam deal with the purpose of the creation by way of answering the purva paksha. we have got several answers depending upon the level of the student. The purpose of creation is jivanam karmakshya moksa prapti prayojanam the exhaustion and attainment of moksa is the main purpose of creation. The second one Vyasacharya gives is that the very creation is Bhagavan's leela, sport, fun, joke, or any action falling within the category an action with no purpose. The whole creation is the fun or sports for the God. If you say if the creation is fun for Bhagavan is terrible and unbearable for all the jivas. Such a Bhagavan cannot be accepted as compassionate Bhagavan with partiality and cruelly in creation. in the form of destruction Bhagavan is cruel. A Purva Pakshi makes this charge here.

The answer is differences in creation and jivarasis and destruction or maranam of jivas are not caused by the will of god but the karmas of the people. Sristi and pralaya or destruction are caused by Bhagavan based on the karmas of the people. Bhagavan is samanya karanam and karma phalam is vishesha karanam for both sristi and pralaya. the way in which the judge takes the case is on the basis of the case proceedings and the law code. Similarly Bhagavan also creates the individual sristi mainly on the basis of karma and karma phalam and the sristi is not based on whims of Bhagavan.

Na vaishamyanaighrinye – Brahman has no partiality at the time of creation and cruelty at the time of destruction; sapekshatvat as it is dependent on something else [i.e., karma of the souls];darsayati – revealed so in the scriptures; the significance of the word is vaishamyanaighrinye – vaishamyana means partiality; samam means equal and vishamam means unequal and vaishamyana is abstract noun partiality; naitghrinye means cruelty; two defects are imputed by Purva Pakshi; Bhagavan is impartial and cruel because I suffer. Na means not there that is the two defects are not there in Brahman. hetu is sabeksatvat because all the sufferings and differences in the creation are dependent upon other factors. Not caused by Bhagavan's wills but depends upon other factors which are punyam, papam and punya papa. Nothing is the will of God. Since creation is dependent on other factors other than the will of God. Tatha hi darsayathi – sruti reveals. This particular truth is revealed in this manner. The varieties in creation is not caused by Bhagavan's desire but depends upon punya papa of your own. Adhi Sankaracharya refers to punyena puna lokam bhavati 3.2.13 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; some are born human being some are born plants etc., based on punya papa alone; yatha yatha karma yatha sukham; Bhagavad Gita quotation 14.18 ,reads as *urdhvam gacchanti sattvastha madhye tisthanti rajasah jagghanyagunavrttistha adho gacchanti tamasah* the meaning of the mantra is those who are established in goodness rise upwards; the passionate

remain in the middle [regions] the dull steeped in the lower occurrences of the modes sink downwards. II.5.7 of Kathopanisad says *yonim anye prapadyante sariratvaya dehinah, sthanum anye 'nusamyanti yatha karma yatha srutam* some souls enter the womb to have a body, others go to the plants just according to their work and according to their knowledge. your karma means you are responsible and blame yourself and not God or Bhagavan.

## Topic 12. Vaisamyanaighryadhikaranam[34-35]

**Final end of the creation.**

**Sutra 35 [169]**

***Na karmavibhagatiti chet na anaditvat***

If it be objected that it [viz., the Lord's having regard to the merit and demerit] is not possible on account of the non-distinction [of merit and demerit before creation. [we say] no, because of [the world] being without a beginning.

The objection against sutra 34 is raised and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis. The sutra has got two portion purva paksa objection and Vedantin's answer. the objection is general one raised by all people. People are born differently based on karma and do not blame God for such birth. If the present janma is based on past karma and how the past janma is decided and purva paksa asks \how the first creations on what basis jivas are born. They there is no purva karma for the first creation. in the case of first sristi karma is not the karanam because karma will not be there. if karma is not karanam in the first sristi then the Bhagavan alone is the karanam for sristi. The answer is that you will have eternal problem you hold first creation in your mind. You remove the mind the first sristi. Creation does not have any beginning at all. Creation is a cyclic process and there you cannot talk about the beginning. The answer is anaditvat. There is no beginning at all.

Now we will do the word for word analysis/ abhibagad being divisionless there is no karma with regard to the first creation that is kept in mind. iti chet if this is the objection; na – it is not valid; anaditvat because of the beginninglessness of the creation. Now we will see the significance of the words. Na karma means karma is not the cause of the creation. When he says karma is not the cause of creation he keeps in mind the first creation. the reasons being the karma distinctions are not there before first creation. even jiva vibhagas are not there before the first creation. No punya no papa or punya papa jiva nasti was there before the first creation. Purva paksa takes sruti support *sadeva somya idam agra asit ekam eva ditiyam tadd haika dhuh asad eedam agra asid ekam evadvitiam tasmad asatah saj jayata* in the beginning this was not being alone, one only; without a second. From that non-being being was produced. Where are the karmas to determine the varieties of creation. therefore karma cannot be the cause of the first creation. up to this is purva paksa. if this is the question we do not accept this objection because anaditvat the first creation we do not accept and therefore your question is wrong therefore your question is not correct.

## Topic 12. Vaisamyanaighryadhikaranam[34-35]

**Final end of the creation.**

**Sutra 36 [170]**

***Upapadyate chapyupalabhyate cha***

And [that the world] and also karma is without a beginning] is reasonable and is also seen [from the scriptures]

The argument on beginning-less-ness of creation continues.

Here in this important sutra Vyasacharya says that any intelligent person should accept the creation is beginningless whether he goes by logic or by sruti. First we will take the logic. The scientific reason is that nothing new can be created or destroyed by the Lord as per the law of conservation. If you talk of first creation, you violate this law. It is asat karya vadha you enter. They says that there can be modification and not production. If you talk of first set of jiva, then who will give the first set of karma. Without any basis Bhagavan has to distribute a set of experiences to the first set of jivas. These experiences will be without any cause. it is called causeless experiences. Causelessness itself a defect in the orderliness of creation. the third dosha is without cause or karma the first set of jiva are born. the dosha is called anirmoksa prasangah. The jiva follows karma yoga Upasana yoga destroys sanjita and prarpapta karma and he becomes a mukta. Normarlly the jivan muktas like this are not reborn because they have no karma. Without karma the first creation can take place and what is the guarantee the liberated person will not be reborn. Purva Paksi says the first creation is possible without karma and jivan mukta without karma can also be reborn. It will become anirmoksa prasangah and none will have interest to gain moksa. These are the doshas and therefore you should not talk about the first creation. He also says thata sruti says there is no beginning.Surya chandra masou data yata purvam akalpayat. It is from rg Veda Tattriya aranyakam. Lord created sun moon etc., exactly as he created in the previous sristi. yatha purvam makes it clear that creation is anadi. Bhagavad Gita says *na rupam asya 'ha tatho'palabhyate na'nto na ca 'dir naca sampratistha asvaittham enam suvirudhamulam asangasastrena drdhena chittva* it real form is not thus perceived here, nor its end nor beginning nor its foundation. Having cut off this firm rooted asvattham [peepal tree] with the strong sword of nonattachment. He says never talk about creation. this is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Api cha means moreover; upapadyate beginninglessness of the creation is logical; cha upalapyate this is revealed in the scriptures. The significance of the words is upapadyate means it is logical or reasonable. This is given in general analysis above. Cha api is only a conjunction to club this sutra with the previous sutra. upalabhyate this gives sruti pramanam support. Found support in the scriptures. Therefore the creation is anadhi. We now get the last adhikaranam.

## Topic 13. sarvadharmopapattyadhikaranam [37]

**Final end of the creation.**

**Sutra 37 [171]**

***Upapadyate chapyupalabhyate cha***

Another reason to prove that Brahman is the cause of the world is brought forward.

This is the 13<sup>th</sup> and last adhikaranam of the first pada of the second chapter. It is an adhikaranam having one sutra. this is the winding up adhikaranam in which Vyasacharya concludes defending Vedantic teachings against nyaya, samkya and vaiseshika philosophers. He proves that vedanta is free of all doshas. Here Vyasacharya says jagat karanam requires certain attributes to be the cause of this universe. Jagat karanatvam requires certain dharma to be the cause of the creation. if you analyse and see that all the features requires fit well with Brahman alone. Prakriti cannot be the creation because it is independent. This is the general analysis.

Cha means moreover; sarva dharma upapatteh since all the characteristics or attribute or all virtues require for creation are possible in Brahma only. Brahman is the cause of the creation. the significance of the words is sarva dharma papattteh is compound word with three words. Dharma means qualification; for creating the universe; to maintain the universe. All such qualifications are possible will snugly fit into only with our Brahma. Upapatteh means possible in the word created by the Lord. With this this chapter is over.

Subject matter is conclusion of the first chapter. Conclusion is that Brahman fits with for the creation siddhanti says there is no virodha between the three portions that follow. In the first pada Vyasacharya defended vedanta.now Vyasacharya will give offensive arguments to Purva Paksis. This we will see in the next class.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2			
Classes: 170 to 194 = Sutras: 2-2-1 to 2-2-45			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
170	106	2 . 2 . 1	172
171	109	2 . 2 . 1 to 2 . 2 . 3	172 to 174
172	113	2 . 2 . 3 and 2 . 2 . 4	174 and 175
173	117	2 . 2 . 4 to 2 . 2 . 7	175 to 178
174	121	2 . 2 . 7 to 2 . 2 . 10	178 to 181
175	125	2 . 2 . 11	182
176	128	2 . 2 . 11 and 2 . 2 . 12	182 and 183
177	131	2 . 2 . 13 and 2 . 2 . 14	184 and 185
178	135	2 . 2 . 15 to 2 . 2 . 17	185 to 188
179	140	2 . 2 . 17	188
180	142	2 . 2 . 18	189
181	145	2 . 2 . 18 and 2 . 2 . 19	189 and 190
182	148	2 . 2 . 20 and 2 . 2 . 21	191 and 192
183	152	2 . 2 . 21 to 2 . 2 . 23	192 to 194
184	156	2 . 2 . 23 to 2 . 2 . 25	194 to 196
185	160	2 . 2 . 25 to 2 . 2 . 27	196 to 198
186	164	2 . 2 . 28	199
187	168	2 . 2 . 28 and 2 . 2 . 29	199 and 200
188	172	2 . 2 . 29 to 2 . 2 . 32	200 to 203
189	175	2 . 2 . 33	204
190	178	2 . 2 . 33 to 2 . 2 . 35	204 to 206
191	182	2 . 2 . 35 to 2 . 2 . 37	206 to 208
192	186	2 . 2 . 37 and 2 . 3 . 38	208 and 209
193	190	2 . 3 . 39 to 2 . 3 . 41	210 to 212
194	194	2 . 2 . 42 to 2 . 2 . 45	213 to 216
	199		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2

### Class 170

We have completed the first pada of the second chapter of Brahma Sutra. before taking up the second chapter we should know the background of the various chapters of Brahma Sutra. Vedanta talks about many things like Dvaidam, Advaidam, vishistadvaidam, karma, Upasana and jnanam. therefore we have to find out the central teaching. for this mimamsa rule was followed. By appropriate analysis, we have to arrive at the central teaching, which we call mimamsa or otherwise called sravanam. First chapter is equivalent to sravanam through which we absorbed the teaching of Vedanta. Veda uttarah means Vedanta. This methodology Vyasacharya referred to as samanvaya method of making the teaching harmonious. The central teaching is jagat karanam Brahman. it is consistent revelation or samanvayah. It is unique because no other philosophy arrived at this. All other darsans talk about jagat karanam and they say achetanam vasthu is jagat karanam. Some say pramanam and some say paramanu and uniformly everyone says that achetana vasthu is jagat karanam. They are essentially materialistic in nature and are almost comparable to the modern scientists. They say mater is beginning. For them Consciousness is the intermediary, incidental product which rises in time and disappears. Vedanta is a unique teaching where Consciousness is taught as the central theme of Vedanta. by revealing central theme itself, Vedanta gives moksa. In karma kanda by revealing rituals, Veda cannot give you the benefit because the implementation of the teaching is required. In the purva bagha, revelation is not an end in itself but it is a means to an end that is the karma phalams. But in Vedanta the very acquiring the vedic knowledge and realization of Brahman as jagat karanam and Brahman is adhistanam of the whole universe itself helps liberation. here the revelation of activation but it gives fulfillment to the jiva and it puts an end to all the activity because of fulfillment or purnatvam., jagat karanam Brahman is a means for liberation.

In the second chapter we don't learn anything new but it will reinforce the very teaching. when we fix a pole to tie a rope and after fixing and tying anything you have to make sure that pole is in tact and he shakes the pole and checks whether the pole is more firm. This is sthooana nikanana nyaya. Through sravanam the teaching has fixed the pole of Brahma jnanam. I can be Brahman also I can be part of Brahman also and I can be different from Brahman also. this vague idea is not all right and I would be clear wheter I am Brahman, I am part of Brahman or anything else. This knowledge cannot be applied. You should be sure what is centra theme of the teaching. the entire second chapter is mananam chapter. The vagueness can in our mind because of three reason. One is the doubt whether my understanding is in keeping with the sruti teaching or not. The second is regarding the smriti vorodhah. Contradicting sruti is indirect contradiction of the very sruti itself. Third and the most powerful is mukti virodhah, illogical and reasonable and logical and reasonable and logical. It will not work for me. In the first chapter sruti, smriti, yukti virodha pariharah was done. In the third and fourth chapter sruti virodha parihara will be done. This chapter is called virodha parihara adhyaya. The purpose is to remove the vagueness from my knowledge. convert prajna to sthiraprajna samsaya rahita jnanam. if padas one, three and four are meant for virodha parihara, the second pada there is a small diversion. In other padas we remove contradiction and establish Vedantic teaching and it is defensive approach. What Vyasacharya sees is that it is not enough that this teaching is right and he wants that this knowledge alone is the best to gain knowledge. first we say our darsanam does not have virodha and in the second pada we attack other darsanams and we prove all other darsanams

are nyaya virodha. We know six asthika darsanams and six nasthika darsanams do not accept Vedas. Of these eleven darsanams Vyasacharya takes samkya yoga darsanam we want to show the defects; and nyaya vaiseshika. Purva Mimamsa we do not take and this has been discussed in sutra 1.1.4. Thereafter Vyasacharya takes the nasthika darsanams which do not accept Vedas. Afterwards the agamas are taken for discussion. Agamas as systems of worship are useful but as philosophy, it is negated. This is the approach of the second pada. Adhi Sankaracharya asks a question when you dismiss other systems does not you have dvesha for others and does it not add to your dvesha or hatred towards them. We say there is difference between accepting the people and accepting the teaching. As far as people are concerned, you should accommodate all the people. Such an attitude is a virtue. With regard to teaching, accepting all of them is neither intelligent nor is it possible as they contradict each other. Several teaching is contradictory and accommodating one will automatically contradict the other. Wrong theories should be proved wrong and right is only right. This is the basis of science. We cannot accept all types of teaching. The rejection does not mean fanaticism. Dvesah does not come because we do not hate the founders but we only reject some of the ideas taught by their philosophy. it requires tremendous intellectual honesty. Adhi Sankaracharya respect all the founders like Pathanjali, Kapila, Jaimini, Kanadhana and others. Samkya darsanam is most powerful and closest to Vedanta. it is so because of two reasons. In all other darsanams Consciousness is considered to be the property of the matter. They consider that the matter is the fundamental and the Consciousness is the property of the matter. Samkya is most important philosopher who has separated Consciousness from the matter and has acceted that Consciousness as an independent entity. It is a very big step forward. He calls matter as prakriti and Consciousness as Purusa. but only thing is both are independent reality swatantram. Previously matter was more important and Consciousness was less important. Samkya says matter is important and Consciousness is as important as matter. in Vedanta we say Consciousness is more important and the matter depends upon Consciousness. There is total reversal from the first stage to the last stage. Samkya is in the middle stage. First is materialism and the third is spirituality and the second Samkya system is in transitional stage. It is because of that it is closer to Vedanta than all other people. Having doen Samkya he will do nyaya vaisesika also. now we will take up the first sutra.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 1 [172]**

#### ***Rachananupapattescha nanumanam***

That which is inferred by the Samkya viz., pradhanam cannot be the cause [of the world] because [in that case it is] not possible [to account for the] design or orderly arrangement [bound in the creation]

An argument is brought forward to the effect that the pradhanam of the Samkya.

The main purpose of the Brahma Sutra is to show the purpose of the revelation of the truth in the Vedas. They aim also at refuting the wrong doctrines in the other systems of philosophy. in the previous portion the doctrine of the samkyas ahs been refuted here and there on the authority of the scriptures. Sutras 1 to 10 refute it through logical reasoning. it is a big adhikaranam consisting of ten sutras. It is Samkya madha nirahara adhikaranam. in the first

chapter Samkya darsanam has been negated. Why should it is taken again now in the second chapter. Adhi Sankaracharya defends and says there is difference in the first and the second chapter of the second part. in the first chapter the Samkya Philosopher claimed that their philosophy is Veda sammadha darsanam. in support of that he quoted sruti support. In addition, our aim in the first chapter was to show that Samkya did not have sruti support. Whatever sruti support he claimed was only a seeming support and not a real support. Here Samkya Philosopher claims the support of logic also and we show that he does not have logical support also. We negate their claim and say that the support is 'seeming support' and not the real support.

The subject matter is Samkya darsanam and we will see whether their philosophy has the logical support or not. They claim that it has the support of logic and we will say that it is not supported by logic. He says that the whole universe is born out of prakriti or pradhanam. the word pradhanam is prakriti only. in Samkya prakriti is independent and in Vedanta prakriti is dependent. Pradhanam is achetanam and it is the basic matter or energy. It is avyaktam, it is un-manifest, and it is in causal form. It is like the seed of a tree. It is an independently existent reality. Third feature he says is anumanam or anumeyam. This means that it can be arrived at through logic. Every effect has a material cause and it has basic ultimate moola karanam. finally he says pradhanam has got three gunas. They are sattva, rajas and tamogunas. Such a pradhanam alone evolves into the creation. pradhanam evolves into Prapancha independently without any intervention even without the blessings of Isvara. Samkya Philosopher does not accept Isvara. he says that there is Purusa and Purusa is not Isvara and it is asanga nirvikara Chaitanyam. It is unrelated and uninvolved changeless Consciousness. since it is uninvolved Purusa is not going to activate prakriti. then it will become involvement and activation means an action and it will mean change or modification of Purusa and it will become savikaram. But Purusa according to them is nirvikaram. Purusa does not activate and Isvara does not exist. This Vyasacharya negates in this adhikaranam.

Now we will see general analysis of the first sutra. the first reason is given in this sutra. an inert thing cannot naturally produce vast orderly intelligent and complex creation. Vyasacharya uses the expression rachana the world with wonderful design. Now we talk about design, which is a big job. The Lord even in the creation of the huge universe has done this great design. It is impossible to think of accidental formation of creation. Therefore we require intelligence. Wherever there is intelligent product there behind is intelligent cause. you have to accept achetana pradhanam cannot produce the universe.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Rachana anupapatteh – means because of the impossibility of arrangement of the world; anumanam means pradhanam na it is the material cause of the universe. Now we will see the significance of the word. Rachana anupapatteh is a compound word rachana and anupapatteh. Rachana means this magnificent design mind-boggling design from micro to macro universe. Anupapatteh means impossibility. It cannot be done with intelligence behind it. cha means other reasons also. na means not and complete by adding pradhanam na jagat karanam and it cannot be the cause of the universe. Anumanam means pradhanam. anumanam means primarily pramanam. That is the vachyartham but the implied meaning of the word here is pradhanam. the connection between pradhanam and inference is pradhanam is arrived at and the means can infer the end. With this the sutra part is over. more we will see in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 171

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

**Sutra 1 [172]**

#### ***Rachananupapattescha nanumanam***

That which is inferred by the Samkya viz., pradhanam cannot be the cause [of the world] because [in that case it is] not possible [to account for the] design or orderly arrangement [bound in the creation]

An argument is brought forward to the effect that the pradhanam of the Samkya.

As I said in the last class in the second pada Vyasacharya wants to show that all non-vedantic darsanam like samkya etc., do not have any logical support. In the first chapter it was proved that they do not have sruti pramanam. First Vyasacharya takes up samkya darsanam, which is very close to Vedanta and it seeming support, from the Veda mantra.

Vyasacharya pointed out earlier that pradhanam does not have vedic support. Samkya philosopher has pointed out that pradhanam does not have sruti any pramanam. Pradhanam is inert material with no capacity to think and act in a particular manner. Inert pradhanam is not even managed by the intelligent Lord for they do not believe in the Lord Isvara. Even Purusa is not of any use because it is uninvolved Consciousness and therefore it cannot handle or help prakriti in evolving the creation. pradhanam is not handled by karma also because they say pradhanam is swatantram and its activity is not governed by karma. If its activity is governed by karma, pradhanam cannot be called swatantram or independent. God is not there. Available Purusa is useless; karma does not control; what does it mean? Matter accidentally becoming a universe is their philosophy. when they introduce pradhanam as inert philosophy, when they talk about the role of pradhanam as though intelligent secretary to Purusa. pradhanam's job to assist Purusa in forming dharma etc. although they take pradhanam as intelligent and capable, but it is inert and it cannot intelligently work for the benefit of Purusa. How can an unintelligent blind pradhanam accidentally evolve into a universe, which is to be governed, and have to be controlled? This is the question posed by the Vedantins to the samkya philosophers. Therefore, what Vyasacharya says is samkya philosophy takes the creation of universe as an accidental creation. An accidental creation is not possible to form a complex universe by the inert prakriti. I ask you to paint 26 metal plates with all the 26 alphabets and drop them from the top floor of a building. I ask you to read the letters. You put them in such a way all 26 plates to fall in straight line. What are the chances and it is still remote. Then I put the third condition not only they should fall and all the letters to fall in the same order. we know it is almost impossible. When this is the case with the ordinary letter plates, how is it possible the complex world order, atoms and molecules, elements, Self jivatmas etc., getting arranged in the proper order that too by an inert and unintelligent pradhanam. this is the meaning of the sutra. cha in the sutra further refutes samkya theory of creation. Adhi Sankaracharya shows the fallacy of samkya

reasoning for creation. their philosophy is given in a book called samkya philosophy. samkya sutras are not available. We have samkya karika in verse form where the basic samkya philosophy is written by one Isvara Krishna. He has enumerated various reasons for his advocacy of an independent creation. Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam these reasons and shows the fallacy of their view on creation. One reason is that karya karana vibhaga avibhagabyam. In the creation, it is said that all the effects are born out of the cause and later effects merge into the cause. Such an action is called karana karyasya avibhagah. The separation of the effect from the cause and again the merger of the effect into the cause are indicated by them. All the trees, plants etc., merge into earth and earth merges into water and then reverse back and say water merges back to Agni and we find that all products emerge out of cause and merge back to the cause. There is one basic cause from which all effects are born and later all effects merge back to the cause which samkya calls it as Moola karanam. Emerging and merging we have to infer on one moola karanam. Since such karanam is required, we infer pradhanam as the moola karanam, which is the ultimate limit of karya karana flow. For this Vedantins say wonderful for they believe in one ultimate cause from which every effects take birth and it is there all the effects ultimately merge back. That there should be an ultimate cause is reasonable and what is the cause to be shown that ultimate cause is pradhanam and why not it be our Brahman. the controversy is whether it is pradhanam or Brahman. karya karana avibhaga is legitimate conclusion and what is objected by the siddhantis is how can an inert pradhanam is the moola karanam and why not it be the chaitanya swarupa Brahman.

the next reason is parimanat. Everything in creation is finite in nature. All finite things are born out of finite things and ultimately you have to come to the ultimate cause and it alone can be the cause of the whole universe. For this Vedantins argue and when you say every object should have cause because it is finite and ask what type of finite thing you talk for inference of the cause. Suppose you say desa pariccheda is condition for inferring the cause you will have a problem, with regard to Akasa. You say that Akasa is a product with a cause. But we know that the space cannot be limited by space itself. Akasa does not have desa pariccheda and still you talk about Akasa as a product even though it has desa pariccheda. Next, we cannot accept kala pariccheda, which is not included as one of the tattvams in your samkya philosophy. There is no principle of kalam at all in your philosophy. You have no right to talk about kala pariccheda. Do you talk about vasthu pariccheda, the propertywise limitation? That you cannot say. If it makes something a product three gunas themselves will have vasthu pariccheda. Sattva guna is sattva because it does not have rajo and tamo guna; rajo guna is rajo guna because it does have either sattva or tamo guna. to make an object a product three gunas themselves should be a product and pradhanam being a mixture of three gunas and pradhanam must be a product and if pradhanam itself a product it requires another karanam, and how can the pradhanam can have karanam. Then he gives third argument samanvayad. He says the creation three factors are inherent in the universe and they are sukha and dukha and mogah. These three factors experienced are but three gunas sattva, rajo and tamo guna in disturbed format. Sattva represents sukha anubhava; rajo guna represents dukha anubhava and tamo guna represents moha or the delusion. All the three sukha and dukha and moha pervades the entire universe. In the cause three gunas should be there. when they are in causal form it is in equilibrium and when activated it is in disturbed form with sukha dukha and mohatmam. Adhi Sankaracharya points out that we cannot agree. Sukha and dukha and moha are emotions possible only in the internal human being and they are not inherent external objects. There is no pramanam to show that they are there in the objects. The heat is there in the fire. Anybody touching it will feel. It is not the subjective feeling. The very same object because of the attitude of the person either give sukham or dukham. There

is nothing good or bad in the creation. since these three are not there, you cannot take three gunas are there. you can say pradhanam may be karanaam but you cannot say pradhanam is the ultimate cause and you cannot say the inert pradhanam is the case for this inert pradhanam cannot produce anything and for that we require intelligent and all powerful Isvara for creation. for Vedantins there is not problem for prakriti is managed by Isvara. here we establish a vyavaharika Isvara. other than Paramarthika Brahman we require a vyavaharika Isvara which samkya philosopher do not have in their philosophy. here the topic is vyavaharika Isvara other than the Paramarthika Isvara.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 2[173]**

#### ***pravrittescha***

And on account of the [impossibility of] activity.

This is the argument in support of sutra 1

Pradhanam cannot be the cause of the world because it is also impossible for it to have an inclination for the creation.

We said that inert prakriti cannot thoughtfully create the universe. If the creation is already programmed in prakriti and this programmed prakriti creates the universe and then resolves. It is said that even if the prakriti is programmed, a person is required to switch on the programme. If it is off eternally, sristi cannot happen and if it is on eternally, pralayam cannot happen. For switching off and switching on that to create and resolve, an activating force is required within pradhanam. it does not have Self motivating force because it is an inert principle. Since the motive force is lacking even if the creation programmed, it cannot thoughtfully switch it off or switch it on. How the whole thing has started is a mystery. The origin of creation remains one of the mysteries in science and the problem, is threshold problem and only when organic molecule reaches high level of complexity it can start living. Pravrutti means the first motivating force. We require Isvara other than Nirgunam Brahman, or Chidhabasa Chaitanyam is required to handle the first creation. This is the essence of this sutra. The desire or tendency to create cannot be ascribed to the inert pradhanam. The inert chariot cannot move by itself. It is only the intelligent charioteer moves the chariot by directing the movement of the horse. Mud by itself is never seen to create a jar without the agency of an intelligent potter. There must be a directive intelligent Being or Entity for that purpose. The activity must be attributed to the directive intelligence rather than to the inert matter or pradhanam. every activity is seen as the result of an intelligent agent. Inert matter or pradhanam has not agency. Matter or pradhanam has no Self initiated activity of its own. If the objector says I don't see the chetana, our reply is that there is no activity without soul. Therefore first cause but not with the doctrine of a non-intelligent first cause pradhana of samkya.

Now I will word for word analysis. Cha moreover; pravritteh because of the impossibility of the motive force in an insentient object pradhanam cannot be the cause of the universe. Now we will see significance of the words. Now we will see the significance of the words.

Pravittah is switching on force that crosses the threshold. Impossibility is supplied in this sutra. It is because of the absence of the motive force. It is absent because of jada pradhanam. Because of this reason, pradhanam cannot create anything. In Vedanta, we say that there is motive force behind pradhanam, which we call as Isvara. The next word is a conjunction.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 3[174]**

#### ***Payo'mbuvaccet tatra'pi***

If it be said [that the pradhana moves or spontaneously modifies herself into the various products] like milk or water [without the guidance of any intelligence], [we reply that] there also [if it is due to intelligence].

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

If the objector says that there could be Self-activity of nature as in milk or water, we reply that even then there is the operation of an intelligent agent.

First we will do the general analysis. First portion relates to purva paksa and the second portion to siddhanti. Purva paksa says that motive force belongs to inert things also. There are many inert things functions and it is very useful to us. Milk in the body of a cow and he says that the milk is inert. Inert milk naturally flows out of the cow to help the jivas. The second example is water. Water is there in the Himalayan mountain. With the motive to serve people, Himalayan waters flow down. We see that water flows without any intelligent person so also pradhanam can flow down like river and milk to help the people.

Siddhanti says that the first example is the milk flowing out of cow. Even though milk is inert it is assisted by a chetana adhistanam. Then purva paksa says that dristanta supports him and not siddhantis. The details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 172

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

##### **Sutra 3[174]**

##### ***Payo'mbuvaccet tatra'pi***

If it be said [that the pradhana moves or spontaneously modifies herself into the various products] like milk or water [without the guidance of any intelligence], [we reply that] there also [if it is due to intelligence].

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

If the objector says that there could be Self-activity of nature as in milk or water, we reply that even then there is the operation of an intelligent agent.

As a part of showing the logical fallacies in darsanams other than Vedanta Vyasacharya takes up some other darsanams for discussion. He has taken up first Samkya darsanam. it is not having sruti support has been negated in the first chapter. Vyasacharya attacks the concept of pradhanam which is stated to be the cause of creation. Pradhanam's activity is stated to be independent, purposeful and skillful. All the three adjectives attributed to pradhanam is being negated by Vyasacharya one by one.

The first adjective has been negated in the first sutra saying that the inert pradhanam cannot design and execute such a mind boggling and complex universe. Even we are not able to understand the nuances of the creation of universe and how can the achetana and inert pradhanam can ever design or execute the creation of universe. Pradhanam does not have the skill and implement the cosmic design and creation.

Having negated the skill, Vyasacharya has taken up the independent activity is not possible for pradhanam. He said that inert pradhanam could not have independent activity Samkya raises an objection as to why the inert pradhanam cannot act independently. He quotes some examples to prove his point. An inert thing can be active without human intervention is Samkya Philosopher's argument and in support of which he gives two examples. The first example is milk flowing from cow naturally. The milk is inert and it has the natural flow to serve others. second is the water flowing from mountain to serve the humanity. The first one is already refuted by us that milk flows from the cow that milk exists in a cow which is sentient. Milk is backed by chetana adhistitham achetanam. It is an achetanam activated by the cow which is chetanam.

Now he says that water flows from the mountain. Mountain is not chetanam. River water which is achetanam without being assisted by achetanam flows from mountain to the plains to serve humanity. The first answer temporarily accepting Samkya's view even though it is not acceptable to us. now Vedantins asks the question because achetana jalam acts without

being assisted by chetana intervention. Can we make a vyapti or generalization that wherever achetanam functions without being intervened by chetana thing. If you have an example for independent activity for achetanam I have got some other example where achetanam does not function independent. There is an achetana car, it does not move on its own, and that is the reason why we park the car on the road and you come to the class. Imagine the situation that the achetanam car starts moving on its own. The movement of the car depends upon the chetana jiva behind the wheel. Achetana ratham achetana car do not function without the help of chetana jiva behind. Vegetables do not work on its own and becomes a dish. Therefore I have equal number of examples to show achetanam functions dependently. When we have both examples you don't have a vyapti at all and which example you will apply to pradhanam. if you apply your example and I will apply my example. You do not have a clear general vyapti and anumanam cannot be applied at all. You can maximum say pradhanam may be independently active but you cannot have nicchaya jnanam. then when you go to the sruti, and if you come to sruti Vedantins win. Lord Krishna in Bhagavad Gita saus in sloka 10 of chapter IX *maya dhyaksena prakrtih suyate sacaracaram hetuna 'nena kaunteya jagad viparivartate* the meaning of the sloka is my guidance, nature [prakriti] gives birth to all things moving and unmoving and by this means o son of Kunti, the world revolves. The Lord intervenes in the activity of prakriti. assuming the water functions independently you cannot take that example of pradhanam because I have another example also. this is the first level argument.

I initially accepted that water functions independently without the involvement of chetana tattvam. Even though jiva intervention is not there, the Isvara's intervention is there in the functioning of the achetana vasthus. All the inert creations function with the blessings of the Antaryami tattvam. Antaryami Isvara is in the water and it functions behind the water and it operates through the law of nature. There is another mantra in Aksara Brahman. 3.7.4 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad *yo 'psu tisthann, adbhyo 'ntarah, yam apo na viduh, yasyapah sastram yo 'po 'ntaro yamayati, esa ta atmantaryami amrtah* he who dwells in the water, yet is within the water, whom the water does not know, whose body the water is, who controls the water from within, he is your Self the inner controller the immortal; further we see in 3.8.9 of the same Upanishad *etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi suryacandramasau vidhrtau tisthatah; etasya va aksarasya prasasane gargi dyavaprthivyau vidhrte tisthatah, etasya va aksarasya prasasane garg;i* it says verily at the command of that imperishable, O Gargy the sun and the moon stand in their respective positions. All the command of that Imperishable O gargi the heaven and earth stand in their respective positions. So it is concluded that it is with the blessings of Isvara alone the rivers flow downwards. Thus we find that achetana jalam flows with the blessings of Isvara alone. Since one opinion based on pratyaksa praman and another on sastra pramanam, and a controversial thing cannot be taken as an example. An example should be that it should be non-controversial. The rule is that the example should be accepted by all without any restriction. The idea is the example should be noncontroversial. Our controversy is whether achetana pradhanam can function independently. Achetana jalam function independently is not correct. We have to correct whether achetana jalam functions independently or not. Since water itself is controversial, first we should resolve whether the natural happenings are acting independently or not. The noncontroversial thing is our vehicle. Samkya also accept a chariot cannot move independently. Chariort is non- controversial example. All the inert things function backed by the blessings of chetana tattvam. on the same line achetana pradhanam also functions backed by the blessings of Isvara alone. Finally to say achetana jalam functions blessed by Isvara behind the water may be their argument. Intelligence is perceptible in any case. we do not see intelligent principle but we see only the matter, intelligent is an inferred awareness and we cannot see through perception. Even

brain's death some reflexes continue. All these things show that jivatma stays behind the body. How can we discover Isvara is behind water. Just because there is no proof for jiva, you cannot say that proof is not there. absence of proof is not the proof of absence. Absence of proof for existence of god is not the proof for the nonexistence of god. Absence of proof means that you do not know and it shows your limitation. You don't see the dissolved salt in the water through your normal perception.. You use an exclusive pramanam the tongue. Similarly, Isvara is there throughout the creation but you cannot sense or see Isvara. you cannot through logic establish that there is no Isvara.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. payombhuvat like natural flow of milk and water; pradhanam evolves naturally. This is purva paksa part., chet if this is the contention it is not true or correct; tatrapa there is intelligence presiding over that also. the significance of the word payombhuvat means the milk and water like; the example is for the independent flow without the blessings of anything. Om the case pradhanam the natural evolution is taken here. Chet; means if this is the contention of Samkya Philosopher, in those cases also in the case of milk as also water do not function independently and intelligence is there behind water and milk. Nonperfection of intelligence is not 'nonexistence' of the intelligence.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 4[175]**

#### ***vyatirekanavasthiteschanapekshatvat***

And because [the pradhanam] is not dependent [on anything], there being no external agent besides it [it cannot be active]

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

First we will see the general analysis of the sutra. pradhanam cannot function independently we said. You cannot say Purusa supports pradhanam. Purusa is absolutely useless at the time of creation. nrvikaratvad, asangatvad and udhaseena Chaitanyam. How can that Purusa support pradhanam. other than Purusa there is not even Isvara they accept. Therefore Purusa cannot support asangatvad. Isvara cannot support abhavat; prakriti cannot stand on its own. Vedantins has got sasanga Chaitanyam other than asanga Chaitanyam. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Cha moreover; anabegatvad since pradhanam is independent vyatireka anavasthite due to the absence of external agency or support; pradhanam is not the cause of the universe. This is the running meaning. the significance of the word is vyatireka anavasthithethe vyatireka means a third factor other these two that pradhanam and Purusa; external agency like Isvara is not there because Samkya Philosopher does not believe in Isvara. Vedantins refutes Isvara at Paramarthika level and Vedantins accepts Isvara at vyavaharika level. At vyavaharika level there is no Isvara for the Samkya Philosopher. For Advaidins vyavaharika Isvara is there at vyavaharika prapancha or at vyavaharika plane. This is not the case with samkyans. Simply for samkyans Isvara abhavat. Anapeksatvat and therefore pradhanam is anapeksam this means supportless or without a backing. Pradhanam abeksa rahitam and supportless and it

cannot produce a creation. therefore independent functioning is not possible; others to back  
pradhanam is not available. With this the 4<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. more in the next class. .



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 173

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

##### **Sutra 4[175]**

##### ***vyatirekanavasthiteschanapekshatvat***

And because [the pradhanam] is not dependent [on anything], there being no external agent besides it [it cannot be active]

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

It is a pada, which focuses on the negation of all the non-vedantic teaching, and it is also meant for reinforcement of our knowledge. Knowledge to be clear we should know what is right knowledge; we also should know why right is right; also we should know why the wrong is wrong; then alone knowledge is samyat jnanam. therefore parama nirakaranam is important and the aim is only clarity and it is not denigration of a particular person or group of people. It is not parihartham. We don't want to hate other people. We do not want to bring down the reputation of other people. I want to have clarity. Free to hold any view is allowed. We first has taken up Samkya darsanam and we have taken up the pradhanam of Samkya. It is also known as prakriti. prakriti is generally used in Vedanta and the pradhanam is rarely used in Vedanta.. because of commonness of the words one may think that both are same. Here common features of prakriti and pradhanam between Samkya and Vedanta have not been said in the Brahma Sutra. Both are anadhi both trigunatmam and both are achetanam. Most of the main ones are different. Here we highlight some of the differences. First we have taken the activity of the pradhanam. pradhanam is most active category. We dismiss one by one their concept of activity. First, we refuted skillful activity being a jada pradhanam cannot be skillful. Even partially skillful jiva is not able to guess the complexes of universe. How can pradhanam a jada vathu can have the skill to operate the universe. Then Vyasacharya takes up the independent activity of pradhanam. in Vedanta there is Isvara activates pradhanam. in Samkya there is no Isvara and pradhanam is independent and it is jadam. Samkya gave two examples the milk and the water in the mountain. Vyasacharya refuted both of them in the previous sutras. Incidentally Vyasacharya said even if pradhanam wants to take dependence no one is available and the available Purusa is useless and he is indifferent. Independent activity is not possible and dependence is not available. The same topic continues in the next sutra also.

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

##### **Sutra 5 [176]**

### ***Anyatrabhavaccha na trinadivat***

And [it can] not [be said that the pradhanam modifies itself spontaneously] like grass, etc., [which turn into milk], because of its absence elsewhere [than in the female animals]

The argument in support of the sutra 1 is continued.

This sutra is almost the extension of the third sutra dealing in the same topic. Here also purva paksa wants to establish jada pradhanam can have independent activity. He wants to give an example through that a vyapti and through vyapti he will say that pradhanam is cause of creation. trinavat it means the grass. What he intends is when the grass is eaten by the cow, it is converted into milk. Previously it was milk flowing from the cow. Now it is grass turning into milk and nobody plans or orders the cow to convert the grass into milk. This is the dristanta. Grass independent turns to milk and so pradhanam independently transforms into the universe. Vyasacharya gives his answer. if the grass has the independent capacity to become milk, it should change to milk anywhere. Even in the lawn you should get milk. It does not happen. If you say eaten grass turns to milk means anybody eating grass should give milk. The bull also eats grass and it does not give milk. Therefore there is no vyapti of the grass getting converting into milk. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give word for word analysis. Cha means moreover; na – pradhanam cannot independently transform; trinadivat like grass etc; abhavat because of the absence of such transformation anyatra elsewhere; this is the running meaning. The significance of the words is trinadivat we have to understand like grass transforming into milk in the body of the cow; adhidivat it means the food being converted into blood in the body of the human being. This is the example given by purva paksa. Our example is na pradhanam cannot be transformed like grass and create the world. anyatra abhavat because it is not taking place elsewhere. anyatra means any other locus.

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 6 [177]**

#### ***Abhyupagame'pyarthabhavat***

Even if we admit [the Samkya position with regard to the spontaneous modification fo the pradhanam, it cannot be the cause of the universe because of the absence of any purpose.

The argument in support of the sutra 1 is continued.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. skillful activity on the jada pradhanam was refuted; independent activity of jada pradhanam was negated and now Vyasacharya takes up the purposeful activity of jada pradhanam is being negated here. Here he says let us assume the first two stages are a possible and even then pradhanam cannot have purposeful activity. The reason is that purpose always indicates intention; so there should be intended result and intended beneficiary of the result. Not only the result should be envisaged in advance and visualization has two component first is the result of the activity and beneficiary

of the activity. Therefore visualization or intention is required for purposeful activity and it presupposes intelligence. Pradhanam` cannot visualize the activity being a jadam. A waterfall cannot visualize the generation of electricity which has to be done by the chetana jivas alone. The human being will benefit the electricity and you cannot say it is for the purpose of the waterfall. We make use of the electricity and the water cannot have a purpose in mind. result can be there for jada activity and purpose cannot be there for inert pradhanam. inert activity can have consequence and it cannot have a purpose. It is because pradhanam is jadam and pradhanam cannot have purpose because it is jadam. This is the essence of this sutra.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Abhyupagame means even if independent and skillful transformation is accepted in pradhanam since purpose is absent pradhanam cannot be the cause of the universe. This is the running meaning. the significance of the words is abhyupagame the pradhanam can skillfully and independently transform with inbuilt capacity to do such things; this is the assumption arth abhavad even then you cannot attribute the purposeful activity on the part of pradhanam. it is because artha abhavat artha means purpose; abhavat being absent. Both are not there in jada pradhanam. purposeful activity is not possible and therefore pradhanam is not jagat karanam. Adhi Sankaracharya says let us assume that there is purposeful activity. Then Adhi Sankaracharya's argument is let us assume that pradhanam creates the purposeful universe. He asks what is the purpose of the creation of the universe. Samkya Philosopher says purusasya prayojana sidhyartham. Pradhanam does nishkama karma for the enjoyment of the Purusa. pradhanam is a karta and pradhanam is not a bokta. The purpose is for the benefit of Purusa. the prayojanam Samkya calls it purusasya boga abhavartha siddhyartham. That Purusa alone is otherwise called jiva. bogah means dharma artha kamah or otherwise called preyah. Abhavartha means shreyah. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is fine and your system is so great. He asks how can Purusa receive any prayojanam from prakriti because Purusa is defined as asangah or asambandhah or it cannot be related to and it cannot be a receiver of any prayojanam. Purusa cannot have receiver received sambandha and such relation is not possible for Purusa as per Samkya philosophy. Purusa cannot get moksa also because asanga Purusa cannot have samsara sambandha. Therefore samsara sambandha is not possible. Where is the question of removing the sambandha. taking a relation is boga and removing relationship is abogah. Therefore, even if prakriti activity is purposeful Purusa is the beneficiary you cannot say. There is none to gain the benefit. The next concept of Samkya philosophy is not acceptable. Adhi Sankaracharya says let us assume that even though Purusa is a bogta and therefore capable of receiving the prayojanam. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question the bogritvam of Purusa is natural or superimposed. Let us assume that it is natural for Purusa. if you say swabhavika bogritvam is there for Purusa and swabhavika kartritvam is there for prakriti and whatever is natural cannot be eliminated by jnanam. How can jnanam remove what is swabhavikam or natural. Since prakriti is eternal karta and Purusa is eternal bogta the Purusa will suffer for all the time. he cannot gain moksa. It is anir moksa prasangah. This samsaritvam will continue for ever. Your Samkya darsanam will become meaningless. Samkya Philosopher introduces his philosophy for gaining moksa and it is not possible under this condition. To avoid this problem he may say pradhanam cannot have natural bogritvam but arobika bogritvam and whatever arobigam can go through jnanam. if this is accepted where is dosha. Adhi Sankaracharya says that is called Vedanta and you talk of Vedanta only and say Purusa is abokta and akarta. What you claim as Samkya is good old Vedanta, once you say arobika bogritvam is giving up of one's own stand and unknowingly entering into the field of Vedanta. therefore give up the swabhavika bogritvam of Purusa. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]

### Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world

#### Sutra 7 [178]

#### *Purushasmavaditi chet tathapi*

If it be said [that the Purusa or soul can direct or move the pradhana] as the [lame] man can direct a blind man, or as the magnet [moves the iron], even then [the difficulty cannot be overcome]

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

Now we are entering to the next stage of discussion. We have discussed pradhanam skillful activity is not possible; independent activity is not possible; pradhanam pradhanam purposeful activity is not possible and also we have seen Purusa cannot be a bogta. Now we come to the argument that pradhanam is a karta. Pradhanam guided activity is also not possible. First we will do the general analysis. In the previous portion we have dismissed the idea of pradhanam being skillfully active; purposefully active and independently active because pradhanam is a jadam or an inert vasthu unbacked by chetanam. Since pradhanam cannot do that let us assume Purusa is activating the pradhanam. Guided by Purusa prakriti works and therefore Purusa alone is making prakriti work and Purusa receives the benefit. He gives tow examples. One is like a lame person and who cannot walk and he has got eyes. There is another person who has got legs in tact but he is blind. One is lame and another is blind and if both cannot independently reach the destination and the two had a joint venture and the blind man carried the lame person and lame person is capable of seeing. This is antha pantun nyayah. Sakti sambannah purusah and prakriti is anthah being jadam. Prakriti guided by Purusa and mutually they create universe. For that Vyasacharya answers still your problem is not solved. The problems here are many. First, you say Purusa guides prakriti and you can never say prakriti is independent. When it takes guidance how can you say prakriti is swatantram. You relinquish the idea of independence of prakriti. again Purusa cannot guide prakriti because guidance is a form of activity. Purusa being asangah being nirvkarah Purusa will be akartha only and you yourself has accepted Purusa is akartha. It is logical and accepted by your system. How can it guide prakriti. This is yukti virodha or swa abhyugama virodha. This is one set of problem. He is going to give another suggestion. Purusa does not guide by action but by mere presence, it activates prakriti. There is problem, which we will see, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 174

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

##### **Sutra 7 [178]**

##### ***Purushasmavaditi chet tathapi***

If it be said [that the Purusa or soul can direct or move the pradhana] as the [lame] man can direct a blind man, or as the magnet [moves the iron], even then [the difficulty cannot be overcome]

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

In this firsts adhikaranam Vyasacharya negates Samkya Darsanam. the main focus of Vyasacharya is to point out the deficiencies in their pradhanam concept. now we see the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra general analysis. Vyasacharya first negated the skillful activity of pradhanam, then purposeful activity followed by independent activity on the part of pradhanam. it is so because pradhanam is jadam and is inert. Now we have taken the fourth concept that is guided activity on the part of pradhanam. Now we assume that pradhanam is guided by Purusa and let pradhanam function skillfully and purposefully. This is the fourth assumption and here also, Vyasacharya points out that there are deficiencies. If pradhanam is guided by someone who is the guiding factor. Samkya only has Purusa that is asangah, nirvikaratvam etc. he gives two examples in support of that like one blind person carries a lame person and jointly they reach their destination. Purusa guides the pradhanam and create Akasa etc. the second example is asmavat it is like magnet.

If you accept blind lame example, pradhanam is independent which is against your own siddhanta. Further, once you say Purusa guides pradhanam you accept activity on the part of Purusa. guiding pradhanam is an activity. Once you say Purusa guides means change is involved. That is against their own concept of Purusa for they say Purusa is nishkriya udhaseena Chaitanyam. How can indifferent Purusa take interest in pradhanam's activity. How can nishkriya Purusa changeless Purusa do any activity. These are two doshas if you take blind lame examples.

Next they say Purusa guides prakriti. Purusa does not do any activity. Being near the action takes place like a magnet attracting the iron. For this we say even if pradhanam receives guidance from Purusa from its mere presence even then it receives guidance which itself is not correct and it reveals dependence. The previous dosha continues whether Purusa actively guides or passively guides prakriti. Adhi Sankaracharya says if you say by the mere presence of Purusa prakriti will be active then the problem will be Purusa will be eternally present near prakriti and prakriti will eternally be active. There is no thinking involved either on the part of prakriti or on the part of Purusa with no thinking involved. If it is eternally active there will be no pralayam, there will be permanent sristi, prakriti will produce body, and even after liberation the body will be produced, as prakriti will be active. What is all about Vedanta? in

Vedanta other than asanga Purusa and other than prakriti we have got an Isvara who is involved in creation. this Samkya philosophy does not accept. This Isvara you may call prakriti1 pratibimba Chaitanyam and that Isvara is sarvajnah sarva saktiman and sarva karma phala dada. That Isvara will decide which jiva should be reborn and when pralaya should take place and which jiva should not be reborn. This Isvara is not there in Samkya philosophy.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Purushasmavat means Purusa activates prakriti. iti chet if this is the contention; tathapi still [add there are inconsistencies]. Now we will see the significance of the words. Purushasmavat it is a compound word of Purusa and asma and vat. It means a person and here it refers to a lame person who is on the top of blind person. second one is asamat here it means magnet. Purusa assists the blind prakriti. up to this purva paksa's view. Tatha and api means still even then in spite of such a contention [still there are problems] the problems kept in mind are prakriti will nomore be independent and Purusa will no more be inactive.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 8 [179]**

#### ***Angitvanupapatteschaa***

And again [the pradhana cannot be active] because the relation of principal [and subordinate matter] is impossible [between the three gunas].

The argument is in support of sutra 1 is continued.

The next two sutras are almost repetitive sutras that pradhanam cannot be jagat karanam. Now the subject is discussed specifically than before. Samkya theory is Purusa and prakriti were there before sristi. That Purusa does not do anything to the creation. prakriti is guanthriya samya avastha pradhanam. All three gunas are in equilibrium, and they undergo change but there will not be change in the equilibrium. Then there is a change in the equilibrium of samya avasthas of three gunas, because of the disturbance in the equilibrium there is a change in the proportion, there is domination of one guna, and the other two gunas become subservient. This is called vaisamya avastha is called Prapancha or sristi. this vaisamya avastha in which one guna is dominant and they use another expression anga angi bhavah. Sattva become anga and the other two will become angi. This is the Samkya theory of creation. we are all created being and we have all the three gunas. This is their contention and Vyasacharya contends this idea. The disturbance of equilibrium cannot be explained by the Samkya Philosopher. What is the cause behind the disturbance no one knows. We cannot say prakriti is itself is the cause. why it suddenly get disturbed and create production. The only another category involved in Purusa and they say Purusa is triggering factor but unfortunately, Purusa cannot be the activating agent. Purusa is asangatvad and it cannot undergo any change as per their own tenets. But in Vedanta there is no problem. That agent here is Isvara Chaitanyam. All these are possible and Brahma Chaitanyam but vyavaharika Isvara do not do it. Unfortunately, Samkya Philosopher has no Isvara Chaitanyam to do the job. Hence, the Samkya Philosophers cannot explain the disturbance of equilibrium.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Cha moreover; angitvanupapatteh because of the impossibility of the predominance of one guna over the other; pradhanam is not the cause. Now we will see the significance of the words. Angitvam means dominance of any one guna; anupapatteh illogical or untenable; if one guna has to become dominant the equilibrium will be disturbed and it is done only by an external agency and there is no external agency and therefore we cannot explain the changes. Everything in Samkya is acceptable except that they do not believe in Isvara. Vedanta accepts Isvara which is as real as jiva and as real as jagat. if at all Vedanta inegates Isvara it negates only that Isvara at Paramarthika level. In vyavaharika level we accept Isvara whether before or after jnanam. before jnanam pooja is to get jnanam and after getting jnanam pooja is to be done for thanking the Lord to gain liberation. that bakti or namaskara of Advaidin is more deeper than the other person. cha is to connine previous hetus.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 9 [180]**

#### ***Anyathanumitau cha jnasaktiviyogat***

Even if it be inferred otherwise on account of the pradhana being devoid of the power of intelligence [the other objections in the pradhana being the cause of the universe remain in force]

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

We will do the general analysis of this sutra. Samkya Philosopher tries to solve the problem that pradhanam cannot change the equilibrium and it requires an external agency, which is not there. If they say, that external agency is not there and if they argue that pradhanam has got in built system to get disturbed and regulate the equilibrium. For this Vyasacharya says still the problem continues. If your assumption is true, that all the problem attributed to pradhanam will come. How can that change naturally happen at the appropriate time; that independent change takes place; purposeful change and guided change is not acceptable because you do not have such a vyapti in your day to day experience. It is all because pradhanam is inert. Suppose he says why cannot I infer intelligence also is there in pradhanam. then Adhi Sankaracharya says that it is no more achetana karana vadha and you have to come to chetana karana vadha and it is nothing but Vedanta. you the vadhi unknowing become a pradhivadhi and you better accept intelligent cause and if you take intelligent and material cause then there is no problem.

Now we will go to word for word analysis. Cha anyatanumitau even if the inference is modified jnasaktiviyogat because of the absence of intelligence [the objection remains] the problem remains. The significance of the words we will see. anyatanumitih means a modified inference with regard to the nature of pradhanam; original inference is that pradhanam has got three gunas which never undergoes any change. It is in equilibrium at all times. What is the external factor, which will change pradhanam. the modified concept is that pradhanam has got in built capacity to change the equilibrium also without any external factor. Jnasakti viyogat it is chetana sakti, which means intelligence being absent. It is not intelligent enough to undergo change. Purva doshah anuvartante previously mentioned doshas continue. Skillful

activity, purposeful activity, guided activity and independent activity are not possible for the pradhanam which we have already established in the previous sutras.

## **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

#### **Sutra 10 [181]**

#### ***vipratishedhaccasamanjasam***

And moreover [the Samkya doctrine] is objectionable on account of its contradictions.

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

With the previous sutra Vyasacharya concludes his criticism the pradhanam concept of Samkya philosophy. now here he says in addition to the major defect there are so many internal contradictions in Samkya philosophy. Adhi Sankaracharya mention a few of them. It is regarding the number of sense organs. Second thing he mentions about the panca sookshma bootha karanam, which is vague. Some say mahat is karanam and in some other places, ahankara is the karanam. in short they have so many internal contradiction. This is the general analysis.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Vipratishedhat because of the internal contradictions also asamanjasam sakmya philosophy is inconsistent or defective. This si the running meaning. the significance of the word is vipratishedhat literally we mean contradiction but here it is internal contradictions. Asamanjasam means improper deficient, defective etc. cha is only to add to the previous reason. While writing the commentary on the sutra Adhi Sankaracharya introduces a purva paksa. Samkya philosopher says that Vedanta too has many contradictions. The main contradiction he mentions is how can one Chaitanyam Brahman can become Chaitanyam and achetana Prapancha. beda belongs to the vyavaharika plane and abeda is in Paramarthika level and in vyavaharika plane. One dream is divided into chetana and achetana Brahman so this is possible in real life also. ajadam is Brahma and mithya nama rupa is jadam. This Adhi Sankaracharya's answer.

Throughout the adhikaranam Vyasacharya has criticized pradhanam cannot be jagat karanam. there are few important defects emntione elsewhere. They say pradhanam is as real as Purusa. This is one big difference. In Vedanta we do not accept pradhanam as sathyam and it vyavaharika sathyam and it is not Paramarthika sathya,m. wherever two sathyams are there duality will be there and duality means samsritvam will be there. We also dismiss Purusa as bogta and that is asanga and changeless cannot experience anything for experience requires connection. Third, one is Purusa bagutvam. It is not one but Samkya philosopher says that there are many Chaitanyams which are all pervading. This also we dismiss based on sruti and the logic, which we will see during the course of discussion.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 175

### **Topic 1. Rachananupapattyadhikaranam [Sutra 1-10]**

#### **Refutation of the Samkhyan theory of the pradhana as the cause of the world**

##### **Sutra 10 [181]**

##### ***vipratishedhaccasamanjasam***

And moreover [the Samkya doctrine] is objectionable on account of its contradictions.

The argument in support of sutra 1 is continued.

The atomic theory of the vaiseshika that formless, indivisible atoms enter into the composition of the world is now refuted. Through this adhikaranam Vedantic refuted Samkya Darsanam and even though Samkya Darsanam is very close to Vedanta it has got some fundamental defect that makes it different from Vedic teachings. The main differences we saw you should remember are Samkya Philosopher says that prakriti has got kartritvam and we accept kartritvam on the part of jiva and Isvara and not on the part of prakriti. second is we do not accept prakriti swatantratvam the independence of prakriti as it is inert in nature. Any inert thing has got to have the hacking of chetana tattvam. third is prakriti as sathyam not vyavaharika sathyam but Paramarthika sathya and claims prakriti is as real as Purusa and it is dvaidda darsanam. fourth dosha is purusasya bogtritvam. Purusa is another name for Jivatma in Samkya Darsanam. in Vedanta we do not accept bogtritvam on the part of jiva. fourth dosha is purusasya Jivatma bahutvam the plurality. In Vedanta we do not accept plurality of Jivatma and that the plurality of Jivatma is a delusion in Advaidam. Plurality of Atma means one travels from mortality to mortality. Any knowledge in which Atma is seen as plural comes under rajasa jnanam. because of these five doshas are defective. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 1. mahaddirghadhikaranam [Sutra 11]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

##### **Sutra 11[182]**

##### ***Mahaddirghavadva hrasvaparamandalabhyam***

The world may originate from Brahman as the great and the long originate from the short and the atomic.

The atomic theory of the vaiseshika that formless, indivisible atoms enter into the composition of the world is now refuted.

I will give a general analysis of this adhikaranam with one sutra. in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya refutes a logical defect which is attributed to Vedanta darsanam. this is

attributed by nyaya vaiseshika philosophers. They attribute a yukti virodha to Vedanta. what is the virodha he points out is that out of the material cause and achetanam jagat the effect cannot come. from chetana achetana jagat cannot be born. Nyaya Vaishesika says when a cloth is produced out of white fibres the colour of the cloth will be white only. Samkya yoga philosopher also accept this view. It is an experienced fact. In explaining the phenomenon the Samkya philosopher says that there is whiteness of fibre alone appears in the cloth also. karana gunah karye anuvarthate. This is the Samkya yoga theory of creation. but Nyaya Vaishesika says it is not the whiteness of the fibre is not appearing in the fabric and fabric has got another whiteness which is different from the whiteness of the fibre. Fibre whiteness does not appear in the fabric. Then we ask if fibre whiteness does not appear and then how the white cloth we see. he says that fibre whiteness produces fabric whiteness. They are not identical but they are only similar. Fabric whiteness resembles fibre whiteness. Based on the he creates a law. Karna guna karye swa samana jathiyam gunantaram krijate. Property of the cause produces another property in the effect and whiteness of the fabric cloth. This another property is similar to the fibre property. The new whiteness will resemble the whiteness of the fibre property. That whiteness resemble this whiteness. This is distinct phenomena. This is karya utpatti niyama. Nyaya Vaishesika says that this law is violated in Vedanta sristi. it is very simple. You say Brahman is karanam and jagat is karyam`. If Brahman is karanam and jagat karyam and Brahman should produce a property which is similar to the property of Brahman. he says Brahman is chetana gunah. Sentiency is essential feature of Brahman. this Brahman produces jagat and naturally Brahman Chaitanyam gunam should produce another chaitanya gunam and not jadam. But our experience is that jagat is not chaitanya gunam. It is nyaya virodhah varthate and Brahman is not jagat karanam. therefore samanvaya established becomes defective. It is yukti virodha.

Siddhanta then gives the answer. the answer given by Vyasacharya is that this nyaya is not absolute nyaya and it is violated in your own darsanam. This rule is violated in Nyaya Vaishesika itself. Where is it violated? According to Nyaya Vaishesika philosopher paramanu is the jagat karanam and paramanu produces the universe. If Prithvi paramanu produces earth and Agni paramanu produces Agni. When Prithvi paramanu produces Prithvi there is gandha guna is there. When Prithvi paramanu produces earth, Prithvi paramanu guna will produce on earth the Prithvi paramanu guna earth and thus the law is maintained. Vyasacharya says it is wonderful. When you talk about guna he has given the possible attributes, he has enumerated twenty-four guna, and one of them is dimension or size the parimanah. He says paramanu has subtlety and minuteness as its property. It is invisible. He says the world is a product of paramanu. The world has got mahatvam and stholatvam as its dimension. Minuteness and subtlety are the property of paramanu. When paramanu is cause of the world, it should produce another product with the same attributes of minuteness and subtlety of the world. paramanu is endowed with property of minuteness and subtlety as the property of the world. But we find opposite attributes we see in the world that niyama is violated. Therefore Nyaya Vaishesika darsanam is wrong. He says that their law is general with some exception. He says the colour etc., we accept the law and in the case of dimension it will be different and parimana is exceptional one. this Nyaya Vaishesika should say and if you have exception some guna produce smana guna and some have exception. So Brahman also has got two guna; satta guna produces the existence property in the world and in this respect the niyama is followed and in the case of chetanatvam it is not applicable exactly like your parinama exception. Therefore you have no right to criticize our plea. We find in this andhakaranam Vyasacharya refutes yukti virodha attributed to Vedanta. the smriti virodha parihara and yukti virodha pariah has been the topic of the previous pada. In this pada defending is the aim but offending is the aim. If you remember in the pradhana pada,

Samkya philosopher pointed out by yukti virodha and we negated their argument. Here Nyaya Vaishesika points out the yukti virodha here. This adhikaranam better located in the previous pada. This is the general analysis to this adhikaranam.

Here we will see a little bit of theory of creation. they say before creation all the elements were in atomic form. this he calls paramanu. He accepts five elements and paramanus are four Prithvi, jala, Agni and Vayu. The paramanus are infinite in number. Akasa is not included in paramanu and it is eternally in the same form. as regards Nyaya Vaishesika Akasa is partless and nithyah. As regards Vedanta is concerned Akasa is not nithya. Because it is born Akasa also has got subtle avayavams. For all practical purpose, Akasa is also endowed with sookshma avayavas. He says Akasa is nithya nnd niravayavah. Other things existed in paramanu form at the time of pralaya. all jiva's karma which they call as adhristam. Paramanus do not have any motions but because of the adhristam paramanu moves and the paramanu join and a molecute is produced and in the first molecute that is produced, it is call dvianukam. Divanukam has got two paramanus. In English we can call it dyad molecule. It is combination of two paramanus. Then three dyads will combine and form trianukam. Even though we call trianukam and it means six anus will be there. it is called triad molecules. Further four triad molecules will produce chaturanugam. What Vyasacharya wants to show is that when you take the dimensions and analyse you find your own law is violated karana guna karye samana jathiyam. And to show this we should know the dimension of the each one. according to Nyaya Vaishesika theory the dimension of paramanu is called parimandalam. That is called minuteness. Or it is called parimandalah. We have a minute paramanu. To produces dyad paramanu and the dimentsion in this context is called 'smallness and shortness'. We have a small and short dyad molecule. Minute moleculite is father and it produces dyat and triad molecule. It produces big and long molecule. In Sanskrit we call it mahat dirgha trinugam anu tattva vyanukam parimandala paramanu. Minute atom produces small short dyad moleculite and small long dyad molecule. Here the substances involved are paramanu, atom producing dyat molecule and dyat molecule producing triyad moleculite. Each one has gunas also. Vyasacharya's argument if your law is to be upheld, the atom must be minute and dyad moleculite also must be minute, which is the property of the paramanu. But we find when atom produces triyad moleculite the property produced are different. So also is in the case of triyad moleculite. The law is either wrong or this is an exception. So from chetanam Brahma jada Prapancha is born. therefore yukti virodha doshah nasti. The word for word analysis will be taken up in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 176

### **Topic 1. mahaddirghadhikaranam [Sutra 11]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 11[182]**

#### ***Mahaddirghavadva hrasvaparamandalabhyam***

The world may originate from Brahman as the great and the long originate from the short and the atomic.

The atomic theory of the vaiseshika that formless, indivisible atoms enter into the composition of the world is now refuted.

Generally many people consider Brahma Sutra as a dry subject. In that so-called dry subject, also the second pada of second chapter is considered very dry subject. Here we do not learn Vedanta we do not even defend Vedanta and we only examine other systems and after lot of struggle and examination and we put it in waste paper basket. Why should we study and leave is a question and people wonder about the content of this chapter. Often this chapter very often dropped. I chose to teach it because I wanted to go through and revise it for myself. Here we do the second adhikaranam where Vyasacharya refutes Nyaya Vaishesika system. He says that from chetana Brahman achetana Prapancha cannot come emerge based on the law *karana guna karye samana jathiyam gunantram utpayati*. The property of the cause never comes to the effect. In Samkya, yoga philosophy the property of the cause inheres in the effect. In Nyaya Vaishesika, the property does not inhere in the effect but the separate property in the effect comes into effect, which is similar to the property of obtaining in the cause. This is we have discussed in detail in the last class. Vyasacharya points out the violation of law in Vedanta and on scrutiny that the law is violated in your own theory. Atom produces smaller molecule and bigger molecule. Ma produces short small dyat. Short small dyat produces big long triad molecule. This is the creation. 'MA' is the property and atom is the subject; in the second SSD, SS is the property and dyat molecule is the substance and in the third layer, triad is the substance and bigness and longness is their properties. Here the minute property in the form of atom produces big molecule in the third range. Minute atom produces big molecule, the minuteness and bigness are very different attributes, and they do not belong to the same jathi. Minuteness should produce only minute molecule, [just as the white thread can produce another fabric of whiteness] alone as the property of molecule and one is unable to explain minuteness producing bigness and longness in vaiseshika matham if they say that the moment atom produces molecule that the minuteness is lost and bigness replaces the minuteness. This argument is not acceptable because minuteness of atom is eternal property and how can it be replaced when the substance with minuteness as property produces a molecule. This argument is not tenable. He can say that minuteness is not lost but when several atoms join together and when the several minutenesses join and the cumulative effect of all minuteness becomes large. So argues. Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya say that this can be argued by Samkya yoga philosophers but not by Nyaya Vaishesika philosophers and we accept the minutenesses join together make it large. Minuteness of atom

will be there in atom and minutenesses can join and can make joined item make the product molecule large. The Vaisesika philosophers cannot apply this to because they say karana guna karye na anuvartante minuteness of the cause cannot go to the molecule and how can it make the molecule large. Little drops makes an ocean is applicable to all the systems of Vedanta, Samkya and other but this rule does not apply to Nyaya Vaishesika because for the largeness is not an addition of minuteness but aa separate property produced out of minuteness. He will never be able to explain minuteness producing the smallness or the largeness. The Nyaya Vaishesika in the case of paramanu joining and making the product molecule large and big violates the general law 'karana guna karye samana jathiyam gunantram utpayati'. In the case of dimension the exceptions are there means Vedantins also would say in the case of Vedanta also there is an exception of chetana vasthu producing achetana Prapancha. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Mahat dirghavadu like the origination of the big long diat unlike small short diat hrasvaparamandalabhyam out of small short dyat and minute atom respectively. The world is born of Brahman. the significance of the words is mahat dirghavadva mahat means big and dirghavad means long; like the big and long triad; va refers to the birth of small short dyat; just as small short dyat is born. these two are born out of hrasva paramandalabhyam short small dyat and paramandalabhyam means minute atoms. Out of chetanam Brahma achetanam Brahman can be happily born. with this the small adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 12[182]**

#### ***Ubhayathapi na karmatastadabhavah***

In both cases also [in the cases of the adrishta, the unseen principle inhering either in the atoms or the soul] the activity [of the atoms] is not possible, hence negation of that [viz., creation through the union of the atoms]

The argument against the vaiseshika system commenced in sutra 11 is continued.

First I will give you general introduction to this adhikaranam having six adhikaranam. it is called paramau jagat akaranatva adhikaranam or vaiseshika madha kandana adhikaranam. this Nyaya Vaishesika is discussed from the standpoint of creation theory. We differentiate Vedanta vaiseshika from the point of view of creation. Nyaya Vaishesika says the matter is material cause of creation and Vedanta alone says that Consciousness is material cause of the creation and it is mind boggling question. Therefore it is from this angle Nyaya Vaishesika system and it says paramanu is the basis of creation. we refute this theory. We say paramanu is not karanam for the creation. this is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you general analysis of the sutra. vaiseshika cannot explain the creation and they say before creation there were atoms. Akasa is not anu and it is all pervading principle. Before creation, all paramanus stood isolated and all alone. They remain static without relationship. The time of karma ripening came which they call adrishtam a common name for both punyam and papam. When the adrishtam is ready the paramanus run and bombard at each other. They start joining together two atoms makes dyat; three dyat make triat etc. not

only they join together and form molecule and when they join further they become visible Agni, water, Earth etc., and out the elements the bodies emerge. This is their theory of creation. Here Vyasacharya asks as to how the inert atoms join together intelligently and form this wonderful creation, body, complicated brain, sense organs etc. then he says it happens because of the effect of adristam. It is that which pushes the paramanus to combine. Vyasacharya asks where is the adristam located. There are two possibilities. One is that it should rest in paramanu itself and the situation is not better because paramanu is jadam and adristam is jadam and karma and karma phalam is jadam and paramanu is jadam and how can jada paramanu guided by jada adristam form the creation. this doll is also jadam and how can the jadam doll drive inert car. No inert object can intelligently form as one to form a chetana vasthu. Then he says Atma is eternal paramanus are eternal. He says adristam resting in the Atma guide the paramanu to join so that the world is created for the benefit of Atma to have gala time. now Vyasacharya says there is problem. in their peculiar view of Nyaya Vaishesika Atma is jadam. Atma jada dravaym they say. How come we experience as live chetana vasthu. In Atma Consciousness is generated as property and only when Consciousness property is generated and after the generation only Atma becomes chetanam. Once the property goes the Atma is jadam. In sleep one is jadam. On waking, he becomes chetanam. One condition for Atma to become chetanam is physical body. This means before sristi the conditions were not there for existence of Consciousness. during pralaya there was no Consciousness in the Atma; Atma is jadam adristam located in Atma is jadam; and how can jada Atma with jada adristam form this wonderful creation. karma means intelligent combination and it is not possible because everything under Nyaya Vaishesika system is inert like adristam is inert, intelligence is inert; Atma is inert and everything is inert. Since atomic combination is not possible how can there be dyat, triads and how can there be four elements. Since first movement of atom is not there, the possibility of the creation is not possible under Nyaya Vaishesika system. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Upayatha abhi either way na karma there is no motion in the atoms; therefore there is no combination of atoms. The significance of the words is upayatha abhi adristam resting on paramanu or adristam resting on Atma either way motion is not possible for paramanu. Prithvi paramanu should join Prithvi paramanu and not with jala paramanu. Athah therefore since motion is not there karma tad abhavat combination of atom to form molecules is impossible without the motion of atoms. Motion of atoms is not possible without chetana tattvam. if formation of molecules is not there how can there be formation of the universe.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 177

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

**Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

**Sutra 12[183]**

#### ***Ubhayathapi na karmatastadabhavah***

In both cases also [in the cases of the adrishta, the unseen principle inhering either in the atoms or the soul] the activity [of the atoms] is not possible, hence negation of that [viz., creation through the union of the atoms]

The argument against the vaiseshika system commenced in sutra 11 is continued.

We are in the third adhikaranam. here we have completed the 12<sup>th</sup> sutra in which we pointed out that paramanu can never intelligently and purposefully form the complex universe. Everything before creation happened to be inert in nature; even Atmas which exist before which are different from paramanu are also jadam according to them because Consciousness is only the property that comes after the creation why, even the adhrishta the punya and papa is said to be responsible for creation also is jadam. And whether you place in paramanu; or whether you loate adhrishta in Atma and jadam and jadam is equal to jadam only. There is no intelligence to direct the adhrishta as the soul is then inert; moreover, the soul is partless like the atoms. Consequently, there cannot be any connection between the soul and the atoms. Hence, if the adrishta inheres in the soul it cannot produce motion in the atoms, which are unconnected with the soul. it does not improve the position even after creation. We have also seen in Samkya philosophy says that inert pradhanam cannot create anything without backing of the Consciousness so also we say inert paramanus also cannot create any creation. There while discussing the Samkya philosophy, we negated the intelligent evolution and here while discussing Vaishesika philosophy Vyasacharya negates intelligent combination of paramanus, Atma and adhrishta and the resultant creation. ubhayathapi; karma movement leading to the combination is not possible and creation is not possible and therefore paramanu jagat akaravada is established and paramanu jagat karavada is established.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

**Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

**Sutra 13[184]**

#### ***Samavayaabhyupagamaccha samyadanavasthiteh***

And because in consequence of Samavaya being admitted a regressus ad infinitum results on similar reasoning [hence the vaiseshika theory is untenable]

The argument against the vaisheshika philosophy commenced in Sutra 11 continued.

In this sutra, Vyasacharya negates certain technical aspects of vaisheshika philosophy. Before negating this, we have to know what is the technical aspects. Let us now try to understand the vaisheshika system. It divides the whole system into seven padharthas. In English we can say category. The seven padharthas are as below; 1. substance dravyam in Sanskrit; 2. Property or guna; 3. Action or karma or universal or samanyam 5. the particular as opposed to universal or visheshah 6. inherence or smavayah 7. non existence or abhavah.

Dravyam means the substance that is the fundamental stuff of the entire creation; the solidity and tangibility of the universe depends on the substance. Substance is divided into many things. 2. it is the property; if the chair is the substance red. Blue, long or short the adjective in English refers to property or guna. property cannot exist independent of padhartha 1 the substance; this exists in substance inseparably; 3. it is action and activity is also inherent aspect of substance alone and you cannot separate activity from the actor the agent; if the speaking activity is to be there then the speaker has to be there. it is also resting in substance [1] inseparably. 4. The universal when we take the chair example we said chair is substance and it can have colour etc. It can also move; it has also got one universality and it has one thing in common is 'chariness' the universal unites the chair by showing that every chair has got oneness or the universality and it is called samanya oneness, manushyatvam etc. to quote a few examples. Vaisheshika points out that universal also cannot be separated from the substance [1]. It rests in dravyam; dravyam seems to be the foundation on which everything is dumped; 5. The particular is opposed to universal, universal unites all the members, and the particular separates the members. The thumb impression, the skull arrangements, the teeth arrangements etc., have particularity one from the other even though you happen to be samanya. Because visheshah is deeprooted subject the system is called vaisheshika. 2 to 5 are located in one. No padhartha singly exists and every padhartha exist in association with one. 6. it is samavayah or inherence which means the intimate relationship existing between two padharthas. Number 6 is relationship between 1 and 2, 1 and 3 and 1 and 4 and 1 and 5 is called samavayah inherence. Vyasacharya will attack this samavaya. This is a very fundamental concept of vaisheshika. It is like adhyasa the fundamental concept of Advaitam. Brahma Sutra starts with adhyasa which being the main topic on which Advaitam stands. Vishistadvaitam talks about seven types of illogicality or logical fallacy of adhyasa of Advaitam. Now there is philosophical debate between Vedanta and vaisheshika. Vyasacharya attacks samavaya. The last padhartha is absence or non existence. Vaisheshika divides non-existence into different types. There are four kinds of non-existence. Adhi Sankaracharya attacks this in his Upanishad bashyams. Abhava is attacked in Brihadharaynaka upanishad and Taittrya Upanishad etc.

Now we will find out the fallacies Vyasacharya points out here. Vyasacharya says not all the padharthas exist independently and everyone is associated with another padhartha. If all the padharthas are associated in the relationship of inherence samavaya 'itself' a padhartha and being a padhartha it also should exist in association with another padhartha. Sixth one is also a padhartha and this also should exist in number one. the sixth one inherence also should exist or be located in dravyam [1]. Suppose he says yes, Vyasacharya asks 2 is located in one in samavaya relationship; 3 is located in one in samavaya relationship; 4 is located in one in samavaya relationship and 5 samavaya is also located in one; now tell me what is the relationship of samavaya and it is located in number one; what is the relationship between the two. If he says inseparable relationship, then samavaya is resting in samavaya relationship and thus you have to introduce another samavaya. The second one where does it rest and what is



the relationship between the two. He has to refer to sambandha. he will have the defect called infinite regress and therefore he cannot explain samavaya relationship. The new samavaya will require another samavaya to connect it with the first and so on. Thus their theory is vitiated by the fault of navastha dosha or regresssus ad infinitum. The argument is faulty. Hence, the atomic doctrine which admits samavaya relationship for the union of the atoms is not admissible. It must be rejected as it is useless and as it is an incongruous assumption. Vaiseshika system circles around samavaya which suffers the above dosha. samavaya should have relationship with another padhartha like dravyam etc. you cannot explain what is the relationship between padhartha and samavaya. This is the general analysis. Now we will do word for word analysis.

Samavayabhyupagamat because acceptance of samavaya because of regresssus anavasthiteh ad infinitum and other categories so the combination of atom is not possible. This is the meaning of the sutra. samavaya bhyupagama means inherent or the sixth padhartha of seven padharthas of vaiseshika. Inseparable relationship; abhyugama acceptance; Advaidam does not accept samavaya sambadha but accepts adhyasa sambandha. samyat it means similarity; similarity between the other categories and samavaya category; this similarity creates the problem of anavasthiteh it brings regresssus ad infinitum; in their syatem samavaya is only one and here we find various samavaya which is not possible.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 14[185]**

#### ***Nityameva cha bhavat***

And on account of the permanent existence [of activity or non-activity the atomic theory is not admissible.

The argument against the vaiseshika commencing in sutra 11 is continued.

We have seen that the combination of atoms is not possible because they are inert in nature and some intelligent principle has to stimulate the action. Atma the same problem; they do not have Isvara and if they had accepted Isvara it would have solved the problem. The question is how will the motion of atom come. How it will produce the first motion. In science, the molecule or atom will remain in the same position unless such atom is compelled to change its position by an external force. Since he does not ave any intelligent being he will have to say that motion is the swabhava of the action. External agent is required for incidental property and for the intrinsic property. Supposer they claim they have motion inherently. Then Isvara is not required. If you say paramanu is the enteral motion and then you cannot accept the concept of pralaya where creation is dismantled or resolved. All paramanu gets separated and will remain in paramanu form without any combination. How will you explain pralya avastha where paramanu remain static? It the motion is inherent pralaya cannot be explained. If motionlessness is the inherent quality then sristi cannot be there. The integration and disintegration is an intelligent phenomena framed in the creation of law. This is the general analysis. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; nithyameva because of permanent existence of the essential nature of atom your theory of creation is untenable. Eva is for emphasis. Nithyam means permanently; existence means essential nature. The only way is both of them are not essential nature and separation comes at the time of pralayam and once you say it is of incidental nature; then I will ask as to how bring the power to be of incidental nature. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 178

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 14[185]**

#### ***Nityameva cha bhavat***

And on account of the permanent existence [of activity or non-activity the atomic theory is not admissible.

The argument against the vaiseshika commencing in sutra 11 is continued.

In this second pada of the second chapter Vyasacharya primarily talks about the defects in the other systems of philosophy of which two are prominent in the asthika systems namely Samkya yoga and Nyaya Vaishesika system. Aasthika syatems accept vedapramana but do not accept Isvara. All others are only feeble purva paksa. Of these two also Samkya yoga is considered to be the main purva paksa to the Vedanta system. Samkya yoga has already been refuted from sutra 1 to 10. Now we are in Nyaya Vaishesika system. Vyasacharya points out the loophole in the system particularly in the theory of creation. It is from the creation angle Vedanta is introduced by Vyasacharya. Since it is creation based Vedantic teaching we hover around through the study. They the Nyaya Vaishesika could not explain the intelligent combination of paramanu because of the absence of intelligent principle behind Atma, paramanu, adhistam etc., which are inert in nature and they do not believe in God. Only one way they can try to escape by saying the movement of action is intrinsic nature of atom. Atom moment they said is natural and you do not require Isvara. If that is so it will be eternal and then the combination of atom will be eternal and the creation will be eternal and pralayam cannot be explained. Then we discussed paramanu samyoga, dyat, triyat etc., formation will be eternal without any pralaya. In case if they said took the plea that paramanu, atom etc., will be motionless then sristi cannot take place because according to them sristi is combination of atom, adhistam, paramanu. Dyat, triat etc. Intelligent motion should start at the time of creation and stop at the time of pralayam and it should coincide with the karma of each jivaris. Even managing the death one individual is difficult` and it should be connected with ten members of the family and each one is affected according to the karma of every individual. Then imagine the samasti pralayam.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 15[186]**

### ***Rupadimatvacca viparyayo darsanat***

And on account of the atoms possessing colour, etc., the opposite [of which nthe vaiseshika hold would take place] because it is seen or observed.

The argument against vaiseshika is continued.

First we will do the general analysis. Here Vyasacharya, points out that vaiseshika cannot explain the eternity of paramanu. There are many logical problems. The nature paramanu they say is eternal and it is the ultimate cause of everything<sup>1</sup>. They also say paramanu is niravayavam and it has properties depending upon the nature of the paramanu. If it is the paramanu of Prithvi then it has got sabda, rupa, gandha, sparsa and rasa; if it is jala paramanu it has got four properties; Agni three and Vayu three. Of these, four exist in the form of paramanu and it is aprathyaksam. Therafter it forms dyat, triyat etc., formation. Thus all the combination of paramanus will form Prithvi and in the end the entire universe. They say visibility starts from triyat only while paramanu and dyat are not visible at all. Dyat or triyat all will have the same guna of the cause on the effects. Panca gunas of the dyat will produce on the triyat and will there throughout the creation. All these characteristics of paramanu how do you come to know. What is the pramanam for this. That is why our philosophic system starts with the source of knowledge. Some system accept one pramanam and others accept two and some three etc. Prathyaksam is not pramanam because it is invisible; sastra is pramanam because sastra does not talk of paramanus. It talks of maya as pramanam. Nowhere sastra talks paramanu as pramanam. Only you have to go by anumanam. Samkya's prakriti is anumana pramanam. So also Nyaya Vaishesika. It talks through anumanam pramanam. Vedanta says prakriti is knowable through sastra alone; but Samkya says prakriti is proved through anumanam and they say sastra is secondary pramanam. Nyaya Vaishesika says paramanu is also inferentially proved. Based on experience all produces endowed with colour etc., is perishable. This is a valid vyapti, which we can gather from our experience of the universe. There is no exception at all. Once the vyapti is derived that an anumanam on your paramanu also. Paramanu anithyah. This inference you cannot refuse because it is based on vyapti, which is un-negatable. To show that paramanu is an exception you require evidence. Where is the evidence? To classify one an exception you require an anumanam. Inference does not support and sastra you do not believe. Therefore logic reveals that paramanu is of the nature that is opposed to your postulate that paramanu is nithyam but it is actually anithyam. Thus, it is proved that paramanu is anithyam. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; viparyayah atoms have an opposite attribute. Rupadhi matvad since they have properties like colour darsanat and since it is experienced so; the significance of the words is rupadi matvat because of the presence of colour etc., sound, touch etc., and these properties are in Prithvi with panca gunas Agni with four etc., cha is conjunction to join the previous sutra viparyayah means it has an opposite nature; here reverse means opposite attributes that is paramanu has got opposite attribute which is impermanence is the opposite attribute of permanence which vaiseshika claims. This logical impermanence is opposite attribute of their claimed permanence. Since paramanu has got colour etc., it is impermanent. Darsanat this is our experience. This experience refers to vyapti siuce vyapti is experience based. It is invariable coexistence. Vyapti that we experience is the co-existence is the colour and impermanence. In Vedanta, only permanence is Brahman, which is Nirgunam. Sagunatvad anithyam and nirgunatvad nithyah.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 16[187]**

#### ***Ubhayatha cha doshat***

And because of defects in both cases [the atomic theory cannot be accepted.

The argument against vaiseshika is continued.

First, we will do the general analysis. In this Vyasacharya says that vaiseshika cannot talk about the uniformity of the atoms. He says that the Prithvi paramanu, jala paramanu, Vayu paramanu and Agni paramanu are not minute and partless and therefore they are uniform. But Vyasacharya says that it is not so, because although they are paramanus, they have differences interms of the number of propertites; Prithvi has got four gunas jala three gunas and Vayu paramanu has got two gunas and since number of properties vary, the density vary and hence they are not uniform. When the paramanu form the core elements, in the visible elements we see the difference in density. Prithvi is solid; jalam is subtler; Agni is subtler and Vayu still subtler and we see the differences in bhutas in terms of gunas and the density and how can they be called uniform. Therefore sthoola taratamyam, Sookshma taratamyam will be there at the level of paramanu but they do not accept the gradation and they do not accept the fact. To avoid this they should say all the bhutas have got pancha gunas and then the problem is when all paramanus have got same panca gunas and when they become visible elements and they also will have equal pancha gunas. What is the guna at the karya level will continue in the karana level and the characteristics of paramanu alone will form the characteristics of the bhutas which being the combination of paramanus at different degrees. This is not correct. Then they may say that all the paramanus will have one guna and then the products will have only one guna. Since we have gradation at the bhuta level, there will be gradation at paramanu level also which the Nyaya Vaishesika do not accept, thus there is dosha at paramanu level of what Nyaya Vaishesika says. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Cha moreover; doshat since there are defects; uphayatha either way [the vaiseshika system is wrong or defective]. Uphayatha means either way it means whether all the four paramanus have one guna whether all have more gunas or different gunas; doshat means there are defects. Complete it by adding paramanu karana vadha is wrong.

### **Topic 3. Paramanujagadakaranatvadhikaranam;[Sutra 12-17]**

#### **Refutation of the vaiseshika view**

#### **Sutra 17 [188]**

#### ***Aparigrahacchatyantamanapeksha***

And because [the atomic theory] is not accepted [by authoritative sages like Manu and others] it is to be totally rejected.

The argument against vaisheshika is concluded.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya first said that Samkya philosophy has its own defects and now Nyaya Vaishesika has logical defects through this adhikaranam. Now he says both the systems have logical defects. Even then, Samkya yoga system has one plus point. That is because of its little bit closeness to Vedanta. Traditional acharyas have borrowed some ideas from Samkya and it is used in some of the smritis. In Gita also we find sristi prakriya based on Samkya yoga. 7.4 of Bhagavad Gita says *bhumir apo'nala-vayuh kham mano buddhir eva ca hamkara iti'yam me bhinna prakrtir astadha*. The meaning of this sloka is earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind, understanding, and self-sense – this is the eightfold division of My nature. So declares Lord Krishna. Para prakriti is Samkya based understanding. Again in 13.5 Gita says *mahabhutany ahamkareo buddhir avyahyam eva ca indriyani dasai 'ham ca panca ce ndriyagocarah* the meaning of the sloka is the great [five gross] elements, Self sense, understanding, as also the unmanifested, the ten senses and mind and the five objects of the senses. In fact, even in Tattva bodha sristi prakaranam of Samkya is discussed. Chaturvimsadi tattva is based on Samkya. Nyaya Vaishesika does not have even the partial acceptance. Therefore, Nyaya Vaishesika system very useless for it and us is to be negated in Toto. He says it is an intellectual exercise for sharpening the brain. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to word for word analysis.

Aparigrah means because of the non-acceptance by traditional acharyas. Vaisheshika system is totally rejected. Aparigrah the ideas of Nyaya Vaishesika are not at all borrowed by any other system. They have evolved a system of anumanam or inference that is how to logically see things. They also talk about the logical fallacy. The logical and anumana portion of Tarka sastra is useful and other than that, their system of philosophy is not useful to us. The very definition of Brahman is jagat karanam and world has come out of Brahman. Since this is the primary definition and from this angle only Vyasacharya wants to see the other systems of philosophy. With regard to jagat karanam alone, the main difference is there with other philosophies. Vyasacharya differentiates other darsanas from Vedanta only on single topic of jagat karanam. In one topic all other systems differ with Vedanta and the uniqueness is that chetana upadana karana is said to be Brahman in Vedantic system. In the last sutra Vyasacharya hints that not only jagat karanam but also various other differences are there without going to detail. Even though Nyaya Vaishesika, Samkya, and Vedanta have differences and in what way the difference is there in Nyaya Vaishesika, is that the difference between Vedanta and Nyaya Vaishesika is much more. No student need feel guilty if he had not studies other darsanams. You know only be thorough with what is said in Brahma Sutra about other darsanams it is sufficient it is said. But Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary has pointed out one or two more difference in Nyaya Vaishesika system. This Nyaya Vaishesika philosopher talks of three dimensions. One is anu dimension and the other is vibhu dimension [parimanah] vibhu parimana means Infinite dimension. Anu is Infinitely small and vibhu is Infinitely large. Everything is in between anu and vibhu infinitely small, Infinite big and in between Infinitely small and infinitely big. Mind also in this system it is anu. All paramanus including mind is anu. There is one Akasa but atmas are Infinite all pervading atmas are there. Atma and Akasa re examples for vibhu and paramanu and mind are examples for paramanu. All of them come under madhyama parinama. They point out Infinitely small also is eternal and infinitely big is eternal. Infinitely small is eternal because it cannot be disintegrated further and similar Infinitely big Akasa is also eternal because Akasa cannot be assembled together and therefore it has to be eternal. Anu is not assembled, vibhu is also not assembled, and therefore both are eternal. All madhyama parinama are non-eternal. They formed by anu parinama and vibhu parimana and both are niravayava, which

means both are partless. Madhyama parinama vasthu are formed by building block and when combined it is block when disintegrated it is destroyed. What Adhi Sankaracharya says is once you accept niravaava Akasa, Atma, you cannot talk about the combination at all and the combination requires avayavam. You always combine one part with another part. Samyoga require avayavam or part and when part is not there then samyoga is not possible. The space is niravayava, it has not parts, and we cannot able to combine space with anything. Therefore Akasa samyoga rahitah and it is pratyaksam. We say paramanu also being niravayava cannot have sambanda with anything; Atma also cannot have any samyoga with anything. Paramanu is Infinitely small and it cannot have any samyoga with anything being niravayavatmam. Therefore the very creation starts with paramanu dvaya samyogah asambhavah. Therefore dyanukam is not possible.. In short the arrival of bogya Prapancha you cannot explain. Similarly according to Nyaya Vaishesika Atma is niravayavam and it is Infinitely big and partless; mind is Infinitely small and partless. Both are partless and unfortunately, both are inert in themselves. During pralaya it will be inert. When Atma and mind combine, Consciousness arises. Here also Adhi Sankaracharya points out many problems. First Atma is partless bit Infinitely big and mind is Infinitely small and partless and how can the samyoga possible between Infinitely small Atma and Infinite big mind. Because of the same reason Atma mana smayoga is not possible and therefore Consciousness cannot be generated. If Consciousness cannot be generated the bogtru jiva cannot be born. In Nyaya Vaishesika philosophy bogtru jivah cannot be explained and bogya Prapancha cannot be explained. He also points out talking about Atma manas samyoga is not possible with Atma Infinite and mind is Infinite. Any two finite things can combine and how could all pervading Atma and atomic mind combine. It is not possible. How can they have contact between them an event in time? When they combine how many atmas are there and how many minds are there. All atmas will encounter the entire mind and if I come in contact with some other person and there is lot of problems. I pointed out earlier substance property action universal and particular. All have inseparable relationship between one and 2,3 and four and five. Samavaya sambanda is nithya sambanda. Then one more is added to the list and that is between two dravyam the substances also sambanda is possible. Two substances can have eternal relationship under one condition. But this sambanda is not inseparable relationship. The condition is that when thesn two dravyams are related as karana karya sambanda or the cause and effect relationship. The pot and clay is the best example quoted here. Adhi Sankaracharya attacks this also. How can the karya dravyam and karana dravyam as though they are two relationships. Here there is not two substances pot and clay and substance is one only. Because of the peculiar theory of Nyaya Vaishesika they call clay and pot as separate substances and both have karana karya relationship as though they are two separate substances. Then also Adhi Sankaracharya asks they can have nithya sambanda. Karana dravyam and karya dravayam has nithya sambanda. Then the sambandhi should be nithyam. Karya dravyam being anithyam according to you how can there be nithya sambanda between nithya and anithya dravyam. Your very division of the category itself is found to be defective Adhi Sankaracharya says. When substances and properties are inseparable, why should you enumerate them separately? Why do you enumerate guna separately when it is inseparable from the substances? You have included samavayah a form of relationship is included in this category. A separable relationship he does not put in the category of the seven pointed out earlier. Why cannot you include the separable relationship in the above category? The very division of the universe is full of defects. This is a powerful attack from the Vedantins. Thus, there are so many problems and therefore after learning you try to forget the whole thing which being not of much useful for the study of Vedanta. With this vaiseshika madha negation is over.

Some of the other differences Adhi Sankaracharya has discussed in his bashyam, which we will see in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 179

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 18 [189]**

#### ***Samudaya ubhayahetuke'pi tadapraptih***

Even if the [two kinds of] aggregates proceeds from their two causes, there would take place non-establishment [of the two aggregates]

After refuting the atomic theory of vaiseshika the Buddhistic theories are now refuted

Before I go to the next adhikaranam I will give you the lay out of Brahma Sutra. We have twelve darsanams and six are asthika and six nasthika darsanams. One accepts Veda pramanam and the other do not accept Veda pramanam. Darsanam means a view. The conclusions arrived at through unaided reasoning is called philosophy. Here the scripture should not come under the study. Philosophy is speculative and it is part of the human intellect alone. The world philosophy is applicable to nasthika darsanams alone.

Six asthika darsanams are Samkya and yoga; nyaya and vaiseshika and purva and uttara mimamsaka. All the six are called asthika darsanams. Of this Samkya yoga accepts Veda and they are tarka pradhana and they are heavily tarka based. Similar Nyaya Vaishesika are also tarka pradhana. Since Nyaya Vaishesika is more tarka pradhana, they are far away from Vedas. All are called asthika. The first adhikaranam of Brahma Sutra tarka pradhana Samkya yoga was negated and later Nyaya Vaishesika is negated. Purva Mimamsa problem is other extreme and he is so Veda pradhana and he left out tarka totally and therefore many of his conclusions are difficult to swallow. He will say karma phalam is swarga and we cannot accept it being Veda vakyam. Therefore moksa is nothing but going to swarga by performing the rites. He does not want to question anything other than Vedas. Vedanta is different and he accept reasoning. Just as body can digest iron in the form of keera and you cannot eat iron. Buddhi can digest only the language that it can accept and understand. So he says shruti and buddhi should be taken up for consideration. Vyasacharya does not directly discuss Purva Mimamsa. Purva Mimamsa is also refuted in samanvaya adhikaranam. When we refute Purva Mimamsa or Karma Kanda of Vedas, we do not refute Karma Kanda of Veda but we refute wrong interpretation of Karma Kanda. Even analysis of ritual is required, Purva Mimamsa you can use nothing is wrong, and analysis of methods of performing the rituals you take it but do not take that kamra will give moksa but take it that it will purify the mind. He has said that Purva Mimamsa is important but at the same time he says that it should not taken for gaining liberation. All the five darsanams have been refuted and sixth being the Vedanta darsanam is ours and there is no question of negating it. Now we are ready to refute the nasthika darsanam. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 180

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 18 [189]**

#### ***Samudaya ubhayahetuke'pi tadapraptih***

Even if the [two kinds of] aggregates proceeds from their two causes, there would take place non-establishment [of the two aggregates]

After refuting the atomic theory of vaiseshika the Buddhistic theories are now refuted

With the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra we have completed the first three adhikaranam of the second chapter of second pada. First was devoted to the negation Samkya yoga darsanam and later Nyaya Vaishesika darsanam and Purva Mimamsa was negated in the first chapter. In short all the five asthika darsanams have been critically analysed and we had negated the various defects observed in their philosophies and upheld Vedanta alone stuck to the Vedas in letter and spirit. After dismissing asthika darsanams, we enter the nasthika darsanams, which are six in number. Of them four schools of Buddhism belong to nasthika darsanam which negate Vedas. Fifth one is jaina darsanam and sixth is caravaka darsanams. Of these six darsanams Vyasacharya does not discuss caravaka. It discusses that the body is sentient because of the peculiar combination of the elements and they do not accept karana sariram, Atma, Sookshma Sariram etc. They consider that the birth of the individual and the death of the body is the death of the individual. Their philosophy is presented as enjoy as long as your are around and do not bother about purva janma punya papam and the effect of punya papam on the future janma. Have money to enjoy the pleasure and pain. They do not believe in next janma once the body is reduced to ashes. They do not believe in artha and kama and they do not believe in dharma and swarga or moksa. Such a kind of philosophy we do not even want to discuss about that for discussion on such a subject is considered a sin. In Brahma sutra Vyasacharya has discussed this subject. Of the five darsanams Bouddha darsanam has been discussed in detail. Now we enter the Bouddha darsanam in this adhikaranam.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is fairly big adhikaranam with ten sutras. This adhikaranam deals with Bouddha darsanam. In Mandukya Upanishad four of their vaibashika, choutrantika, yogachara and madhyantika madhams were discussed. Adhi Sankaracharya reduces the four madhams into three for the sake of our study. Here vaibashika and choutrantika madham and this group is called jnana artha ubhaya asthitva vadha. Jnanam means knowledge or ideas; all the vritti jnanam comes under this category; artha means object of the cognition; every cognition must have corresponding objects. In the place of padam we take cognition and object of cognition. Cognition is inside and object of cognition is outside; it is antaram and bashyam. Do we accept the existence of both of them? It is very big discussion in all the systems of philosophy. Ultimately the

discussion boils down to Consciousness and matter study. It is a system, which accepts both the cognition and the corresponding objects.

Naturally an aside discussion will come and that is whether vaibhashika and chourantika accept jnanam and artha and if so why should we subdivide them into two? I will give you a simple explanation. Of these two, one of them says that the object is there and it is inferred one; the other one says that it is perceived object. One talks of anumana pramana and the other one talks of pratyaksa pramanam. The existence of an external object they call that the external world is there whether it is inferred or perceived. This is called Bouddha darsanam one discussed in Brahma Sutra.

The next is yogachara madham. It accepts the jnanam alone and do not accept the corresponding objects. They believe in cognition and not accept cognized object. It is jnana matra arthitva vadha. The next one is called sunya vadha or madhyantika madham. Here they believe in jnana artha ubhaya nasthitva vadha. They don't accept cognitions as also cognized objects also and that is why it is called sunya vadha. One says two are there and one says one is there and third one says nothing is there. Of these three divisions Vyasacharya does not deal with the third one that is ubhaya nastitva vadha or sunyavadha. The reason is that there is neither the subject nor the cognized object and are you the purva paksi is there or not. If you say your madham is not there being neither the subject nor the object. To avoid the problem if you I the Purva Paksi is not there means why should I answer since Purva Paksi is sunyam. This argument is given by vidyaranya in his panca dasi. He says you can never negate everything for negator cannot negate the negator. It is not absence of everything else is the sunyam is talked about. Only jnana artha ubhaya arthitva vadha and jnana matra ubhaya arthitva vadha are discussed here.

What does the Jnana artha ubhaya arthitva vadha say about the creation is the topic of our discussion here. Creation is a combination. The object is also a combination and the subject is also a combination. Otherwise it is called aggregates. Since we explain the creation is a combination, we call it samudaya vadha or sangatha vadha. It is the theory of combination or aggregation. It is different from the asat karya vadha of Nyaya Vaishesika and sat karya vadha of Samkya yoga.

What is difference from Samkya theory of creation and nyaya theory of creation and Bouddha theory of creation. The matter modifies into universe or it called parinama avadha. The matter changes to become the creation are their theory. In Nyaya Vaishesika theory matter does not modify to become the world but matter produces the fresh world which was non-existence before. Since it talks of production of a fresh entity, it is called arambha vadha. In the Bouddha theory of creation, he does not talk about of modification or he talks about production but it is only a simple combination without any modification. When the milk becomes curd, there is modification but when you make fruit salad, nothing modifies and you take various fruits and combine them together and it is called combination or sangathah. Here nothing changes. We have parinama vadha, sangatha vadha and aramba vadha. We do not accept all the three. We do not accept parinama vadha theory because Brahman never undergoes any change; we do not accept arambavadha theory of creation because creation is anadi. There is no question of combination because Brahman is one. Vedanta has got vivartha vadha. Aramba vadha belongs to Nyaya Vaishesika; sangatha vadha relates to Bouddha madham; parinama vadha relates to Samkya philosophy and Vedanta vadha is vivartha vadha.

The Bouddha accepts the subject and objects and the subject as also the object are combination. He is absolutely similar to Nyaya Vaishesika and he also says paramanus are the blocks. They say that we have Agni paramanu, Prithvi paramanu, jala paramanu and Vayu paramanu and they are Infinite in number and the four paramanu combine and produce the entire world. The combination of all the four becomes the creation they say. But there is a difference between Bouddha and Nyaya Vaishesika . Nyaya Vaishesika says paramanus are eternal but Bouddha says that there is nothing eternal and everything is ksanigam. All the paramanus are ksanagam and therefore sarvam ksanigam they say. They say that the paramanus produce the elements and the elementals by some combination. Paramanu is of four types. What about the subject the individual? Individual is also another samudhayah or assemblage. This subject is assembly of four types of paramanus. Here we say the skandha and it is a technical name of buddistic philosophy. The basic unit is called skandha. They are five in number. When the five join together, you are assembled. Panca samudhayah makes the objective world and panca skandha samudhayah makes the subjects, the individuals. What are the five skandhas?

They are the following. 1. Rupa skandha; this means the sense organs; indriya skandha; 2. Vijnana skandha the cognition or the knowledge comes under this category; here vijñanam means momentary cognition. It has nothing to do with the nitya Chaitanyam of Vedanta; we see cognitions and cognitions; 3. Samjna skandha here it refers to identification or specification. The moment cognition takes place the job of the intellect is identification. Here jati guna etc., are the identification tag and this is called samjna and buddhi has got the slot where all the cognitions are noted within. That tagging is called samjna. 4. Vedana skandha. Once you tag the object you react or respond to the tagging you are happy, you are unhappy or you experience the both; one calls an incident happy another calls it unhappy and the third one call it is experience of both. 5. It is samskara skandha it is the experience of the feeling. You use the experience for the future. They include dharma and adharma in samskara skandha. Thus we have five skandhas. They are the building blocks on which the body is kept together. All these panca skandhas are also ksanigam and momentary. I am momentary and you are momentary. Continuity they call it a delusion and it is like a flame. Really speaking since the oil is exhausted we can infer it is not the same flame. The very fact that you add the oil indicates that the flame is a flow but to our eye it looks like a flame. It is also said that the body is like a river where there is a constant flow of water but it looks as if the water is the same. Even our body it is said changes continuously and the blood in our body goes on changing. In fact medically speaking your body now and two years before are totally replaced. It is only an assumption and it is not a fact. This is samudhaya vadha. This is a general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we will see general analysis. Vyasacharya says that the combination is not possible both in the case of objective world and in the case of the skandha panca samudhaya. The reason is the same. An inert thing cannot intelligently or purposefully combine in a well-directed manner. This is the argument we give to all the darsanams. Achetanatvad jadatvad. But this is true in the case of the skandha pancakam or individual combination because one of the five skandhas happens to be vijñanam. Why cannot combination happen intelligently? Combination is possible only if they join and before combination, cognition is not there. Therefore, both are not possible. Now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Samudaya means the aggregate; in the case of twofold aggregate or assemblage or combination ubhayabetuke api which has twofold cause their combination itself is inexplicable; the significance of each word I will explain in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 181

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 18 [189]**

#### ***Samudaya ubhayahetuke'pi tadapraptih***

Even if the [two kinds of] aggregates proceeds from their two causes, there would take place non-establishment [of the two aggregates]

After refuting the atomic theory of vaiseshika the Buddhistic theories are now refuted

Samkya yoga and Nyaya Vaishesika theory of creation has already been negated and now Vyasacharya has taken up the Bouddha madham. This poses a fundamental question whether Vyasacharya is after Buddha or Buddha was after Vyasacharya. Vyasacharya seems to belong to long before and how can he be there after Buddha. There is discrepancy here and many reasons are given. They that there are two Vyasa. One Vyasa existed before Buddha and the other Badarayana Vyasa is of latter century and according to them Brahma Sutra was written by the second Vyasa. They say that there is only one Vyasa who is the author of puranas or Brahma sutra. They never bother about the history. One answer they give is that vyasa is a sage of jnana dristi and he can refute things that comes in the future. Another argument is that Vyasa is chiranjivi and therefore he existed before and after Buddha. We need not bother about this because we do not have any clear proof in the matter.

We saw that the four schools of Buddhism are eka asthitva vadha, ubhaya asthitva vadha and ubhaya nasthitva vadha. Adhi Sankaracharya negates only the first two. As far as Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya are concerned that ubhaya nasthitva vadha is unfit to discuss in the Brahma Sutra. In this andhakaranam ubhaya adthitva vadha and eka jnana matra asthitva vadha will be taken up for discussion.

Ubhayam means sarvam or also it is called Hinayana Buddhism. Hinayana means inferior branch of Buddhism. Another one is called mahayanam the superior path. The hinayanam is subdivided into choutranika and vaibhashika. We discuss only vaibhashika Buddhism. Choutrantika Buddhism is pratyaksa bashayarta. Arthitva vadhi and the choutrantika is the anumana bashyarta arthitva vadhi. External world is there independent of cognition. This vadha hinayana is refuted in the samudhaya adhikaranam. The external world and the individual can never be created according to your theory of creation argues Vyasacharya. The subject or individual is combination of skandha samudhayah. Paramanu chatustaya samudhaya. Both cannot be explained. Paramanu caused external world and skandha caused subject also cannot be explained by you because the reason given in Nyaya Vaishesika that purposeful combination requires intelligent principle. An inert thing cannot combine without the backing of the intelligent principle. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Samudaye means combination. Otherwise, it is called sangathah. By the word samudhaya two types of combination, one is objective combination, which is otherwise called the bogya

Prapancha. The second samudhaya kept in mind is the subjective skandha samudhayah. One is paramanu samudhaya and another is skandha samudhaya bogya samudhaya and bogtrun samudhaya. Ubhayabetuke two samudhaya have got the material cause bogya samudhaya is one of paramanu samudhaya and the other is skandha samudhaya. The paramanu skandha samudhaya forms bogya Prapancha and bogtru the subject individual. There are two samudhaya formed of skandha and paramanus.tadaprapthih means combining process; this is untenable and it is incomprehensible. It will not take palce and it cannot be established. We have got only material cause and we do not have intelligent cause. Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam there are some additional points.one is the same argument given in vaiseshika case. Bouddha says the combining activity is the intrinsic nature of paramanu. Therefore paramanu includes the skandha also. In the case of intrinsic nature you don't require the intelligent factor. There is no need of Bhagavan. The nithyam eva cha abhavad. This argument has been given in Nyaya Vaishesika negation taken up in the earlier sutra. Constant creation leads to constant pralayam. Either activity should be of intrinsic nature or the inactivity should be the intrinsic nature. In the case of the former there will be no pralaya and in the case of the latter there will be no creation. If there is sristi for sometime and pralaya for sometime the activity comes and goes and if that is so, the activity if not of intrinsic nature. Then you require some intelligent principle and that being absent you cannot create. This is one point of argument.

Vaiseshika philosopher has said the world is born out of paramanu combination and Bouddha also says the world is born out of paramanu. The common problem between the two is that both do not have any intelligent principle. Vaiseshika says paramanu is eternal. And therefore paramanu can slowly and comfortabnly combine together and form the universe. And it is able enough to combine. Bouddha's paramanu is ksanicam and even as it occurs the next moment it is gone. It has enough time only to appear and disappear. Seeing the second paramanu and it does not exist for any activity to take place. It does not have even a second ksana for combination activity. So combination activity cannot take place and before it takes place the paramanu will disappear.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

##### **Sutra 19 [190]**

##### ***Itaretarapratyayatvaditi chennotpattimatranimittatvai***

If it be said that [the formation of aggregates may be explained through [nescience] standing in the relation of mutual causality, we say no; they merely are the efficient cause of the origin [of the immediately subsequent links and not the aggregation]

An objection against sutra 18 is raised and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Bouddha tries to answer the objection raised in the previous sutra. Vyasacharya refutes the answer given by the Bouddha. He says this combination can be formed even without Isvara. You say Isvara is required for the combination. I say that without Isvara such combination is possible. Our answer is that there is a causal chain, which is responsible for the formation of the sangathah, the world as well as the individual. When the causal change can explain the combination why do we require Isvara and that causal change is called nidhanam that is sued for the causal change. The

causal change consists of 12 changes. The causal change begins with avidhya, vijnana, nama rupa, vedana, Krishna, vyathi, jara and marana. This avidyadi dvadasa chakra is responsible that will lead to one sangatha and then another sangatha. This theory of causal circle is wellknown buddhistic theory. It is theory of dependent origination. It means each one originates depending upon the previous one and thus there are twelve members are there. Karma produces sariram and sariram produces karam. We have one two items but Bouddha system has got twelve items that comes in circle. For which Vyasacharya answers that these twelve nidhanams require a sariram for asraya. Their very existence presupposes a body or a jiva. We talk about avidhya. Ignorance is for the individual. Remember in Vedanta avidhya has got Brahman has got the locus and that Brahman is absent in Buddhism and avidhya is located in individual and avidhya presupposes already existent sangatha. There is a jiva and that jiva has got avidhya and because of avidhya he has all that follows. It can explain the sarira and its effect, existence of avidhya etc., but it does not explain the first sariram. Suppose you say avidhya is the cause of sangatha then avidhya cause should exist even before sangatha is formed, my parents should have existed before me. So avidhya is the cause and you cannot explain the existence of sangatha. Therefore, avidhya etc., are only explaining the 12 members of the causal change but they do not explain the sangatha of origination. From avidhya raga dvesah is understandable. You can say avidhya is responsible for causal change but you cannot explain as how avidhya came that you cannot explain. Avidya etc., can be the cause of the latter members of the causal change but it can never be the cause of sangatha, which is the locus of the causal change. This is the answer given by Vyasacharya. You give only the nimitta karana explanation but you do not give the upadana karana explanation. Now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Itaretarapratyayatvad means because of the cyclic change of causality [the formation or the combination can be explained] this is said by Bouddha purva paksa. If this is the contention na it is not acceptable. Utpattimatranimittatvat because the link of the causal change [each member of the causal change i.e. Twelve members] the links of the causal change are the causes of the next link only; [and not the cause of the sangatha]. This is the running meaning.

The significance of the word is itaretarapratyayatvad means mutual or one another in this context Buddhist terminology pratyayata means karanam; karanam runs to make the karyam. Each one is the cause of the next one and next one is the cause of the next one. Each one is cause of the other. Janma is the cause of karma and karma is the cause of janma. So also the twelve cycles of Bouddha philosophy. Because of the dependent origination. You complete the sentence for the Buddhist the combination can be established without Isvara. Utpattimatranimitat it means of the twelve member of the causal change one is responsible for the previous member; each one is the cause of utpatti of one of the twelve members. Sangatha is not any one of them and it is asraya where all other members are there. For samskara sangatha is there and asraya sangatha is taken for granted while talking of sangatha and it is not explained. It is like talking of the first jiva. How jiva is formed is our question. Karma janyam is Isvara. Uttara nithana utpattih tan matram utmantra nimmatam tvad because of the causal change id the cause for the birth of only the nnext member and not the sangatha which is the locus. Sangatha formation is not explained fully. Adhi Sankaracharya writes much more. He says that everything is ksanigam. This causal change is convincing. Who will work for bogha or moksa when I know that I will nt be there when bogha and moksa comes. What is the use of working for shreyas and preyas. I work for gaining liberation after some time and I will be there to enjoy. When in ksaniga vijnana one is alive for aksanigam and how is purusartha is there to reap the fruits of my karma. Therefore, in whose aid I am working and the Bouddha sastram is futile and useless. More in the next class

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 182

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 19 [190]**

#### ***Itaretarapratyayatvaditi chennotpattimatranimittatvai***

If it be said that [the formation of aggregates may be explained through [nescience] standing in the relation of mutual causality, we say no; they merely are the efficient cause of the origin [of the immediately subsequent links and not the aggregation]

An objection against sutra 18 is raised and refuted.

In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya negates Hinayana Buddhism. According to them we have bashya Prapancha and adhyatmika Prapancha and both are conglomeration of anumana and skanda assemblage. Here Vyasacharya points out that there is formation or conglomeration. In the absence of intelligence, such conglomeration or combination is not possible. Bouddha has no belief in Isvara or any intelligent cause to back the combination. In this regard, Bouddha philosophers point out twelve factors that are behind the combination. He says that this cyclic change of the twelve factors will continue in one's life both present and future. Each one becomes the cause of the next one and we do not require a god they say. Each one depends upon the previous nidhanam. The causal change does not explain because like avidhya, knowledge etc., cyclic chain presupposes the existence of sangatha the individual body. You can talk of ignorance of the individual and even the formation of jnanam is based upon the individual. The cyclic change does not explain the causation of the individual. What happens after can be explained but one cannot explain how the first event happened. The answer is that the cyclic change exists before sangatha and how did the sangatha takes place is our problem, which has not been explained. If it existed before production where did it exist is our question. Where was the cyclic change before the sangatha which is not explained. One more possibility one can assume and answer. The possibility is that the causal change even before the sangatha was formed. We ask the question where did it exist. There is one possibility that before the assembly the causal change existed means it should be in paramanu or in skandha. Before sangatha assemblage is formed skandha existed and skandha is panca skandha and it existed before the formation of sangatha. Skandha must have existed before or you must place them in paramanu which are the constituents of the world. Why cannot we do that? Adhi Sankaracharya considers this possibility. Before the formation of sangatha even if the causal change existed in paramanu or skandha, everything would have been jadam. Therefore, skandhas are jadam and paramanus are jadam and causal cycle existed before also would be jadam and how can the three jadams cdan create an intelligent thing. How can paramanu a jadam and skandha is jadam and therefore it cannot be responsible for an intelligent formation. It is removing the foundation stone of the Buddha madham. The individual soul for whose enjoyment the aggregate of body etc. Exists is also evanescent or momentary. It cannot therefore be an enjoyer. As the individual soul is momentary whose is the liberation? As there is no permanent enjoyer, there is no necessary



for these aggregates. There may exist a causal relation between the members of the series consisting of nescience etc., but in the absence of the permanent enjoying should it is not possible to establish on that ground the existence of aggregates. Hence the doctrine of the momentariness of the Buddhist school of realists cannot stand.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

##### **Sutra 20 [191]**

##### ***Uttarotpade cha purvanirodhat***

[nor can there be a causal relation between nescience etc.] Because on the origination of the subsequent thing the preceding one ceases to be.

The argument against Buddhistic theory commenced in sutra 18 is continued.14.13

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. In the previous two sutras Vyasacharya has negated the very samudhaya possibility [external and internal combination] has been negated. They also did not have the logical explanation. In this sutra, the very Karya karana bhava is not possible in the Buddhistic philosophy. Unfortunately, they talk about the karya karana sambandha. In this sutra karya karana sambandha is negated. Because of ksaniga vadha thata everything exists only for a moment, when a thing comes into existence, the previous thing disappears which means at any moment there is only one thing. During the origination of a thing at a moment, the previous thing does not exist. When there is one thing at a time how can you talk of any sambandha or karya karana sambandha. For sambandha you need two things. Therefore you cannot talk about karya karana relationship at all. This is the essence of this sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Cha moreover; purva nirodhat since the previous or former one is absent uttarotpade during the origination of the latter one; complete by adding there is no cause effect relationship between them between the former and latter between the previous and the subsequent. Uttarotpade; utara means latter one; utpadah means origination; this happens every moment. Everything has one moment existence. Afterwards it disappears; cha is the conjunction to the previous negation; purvanidhat; the former one as opposed to utara nirodhah means nasah; the end of destruction of the previous one; because of the destrctuion of the former one during the arrival of the latter one, your theory is untenable. At no time there are two things at two different time. Hence cause effect relationship cannot be there. This is the answer. Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary add a few more extensions. Purva paksa argues why should karyam and karanam exist simultaneously. Both should not exist simultanously. The very fact that x existed before and y exist now is the fact that the one existed and the other exist now. This is karana kaya sambandha. The object in the present moment is karanam and the object coming latter is karyam. This is the condition for karya karana sambandha. It is said karanam is that which exists prior to karyam a product. Therefore during this moment one thing is there, next moment another thing is there, previous thing is karanam, and later karyam is the effect. This is the question. For which Adhi Sankaracharya says mere existence in the prior moment does not mean it is the cause. Mere existence during the prior moment is the cause, then anything can become the cause of anything. To a cause to be cause, it should contribute something to be a cause. Karana vyapara is required to be the cause of something.

Even as a thing comes to existence, it has one thing to do and that is to disappear. Similarly in your theory no object can do any function because it exists only for a second. One second is for arrival, next second is not there, and it disappears. For this Bouddha says vyapara is not required. The mere fact that it existed during the previous moment is sufficient to enjoy the cause. For which Adhi Sankaracharya answers that whenever we talk about karana karya sambandha a thing is said to be the cause of something only when the essential nature of the cause inheres in the effect. The clay even after losing the lump form after losing the superficial nature the cause in its essential nature inheres in the effect. Similarly, when the seed produces the tree, the seed is destroyed and the mango-ness of the mango seed inheres in the new tree. If the mango seed is totally destroyed why should mango seed is needed for the mango tree. The causal destruction is of two types. One is sanvaya nasah and the other is niranvaya nasah. Nirvanvaya nasah means the total destruction in producing an effect. Anvaya means inherent. Nirvanvaya means it is without anything part of cause continuing in the effect. Sanvaya nasah means destruction of the part of the cause while producing an effect. Only superficial nature of nama and rupa and when nama and rupa goes, the essential nature of seed continues there. The mango seed goes but the mangoness continues. The total clay is not destroyed while clay nature goes away. When there is total destruction is there, how can you find what is the cause and what is the effect. The clay inheres in the furniture. In your theory, nothing can inhere in the product and be it does not continue to exist. Therefore if the clay is totally destroyed what will be there in the pot. One more point Adhi Sankaracharya adds is that you talk about an object being born and it cannot do anything immediately. In Buddhism one comes and goes. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the two features or the property of the momentary objects, do they exist simultaneously or one after the other. Alternatively, the utpatti vinasa is separate entity or property of the thing and if it is so whether it simultaneously exist or not. Suppose you say they are not property utpatti and vinasa, if they are separate thing and are not property of the world, the world will not have utpatti vinasa of the world. World will be nityah. If you say utpatti vinasa is the property of the world, then Adhi Sankaracharya argues if they are the property are they simultaneous or one after the other. If you say simultaneous, it is not possible because utpatti and vinasa cannot exist simultaneously because they are opposite attributes. Since they are simultaneously happening but happening one after the other, then you require two moments for utpatti and vinasa and you say that it is ksanigam. If you say utpatti sthithi means you need three ksanigam. Your philosophy is ksanigam and there is no question of karana karya sambandha.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

##### **Sutra 21 [192]**

##### ***Asati pratijnoparodho yaugapadyamanyatha***

If non-existence [of cause] be assumed [while yet the effect takes place, there results contradiction of the admitted principle or proposition. Otherwise there would result simultaneity [of cause and effect].

The argument against Buddhistic theory is continued.

We will do the general analysis of this sutra. In the previous sutra Vyasacharya refuted karana karya sambandha. In first two sutra Vyasacharya he refuted samudhaya. Here to avoid

the problems mentioned in the previous sutra, Bouddha asks why should we produce and asks why not abolish karana karya sambandha itself. If this is the argument Vyasacharya it goes against our own system of philosophy. While introducing the system you have accepted karana karya sambandha and swa madha virodhah comes which Vyasacharya calls pratijna virodhah. Now you cannot remove karana karya sambandha Adhi Sankaracharya asks. Therefore karana karya sambandha they cannot negate because they have accepted. Now Bouddha says let me somehow explain karana karya sambandha. The only way of explanation is to negate the total destruction because karana should not be totally destroyed because karana inhere in the karya. Therefore you should accept sanvaya nasah only. Sanvaya nasah means the mangoness of the mango seed never gets destroyed and it continues to be there even if the tree or the seed is destroyed. Now karana karya sambandha explained. The essential feature of karana should exist in the karana and it inheres in the karya means it should be in the next moment and avter the arrival of karanam and simultaneous existence of karyam. Even after the effect comes the essential nature of pot continues to exist if you accept sanvaya nasah. Since the essential nature was existing before and it inheres in the effect and exist along with effect also means essential nature continued to exist and your theory of ksanikatvam virodhah. In total destruction karana karya sambandha is impossible and if it is not total destruction you accept continuity and then ksaniga vadha is gone. Either way you are in trouble.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Asati in the absence of the cause; pratinjoparodhah there occurs or there will be violation of your own proposition. Anyata otherwise; [in the acceptance of a cause yougapadyam there occurs the defect of simultaneity [cause and effect] s the running meaning. The significance of the verse I will explain in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 183

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 21 [192]**

#### ***Asati pratijnoparodho yaugapadyamanyatha***

If non-existence [of cause] be assumed [while yet the effect takes place, there results contradiction of the admitted principle or proposition. Otherwise there would result simultaneity [of cause and effect].

The argument against Buddhistic theory is continued.

Sarva asthitva vadha of Bouddha madham is being refuted by Vyasacharya. Ksaniga arthitva vadha will be refuted in the following sutra. In the first sutra the formation of combination was refuted; dependent origination was refuted in the next sutra. In the third and fourth sutra Vyasacharya refutes karana karya sambandha; this is done in two sutras. We said to talk about karana karya sambandha you should accept karanana permeating in karyam and then only you can talk of karana karya sambandha. Therefore, karana karya sambandha acceptance requires inherence in the effect and the Buddhist cannot talk about permeation there should be first karana must be there and karana should be partially destroyed and it should be partially destroyed and the essential feature will inhere. Essential 'mango-ness' should be there in the tree. Continuity is important and continuity Buddhist cannot say because their axiom is sarvam ksanigam. Once they accept karana karya sambandha ksanigatvam cannot be there. Either they can have ksanigatvam or karana karya sambandha and they cannot have both. This is the idea conveyed here. They have accepted both and hence their system is defective. This is the idea we have to see the significance of the words. Asati means in the absence; here in the absence means in the non-acceptance of karana karya sambandha by the Buddhists and when we say karana karya sambandha is impossible and if you drop the problem would be that you forget your theory of Buddhism. If you drop the idea now, which was accepted in the beginning, it would go against the essence of your teaching. Pratijna hanih; then anyata it means otherwise; it means other than what was said previously karana karya sambandha abhave other wise means karana karya sambandha if you accept to avoid pratijna hani uparodha problem, the problem would be yougapadyam simultaneity of cause and effect you have to accept. This is presenting it in a roundabout form. If you accept it ksanigatvam will go away. Yougapadhyam means simultaneity of effect and the cause in its essential nature; even after karyam comes into existence, karana should coexist with the karyam as its very swarupam. Clay exist in pot as its swarupam. Once you say karana coexist with karyam then you have to accept that karana existed before and it exist now also means the continuity is there. Once you come to continuity ksanigatva hani is easy. Clay's continuation is accepted ksanigatvam goes. This is the meaning of yougaphadyam. With this the karana karya sambandha niraha is over. If they want to hold on to karana karya sambandha, the ksanigatva vadha is negated. Now we go to the next important vadha of Buddhism.

## Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]

### Refutation of the Bouddha realists

#### Sutra 22 [193]

#### *Pratisankhyapratiskhyanirodhapraptiravicchedat*

Conscious and unconscious destruction would be impossible on account of non-interruption.

The argument against the theory of the Buddhism is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Buddhism [hinayana] talks about three kinds of 'nothingness'. Naiyayika talks of four kinds of nothingness. Nothingness means abhava and they translate it differently. Nirupakya means 'you can not talk about it' niswarupam, avasthu and thuccham. And abhava. Vyasacharya chooses a word different from all the five and he uses the word nirodhah. First kind of nothingness is pratisankya nirodhah, second one is apratisankya nirodhah; and the third is akasah the space. Akasa is nothingness or emptiness according to Buddhism.

Pratisankya nirodhah nothingness is caused by a deliberate destruction of a thing. Deliberate destruction I will call it as artificial end of things. It is like destroying a chair or killing a thing. It is hostility or enmity. You destroy a thing when you are not in favour of its continuance.

Apratisankya nirodhah there is no pratikula bhavana and the things has a natural end. It is an end not caused by pratikula bhavana. The word natural end indirectly reveals the nothingness caused by the natural end.

Akasah the space is nothingness but it is not caused by natural or artificial end but it is nothingness eternally existing nothingness. The third one is called uncaused nothingness and therefore it is nithya abhava.

These are the three types of nothingness is refuted by Vyasacharya. The first two are negated in two sutras and in the third sutra akasah is negated.

First one is artificial end. Vyasacharya says that Buddha cannot talk of artificial end because you don't require to deliberately destroy anything because in Buddhism everything gets destroyed in one second because it is ksanigam. There is no question of deliberate destruction and it is not required. Also deliberate destroyer is required. Then it will be destroyed. There is no question of deliberately destroying because before thinking of destruction, a thing is destroyed being ksanigam. More about it will be discussed in the next sutra.

Apratisankya nirodha or the natural destruction of the end. That also is not possible because when they talk about the natural end of a thing the end they talk about is the total destruction of a thing. They talk about absolute destruction or niranvaya nasa. It is done without a trace. We cannot talk about it because pratyaksa pramana is against it. Total destruction is not possible. Matter cannot be created or destroyed as per the scientists. Destruction of end is one of the modifications as accepted by us. When body is destroyed it is reduced to ashes. Even water evaporates and the vapour remains. Therefore niranvaya nasa is pratyaksa virodhah.

Niranvaya nasa is anumana viruddhah. Therefore once a thing exists it will continuously exist maximum the condition may change; it may be full manifest condition, or un-manifest condition or semi manifest condition and therefore there is no question of natural end of anything. Nothing is fully destroyed and you will go out of shape. Little bit more radical change is called death.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Pratisankhya nirodha natural end is not possible; avicchedate because of the continuity or because of noninterruption; pratisankhya means pratikula bhavana or artificial; apratisankhya means natural; nirodhah means end which we should understand as nothingness. The word nirodhah must be added to both the words pratisankhya and apratisankhya. Apraptih means impossible; it cannot happen. Avicchedat means without any break. This is used when there is a flow and when the flow is stopped. When we say continuity we should know Buddhist also talks about vinasa. The word destruction we do not have any objection. The difference is when they talk about total destruction, which we do not accept. We say on destruction something else replaces the earlier ones. Adhi Sankaracharya analyses one or two more points. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question when you talk about artificial or natural end are you talk of the end of the series or the end of a particular thing. When we say ganga is eternally there we don't talk of particular water. Are you talking of series or flow or are you talking about individual member. With regard to individual member, there is no artificial end because anyway things will die. In addition, there is no natural end and here total destruction cannot take place because something will continue to remain. Individual things or member cannot be artificially or totally destroyed. There is no question of destruction of series.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Buddha realists**

##### **Sutra 23 [194]**

##### ***Uphayatha cha doshat***

And on account of the objections presenting themselves in either case

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya deals with a particular case of pratisankhya nirodhah the deliberate destruction or artificial end. In this sutra a particular pratisankhya is talked about. In fact, this is introduced for introduction of this particular case alone. This is introduced for the end of samsara. The end of samsara is pratisankhya nirodha. Buddhism has got an elaborate discussion on this subject. The end will take place by the destruction of twelve members of samsara nidhanam beginning with avidhya etc. [refer to 19<sup>th</sup> sutra] they do according to Buddhists they do the deliberate destruction of avidhya. By jnanam or enlightenment, the destruction of avidhya takes place. Avidhya removal will effect in the end of the entire cycle. Adhi Sankaracharya asks whether this samsara is ksanigam or not. He has to naturally answer that everything is ksanigam. Why should a person do destruction of a ksanigam. It is going to be naturally destroyed and where is the question of artificial destruction. The deliberate destruction of samsara does not exist at all. Hence sadhana is not required. To avoid that the Buddhists would say it would not naturally end and samsara will not end naturally. If you say so, that means you talk about

continuity of samsara chakra and once you talk of continuity ksanigatvam goes. Therefore, uphayadha if you accept ksanigatvam sadhana becomes meaningless and if you accept sadhana ksanigatvam becomes irrelevant. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Doshat since there are logical fallacies; uphayatha in either case your system or your philosophy is defective. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word is doshat means logical fallacy and because of this your system is defective; uphayatha means in either case; if ksanigatvam is accepted or it is not accepted there is dosha. If sadhanas are accepted, there will be dosha. Acceptance of sadhana means pratisankya nirodhah. The pratisankya nirodha will not be there. If you accept sastra ksanigatvam has to be given up. Then continuity will continue. We will see the Akasa in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 184

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 23 [194]**

#### ***Uphayatha cha doshat***

And on account of the objections presenting themselves in either case

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

This adhikaranam known as samudayadhikaranam refutes Hinayana Buddhism. Vyasacharya refutes important features in this adhikaranam. The space here is defined as absence of things. Everything naturally ends every moment and where is the need for artificial ends. As regards the natural ends, also, we agree with them but we do not agree with the definition provided by Buddhism. They say natural end means total destruction but we say nothing can be totally destroyed nor created. We say radical modification is the end or destruction. It is a modification of an existent thing and we say even after destruction something remains. After destruction remains is ash and we say ash is Brahman. Ash symbolizes Brahman and that is why we apply ash. The idea to be noted is that even in total destruction ash remains and therefore there is no total destruction. Niranvaya nasa is illogical. Hence apradisankya is illogical. Two abhavas are negated. What is left behind is the third abhava. The third abhava is akasah. That is absence of things.

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 24 [195]**

#### ***Aakase chaviseshat***

The cause of Akasa [ether] also not being different [from the two other kinds of destruction it also cannot be a non-entity.

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya does not give any reason for their concept of Akasa. He says that the third abhava is no better than the third, which is also equally illogical. He gives a general reason for extrapolation. Adhi Sankaracharya give in his bashyam gives a few reasons.



Now I will give you the word analysis of the sutra. Aviseshat being non different from twofold ends or abhava discussed before. You have to complete that your contention is untenable. Akasecha in the case of space also; this is the meaning of the sutra.

The significance of the words is akase means the third abhava. We should know Buddhist concept of Akasa, which is defined as the absence of things. This logic is extended to Akasa in addition to the previous abhavas the natural and artificial ends also. Aviseshat means the non-difference which means identity or identical. Being non different or because of non different. Between first second and third abhava there is no difference. This much is given in the sutra.

Now we will see Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam in this regard. He says that sruti pramanam even though we need not give sruti pramanam because it is not acceptable to Bouddha. It is acceptable to us. Sruti clearly talks about origination of Akasa and nonexistence cannot originate at all. This is the reason number one. In all asthika system Akasa is stated to have the property of sound. They find that there are panca bhutani and panca guna. When you analyse these five substances and five gunas and each guna is located in each bhuta. Each bhuta has got one one guna as its character. The four gunas are four vishesha gunas of four elements. Guna requires a substance and substance requires a guna. Parishesha guna is sabda and the left over substance is Akasa and establishes Akasa is sabda gunah. If Akasa is asraya the support of a specific property and it is a positive substance and nothingness cannot be a locus of a property. Therefore Akasa should be taken as positive substance. It is bhava padhartha as is the case with other bhutas. In their own system in Buddhist system itself there is a series of dialogue elaborating which element has which guna. Prithvi has got asraya which is given as jalam Agni and the panca bhutas are mentioned. Last portion of the dialogue is Vayu. They themselves answers Vayu has the asraya. He says Akasa has the support of Vayu. Then it must be a bhava padhartha and it is Vayu in this case. Just as Vayu padhartha of jalam Agni etc., so also Vayu is bhava padhartha of Akasa also. He says that this Akasa which is abhava padhartha is nityah. Adhi Sankaracharya asks if you use an adjective nitya if it can be an attribute and how can you give this attribute to a nonexistent visheshyam. Nityatva guna vishistatvad is Akasa is the argument given by yourself. Next is specific argument given to their contention? Adhi Sankaracharya asks what is definition of space is absence of things. Avarana bhavah akasah. Incidentally we will see the significance of avaranam. The thing he translate as avaranam because absence of things is space and therefore presence of a thing removes space. Every object is inimical to space. If it is there the space is displaced. The presence of thing or things is concealment to the space. Therefore things are called avaranam because it hides the Akasa. The space is concealed by a person and the person is called avaranam. Therefore avaranam means anything. Now Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question suppose the bird flies in the sky. A bird is a thing or not and it is a thing. A thing is avaranam of space. The moment flies in the sky an avaranam has come and once avaranam has come the space is gone. Once avarana abhava is negated and a moment a bird flies the space is negated. Adhi Sankaracharya asks once the space is gone, the second bird cannot fly because the space is gone, avarana abhava is gone. Therefore the second bird cannot fly. Then Buddhist will say where the first bird flies there is avarana bhava; there is no avarana abhava. Where the bird is not flying there is avarana abhava. Therefore, he says that there is locus number two bird is not there. In locua one bird is there. The second bird can go to locus two. Now Adhi Sankaracharya says that you say in locus two there is avarana bhava where the bird can fly; the bird can fly in locus two and locus two is a locus where there is avarana abhava. Now Adhi Sankaracharya says I define locus two as space, which is the locus of avarana abhava, and avarana abhava is not the space but the locus

of avarana abhava is the space. Therefore Akasa is not avarana abhava but the asraya of avarana abhava. Akasa is a positive entity and in another space avarana abhava is there. Where the bird is there, the bird cannot go and where the bird is not there, the bird can go. Pakshi padana argument it is called. According to Buddhism, only one bird can fly in the sky and the second bird flying cannot be logically possible under Buddhistic philosophy. Thus it is concluded that Akasa is a positive entity. With this Akasa negation is over.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

##### **Sutra 25 [196]**

##### ***Anusmritescha***

And on account of memory the things are not momentary.

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

First I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. With the previous sutras we have negated abhava triya nishedah that about which nothing can be postulated or talked about.

In this sutra Vyasacharya directly refutes ksanigatva vadha niradhah the refutation of theory of momentariness. When he says everything is momentary for him object as also the subject is momentary. At the objective level momentariness has already been refuted in the last sloka by the word yougapadhyam. As long as karana karya sambandha you have to accept the fact that the karana inheres in the karyam and inherence alone enjoys the karanatvam only because it inheres in all the ornaments. Inherence means continuity. Continuity is opposed to ksanigatvam.

In this sutra we will concentrate ksanigatvam on subjective level. The main argument is the existence of memory proves the continuity of the person because of the general rule preceded by the experience or anubhava. You can never remember what you have not experienced. Whatever you remember you have experienced. Whatever you experience you remember I cannot say. Whatever you remember, you experienced and whatever you experienced, you need not remember. Wherever there is, memory there is a preceding or past memory. Secondly, equally important principle is that the memory and experience cannot be simultaneous. They should be one after the other. You have to accept non-simultaneity of one after the other the first is experience and thereafter memory. Experience should precede the memory; memory and experience should have the same locus. If I experience something who can remember that; what I experience I alone can remember; the locus of experience and memory should be the same. You should accept a common locus for past experience and present memory and if it is not possible memory is impossible. Then what Buddhistic would say? Memory cannot be negated and it is anubhava virodhah; once you accept common locus, the common locus should have continued existence. This presupposes the existence of experiencer and rememberer and you cannot say experiencer and rememberer are different. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Anusmriteh cha because of the memory also ksanigatva vadha the theory of momentariness is illogical; anusmriteh means anubhava janaya smritih; this means memory born out of

experience, this only indicates continuous experience. Experience based memory anusmriteh because of the experience-based memory also cha means also; momentariness has already been negated earlier. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives one more reasoning, which is close to sruti reasoning. Partya vijna means recognition; this we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 185

### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

#### **Sutra 25 [196]**

#### ***Anusmritescha***

And on account of memory the things are not momentary.

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

Vyasacharya negates the concept of hinayana Buddhism. The uniqueness of their theory is subject as also the object is ksanic. In then 25<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya refuted the momentariness of the subject. The observer has to be a continuous entity to keep the memory. The memory is possible only when the subject is a continuous entity both at the time of experience and at the time of remembering the event at future time. The experience belongs to the past and memory belongs to the future and they belong to two times and should be identical with the person who experience and who remembers. Therefore the asraya must be a continuous entity. The locus of the past experience and future memory should be identical. Adhi Sankaracharya has a few more points on this issue.

There is a very important concept called pratyak vijnanam which is different from pratyaksam and smriti. In English we call pratyakasam as cognition; the memory is translated as recollection and pratyak vijna is translated as recognition or recognition. These three words themselves indicate their difference. Cognized means cognized object is in front of the observer. There is no memory is involved here and it is fresh knowledge. In cognition memory is not involved and only contact between the subject and object is involved. The second one is recollection. Here I remember the past object. I recollect the experience and retrieve from archival source. The object is not in front. The sensory contact is not there. In cognition sensory contact is there and memory is not there. In recognition it is both cognition and memory. Cognition is involved because the person is in front. When you see the person you remember the person whom you experienced before and you connect the present experience with the 'past experience' that that person is this person. That person belongs to the past memory and this person belongs to the direct contact. It is called recognition. The recognition is perception plus memory. Therefore recognized object is an object which is a memorized and perceived object. Since it is memorized object it belongs to the past and as a perceived object it belongs to the present also. It is an object which existed in the past and which exist present also. Recognition proves the continuous existence of the object. It is proved because recognized object is proved by the memory. By this we destroy the theory of momentariness. This pratyak vijnanam is used in Vedanta to prove the continuity of object and also the subject. Pratyak vijnanam recognition is expressed in the form of soyam. Soyam vrikshah means that tree is this tree. Even though I did not see the tree, the continuous existence of the tree is proved by the second recollection and recognition. This pratyak vijnanam is taken as a pramanam and not as seventh pramanam and it is a form of pratyaksa

pramanam. Sureshvaracharya in the seventh verse of Dakshinamurthy strotam writes a varthikam about the pratya vijnanam. An object which was experienced in the past and the very same object which is present now also connecting the past and present through the expression soyam 'that is this' the past present connecting experience is called pratya vijnanam. This is with regard to the objective world. Buddhist gives an answer to our poser. He says that he does not accept pratya vijnanam as a pramanam. He says it is a type of brama. It is not that the object continuously exists but what happens is in the case of pratya vijnanam the second object looks the same with the past experienced object. The last week swamiji is gone and the next ksanam the same swamiji and on the seventh day you the swamiji the same as that of the one previously seen. Continuity is a delusion because of the similarity. A flame seems to be continuous flame and the flame of the first minute is not the same in the second minute. If the same flame is continuously, existing the oil used would be there but the oil goes on exhausting revealing the flame is different. You the flames are 'seeming continuity' because of the delusion. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives his answer. Who recognizes the past flame and the present flame? To talk about the continuity someone has to register similarity. Similarity should be there between the past and the present one. One who talks must have experienced the past and must be experiencing the present and then talk about the similarity. Who talks about the similarity must be continuous. In ksaniga vadha you cannot have pratya vijnana branti also. There is no reason to establish the continuity of the branti. To establish a branti there should be a future pramana to establish the knowledge. Rope snake is called branti because latter it is negated by another pramanam. If pratya vijnanam is proved as branti, it should be negated with knowledge at a latter time. Therefore, the objective must be continuous. Thereafter we use the same argument for the subject also. The subject is also an object of pratya vijnanam. Do you have any doubt with your continuity of the person of the past Saturday and the present Saturday? The objection recognition is in the form of soyam and the subject recognition is in the form of soham. Aham is the same at all times. It is not different from one time to another time. Aham is a continuous entity and that continuous Atma is nithya Chaitanyam and not ksaniga Chaitanyam. Soyam pratya vijnanam proves the continuity of the object and soham pratya vijnanam proves the continuity of the subject. Of course is relatively continuous and subject is permanently continuous. So ksaniga vijnanam is full of defect.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

##### **Refutation of the Bouddha realists**

##### **Sutra 26 [197]**

##### ***Nasatu'dristatvat***

[existence or entity does] not [spring] from non-existence or non-entity, because it is not seen.

The argument against the Buddhistic theory is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. All the three sutras are meant to refute the ksanigatvam. Now ksanigavadi says that every object is destroyed every moment and a new object is created. When he talks about destruction, he talks of two types one is niranvaya nasa [absolute destruction without trace] and we say the matter cannot be totally destroyed and destruction is only going back to the un-manifest form. We say sanvaya nasah [partial

destruction] and they say niranvaya nasah. According to ksaniga vadhi vasthu number one and its destruction and vasthu number two is generated out of nothing. There will be nothing in the intermediary gap and there will be nothing in between the destruction and the origination of second thing. Ksaniga vadha indirectly says that out of nothing something is created. The abhava which exists between the deliberate or natural destruction and the new creation. In this there are so many defects and the primary defect is anubhava virodhah. Therefore ksaniga vadha is incorrect.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Na asatah. Na means nothing arises asatah from non-existence; adrishtatvat because it is not seen [by us] this is the running meaning. First word is na na utpatyate; nothing emerges or originates; the negation of new padharthah. Asatah means from non-existence. Buddhist does not directly say a thing is created out of non-existence. But what Vedanta points out is ksaniga vadha implicitly says that out of nothing something is created. The argument is given in the previous para. This is implicit in ksaniga vadha. Adrishtatvat is the reason for negating this. It is pratyaksa pramana abhavad. This is the essence of the sutra.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives a few arguments supporting further. First one na abhavat out of nothing, nothing can originate. How can sat can born out of asat? It comes in sixth chapter of Chandogya upanisad. If abhava, which is born out of by the end of the previous object why, should a person, take a particular cause to a particular effect. For curd, we take milk only. For mango, we take mango seed only. For ksaniga vadha particular cause is not required. Anyway, it has to go away. Mango seed destruction can be born what is the difference from the abhava caused by the coconut seed. There is no difference between what should take and what you get from the same seed? You can take any seed. This vadha has got the defect that a person should not take a particular material for production of particular object. This is the second argument.

The third argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives is that if abhava is the cause of the next object, the cause must be inherent in the effect. Your intellect says that the abhava is the cause of the latter effect. The abhava caused by purva ksana padhartha. The next object will have the inherence of abhava. Therefore, if that be so, if abhava is anuvruttam you will experience every object as non-existence or asat; our experience is book is pen is but according to ksanigavadhi everything is non existence but according to Vedanta everything 'is everything everything is' this is the third argument.

The fourth argument Vyasacharya gives in the next sutra. There is one more point. If karanam is not destroyed, there cannot be production of next object. Destruction alone can being a new object. Adhi Sankaracharya says sthira padhartha alone can be karanam and that should continuously exist in the effect. The clay is there before production; the clay exist in the karyam and even after the destruction of the karyam the clay continues to exist. Therefore, karanam is anuvarthamanam. Sthira padhartha alone can be karanam. Production is only a superficial avastha bedah, super configuration alone takes place, karanam continues to exist, and we expect the gold continue to be gold in the ornament. We all know karanam is sthiram. What happens in production is superficial configuration, changing configuration is not the karanam, and changeless substance alone is karanam. The gold alone is inherent in all avasthas. Ksaniga karanam cannot be the cause and sthira padhartha alone can be the cause.

#### **Topic 4. Samudayadhikaranam [Sutra 18-27]**

## Refutation of the Bouddha realists

### Sutra 27 [198]

#### *Udasinanamapi chaivam siddhih*

Thus [if existence should spring from non-existence there should result] the attainment of the goal by the indifferent and non-active people also.

The argument against Buddhistic theory is continued.

First I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. Vyasacharya refutes abhavat bhavotpattih which he has done in the previous sutra. He gives an additional supportive argument. Ksaniga vadha means he does not say directly but implicitly says abhavat bhavotpattih. If bhavotpattihi is universal law every one can accomplish anything without any effort. To produce a thing you need abhavat. You don't have rice at home and from that you can produce anything. Even you need not make any effort to do a thing. Not all these things can happen. All lazy people will be accomplishers and all you take efforts you will not accomplish anything. Therefore ksaniga vadha is improper.

Now we will do the word for word analysis, evam cha in such a case udaseenanam abhi even inactive ones siddhih will have accomplishment [of things]. This is the running meaning. Udaneenanam means inactive people and those who have plenty of abhava; material cause for getting things is abhava; that is the indication of the word which includes the abhava of knowledge, efforts and material etc. Udaseena people will have accomplishment of things. Evam means in your theory or according to your theory of karanam; even moksa will come like that. With this ksanigatva vadha niradha is over. Now what is left out is Mahayana Buddhism. Ksaniga vadha will be discussed in the next sutra which we will discuss in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 186

### **Topic 5. Nabhavadhikaranam [Sutra 28-29]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha idealist**

#### **Sutra 28 [199]**

#### ***Nabhava upalabdheh***

The non-existence [of eternal things] cannot be maintained; on account of [our] Consciousness [of them]

The argument against the Buddhist theory is continued. From this sutra begins the refutation of Buddhist idealists.

This is known as nabhavadhikaranam. As I said before in this adhikaranam we take up jnana matra asthitva matrah. This philosophy has got several different names. Adhi Sankaracharya uses several names at several places. One is ksaniga vijnana vadhah or vijnana vadhah. The next name that is given is jnana matra arthithva vadhah. There is only knowledge and there is no object. Vijnana eka skandha vadhah is another name used by the commentators. among panca skandha here vijnana vadhi accept only vijnana skandha. He accepts only one category of knowledge. another name for this system is yogachara madham. They insist on yoga and acharah because they are called yogachara madham. It is a branch of Mahayanam. Buddhism is divided into Hinayanam and Mahayanam. Hinayanam is subdivided vaibashika and chourantika alone were refuted in the previous adhikaranam. mahayanam is also subdivided tino yogachara and sunyavadha madham. Only yogachara alone we take up for discussion. Sunyavadha is otherwise known as madhyantika madham. Yogachara madham says that there is no object other than the ksaniga vijnanam and there is no external world. when we talk about gata padhartha and gata jnanam we accept two things gata jnanam within you and gata padhartha outside. Normally we accept external object and internal knowledge. yogachara says that there is no external object at all. They say there is only internal knowledge alone. Not all the students or things are outside and the knowledge of them is inside. this cognition is momentary. The jnanams are infinite number of jnanams are there and each jnanam existing for one second. When gata jnanam is there, I get the illusion of the pot. When manushya jnanam is there, I have the illusion of seeing a man. This flow of Infinite momentary cognition alone is the reality. That alone is the meaning of Atma. Therefore there is nothing other than Atma. When he says there is nothing other than Atma it appears exactly like Vedanta. that is why many people mistake Vedanta to be Buddhism. Many people are angry because he also says there is no world other than Atma and we always say that there is nothing other than Atma. When he says Atma he means ksaniga vijnanam, a flow of thought when we talk of Atma we mean nithya Chaitanyam. The mistake he has committed is this. Even though he uses the word ksaniga vijnanam what he means unknowingly is the flow of thought that is occurring in the mind. he has mistaken thoughts as vijnanam. Moreover, he has committed the mistake because in jada vritti there is reflected Consciousness and because of the reflected Consciousness jada vritti glows with sentience. What he calls vijnanam is nothing but thoughts. Since thought is momentary, he says thought is ksanigam. Thus, the



parampara of momentary thought is seen to be the parampara of ksaniga vijnanam. When he says there is no external objects what he means is that there is nothing other than thoughts. He says thoughts alone are the object. There is no pot other than pot thought; there is no tree other than tree thought. There is no man other than man thought. Ksaniga vijnana vadhi's contention is there is no thing other than thought. Since thoughts are nothing but modification of mind, ksaniga vijnana vadha can be presented in another way also. Since thoughts are but modification of mind, what he means that there is no object other than the mind. He says mind alone is there. Therefore is no world other than the mind. There is no world other than ksaniga vijnanam other than the mind; there is no world other than the thoughts; this is the yogachara madham. What are we going to say?

Our answer is Advaita accept the external world and we say world is not a projection of thought and or mind and the world exists separate from thought and mind. there is no world separate from Atma the nithya Chaitanyam. There is no world separate from Atma the all-pervading Consciousness. we never says that there is no world other than the mind. yogachara says you see and therefore there is an object. For him objects are mental projection. In Advaita there is an object and therefore the mind sees. The mind entertains the thought and therefore there is a perception. This is the view of yogachara madham. The mind sees therefore object is. The object is seen and therefore the mind sees is the Advaitin's view. In yogachara the external objects are the mental projections. In our view we say Atma's projection is the external world. yogachara says the external world is mental projection; the external world is not the mental projection and even without mental projection the world exists. This many people have not understood and they criticize Advaitam. Third difference is since they think the world is mental projection it will be jiva sristi whereas in Advaitam it is not jiva sristi and it is Isvara sristi or vyavaharikam. We will establish that there is a world other than thought. In fact, in Advaita teaching itself in certain context for emphasizing the point the world is presented as mental projection but we should not take it as ultimate siddhanta. In such cases we should understand it as Atma projection alone. External world is called siddha spandanam and it looks as yogachara madham hence siddham is called Chaitanyam. World is not a projection of mind. World exists separate from Atma. Mind also does not exist. Mind is different. Mind is vyavaharikam world is vyavaharikam. But mind and world do not exist separate from Paramatma nithya chaitanya Atma. The world never exists within my mind and world exists within the Atma. World is born of me world exists in me and world resolves in me means the Atma and not the mind. in this adhikaranam we will establish that there is a world separate from the mind. now we will go to the general analysis of the first sutra.

In this purva paksha is not mentioned and only the answer from siddhanta is mentioned. Vyasacharya says that the external world exists and do not say it is a mental projection. That is why we should not say illusion. We should not translate the world maya as illusion. It is because illusion is understood as mental projection. If I say world is an illusion I will be saying world is a mental projection. If that is said, unknowingly I will become a Buddhist. There is a world separate from the mind.

We say the world is there because we experience outside the mind. it is pratyaksa pramanatvat. This reveals the world separate from the mind. pratyaksa pramanam does not prove whether the world is different from Atma or not. This is different issue and for this we will go to the sastra pramanam. Whether the world exists different from Atma or not is a separate issue. We should not mix up two discussions. First is whether the world is different from Atma or not. This matter we have already discussed earlier. Second discussion is

whether the world is different from mind or not. In this discussion yogachara says the world is non-separate from the mind. Vedanta says that world is separate from the mind. it is because the world we experience everyday. There is a world outside the mind and mind is separate and world is separate. There is plurality. From the standpoint of mind world is separate from the mind. world is mithya only from the standpoint of Paramatma Chaitanyam. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Abhava non-existence of all objects na cannot be established. Upalabdheh because of their experience. This is the running meaning. it has na abhava and upalabdheh. Na means cannot be established. Yogachara cannot establish abhava which means non-existence or absence. Abhava means the objects. Abhava separate from the mind. this cannot be established. The reason is upalabdheh because of pratyaksa pramanam or anubhava pramanam. Everyone knows that there is an object other than the thought. No one is confused between the internal thought and external object; memory and an object. We know the experience when thought is there without object; we also know when there is thought and the object; one is called memory and the other is called perception. In thought object is not there. in perception thought and object are distinctly there. External objects are there sometimes before the mind and sometimes the objects are not there. sometimes when the thought comes, I work for accomplishing the thought to become the object in front of me. This is a simple common sense fact and it can be denied by only yogachara. Advaitin never says ice cream is a projection and he knows it is an object. When I talk of the world, I speak in terms of vyavaharika dristi. With this, the sutra part is over. now Adhi Sankaracharya writes an elaborate commentary on the subject. We say vijnanam alone is the reality; he also says that vijnanam alone is the reality. We say bahya Prapancha is not there; they also say bahya Prapancha is not there. because of this confusion Adhi Sankaracharya writes an elaborate commentary.

One point Adhi Sankaracharya gives is an additional argument to prove that objects are different from jnanam. he says jnanam is inherent in and through all the objects and all the perception in the form gata jnanam, pata jnanam etc. in and through all of them there is one thread common which we call anuvruttam. That is jnanam. there are many vyavruttam the exclusive objects subject to arrival and departure. gata jnanam, pata jnanam, mata jnanam etc. they are vyavruttam it is mutually exclusive. Adhi Sankaracharya says that which is anuvruttam is different from vyavruttam. Just as the thread is different from flowers so jnanam is different from non-inherent from padhartha. Swapna padhartha comes and goes and jagrat padhartha comes and goes but there is something which is ever there and that is not subject of arrival and departure and that is called Chaitanyam. Chaitanyam is different from the object. Knowledge and objects are different is proved here.

Now we enter into a dialogue with yogachara. Here yogachara wants to say that there is no external world other than external to the mind. Adhi Sankaracharya refutes saying that there is a world other than the mind and other than the mind. One argument he gives is that you do not have logical proof for the existence of the world. Yogachara philosopher says this. He says what is world according to you? Yogachara addresses Hinayana Buddhist. Hinayana Buddhist says that there is external world. Mahayana says it cannot be proved. Hinayana says that paramanu samudayah jagat. vaiseshika also says so. vaiseshika has got nithya paramanu and yogachara has got ksaniga paramanu. Ksaniga paramanu assemble to make the world. is the world different from paramanu or not? Either way you are in trouble. If you say that they are nothing but paramanu, then you cannot see the world because paramanus are invisible. They are atoms. Therefore paramanus none will be able to see; can you world is different

from paramanu. Since thw world is not separate from paramanu. There is no group separate from individual. Samudhaya nama nasti eva. The group does not exist separate from individual. There is no world other than paramanu. Since the paramanus are invisible then there will be no world. therefore bahya ra` nasti/ Advaidin will say bahya Prapancha asti. Our argument will be in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 187

### **Topic 5 . Nabhavadhikaranam [Sutra 28-29]**

#### **Refutation of the Bouddha idealist**

#### **Sutra 28 [199]**

#### ***Nabhava upalabdheh***

The non-existence [of eternal things] cannot be maintained; on account of [our] Consciousness [of them]

The argument against the Buddhist theory is continued. From this sutra begins the refutation of Buddhist idealists.

That which is a thought is mistaken by the Bouddha as vijnanam and there is a legitimate reason for this mistake also. The thought is sentient because of reflected Consciousness and not knowing it is mistaken Consciousness they mistake it as glow of Consciousness and the flow of thought as the flow of Consciousness and for our understanding take vijnanam as thought. From this we can conclude their philosophy, as there is nothing other than thought and thought are not different from mind and we can present it differently as there is no object other than mind. They reduce the entire world as the mental projection very, very similar to the dream. In fact, they quote the dream as their support and the essence that there is no external world other than mind and thought. However, Vedanta says that there is very much an external world other than the mind. Then whatever is the reality of the mind and the same reality of the world. If at all we say there is no world we only say there is now world other than Consciousness which is totally different from the mind. This idea is presented in the first sutra. Abhava na the absence of the external objects is not correct means external objects are very much present. External means external to what stand we should know. From the point of view of the hall, all of you are internal. From the standpoint of mind, there is an external world. From the view of Atma the Chaitanyam, there is no external world. It is from the yogachara contention. Because both use the external world. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes commenting upon the sutra, adds a few more points.

I said in the last class there is a dialogue between yogachara madham and Vedantins. Vedanta disproves that there is an external world while they say that there is no external world. The bashya Prapancha nasti asambavat. This is the first argument of the yogachara. He said talking to his opponent [the hinayana people] that you say that there is an external world which is combination of ksaniga paramanu. Atoms are defined as dimensionless entity and therefore invisible. Then yogachara says these paramanus put together is the universe. And according to you the universe is not produced out of paramanus but paramanu combined together is the universe which means that there is no universe other than paramanu. The yogachara madham asks the question if one paramanu is dimensionless and the other paramanu is dimensionless and when the two combine together cannot improve the situation. Invisible gas and another invisible gas the outcome will be invisible mixture only. Similarly if one paramanu of no dimension joining any number of dimensionless paramanus, the

combined output will be dimensionless only and they cannot produce any product with dimension. Nothing will be visible and you cannot explain the universe the combination of paramanus. Hence bashya Prapancha nasti. This is the argument given by yogachara while talking to hinayana people. Vedantins answers bashya Prapancha nasti because when it is revealed through pratyaksa pramana how can you say that it is not there. You cannot negate a thing which is revealed through pratyaksa pramana. For this ksaniga vadhi gives another argument. He says the cognition of perception and object obtains simultaneously. Both simultaneously exist. Whenever I talk about the existence of an object at that time there is cognition, which is connected to the object. You cannot talk about the existence of the object without the existence of the thought. In fact, the words are the symbols of your thought only. What you write is the symbol of the symbol of the symbol. The visible symbol is the written symbol. It is nothing but the sound symbol of the object. The sound represents the thought, which occurs in the mind, and you cannot have it without the experience. The experience cannot be there without the table actually there. Cognition and object go together. Therefore, ksaniga vijnanavadhi argues since both obtain together why should you give separate existence to the object. There is no padhartha other than the thought. Therefore, anvaya vyatireka siddhatvad is operative and why should we accept a separate object. This is the argument of ksaniga vijnanavadhi. Now Vedantins give the answer. Anvaya vyatireka nyaya should be carefully used. There are exceptions also. Simultaneous experience can be there for other than reasons also. When the light is switched on objects are visible. When the light is switched off the object is not perceptible and not seeable. When the light is there the light is experienced and when the light is not there the objects are not experienced. Even though they simultaneously appear and the objects and when the light experience goes object experience is not there and similarly according to us the thought is the illuminator and object is illumined and both of them exist separately. When the thought comes object is illumined and when the object is not illumined and just because object is not illumined, you cannot say object is not there. You cannot use saha upalamba for negating bashya Prapancha. In the form of illuminator and illumined both of them exist. Now let us go to the next argument.

Ksaniga vijnanavadhi says that saha upalamba of either of the nature. Karana karya upena one need not separately exist. Here one does not exist separate from the other. Another possibility is in which both separately exist. In both saha upalamba is possible ksaniga vadhi takes there is no world separate from the other. Vedantins say both can separately exist. Ksaniga vijnani says when both the possibilities are there which one we should use. He says that we should choose simpler one a system in which you have less number of things. In ksaniga vijnana vadha I can explain everything without accepting an external world by pointing out that external world does not exist separate from thought. In your system, you have to take internal thought as also the external world. You live in your own world. For this Vedantins give the answer. No doubt we accept the external world external to the mind not external to the Atma Chaitanyam. Because of the acceptance we have an extra category, which you avoid, and because of that we have extra burden. Gouravam is called superficialness in tarka sastra. We do not mind that gourava because if we accept an additional thing proved by a pramanam then it is not a defect. If it is kalpana it is a dosha. Therefore we accept an external world because it is proved by pratyaksa pramanam. We are able to clearly differentiate and where thought alone is there without object and though is there with object. We have the thought that our family is there now when you are away from them. But when you are at home the thought is there and also the family members are there in front of you. Here thought, as also the family members are pratyaksam. The presence of thought and the presence of thought without object and object is experienced separately. We will have to accept the external world because it is clearly experienced. At the end of the

dialogue Adhi Sankaracharya gives a few more additional arguments pointing out the defects in ksaniga vijnanam.

Ksaniga vijnanam itself I am ksanigam and Adhi Sankaracharya says ksaniga vasthu will not know its own ksanigatvam. For this a good a good argument is given in Advaita Maharantam. Sloka 15 that reads as *na ca sva'janma nasam va drstum arhati kascana tau hi prag-uttar-abhava-carama-prathama-ksanau* the meaning of the mantra is and no one can ever see one's own birth or death. The birth is the final moment of prior non-existence [earlier absence] and the death is the first moment of the posterior non-existence [the later absence], respectively. A person can never know or experience his own or her own birth or death. He can experience the immediate moment of death or immediate preceding moment of death and birth you can never experience. He gives a good logic. He asks the question what is the definition of the experience of the birth. When can you say a thing is born? Experience of birth is experience of the last moment of the prior non-existence of the object. Before a thing is born it is non-existence. Before the birth, there is non-existence. Prior non-existence comes to an end is the birth of the child. What is death? The moment the death comes the object becomes non-existence. At the time of death, the later non-existence begins and therefore death can be defined as the first moment of the posterior non-existence. Death is nothing but the posterior non-existence. Now the question is can I experience my birth. If I have to experience my birth I should experience the last moment of my prior non-existence. Can I experience the last moment of prior non-existence? How can I experience my own non-existence? Can I ever experience death? Then I should experience the first moment of posterior non-existence. Therefore janma anubhava na sambavathi. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya asks who know ksaniga vijnanam is ksanigam and ksaniga vijnanam can never know its ksanigam. Ksaniga vijnanam number two cannot know the ksaniga vijnanam one. When the ksaniga vijnanam two comes one is not there. Therefore no one in your system can talk about the ksaniga vijnanam. If someone talks about ksanigam he should be sthirah/ if he says yes, then swa madha thyagah bhavati. In advaita we can say thoughts are ksanigam and objects are ksanigam because we have got one saksi Consciousness. There is one Consciousness, which continues in infancy, adult and old age to talk about the continuity.

You cannot talk about the plurality of ksaniga vijnanam because at any moment there is one ksaniga vijnanam cognition. The object and subject both are ksanigam and you are not there. When this ksanigam is there the other one is not there. There is no plurality in ksaniga vijnanam and when plurality is not there how can you talk of plurality. You cannot talk about parampara. Still you talk about so many things. There is nobody to talk about the plurality of the vijnanam. With this we will stop the first sutra and enter into the next sutra.

## **Topic 5 . Nabhavadhikaranam [Sutra 28-32]**

### **Refutation of the Bouddha idealist**

#### **Sutra 29 [200]**

#### ***Vaidharmyaccha na svapnadivat***

And on account of the difference in nature [in Consciousness between the waking and the dreaming state the experience of the waking state] is not like dream etc., etc.,

The argument against Buddhistic theory is continued.

Now ksaniga vijñāna vadhi can raise an objection. The objection is not given but the answer is given. In the previous sūtra it was said that the external objects should be accepted. upalapdeh means pratyakṣa anubhava. we clearly experience the world and how can you deny that. ksaniga vijñāna vadhi says you may experience the external world but you cannot say there is external world. In dream, you experience the external world but it is not an external world at all. It is nothing but the mental projection. He talks like an advaidins. He says just because you experience the objects externally, that you cannot say that there is an external world. in dream also you experience external objects but you should know every object in the world is nothing but the mental projection. There is no world separate from thought still it appears as though outside. This world also does not exist but they are only thoughts in the mind. The externality is 'as though' external. Just as in dream, the objects are as though outside and in waking also there are no objects separate from the thought. In waking also there is now world outside and it is as though outside. This is the argument of the yogachara madham.

Dream example is wrong example. It is wrong because when you wake up the swapna padhartha is negated and we come to know that there is no object outside. The negation of externality of object takes place when you wake up. The externality of the waking universe is never negated at any time. I see the object outside throughout. Jnani negates the external world. he never negates the world which is outside the mind. jnani very much accepts the world outside the mind. if at all a jnani negates the world outside the Atma. Outside Consciousness he says there is no world. Outside the mind, he never negates the world. in swapna the world outside the mind is negated. Therefore swapna Prapancha outside the mind is negatable and jagrat Prapancha outside the mind is not negatable. This is the main answer Vyasacharya intends.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Vaidharmyad cha because of the distinct nature of the object of the waking state; na swapnadhivat they cannot be compared to the object of the waking state. The dream object and waker's objects are different. Dream object do not remain outside the mind and waking object exists outside the mind. the world outside the mind is ever be there but the world in the swapna goes on waking up. The significance of the word is vaidharmyad the distinct properties; cha is the conjunction to be added to the previous sūtra also; jagrat Prapancha is unlike the swapna Prapancha etc. never equate the rope and the rope snake. Isvara sristi is separate from jivah sristi has to be accepted. more in the next class.

BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 188

**Topic 5 . Nabhavadhikaranam [Sutra 28-32]**

**Refutation of the Bouddha idealist**

**Sutra 29 [200]**

***Vaidharmyaccha na svapnadivat***



BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2  
By Swami Paramarthananda

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 188

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2  
By Swami Paramarthananda

BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 188

BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 189

**Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33]**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.

**Sutra 33[204]**

*Naikasaminnasambhavat*

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2  
By Swami Paramarthananda

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 189

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 2  
By Swami Paramarthananda

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 189

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 190

### **Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33]**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.

**Sutra 33[204]**

#### *Naikasaminnasambhavat*

On account of the impossibility [of contradictory attributes] in one and the same thing at the same time [the Jaina doctrine is] not to be accepted.

After the refutation of the Buddhistic doctrine of momentariness, vijnanavada and nihilism, the jaina doctrine is taken up for discussion and refutation.

After refuting the three branches of Buddhism except the sunyavadha the fourth branch now Vyasacharya has come to the refutation of jaina madham. Here also there are two branches one is called svetantara and digambara jaina madham. The first one wear white clothes and the second one do not wear any clothes. Even though two branches are there, differences are there only in superficial practices and there is no difference in the philosophy. Vyasacharya discusses the jaina darsanam common to both. I pointed out that the jaina people talk of seven categories which being jiva, ajiva, asrava, samvara, nirjara, bandha and moksa. Jivas refers to bogtru or chetana tattvam. According to them jivas are many in number and jivas are size of the body and they are capable of acquiring karma. Madhyama parinama jivah. They do not believe in Isvara and they worship the acharyas known as tirthankara. They do not have god in their madham.

Ajiva refers to achetana Prapancha and it is born out of paramanus and in this respect they are similar to Bouddha madham and Nyaya Vaishesika madham. It cannot be defined very clearly and world is anirvachaniyam. They are close to Bouddha and Advaidam. Certain branches of Bouddha also call world as anirvachaniyam. The definition of anirvachaniyam differs from one to the other. Buddhistic says world is inexplicable. You cannot say asti, nasti, asti nasti or nasti nasti. When Buddhist talk about anirvachaniyatvam the world is existent nor nonexistent, but in Vedanta especially in Advaida world is sat asat vilaksanatvam. You cannot say sat or asat but it is sat asat; it is undefinable; it cannot be categorically classified. When jaina says it is inexplicable they mean every object is having seven division. In all of them syad is common. Somehow it exists also somehow it nonexists also. What they struggle to say is everything is inexplicable. Asravah means flow of karma towards Atma. By the word karma we mean both action as also the result. The constant flow of activity there is punya papa pravahaha also. Samvarah means stopping this flow of karma. It means asrvava means pravrutti then samvarah means nivrutti. Practice of yama and niyama comes under this category. Giving up asuri sampath and taking to devi sampath falls under this head. Jaina does not talk of nithya naimittika karma. Nirjarah means the elimination of already accumulated karma. Elimination is possible through varieties of tapas and penance is most important sadhana in Jainism. This aims at elimination of all karmas. Karmas are very subtle matter and it is fine matter particle just as you heat the metal to

separate the impurity from the metal all tapas is heating up the jiva and once heated the karma particle gets separated and go away. Even plucking the hair is one of the tapas. Sitting on hot plate is also a tapas of one category. Here the karma gets exhausted gradually. So it is called nirjarah. The next is bandha and moksa.

Bandhah means karma sambandha and dukha sambandhah. The association with karma and consequent association with pain are called bandha. It is caused by asrava the third category. Third and sixth are interconnected. Flow of karma leads to bandh. The seventh category is moksa. It is freedom from karma sambandha and dukha sambandha. They believe that when karma particles go away the ajnanam also will also go away. Ananda arrives as the sorrows go. There is no more acquisition of the body. They are similar to Vedanta. The jivah is of the size of the body. It is the size of the last body. It will not take any more a new body and they reach higher Akasa. It is called aloukika akasah. As vishistadvaidins say that the body takes a new shape and enter Vaikunda, jains believe in a higher Akasa where the liberated souls reach to gain moksa. This liberated soul reach aloukika Akasa. This moksa is achieved by the fourth and fifth categories are the sadhana for the seventh category moksa. Third and fifth has got cause and effect relationship. The principle of inexplicability applies to all. Jains says everything falls within sapta banga. Vyasacharya says that this is not acceptable. He takes the unique concept of the theory of seven features for every object. It is called siyad vadhah somehow vadhah. Anekanta vadhah means indefinable. He refutes this in one sutra. The other topic Vyasacharya refutes is the Atma swarupa. The first sutra deals with the negation of sapta banga vadha. The next three sutra deals with Atma as revealed by jains the Atma swarupa kandanam.

Now I will give the general analysis of the sutra. The seven features on every objects are not acceptable because the seven features are contradictory attributes. The contradictory attributers cannot be there in one object at the same time. In one and the same place and in one and the same time the opposite attributes cannot remain. Rama is tall and Lakshmana is short is ok. Rama is tall and Rama is short is not possible. Tallness and shortness are opposite attributes. One and the same Rama cannot be both tall and shnort. Jaina points out the seven features and of them first is asti an second is nasti. Both asti and nasti cannot be together at the same time.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Asambavat because of the impossibility of the existence of contradictory attributesekasmin in one and the same locus or object na jaina system or the seven feature theory of the jaina system is not acceptable. Now we will see the significance of the words. Na ekasmin sambavat. Na means not; complete by adding it is not acceptable; eksasmin means in one entity or one object; then you supply opposite attributes in one object; not only asti nasti and you can extend to other attributes also. Kyad ekah kyad anekah kyad avasthavyah kyad ekah etc. With singularity and plurality also. Similarly nithyam and anithyam also. How can the finitude and infinitude coexist. It cannot be. Asambavat means impossibility or un-tenability. Hence the seven features theory is unacceptable.

Adhi Sankaracharya tells several things in his bashyam. However, one point out I would like to highlight. Jaina wants to say world is inexplicability. Even scientist has invented the theory of uncertainty theory. We know scientists are struggling to find out the theory. All philosophers have the problem. Adhi Sankaracharya is worried that in your Advaidam also there is anirvachaniyam. When I say anirvachaniyam you criticize and you talk of anirvachaniyam. When jaina says anirvachaniyam they say both sat and asat misra he says.

That we refuse because opposite attributes cannot coexist. Advaidins never say world is a mixture of sat and asat. Advaidins says world is different from sat and asat. If we say sat and asat is world means it is jaina philosophy and if it is said sat and asat are different from the world it is Advaidam. It neither sat, nor asat nor satasat. It is different from all the three. World is distinct from satasat. Second important point is that when you say the world is inexplicable only with regard to satta or existence which means you cannot say it is sat or you cannot say it is asat. But we say all the other features of the world is nirvachaniyam and we can clearly talk about. If you ask the colour of this object I can clearly say it is the colour. So also the weight of the person I can clearly say my weight. Remember anirvachaniyam is with regard to satasat. In all respect, it is nirvachaniyam and you can precisely talk about. Only because it is precisely talk about, all transactions are possible. In anirvachaniyam no transaction is possible. Based on specification alone transaction can take place. So Adhi Sankaracharya says that jaina has extended anirvachaniyam to everything and therefore they cannot distinguish their philosophy with other systems. You have no specific details of each category. You will not be able to talk about the category unless you have specific detail. You can never transact you cannot talk about the specific attribute. Sarva vivahara loka prasangah if precision is not there no vyavahara is not possible. Brahman is definable; sadhana is definable. Now we will enter the next sutra.

### **Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33]**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.

#### **Sutra 34[205]**

#### ***Evam chatmakartsnyam***

And in the same way [there results from the jaina doctrine] the non-universality of the soul.

Other defects of the Jaina theory are shown.

As I said in the first sutra Vyasacharya negated the seven feature theory of Jaina system. Here the nature of Atma as presented by Jaina is being negated. They say Atma is the size of the body. First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. You cannot explain punar janma properly because in this janma one has got a body which is the container and Atma which is the content both are in fit condition. In the next janma if the body is smaller or bigger than the body in the present janma what will happen in the next janma. How can Atma and sarira can be in fit condition if the next janma one is born as ant body or an elephant body? Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Evam similarly; Atma akartsnyam the dimensional deficiency with regard to Atma cha is also another flaw in Jainism. To avoid the problem they may Atma is elastic. It means when the small body comes Atma shrinks and when the bigger body comes the Atma will expand. This will also not work. That we will see in the next sutra.

### **Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33]**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.



**Sutra 35[206]**

***Na cha paryayadapyavirodho vikaradibhyah***

Nor is non-contradiction to the derived from the succession [of parts according to and departing from the should to each different bodies] because of the change etc., [of the soul]

Further defects of the Jaina doctrine are shown in this sutra.

We will do the general analysis of the sutra. Jaina gives a suggestion that the size of the Atma will take different shape in every new janma. It is called successive revision of the size Atma. It will take the appropriate change in every janma. This is the suggestion of Jaina. Then Vyasacharya says then also the problem will come. If Atma also changes, the Atma will have maranam also. Atma will become perishable and who can enjoy the nithya moksa. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Paryayat this is the suggestion of purva paksa the Jaina. Due to successive revision from janma to janma of the size of the Atma avirodhah there is no defect or flaw. Then Vyasacharya replies cha api such a suggestion also is not acceptable. Vikaradibhyah problem like modification. Now we will see the significance of the words. Paryayah means successive change or revision of the size of the Atma in keeping with the size of the body; the flow of different dimension of the Atma. Paryayat because of the regular revision of size of Atma there is no problem of unfitness; up to this is quotation. Na such a suggestion is not free from defect. It is not possible vikaradibhyah this modification is not possible. Body is perishable and we turned to Atma and if Atma is having the problem then problem will continue; adhi means etc. One is it is subjective to modification and it is subject to nasa or destruction. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 191

### **Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33}**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.

**Sutra 35[206]**

#### ***Na cha paryayadapyavirodho vikaradibhyah***

Nor is non-contradiction to the derived from the succession [of parts according to and departing from the should to each different bodies] because of the change etc., [of the soul]

Further defects of the Jaina doctrine are shown in this sutra.

In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses the Jaina madham and we saw that Jaina madham talks about seven categories. Of the seven Vyasacharya takes up only the first two category for discussion and show the deficiencies there. The two categories which Vyasacharya analyses are jiva and ajiva whereas the others are not taken for analysis. Of these first two also the second category of ajiva was analysed in sutra 33 and by way of discussing that Vyasacharya he negated the sapta bangi in one sutra. In the other three sutras he discusses the Atma, the bogta the experiencer of the world. Jaina madham has no Isvara and the Consciousness being is jiva only. The deficiencies shown here are that in Jaina madham Atma has got finite diemension which corresponds to the size of the body. The extremely small size is called anu parinama, the extremely big is called vibhu parinama and all the other sizes in between anu, and vibhu is called madhyama parinamah. Vyasacharya says there will be lot of problem regarding the fitness of the body or unsuitability of Atma with the size of the body in janma to janma. Janma to janma the physical body will not be of the same size. Therefore Vyasacharya what will do either Atma will be oversized or undersized. This is the main objection with regard to the size of the Atma. They suggested a solution that in keeping with the variation of the body let Atma also expand or contract as required. If it is ant's body Atma will shrink and if it is elephant's body Atma will expand and the Atma will be flexible according to the janma taken by the Atma. This is called paryaya successive expansion or contraction and successive means form one janma to another janma. And for that the answer was given na it is not acceptable because once you talk of expansion and contraction exactly like body the Atma will also be mortal savikaratvad sariravad. Atma will become anithya. By shifting the body to Atma there will not be any benefit. We will not have mortality problem and then anir moksa prasangah. I said in the last class that there is one more problem. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question if Atma has to expand from where will Atma will get the material for expansion. You cannot any substance form the external world which is made of matter and Atma is non-matter. For non-matter Atma to expand you need non-matter Atma. There is no source of raw material for expansion of Atma. Because of these reasons expanding Atma is not acceptable to us. Now we will go to the last sutra.

### **Topic 6 Ekasaminnasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 33}**

Refutation of the Jaina doctrine.

**Sutra 36[207]**

***Antyavasthiteschobhayanityatvadayisesah***

And on account of the permanency of the final [size of the soul on release] and the resulting permanency of the two [preceding sizes] there is no difference [of size of the soul, at any time]

Discussion on the defects of the Jaina doctrine is concluded.

First we will do a general analysis of this sutra. Vyasacharya raised the problem that the Atma cannot fit into the varying bodies from janma to janma. For this Jaina madham offered the solution let the Atma change accordingly. Once answer was given in the previous sutra and another answer is given here. First they said let us accept the solution offered by Jaina madham. Vyasacharya said that it would solve the problem but will lead to another problem that in expanding and contracting Atma will as much mortal as that of the body. In this sutra the solution given by you that Atma is not an acceptable solution. The solution that Atma expands and contract in every janma is not acceptable to us. In fact this solution is not acceptable to Jaina madham also. On gaining moksa that there will be no more sarira grahanam on getting moksa. Then we ask the question if the Atma does not get another body in moksa and what will be size of the Atma in moksa is the question posed by us. Since no further body is taken, Atma's size cannot be taken and whatever is the final size of the Atma at the time of liberation and that size will be eternally continue. Atma will have one particular size, which will eternally continue. They accept this size. If you say that particular size is permanent and it should be trikala avasthahi is permanent. It should be the same eternally in future and in the past also. If you accept one form in moksa and you should accept the same size before moksa also. If Atma is of uniform size at the end and Atma should have uniform size in the present and the past also. Then alone the size can be the same in future also. You cannot say the permanent size begins from tomorrow. If it begins tomorrow, it cannot be permanent. Since it is uniform and therefore now also it should be uniform and therefore the expansion and contraction solution cannot be accepted. If the size is uniform, the problem mentioned in 34<sup>th</sup> sutra will continue. If the size is uniform, the Atma cannot fit into different type of body during different janma. In 36<sup>th</sup> sutra, the solution given by you in 34<sup>th</sup> sutra is not acceptable. Now look at the word meaning.

Antyavasthiteh because of the permanence of the size of the Atma during he final stage of liberation ubhayanityatvat it should be changeless; it refers to the size. It should be changeless during the beginning and middle state also. Aviseshah it should be uniform the size should be uniform. If it is uniform in moksa kala it should be uniform now also. In that case the unfitnes of size will continue.

Antiavasthiteh is one word. It is a compound word consiting antya and avasthithi. Antya means antya avastha parimanah the size at the time of liberation; antya means moksa avastha parimanah means size. The size during the final state of liberation; avasthithi means endurance or permanence. Ubhayanityatvam the ubhaya refers to ubhaya avastha which means adhi avastha and madya avastha; antya avastha has been said and ubhaya refers to adhi and Madhya avastha. Adhi and Madhya should be the same as is found in antya avastha after liberation. It must be enduring permanent. Cha is conjunction; here also nithyatvad because of the uniformity in the end it should be there in the beginning and the middle also. Aviseshah means the size will be ever the same. Jaina madham says that size is the same

during liberation only. Vyasacharya says it should be ever the same size. From this we have to derive the corollary if the size is uniform in samsara also the size of the Atma will be the same and will affect the content of 34<sup>th</sup> sutra. Therefore Jaina madham is not acceptable. Both jiva and ajiva are not acceptable. Adhi Sankaracharya says while talking about creation Jaina accepts creation as a product of paramanu. The definition of creation cannot be given. This anirvachaniya creation cannot be explained and this is not acceptable to us, paramanu vadha is also not acceptable. Why Vyasacharya did not say that here. Vyasacharya does not refute paramanu vadha here because it has been refuted in adhikaranam three and sutra number twelve while discussing vaiseshika philosophy. Paramanu vadha is accepted by vaiseshika, Jaina and Bouddha. Therefore Vyasacharya does not want to deal with it again. With this Jaina madham is also over. What is left out is sunya vadha Buddhism and one more is caravaka madham the materialistic system of philosophy, which Vyasacharya does not consider, fit to discuss in Brahma Sutra. All eleven darsanas have been covered, now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

#### **Sutra 37[208]**

#### ***Patyurasamanjasyat***

The Lord [cannot be the efficient or the operative cause of the world] on account of the inconsistency [of that doctrine]

The pasupatas or the Mahesvaras are divided into four classes viz., Kapala, Kalamukha, Pasupata and Saiva. Their scripture describes five categories, viz., cause [karana] effect [karya], union [yoga by the practice of meditation], ritual [vidhi] and the end of pain or sorrow [dukhanta], i.e., the final emancipation. Their categories were revealed by the great Lord Pasupati Himself in order to break the bonds of the soul called herein pasu or animal.

In this system, Pasupati is the operative or the efficient cause [nimitta karana] mahat and the rest are the effects.

This is another topic, which is called adhikaranam. This is called pratyadhikaranam. It is also a big adhikaranam with five sutras. The topic here is with regard to the nimitta karanam of the world. Throughout the Brahma Sutra the upadana karanam of the world is in focus and the very definition given in second sutra is Brahman is material cause of the universe. In addition, in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya wanted to discuss other darsanams and Vyasacharya has primarily taken the upadana karanam as defined by the other darsanams. It is because material cause is the crucial cause which differentiate one darsanam from the other. The uniqueness of Vedanta is the most unique darsanam in which material cause is Consciousness itself. Nonmatter is the material cause of the material universe, which is extremely difficult matter to swallow. Gouda pada takes lot of time to analyse this in alati santi prakaranam. He says the Consciousness in motion is matter. There is no matter at all. This is most unique aspect of Vedanta whereas in all other darsanams the material cause is the matter alone. Jada is the karanam of jada Prapancha. Therefore Vedanta is called chetana karana vadha. If you take Samkya yoga system of philosophy achetana prakriti is the material cause. They say achetana prakriti is the karanam. If you take Nyaya Vaishesika they say

achetana paramanu is the karanam for the creation. Purva Mimamsa has no problem and they never talk about the utpatti of creation. They are absolved of the creation mistake. They do not accept creation. They think world is as it is. If you take Buddhistic branch they say achetana paramanu is the karanam. Achetanam is the karanam or material cause of the universe. Jainism also talk of achetana paramanu is the material cause of the creation. Vyasacharya has show how different is the material cause of the universe from darsanam to darsanam. Now Vyasacharya takes the case how Vedanta is different from the point of view of nimitta karanam. Nasthika darsanam will not come into the picture. They do not believe in god. Christianity nimitta karana will have problem. Islam's nimitta karanam also will have the problem. This Buddhist will not have the problem. Asthika darsanam has a theological Lord. They have a nimitta karana, which is unique. They call the agama people as Mahesvara. They follow agamas and not Vedas. Agama is set of literature different from Vedas. Generally these agamas are followed by Shaiva, vaishnava etc. Here nimitta karanam is considered from shaiva agama people. Vaishnava agamas will be discussed in the next sutra. The nimitta karana Isvara of Samkya, nyaya, vaiseshika or mahesvara is discussed here. Samkya is not supposed to have Isvara at all. It seems there is another type of Samkya and they have god as Isvara. They are called Hiranyagarbha vadhinah otherwise called seshvara Samkya. I take only the necessary points. The Lord the nimitta karana Isvara in shaiva agama is called pasupathi. Otherwise shortened pathih and all jivas are called pasavah. We are pasu and Lord is called pathih and samsara is called pasam. Therefore, the word pathi refers to nimitta karana Isvara of all these five darasanams. Vyasacharya negates this nimitta karana Isvara. What is this theological god? In Vedanta, also we do accept nimitta karana Isvara. Therefore, when you dismiss nimitta karana Isvara then Vedanta Isvara also will be in trouble. Nimitta karana Isvara of Vedanta and other system have to be dealt with separately. Nimitta karana Isvara is also upadana karanam also. He is not mere nimitta karanam enjoying the status of upadana karanam also. The theological god of all darsanams are mere nimitta karanam and not upadana karanam and they are called kevala nimitta karanam and it is theological god. Our nimitta karanam is combine dwith upadana status. This is called tadastha Isvara. Tadastha Isvara means remaining separate from raw material. Carpenter is different from wood. Word is upadana karanam and carpenter is kevala nimitta karanam. This man handles the wood and develops furniture. Intelligent cause will be separate, material cause will be separate, and both will work together to create the universe. God produces a universe using the matter and the intelligent cause. Such a theory has logical fallacies and is into acceptable to us. It will have lot of logical and practical problems also. This is the discussion of this adhikaranam. Initially tadastha Isvara is ok and later we have to take it differently. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 192

### **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

#### **Sutra 37[208]**

#### ***Patyurasamanjasyat***

The Lord [cannot be the efficient or the operative cause of the world] on account of the inconsistency [of that doctrine]

We have entered into the seventh adhikaranam of the second pada of the second chapter. I introduce this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya refutes maheswara madham in which Lord Shiva is the ultimate cause and reality. This madham has four-sub divisions because of the internal division. They are Pasupata, shaiva, kapalika and karunika siddhanta madham. All the four put together is called Maheswara madham. I will call it Shaiva madham. Here Lord Shiva is the ultimate cause and reality in this madham. Are we shivas or vaishnavas. When such question is asked we do not give the answer and ask a counter question. If it is saguna Shiva it is not ultimate reality and if it is nirguna Shiva then we are ready to claim ourselves as shaivas, which is same as Nirgunam Brahman. Similarly, if you say saguna Vishnu we do not accept saguna Vishnu we do not accept and if it is nirguna Vishnu, we are willing to claim as vaishnava because nirguna Vishnu is Nirgunam Brahman. If you ask nirguna Shiva is ultimate or nirguna Vishnu is ultimate, then I will say that both are one and the same. Both Vishnu and Shiva are Nirgunam Brahman alone. We talk about Nirgunam Brahman, which can manifest as Vishnu or Shiva and one Nirgunam Brahman appear as Vishnu or Shiva from vyavaharika level and at Paramatma we are beyond all of them. Maheswara madham call Shiva as the ultimate reality. We ask Shiva is nimitta karanam or upadana karanam or both. They say Shiva is nimitta karanam. We also say Shiva is nimitta karanam and they say Shiva is kevala nimitta karanam. How do you establish nimitta karanam through sruti or yukti pramanam. Suppose they say it is through sruti, and then we ask why do you say Lord is nimittakaranam because Lord is upadana karanam also. It is said everywhere in Upanisads. Through spider example, it is clearly said that Lord is upadana karanam. Let me myself multiply into manifold world without bringing any outside material. Why do you accept the partial sruti and why not you accept Isvara as both nimitta and upadana karanam. He says I accept Isvara as nimitta karanam not as per sruti. My nimitta karanam Isvara is not proved through sruti and it is proved through yuktih. It is yukti siddha nimitta karana matra Isvara is maheswara madham. A Lord who is only nimitta karanam, which is proved only through logic, is maheswara madham. This Isvara they call as pathih. This adhikaranam is called pathi adhikaranam because we refute pathi in this adhikaranam.

Adhi Sankaracharya says this concept is not unique to Maheswara madham only and it is seen in other madhams also. And therefore by refuting maheswara madham we refute yoga madham vaiseshika madham etc. This Isvara is known by specific name in Vedanta is tadastha Isvara. Tadastha Isvara. Now I will come to general analysis of the first sutra.

Here Vyasacharya says we cannot say Isvara is mere intelligent cause because there will be too many logical incongruities. It cannot be avoided. Vyasacharya does not say what are the problems. Adhi Sankaracharya has done the homework and presented in his bashyam. When you establish Lord through logic which we have discussed elaborately before. I will give you the reference. Adhi Sankaracharya has indicated the problem in 1.1.2 known as janmadhikaranam. According to Advaidin Lord can never be established logically. I discussed the topic not in second sutra I have elaborately discussed in 1.1.3 sastra yoni adhikaranam. Logicians have established god in three stages and we established all the three stages are fallacy and they are not acceptable and Lord cannot be established logically. Advaidins say only by using sastra and using logic to understand sastra you can arrive at god. This is Advaidins contention. In addition to the reasons given in 1.1.2 Adhi Sankaracharya gives two more points in this sutra. First one is major argument which we have seen in the above adhikaranam. The first one is called vysamy nyahrimya dosha or partiality. If you say Lord is creator, will be partial because he creates the world with differences. Some are healthy some are sick and some have good parentage and some have bad ones etc. For that his answer is that if Bhagavan is to decide different types of janmas for different persons and he says Bhagavan is not partial because janma is based on punya papam and don't blame our god. So god is nimitta karanam Isvara and people suffer because of punya papam. We ask what is the proof for punya papam. Punya papa can never be logically proved at all and they are called adhrishta that indicates it cannot be proved scientifically. Punya papam is apouruseya vishaya and we cannot discuss about it unless we have faith in sastram. If this mahesvara vadhi claims, Isvara does not have partiality and if birth is based on punya papa then how can the punya papa be proved scientifically. We can talk about possibility and possibility is not a proof. Purva janma cannot be said to be proof. Sookshma Sariram is not scientifically provable. What is mind and we do not know anything about it. It has not been scientifically proved as to what is the mind. Science accepts physical sariram and science does not accept Sookshma Sariram, karana sariram and even Atma because none of them can be proved scientifically. How will you accept purva janma logically and when it is not proved how will you accept punya papam. Suppose he says punya papam I come to know through sastram means Bhagavan creates the world based on punya papa and that Bhagavan is nimitta karanam. We will say to prove punya papam you accept sastra pramanam and then we will ask why not accept the reasoning in sastram that Bhagavan is nimitta and upadana karanam. Vysamyam means partiality and naihrimyam means cruelty.

The second fallacy Adhi Sankaracharya mentions is based on naiyayika nyaya sutra. Naiyayika says that pravarthana dosah or the evils in jiva can be established through activity. Any activity is in the form of pravritti or nivritti, going after or going away. This means it is based on raga and dvesha. You go after because of raga and you go away from it because of dvesha. If you say every activity is raga dvesha dosha the creation of world is also an activity. And therefore god also must have raga and dvesha dosha. Suppose he says scriptures says god is dosha rahita then we would say no doubt dosha rahita and then you also accept god is nimitta and upadana karanam. This is the second fallacy in logically establishing nimitta karana Isvara.

Third argument given by Adhi Sankaracharya is against Samkya yoga philosophy. They define Isvara is free from all the doshas. He does not have various problems like raga and dvesha. Because of that only karma nasti and Isvara does not have karma. Karma is based on raga and dvesha alone. That is why Isvara does not have punya papa phalam and karma phalam. Wherever karma phala experience comes sukha and dukha comes. Bhagavan is free from karma phalam punya papa and sukha and dukha. If this is the Isvara that Isvara must be

absolutely udaseenah. Isvara is passive. Karma is not there and raga dvesa is not there. How can udanseena Isvara create the world? Suppose you go to Bhagavad Gita there, it is said I create the world without doing any action. Once you go to sastram we will say Bhagavan is both nimitta and upadana karanam. According to your definition god does not have raga dvesha karma phalam etc. If you go by naiyayika madham Bhagavan will have raga dvesha. If you generally define god as creator god will be a sadistic Isvara. Never play with god or proof of god without bringing in the sastram. This is general analysis of the sutra. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Patyuh and asamanjasyat are two words in the sutra. Patyuh means status of merely being the intelligent cause is not acceptable; kevala nimitta karanatvam na sambavati; asamanjasyat because of the fallacy; logical defect. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word is patyuh means pathi the god. In shaiva madham they use pathi, pasu and pasam. Pathi here refers to the technical pathi yukti siddha kevala nimitta Isvara. Merely being intelligent cause of pathi. Na sambavathi is unacceptable and therefore all those religion where we talk about god sitting there and go on creating the world are ok when we have childish mind and not when we are intelligent before long all such idea is not acceptable to a thinking person. By suppressing the intellect you can create a personal god and a personal god located somewhere is illogical and it can be pratibasikam and not vyavaharikam. Then we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

### **Sutra 38[209]**

#### ***Sambandhupapattescha***

And because relation [between the Lord and the pradhana of the souls] is not possible

The argument against the Pasupata view is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Another defect in this madham is pointed out here. He says we are able to appreciate a carpenter being an intelligent cause and wood is the material. Carpenter can contact the wood and carve out a beautiful furniture. If god is an intelligent cause like this tell me what is the material cause. Different madham says different material as the cause. Nyaya madham says paramanu is the material cause; Samkya says pradhanam is the material cause and all of them say the material cause is niravayavam partless paramanu and also pradhanam and it is apratyaksam not available for sense organs and this is the material out of which god has to shape the world. It is only anumeyam inferred. This Bhagavan has to shape a Bhagavan who does not have mind, one organless, intangible, and imperceptible. How can the bodiless nimitta karanam and intangible upadana karanam make the world? Carpenter example is understandable and Isvara does not have the body. Therefore, you cannot talk about the contact between the nimitta karana Isvara and your raw material prakriti and paramanu. Whether you say prakriti is raw material or paramanu are raw material the bodiless Bhagavan cannot create the world. Suppose you say that scripture talk about the possibility of contact then I would say the very same scripture say Bhagavan is upadana karanam you should accept. The nimitta and upadana karanam they cannot talk about it. Samyoga sambandha is not possible because Brahman has no parts.



Samavaya sambandha is not possible. So he gives a list of five items. The details I do not want to go through here. Your Isvara and pradhanam cannot have contact and your Isvara and paramanu cannot have any contact. Now I will give the word for word analysis.

Cha again; sambandhanupatteh because of the impossibility of any contact or relationship between nimitta karanam and upadana karanam god cannot be the intelligent cause. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word is sambandhanupattih means contact is impossible to have contact between nimitta and upadana karanam. In Vedanta there is no contact needed because nimitta and upadana karanam are one and the same Brahman. Hence you god cannot be intelligent cause.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 193

### **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

**Sutra 38[209]**

#### ***Sambandhupapattescha***

And because relation [between the Lord and the pradhana of the souls] is not possible

The argument against the Pasupata view is continued.

In this seventh adhikaranam known as patyadhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses all those systems of philosophies that hold Isvara is nimitta karanam and not upadana karanam of the world. In Vedanta Isvara is both nimitta and upadana karanam for the creation of the world. Another expression we use is tadastha Isvara vadha the concept of god who exist separate from the world. We all know a product is non-separate from its material cause and the product is always separate from the intelligent personal god and material cause. In all the systems of philosophy upadana karanam is matter and nimitta karanam is intelligent god like the carpenter. They say the world is non-separate from god and world is necessarily separate from intelligent god that is Isvara. In all systems of philosophy is away from god like carpenter is away and separate from furniture. And that god who is away from world is called tadastha Isvara. Not only that when god is away from world they have to assume that the god is away from space also the space being the integral part of the world. These tadastha Isvara vadhi we take it as maheswara madham and this includes all those who talk of separate god away from the world. All have difficulty in establishing it through Vedas and once they accept they have to accept that Isvara is nimitta and upadana karanam and they cannot go by Vedas. Veda says god is upadana karanam also. Therefore they should not take vada pramana for support and they have to take anumana pramanam. They are tarka pradhana darsana. Intelligent god outside the universe are tarka pradhana people and Vyasacharya negates by pointing out the loopholes in their logic. When Adhi Sankaracharya refutes all these darsanams, he resorts to nyaya arguments and some Samkya system or yoga system and since tadastha Isvara vadha is not confined to one system, Adhi Sankaracharya jumps from one system to another and he refutes the common wrong conclusion that god is not nimitta karanam alone. Carpenter and wood should have contact to produce furniture. Similarly, if you say nimitta karana is Isvara and upadana karanam is pradhanam or paramanu you cannot establish the contact between god, pradhanam, god, paramanu, and description of paramanu and pradhanam are niravayavam. It is like Akasa. Now we will go further.

### **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

**Sutra 39[210]**

### ***Adhishthananupapattescha***

And on account of the impossibility of rulership [on the part of the Lord.

The argument against the Pasupata view is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two meanings to this sutra. First meaning he gives in this sutra and the second meaning in the next sutra. And of the two meaning is easier to communicate and understand. The second meaning is given in the 40<sup>th</sup> sutra. Once you postulate an intelligent god as an intelligent cause of creation as carpenter or goldsmith you have to extend the concept of god accordingly. You cannot apply the logic partially. First thing I find in the carpenter is the body. Sariram is required for the intelligent cause to be the nimitta karanam and it should have the body and the various indriyams. Using the sariram and instruments he carves out the product out of the material cause. In the same way you have to accept the body to your personal god. Suppose they accept that there is a body for the god then they will have some problem, which we will see in the next sutra. God cannot have a body but according to you god should have a body and that is impossible. To have a body again you require raw material and panca bhutas are require which has not so far been created. What type of body the god can have and not having a body is illogical. If you talk of the body then the next question comes as to where is the body located and how the body is made of. Then the creator requires a place for creating the universe. Any loka you talk about has to exist within the space but the god has not created the space. Space is going to come later after creation only. If you talk about the personal god where is he located before creation and how can he have a body because panca bhutas are not there. Without the body, how can he shape the raw material into the universe? If you say that Bhagavan can do without anything then where is the pramana or proof? How do you establish the body? There is no pramana for the god having the body. Suppose you say sastram says then I will counter that if you say Bhagavan can create the body then I would say Bhagavan can be nimitta karanam and also upadana karanam as well. This is the argument. Now we will give the word for word analysis.

Cha moreover; adhishthana anupapatteh; because of the impossibility of a physical support Isvara cannot be merely the intelligent cause of the world. Now we will see the significance of the words. Adhishthana anupapatteh adhishthanam literally means support; in this context Adhi Sankaracharya takes the support as Sthoola Sariram for the intelligence to exist because intelligence cannot exist without a locus. That support or adhishthanam is needed and we see in the sloka 14 of 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita. The sloka reads as *adhishthanam tatha harta karanam ca prthagvidham vividhas eva prthakcesta daivam cat 'va'tra pancamam* the meaning of the sloka is that the seat of action and likewise the agent, the instruments of various sorts, the many kinds of efforts and providence being the fifth. The seat here refers to the physical body. Tell me where is god's Sthoola Sariram. You cannot say it is universe because you say it is away from the body; then where is the intelligence without Sthoola Sariram or Sookshma Sariram. The physical body has got to be located somewhere and these people is not able to say where is the body and where the body is located. Anupapattihi means illogicality. Because of the impossibility of the physical body for the Lord you cannot talk about the personal god sitting somewhere and creating the universe. Now we will see the next sutra.

### ***Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]***

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

**Sutra 40 [211]**

***Karanavacchenna bhogadibhyah***

If it be said [that the Lord rules the pradhanam etc.,] just as [the jiva rules] the senses [which are also not perceived, [we say] no, because of the enjoyment etc.

An objection against sutra 38 is raised and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. In the previous sutra we asked the question as where will such god will stay or what will be the body of the Lord. You cannot imagine the intelligence without body and the body is not possible without panca bhutas, purva paksa says that body is possible and we postulate the body. In addition, I conclude that Bhagavan is the personal god and is located outside world. Why cannot assume such a body to god. Vyasacharya says there will be problem. Once you say that Bhagavan has the body and that body will be subject to Sukha and dukha anubhavah. Bhagavan will have experience favourable and unfavourable. Sukha and dukha means vasana and the body is subject to modification and all changes. This is the main problem once you accept the sariram. Then comes the question what is the body made up of. Body must be made up of panca bhoudikam only. There is a body not made up of panca boudhika then I will ask what is pramanam. For imagination, there is no limit at all. Suppose you say sastram says Bhagavan has got special body and then I will argue that the sastram says Lord is nimitta karanam and upadana karanam and Lord is not located anywhere but he is in the form of the world itself. Material cause is never away from the cause and god is there anywhere where the things are. The next problem is where is the sariram or locus of the sariram. You will not be able to answer to mention the location Akasa is required and the Akasa is not born before sristi. A personal embodies god located elsewhere before the creation of the world is full of logical loophole. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Karanavat chet na and bhogadibhyah are the four words in the sutras. Karanavat god has got the body with organs. This is Purva Paksi statement. Chet means if this is your contention na it is not acceptable; bhogadibhyah because god will be subject to experiences of pleasure and pain. Now we will see the significance of the words. Karanavat that which possess organs; it means Sthoola Sariram is the one that contains the Sookshma Sarira organs; then complete the sentence Isvarasya karanavat sariram asti. God with all organs is available. Next word is chet if this is your contention it is not acceptable to us and it is an irrational proposition. Bhogadibhyah means sukha and dukha anubhava bhogah and adhi means etc., once Sukha and dukha anubhava comes Isvara will have vasana and with vasana raga and dvesha will come. Once raga dvesha comes pravrutti comes and once pravrutti comes karma and karma phalam will come. All these things will be there for god also. If you say Bhagavan has samsara then he will be anisvara and we will have to console Isvara when god is in trouble. Therefore don't imagine personal god located outside the world and you can accept only when you suppress your intellect. Then we will go to the last sutra.

**Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

**Sutra 41 [212]**

***Antavattvamasarvajnata va***

[there would follow from their doctrine the Lord's] being subject to destruction of His non-Consciousness.

The argument raised in sutra 49 is further refuted and thus the Pasupata doctrine is refuted.

I will do the general analysis of this sutra. All the Tadaatha Isvara vadhi talk about Bhagavan as separate entity as intelligent cause like carpenter. They also talk of raw material and that is another entity, which is upadana karanam. If he is Samkya philosopher, upadana karanam is pradhanami and if he is Nyaya Vaishesika he will take paramanu as second entity. Isvara creates the world not for his sukha and dukha anubhava and that cannot be said. Isvara uses pradhanam for the benefit of jivas. Pradhanam is modified into universe for the benefit of jivah. There are three entities and they have to accept and each one is distinct. In Advaita there is only one. They take three things as distinct, Vyasacharya argues if there are three entities each one will be limited by the other necessarily. Intelligent cause will be away from the carpenter and where carpenter is there furniture will not be there. If Isvara is material cause, material cause will be inherent in creation and therefore Isvara is not sarva vyapi just as carpenter is not furniture vyapi. Therefore since there are three tattvam each one will limit the other, jivah will be limited, Isvara will also be limited, and the desa pariccheda will lead to kala pariccheda. It will bring in timewise limitation and Isvara will be subject to mortality. And even for argument sake we take pradhanam and jivahs are limited and Isvara is unlimited then the problem would be that there would be a day when all will be destroyed and gone. Isvara alone will survive and jiva and pradhanam are gone. The Isvara is for what and for whom. I enjoy the status of because of the students. If you are gone I am no more the teacher. Similarly pradhanam and jivah disappear the isvaratvam will not be there for Isvara. The next argument Vyasacharya gives is that to avoid the problem all are anantam. Even though it is not logically possible, we will take it so for argument sake. Then the problem is that Isvara cannot be omniscient. To be omniscient the object should fall within the range of the knowledge. Pariccheda is required. Pradhanam and jiva are anantra \they can never fall within the range of Isvara jnanam and if they fall within the range they will be limited. Then Isvara will lose sarvajna status. If all the three are limited there is problem. If all the three are limitless there is some problem. If one is limited and the other two are limitless then also there is problem. Now we will do the word for word analysis of this sutra.

Antavattvam means all the three will have limitations; va or; asarvajnata the god will have limitation in terms of knowledge. If the things are limited knowledge will be omniscient and if the things are limitless knowledge will be cheap. If knowledge and things are limitless is not possible. Now we will see significance of the words. Antavatvam means limitation; limitation for the three things intelligence, material cause and for the sake of jiva all the three will have antavatvam. The limitation will be both desa and kala pariccheda. A second one will bring in the limitation. Wherever spatial limitation is there kala limitation will also be there. Asarvajnata literally means non-omniscient which means limited knowledge for Isvara. To fall within the range will be limiting the knowledge. Then Isvara will not be Isvara. Because of these reasons, we conclude Isvara cannot be nimitta karanam alone and Isvara is nimitta and upadana karanam as stated by Advaidins. Most of the religions postulate a heaven and whenever we have to address Bhagavan we have to look up who is located there. As per Advaidins Bhagavan is not anywhere and He is here and now so we 'tat tvam asi' more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 194

### **Topic 7 Patyadhikaranam [Sutra 37-41]**

Refutation of the Pasupata system.

#### **Sutra 41 [212]**

#### ***Antavattvamasarvajnata va***

[there would follow from their doctrine the Lord's] beign subject to destruction of His non-Consciousness.

The argument raised in sutra 49 is further refuted and thus the Pasupata doctrine is refuted.

#### **Antavattvamasarvajnata va**

[There would follow from their doctrine the Lord's] being subject to destruction of His non-Consciousness.

The argument raised in sutra 49 is further refuted and thus the Pasupata doctrine is refuted.

Some of the asthika darsanas and some of the nasthika darsanad were negated by Vyasacharya in this adhikaranam. The word agama is sometimes used for Vedas themselves and often the word agama is used for literature, which is other than the Vedas. These agamas have a particular deity as the ultimate god and Shiva is ultimate for shaivas and vaishnavas the Vishnu etc., as the ultimate. These agamas have the philosophy of its own and also the way of life of their own. As for Vedanta is concerned we do not totally reject them. We reject their philosophy as they have a personal god. When it comes to the religious way of life including samskaras some of them are rejected and some of them are accepted. Whatever is contradictory to Vedas are rejected and whatever are noncontradictory are rejected. As regards the agamas one we have rejected that is shaiva madham consisting of four different madhams. The common feature is that the maheswara is taken as the ultimate. One cordinal principle is god is kevala nimitta karanam and that god is called tadaatha Isvara. And that does not mean we are against Lord Shiva. We consider and worship Shiva but we say Shiva worship is intermediary stage and through worship of saguna Shiva we should come to Paramatma nirguna Shiva. If you accept such a transcendental Shiva you should equally worship Vishnu also. If you can comfortably worship both, the you have transcended both. Tataatha Isvara as nimitta karanam is supported neither by sruti pramanam, nor by yukti pramanam. Incidentally, I said that I discussed at the end of the second sutra. Now we will enter into the last adhikaranam.

### **Topic 8 Utpattayasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 42]**

Refutation of the Bhagavata or the pancharatra school.

#### **Sutra 42[213]**

### *Utpattayasambhavat*

On account of the impossibility of the origination [of the individual soul from the highest Lord, [the doctrine of the Bhagavatas or the pancharatra doctrine cannot be accepted].

The pancharatra doctrine or the doctrine of the Bhagavatas is now refuted.

I will introduce this adhikaranam. It has four sutras. In this adhikaranam also Vyasacharya deals with another agama based madham. It is called panca rathra madham. Otherwise, it is called bhagavata madham. It is based on vaishnava agama. It is called bhagavata madham and it considers vasudeva as the ultimate tattvam. You should know it is close to vishistadvaidam and it is not exactly vishistadvaidam. Ramanuja propounds it much later and Adhi Sankaracharya cannot negate Ramanujacharya who came later. In this madham Bhagavan para vasudeva is the ultimate tattvam who is considered to be suddha chaitanya swarupam. They also accept that this Bhagavan is both nimitta and upadana karanam of the creation. This is far better and it is closer to Vedanta. Therefore, we do not refute particular angle. We refute other aspects only. Para vasudeva expresses in four form and each form is called vyuhaga. Vyuhaga means configuration. Para vasudeva has got four vyugas or four murthis. It is this concept Vyasacharya criticizes. One is vasudevah who is none other than Paramatma. Next one is sankarsanah who is one other than jivatma; third vyuga is pratyumnah the manah or anthakaranam and fourth one is aniruttah and it is ahankara tattvam. They also say vasudeva is the ultimate karanam or karana tattvam. Jivatma is the karyam. Karyam originates from vasudeva Paramatma. Pratyumna is also a karya tattvam. Aniruddha is the great grand son born out of manas the ahankara tattvam. One is karanam and the other three are karya tattvam. This is their foundation. Vyasacharya points out that the above is sruti sruti and yukti viruddha. If you talk about vedic vasudeva, we can accept but not the vasudeva of yours. Vasudeva puja, mantra japa etc., are acceptable and the four-fold vyuga is not acceptable.

Now I will discuss the first sutra. Jivatma has originated from Paramatma is not acceptable because Jivatma's origination is illogical and untenable. If Jivatma is supposed to originate it is sastra viruddham. Only the encasement of Jivatma is gone and Jivatma the content is never gone and it is therefore sruti smriti viruddha. If Jivatma is born, Jivatma will be subject to end also. If Jivatma is subject to beginning and end it will have the dosham of ahruta ahama krita hana dosah. When Jivatma originate, what is the basis of origination and type of life. Both origination and life depends upon the purva karma punya papam. We have acquired only a new body and I the Jivatma has never originated. If agama madham says that Jivatma originated then purva karma is not there, then Bhagavan has to supply punya papa for no purva janma karma. If Jivatma end sthen also so many sanchita karmas are there and what will hang without producing any result because the result receiver has died. In Vedanta we say Jivatma is not born and Jivatma existed before acquired karma and through karma new body is acquired and when the body goes, it takes another body in the next birth. You can talk about utpatti of body and not Jivatma. If Jivatma is subject to birth, Jivatma will be subject to death also. Jivatma will be anithya Jivatma and Adhi Sankaracharya asks how can anithya Jivatma get the benefit of nithya moksa. If one is to get nithya moksa, one should be nithyah. Moksa anithyatva prasangaha. Nithya moksa is useless for anithya jiva.

Now, we will go word for word analysis of this sutra. This sutra has one word utpattayasambhavat. Because of the impossibility or un-tenability of the origin [the origin of Sankarsana Jivatma] from Vasudeva Paramatma. Thus, Bhagavata madham is unacceptable.

This is the word analysis. Now I will give you the significance of the word. Utpatsambavat is a compound word consisting utpatti and sambavat. Utpatti means origination. Origination of Vasudevad sakarsana Paramatma. Then asambhavah means un-tenability or irrationality.

### **Topic 8 Utpattayasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 42}**

Refutation of the Bhagavata or the pancharatra school.

#### **Sutra 43[214]**

#### ***Na cha kartuh karanam***

And [it is] not [observed that] the instrument [is produced from the agent].

The argument against the pancharatra doctrine is continued.

They say from sankarsana pratyumna is born. Sankarsana is Jivatma and pratyumna is mind. Mind is karanam and Jivatma is the agent. Wherever instrument comes, we need someone to operate the karanam. Insturemnt is called karanam and the operator is called karta. Mind is born out of jiva and karanam is born out of karta. Sankarsana is Jivatma. Now Vyasacharya says it is impossible that we have not seen the origination of karanam from karta. Karta uses karanam and karta does not produce karanam. Jiva uses the mind and I have not produced my mind. I use and I do not produce. It is pratyaksa virodha. No jiva produces the mind, it is not only anubhava virodha, and it is sastra virodha. We can say Vasudeva is the producer of mind and not Jivatma. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to the word analysis.

Na cha kartu karanam [mano rupa pratyumna the mind] na is not born; kartuh means out of the agent or karta which is the Jivatma sankarsana; instrument is born out of sankarsana Jivatma. Karta uses the anthakaranam and karta does not produce the anthakaranam. The significance of the word is na means na utpatyate; the word cha indicates the second dosha. In the previous sutra one dosha was pointed out and now one dosha is pointed out; kartuh out of the karta; kartuh means sankarsana Jivatma; then karanam means the instrument here it is pratyumna manah. It is not possible and this is the second dosha..

### **Topic 8 Utpattayasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 42}**

Refutation of the Bhagavata or the pancharatra school.

#### **Sutra 44[215]**

#### ***Vijnanadibhave va tadapratishedhah***

Or if the [four vyuhas are said to] possess Infinite knowledge etc., yet there is no denial of that [viz` the objection raised in sutra 42]

I will giver you the general analysis of the sutra. In this madham the view are inconsistent. Their definition of four views changes from context to context. Here Vyasacharya takes up another view of their with regard to their four vyuhas. Really speaking all the four are Bhagavan only and all of them are omnipotent and omniscient and omnipresent. Bhagavan is



one who has six-fold virtue in absolute measure. That definition we accept also. So they say vasudeva also has the six-fold virtue. If you say all the four are Bhagavans do you say that you have four Isvaras. Then we argue if you say there are four gods then there will be so many problems. Four gods are not required. Redundancy is problem number one; if four heads are the rulers many heads means there will be problems and there will be difference of opinions. Two heads in one family has more problems. Anything to survive there should be only one head and similarly there should be only one Bhagavan. Third is it is swa siddhanta thyagah. If you accept four gods and it is against your own principle that ekah Bhagavan. You decide whether one or four gods becoming for discussion on the issue. Now we will go to the second vikalpa. He may say that there is only one god with four forms. Veshams are four and Bhagavan is only one. Then we ask the question whether the four gods are uniform or different. Adhi Sankaracharya argues if you say that four forms are identical how can you talk about karana karya sambandha. Karyam means it has configuration from karanam. This is called second vikalpa. Third option is suppose you say there are four forms and they are not identical and vasudeva has karana form and others have different forms of karyam and vasudeva is like god and other four are like ornaments. There is one gold and ornaments are many. Wehre is the problem and all are Bhagavan only. Adhi Sankaracharya says then why do you contain the karyam to three. Every one of you is vasudeva with different vasudeva. Then there will be many vyuhas of Isvara. Then why do restrict the vyuhas to three only. The dosha is limiting to four doshas and therefore none of them is acceptable.

Now we will see word for word analysis. Va even if they have vijnanadibhave omniscience and other virtues shat guna is indicated here; tadapratishedhah the fallacies remain unresolved; this is the meaning. Now we will see significance of the words. Vijnanam means sarva vijnanam or omniscience. Adhi means etc., indicating other five virtues of the Isvara. Bhave means existence or presence; even if the four vyuhas enjoy all the six virtues like omniscience; va means even if tad apratishedhaha tad means dosha; utpatti asambhava dosha apratishedhah means unresolved. Dosha continues. Even if you change the interpretation of the four vyuhas you are not able to solve the problem.

## **Topic 8 Utpattayasambhavadhikaranam [Sutra 42]**

Refutation of the Bhagavata or the pancharatra school.

### **Sutra 45[216]**

#### ***Vipratishedhacca***

And because of contradictions [the pancharatra doctrine is untenable

The argument against the doctrine of the Bhagavatas is concluded here.

Here Vyasacharya says that there is contradiction or inconsistency. Two contradictions are indicated here. The mutual contradictions are indicated there in their own definition. In one place they say one is Jivatma Paramatma and in another place all are omniscient Bhagavan or ahankara or mind. You yourself contradict your own statement. Second contradiction Adhi Sankaracharya points out that it is Veda virodhah. Veda never says mind is born out of jivah. Adhi Sankaracharya also says one of the acharyas Sandilya rishi who is supposed to have received the madham from Bhagavan mentions that I have brought in pancharatra madham and people have not benefited from four Vedas. He says Veda is useless so I have introduced

pancaratra madham. Their philosophy is different and their lifestyle prescribed is different. They have introduced some samskaras, which are not there in the Vedas. They are not really speaking vaidhikas and they are avaidhikas. With this, the negation of bhagavata madham is over is over.

Viprasidesa cha because of the contradiction bhagavata madham is unacceptable.

With the 45<sup>th</sup> sutra the eighth adhikaranam of this pada is over. With this second pada of the second chapter is over. This pada deals with the para madha dosha darsanam. The logical loopholes in the other systems of philosophy were pointed out and negated the doshas. Of the sixteen padas of the Brahma Sutra, two padas are considered drier than other padas second chapter and second pada and third chapter third pada. I was concerned more about the second pada of second chapter. Now what did we see in the second pada. Para madha dosha. One question asked is whether it is necessary to criticize other darsanams and whether it is proper to criticize other darsanams. We are often advised not to criticize others but we criticize the other darsanams. Are we right is the question we face now. We should know what we take is good for us or not. We do guna dosha viveka. We can take to guna and avoid doshas and it is required to save us. One of the weapons god has given is guna dosha vivechana sakti to save us from bad. We have to generally use vivechana sakti and know gunas and doshas. It is proper and necessary to protect us to find the doshas in other darsanams. However, what is needed is that we should never allow guna dosha viveka jnanam to develop hatred. Second thing that is criticized having understood doshas and we need not give publicity to the doshas. Knowing the dosha is not wrong and publicizing dosha is wrong. Publicize guna and avoid publicize doshas. This is aimed at informing the student paramadha gunas and para madha doshas. We have borrowed many things from other darsanams. Whatever is correct, we have happily borrowed. We have borrowed all the good aspects of other darsanas. We have borrowed the three gunas from Samkya, the method of logical thinking from Nyaya Vaishesika; the method of yoga from yoga sastra; the method of performing the rituals etc., from Purva Mimamsa; even from Bouddha madham we have borrowed the moral values the eight-fold path right understanding etc. An intelligent person should know guna and dosha also. If you ask me whether paramadha dosha is required and proper I would say yet it is proper and it is required and if it is no so Vyasacharya may not have included this in Brahma Sutra. This also gives the power of thinking. We do not hate any one of them and we do not want to publicize other madha dohsah. In this pada we had eight adhikaranam of which the first analysed Samkya yoga madha dosha darsanam and we saw the logical discrepancies of Samkya yoga. In the second and third adhikaranam we say the Nyaya Vaishesika dosha darsanam. In the fourth and fifth adhikaranam we saw Bouddha madha dosha darsanam; in the sixth adhikaranam we had Jaina madha dosha darsanam and seventh and eight we had shaiva agama and vaishnava agama dosha darsanams. Some of them are asthika darsanas and some of them are nasthika darsanams. The two agamas even though they are not added in the darsanas and they accept Veda pramanam and are included here. Among darsanams three are left one is Purva Mimamsa in the fourth sutra samanvaya sutra it has been analysed; the other one is uttara mimamsa darsanam and it is our darsanam. It is siddhanta or it is called Vedanta darsanam. The other one that is left out is carvaka darsanam a materialistic darsanam and we consider as too base a darsanam and we do not consider analyzing it. They do not accept Veda pramanas, values etc. For them might is right. It is criticized in Gita as also in Kathopanisad. Krishna calls them asurah. Even discussing about them is seen as papam. Adhi Sankaracharya makes the point very clear that we do to negate any darsanam. We have no hatred and we are not fanatic towards any one darsanam. An intelligent person is one who is not prejudiced against any one and he does not hate and he does not publicize. We have

completed six padas. We have completed 216 sutras. We have another 339 sutras to be covered. Even though 339 sutras are there, the later sutras are not as tough as the earlier sutras. We are almost in the half way through/ with this background we will go to the third pada in the next class.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 3			
Classes: 195 to 226 = Sutras: 2-3-1 to 2-3-53			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
195	201	2 . 3 . 1	217
196	203	2 . 3 . 1 to 2 . 3 . 4	217 to 220
197	208	2 . 3 . 5 and 2 . 3 . 6	221 and 222
198	212	2 . 3 . 6 and 2 . 3 . 7	222 and 223
199	216	2 . 3 . 7 to 2 . 3 . 9	223 to 225
200	220	2 . 3 . 9	225
201	224	2 . 3 . 10 to 2 . 3 . 12	226 to 228
202	228	2 . 3 . 12 and 2 . 3 . 13	228 and 229
203	231	2 . 3 . 13 and 2 . 3 . 14	229 and 230
204	235	2 . 3 . 14 to 2 . 3 . 16	230 to 232
205	239	2 . 3 . 16 and 2 . 3 . 17	232 and 233
206	242	2 . 3 . 17 and 2 . 3 . 18	233 and 234
207	246	2 . 3 . 18	234
208	250	2 . 3 . 18 to 2 . 3 . 20	234 to 236
209	254	2 . 3 . 21 to 23 . 3 . 23	237 to 239
210	258	2 . 3 . 24 to 2 . 3 . 26	240 to 242
211	262	2 . 3 . 26 to 2 . 3 . 29	242 to 245
212	266	2 . 3 . 29	245
213	269	2 . 3 . 29 to 2 . 3 . 31	245 to 247
214	273	2 . 3 . 31 and 2 . 3 . 32	247 and 248
215	277	2 . 3 . 33 to 2 . 3 . 36	249 to 252
216	282	2 . 3 . 36 to 2 . 3 . 39	252 to 255
217	286	2 . 3 . 39 and 2 . 3 . 40	255 and 256
218	290	2 . 3 . 40 and 2 . 3 . 41	256 and 257
219	295	2 . 3 . 41 and 2 . 3 . 42	257 and 258
220	297	2 . 3 . 42 and 2 . 3 . 43	258 and 259
221	301	2 . 3 . 43 to 2 . 3 . 46	259 to 262
222	304	2 . 3 . 46 to 2 . 3 . 48	262 to 264
223	309	2 . 3 . 48 and 2 . 3 . 49	264 and 265
224	315	2 . 3 . 49 to 2 . 3 . 51	265 to 267
225	320	2 . 3 . 51 to 2 . 3 . 53	267 to 269
226	325	2 . 3 . 53	269
	326		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 3

Class: 195

I will introduce the third pada of the second chapter. The name of the second chapter is avirodadhya and resolving seeming contradiction with regard to the Vedantic teachings. Of this, we have completed the first pada. Samkya and other darsanasm we have negated certain doshas. The source of knowledge of all the darsanams is same but we have to find what mistakes the other darsanams to differ with one darsanam and we point out the mistake and arrive at the right source of knowledge. The source is same and conclusions are different means there is some mistake in the interpretation of Vedas. The purpose of the earlier pada is to reveal the doshas of other darsanams were revealed. In the third pada we get sruti virodha pariharah. this means there are some people who claim that the Vedantic teachings contradict the Vedantic teachings sruti and sruti. Do we have mutual contradiction or paraspara virodha pariharah. We will see the contradiction between one sruti and another sruti. The fourth pada is also sruti virodha parihara only. If both padas are doing sruti virodha parihara what is the internal difference between the third and fourth pada. Bhuta bogtru sristi sruti virodha parihara is one of the topic here. There are several sruti vakyams dealing with panca bhuta srist. Among the statement, we see mutual contradiction. One Akasa sristi in one sruti differs from another statement in another Upanishad. Brahma Sutra helps you to observe the Veda. The next one is with regard to jiva sristi also there are many contradictory statement in the Veda. For jiva there is another name bogta. Bhuta bogtru sristi sruti virodha parihara is the essence of the third pada. In the fourth pada Vyasacharya talks about the creation of Sookshma Sariram. With regard to Sookshma Sariram, the organs, and their number are discussed here. Sookshma Sariram sristi sruti vakya virodha parihara is the topic for the fourth pada. This is the introduction to the third pada.

There are seventreen adhikaranam and 53 sutras here. It is called vyad adhikaranam and it has seven sutras. First Vyasacharya wants to analyse the panca bhuta sristi and amongst them also the first panca bhuta is Akasa. Here Akasa sristi will be analysed. We find there are contradictory statements in the Upanishad and therefore there are problems. Hence Brahma Sutra becomes necessary. Vyad means Akasa. In all the adhikaranams we see a particular pattern. First Vyasacharya will reveal the seeming contradiction in the sruti vakyam. Sruti virodha will be highlighted. Thereafter the development will be in three stages. One is purva paksa madham, the second is ekadesi madham and the third is siddhantah. The Purva Paksi madham is stand taken by a radical person who is an anti Veda person. He takes since Veda makes contradictory statement, he says Veda is unreliable. Therefore, Veda is apramanam not a source of knowledge at all and therefore Veda should be rejected. The next one is ekadesi madham who accept in Veda pramana and is interested in contradiction and he wants to validate Vedas. He is one among us. He is a vaidhika and establish Veda pramanam. Motive is good and he reconciles contradiction in a wrong way. Wrong reconciliation is ekadesi madham. First one is negative and criticism is his purpose. Ekadesi wrongly reconciles. Siddhanta whose motive is good and he reconciles rightly and properly. In this adhikaranam the first two sutras belong to Purva Paksi madham and negates Veda pramanam. The next three sutras are ekadesi madham and who attempts to resolve the contradiction and save the Vedas. But he uses the wrong methods and comes to wrong conclusions. The last two sutras we get the views of siddhanti. By going through these our intelligence gets sharpened. The unfortunate things is most of the modern people often propagate Purva Paksi and ekadesi. This is the general introduction of this adhikaranam.

[the purva paksin, i.e., the objector says that] ether [Akasa] [does] not [originate] as sruti does not say so.

The opponent raises a contention that Akasa is uncreated and as such not produced out of Brahman. This prima facie view is set-aside in the next sutra.

Now I will do the general analysis of the sutra. Purva Paksi here presents the contradiction obtaining in the Vedas with regard to the Akasa sristi. He presents one main contradiction and he implies two more contradiction. He keeps in mind the mantra 6.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad which reads as *tadaiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tattejo 'srjata tatteja aiksata bahu syam prajayeyeti tadapo 'srjata tasmadyatra kvaca socati svedate va purusastejasa eva tadadhyapo jayante* the meaning of the mantra is that the Existence decided: 'I shall be many. I shall be born'. He then created fire. That fire also decided 'I shall be many. I shall be born' then fire produced water. That is why whenever or wherever a person mourns or perspires, he produces water. But II.i.1. Of Taittiriya Upanishad reads as *tasmad va etasmad atmana akasas sambhutah, akasaa vayuh, vayor anih, agner apah, adbhyah prthivi, prthivya osadhyayah osadhibhyo anna, annat purusah*. The meaning of this mantra is from this Self, verily ether arose, from ether air, from air fire, from fire water, from water the earth, from the earth herbs, from herbs food and from food the person. Chandogya upanisad does not talk the Akasa sristi at all and Akasa is unborn. It is never a karyam as per the Chandogya upanisad. He created Agni and jalam and earth. Isvara creating Akasa is not mentioned. Therefore, being unborn Akasa is nityah and Akasa sristi abhavah. But Taittiriya Upanishad talks of the creation of Akasa. The first contradiction sristi asti and sristi nasti. Whether sristi is there or not is the first contradiction. According to Taittiriya Upanishad Agni is the third creation and according to creation, first creation is Agni. This is called pradamatva tridiyatva rupa virodhah. Then third contradiction is in the Taittiriya Upanishad Agni is not born out of Brahman because Upanishad says Agni is born of Vayu. Whereas the Chandogya upanisad says from Brahman Agni is born. Tell me now whether Agni is born of Brahman or Vayu. Thus, there are contradictions within the Upanisads and therefore sruti is not reliable and therefore reject sruti. In the Vedantic texts, we come across in different places different statements regarding the origin of various things. Some texts say that ether and air originated. Some do not. Some other texts again make similar statements regarding the individual soul and the pranas [the vital airs]. In some places, the sruti texts contradict one another regarding the order of succession and the like. This is in nutshell the Purva Paksi's argument.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 196

### **Topic 1 viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7]**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.1 [217]**

#### ***Na viyadasruteh***

In the first sutra, Purva Pakshi talks of the absence of Akasa sristi and in the second Upanishad he talks of the presence of sristi. Now I will give you the word meaning. Vyad means space or Akasa; na does not originate; asruteh because of the absence of such a statement in Chandogya upanisad. Now we will see the significance of the words. Vyad means Akasa; na means does not originate; is not created; asrute means in the absence of sruti vakyam. Because of the absence of such a sruti statement Akasa sristi sruti statement in Chandogya upanisad, the Akasa is not born.

The main sruti vakyam kept in mind is Brahman created Agni. In this sruti vakyam creation of Akasa or Vayu is not mentioned and the first creation is Agni and according to this sruti statement Akasa and Vayu are not created by Brahman. That is why he said na vyad asruteh. Akasa janma nasti. Asruteh sruti vakya abhavad. This is based on Chandogya upanisad mantra quoted above. This is sruti statement number one. In the next sutra he quotes another sruti statement which contradicts Chandogya upanisad statement.

### **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7]**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.2 [218]**

#### ***Asti tu***

But there is [a Sruti text which states that Akasa is created]

First we will the general analysis of this sutra. Here Purva Pakshi says that however in another Upanishad we find Akasa utpatti is mentioned [Taittiriya Upasana 2.i.1] Akasa tasmad sambutah space is born out of Brahman. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to the word for word analysis. Asti tu means there is however a statement regarding the origination of space. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Asti means sruti vakyam asti; here sruti vakyam asti; sruti vakyam kept in mind is 2.i.1. Tu indicates the differentiation of this statement from the previous statement of Chandogya upanisad. Contradiction is indicated by the word 'tu'. Now we have to take the conclusion of the Purva Pakshi that from the above two sutras contradict themselves in Akasa sristi. Therefore do not depend upon the Upanishad. Bouddha is supposed to have said not to rely on Vedas but believe on yourself.

We are against the Veda ninda is the biggest blot of Buddha. Adhi Sankaracharya says Veda is a well wisher and superior to thousand mothers.

In the first sutra, Purva Pakshi talks of the absence of Akasa sruti and in the second Upanishad he talks of the presence of sruti. Now I will give you the word meaning. Vyad means space or Akasa; na does not originate; asruteh because of the absence of such a statement in Chandogya upanisad. Now we will see the significance of the words. Vyad means Akasa; na means does not originate; is not created; asrute means in the absence of sruti vakyam. Because of the absence of such a sruti statement Akasa sruti statement in Chandogya upanisad, the Akasa is not born.

The main sruti vakyam kept in mind is Brahman created Agni. In this sruti vakyam creation of Akasa or Vayu is not mentioned and the first creation is Agni and according to this sruti statement Akasa and Vayu are not created by Brahman. That is why he said na vyad asruteh. Akasa janma nasti. Asruteh sruti vakya abhavad. This is based on Chandogya upanisad mantra quoted above. This is sruti statement number one. In the next sutra he quotes another sruti statement which contradicts Chandogya upanisad statement. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7]**

Ether is not eternal but created.

### **Sutra 2.3.3 [219]**

#### ***Gaunyasambhavat***

[the sruti text concerning the origination of Akasa] has a secondary sense, on account of the impossibility [of the origination of the Akasa.]

Here is an objection against sutra 2.

The following three sutras relate to ekadesi madham. The wrong definition is given by the ekadesi madham. We will refute this also later. First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Here ekadesi the second Purva Pakshi wants to resolve this problem in a particular way. According to him Akasa is nithya like nyaya philosophy. Like Atma Akasa is also nithya and all pervading? Therefore, what sruti want to communicate is that Akasa is not born and what Chandogya upanisad says is correct. Sruti begins with Agni alone as mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 6.ii.3. Naturally the question will come if you accept Veda as pramanam how do you account for the Akasa utpatti mentioned in Taittiriya Upanishad. He says Akasa utpatti is to be explained as figurative statement and it is not a factual statement. Then he also gives Akasa has to be accepted as nithyam because logically you cannot explain origination of Akasa. Akasa utpatti is untenable and impossible. If sruti talks about Akasa utpatti, sruti is illogical and then we say, sruti is illogical. In Kathopanisad it is said that the people in heaven are immortal. We come to know that swarga people are mortal only. Sruti makes illogical statement what is mortal has been said as immortal and we say that it is figurative immortality and not real immortality. It means compared to earthly life they have very long life. It is like permanent job. It means compared to temporary period, permanency is abekshika alone and similar Akasa utpatti should not be taken literally but should be taken figuratively. Adhi Sankaracharya elaborates the views of ekadesi. First, we should see how



Akasa utpatti is illogical according to the ekadesi. He gives three reasons. First is karana abhavad and you cannot talk about the cause of the Akasa. He says this with the tarkika mind. You have to think in line of nyaya philosopher. He says that every object created is endowed with constituent parts. Yad karyam tad savayavam. Then the next point he says is that all the constituent parts alone is the karanam of this product. This means constituent parts alone are assembled together and the product is made. Wall is product having the constituent part as bricks and bricks becomes the cause of the wall. Therefore he says the constituents or savayavam is the karanam and this savayava dravya rupa karanam is assembled together and become savayavi dravyam. And this savayavi dravyam will be full of savayavams. And therefore to find out the cause of a thing you find out the constituent part of a thing. And the constituent savayava alone will be karanam. That is how tarka sastra earth has been reduced to bits and those bits put together is earth. Then we come to molecules and molecules joined together savayavam. Molecule becomes atom and so on. Then atom further is reduced to sub-atom. Thus tarka sastra has reduced earth to paramanus. So we have paramanu of jalam, Agni etc. If we split savayavi dravyam it will become savayavam. Savayavam is karanam and savayavi is karyam. Now keeping this argument this Ekadesi who is the follower of tarka way of thinking says Akasa is never a karanam because we have not seen any constituent part of Akasa. Akasa has no constituent parts and Akasa is niravayavam. Akasa is not pratyaksam. You cannot arrive at savayava dravyam for Akasa. If you arrive at constituent part for Akasa and those savayava dravyam savayavi Akasa can be produced. Akasa has no savayavam. Pritvi paramanu is constituent parts; Agni has constituent parts in the form of paramanu; jalam has constituent parts in the form of paramanu; Vayu has got constituent parts in the form of paramanus but Akasa has no paramanu or the constituent parts. Therefore, argument number one is Akasa is niravayavam like Atma.

Then the second argument is to establish that Akasa is unborn. Akasa praga bhava asambavad. It means that if you talk about the production of something it follows that before the production, it was non-existence and the non-existence or origination is called praga abhavaha. Now we are able to conceive the origination of the objects in creation because we are able to conceive the absence of that thing. We can conceive of praga bhava [the absence] of everything like jalam, Agni, Vayu, pritvi etc. We talk about the praga bhava of space itself and how can we talk of origination of space and there should have been karanam for origination of space. If you talk about the cause before origination of space then you have to talk of where the cause existed. You have to accommodate the cause of space because before the space, origination there is no space and therefore you cannot talk about the absence of space but talk about the absence of things in the space. Therefore praga bhava asambavat. This is the second reason.

The third reason he says is that Akasa is unlike the other four elements. Other four elements are savayavam, they are limited in nature, and none of them is all pervading. All are paricchinnam and therefore we can talk about the origination of vasthu and Akasa being all pervading, you do not compare with other four elements. Still Akasa should never be compared to other four elements. In tarka sastra when they talk of seven dravyam Akasa is not included and it is compared to Atma. Akasa is closer to Atma rather than the other four elements. Since it is comparable to all pervading Atma, Akasa is nithyaha sarvagadatva atmavad. It is all pervading and eternal. Akasa sristi is never talked of by modern scientists also. The word gauni we should understand. Since it is literally not possible to take the birth of Akasa literally, we should take it figuratively. We never produce space. When we make space to accommodate something it is figuratively space is created. When you dig a well it looks as though you have created space for water and in fact you have removed the earth but it is

figuratively said that you have made a hole. So there is no Upanishad contradiction. Chandogya upanisad talks about figurative origination while taittiriya Upanishad talks literally the origination of space. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Gauni the origination of space is apparent; asambhavat means being untenable or illogical. This is the running meaning. Gauni means figurative; Akasa utpatti is non-actual. Therefore the statement of Akasa origination is figurative. Akasa utpatti sruti is gouni. It is not factual. Another example we give in scripture is that man is like a lion. It is a figurative statement should not be taken literally. Asambavat impossible; hence, we give figurative meaning. We give a figurative meaning only when the actual meaning is not there. Figurative meaning is less powerful than the actual meaning. Only when the primary meaning fails only you should take the secondary meaning. Hence it is taken that Akasa is not born.

The word Akasa is used in a secondary sense in such phrases as 'make room', there is no room etc., although space is only one it is designated as being of different kinds when we speak of the space of a pot, the space of a house etc. Even in vedic passages a form of expressio such as 'He is to place the wild animals in the spaces is seen. Hence we conclude that those sruti texts also which speak of the origination of Akasa must be taken to have secondary sense or figurative meaning alone.

## Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}

Ether is not eternal but created.

### Sutra 2.3.4 [220]

#### *Sabdacca*

Also from the sruti texts [we find that Akasa is eternal}

Here is an objection against sutra 2.

This sutra also relates to ekadesi madham. He says that not only from the standpoint of logic but also sruti pramanam also Akasa is unborn. Previously yukti pramanam was given. Logically ekadesi said Akasa is nithyah. Here he says sruti says that Akasa is nithyah. One is II.3.3. Of Brihadharaynaka upanisad *auschantariksham chaitadamritam*. Here it is said air and the Akasa are immortal. Other three elements were said to be murtham and Akasa is seen as amurtham.

Akasa and Vayu are amritam it is said. If it does not have death, it means it does not have birth. Now Adhi Sankaracharya says quoting from sruti '*akasavat sarvagatoca nithyah*' that states those two qualities of Brahman belong to the ether also. Hence, an origin cannot be attributed to the Akasa. Akasa nithyah it is said. Atma is all pervading and eternal like the space. Because of sruti vakyam also Akasa is nithya and Akasa origination is nonfactual. This is the general analysis. Now we will go to word for word analysis.

Sabdada cha from the vedic statements also space is known to be uncreated or unborn. This is the running meaning. Sabdad and cha. Sabdad means sabda pramana it means Veda pramana; [quoted above] because of these two reasons Akasa utpatti is not there. Therefore there is no

contradiction at all. Word cha is conjunction an additional argument to the previous sutra. Here sruti pramana is given in addition to the yukti pramanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 197

### **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.4 [220]**

#### ***Sabdacca***

Also from the sruti texts [we find that Akasa is eternal}

Here is an objection against sutra 2.

In this first pada the seeming contradiction of the upanisadic statements are being resolved. First we take up the sruti statements relating to panca bhuta sristi and we have taken Akasa sristi vakyani. We have taken two sruti statements Chandogya upanisad and Taittiriya Upanishad. One says Akasa is born while in another Akasa is said to be unborn. First is Purva Paksi madham and the second is ekadesi madham. Purva Paksi says sruti statements are contradictory and therefore sruti is apramanam. Ekadesi madham is purva paksa number two and he is a believer of Veda pramana and he tries to resolve but he makes wrong resolution. First we have to resolve the seeming contradiction presented by purva paksa and secondly we have to say the resolution of ekadesi we have to say is wrong. Here we saw first two sutras Purva Paksi madam and one of ekadesi madham. His method of resolving is that he says that Akasa is not born and Chandogya upanisad sruti is correct. Then the next question if Akasa is not born how did Taittiriya Upanishad talks about Akasa utpatti. Does not Taittiriya Upanishad sruti spoil the Veda pramanam. When Taittiriya Upanishad says it is not literally birth of Akasa but it is figurative expression. Just as we say in Vedanta no jiva is born anytime and jiva continues from purva janma to present and future janmas. The janmas are figurative janma. It is gouna janma and he has been already there from the Sookshma Sariram we talk about birth of jiva. So also we talk of Akasa janam the container or upadhi. In advaيدا prakaranam gatakasa is seemingly born and Akasa is not born. In one place actual non birth is mentioned and in another place figurative birth are not contradictory and therefore Akasa is nithyah. Akasa utpatti sruti is gouni. In support of his resolving of the contradiction ekadesi quotes sruti support also wherein he quoted murtha amurtha Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. He quoted Akasa as amurtham and others as murtham. About Akasa and Vayu it is said to be amritam. Etad amurtham amritam Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.3.3. Another sruti we saw was akasavat sarvagata nitya Atma is eternal as Akasa. The Upanishad clearly says Atma is eternal like Akasa which Akasa is eternal. Therefore Akasa utpatti nasti. Up to this we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.5 [221]**

### ***Syaccaikasya Brahmasabdavat***

It is possible that the one word [sprang – sambhutih] may be used in a secondary and primary sense like the word Brahman

An argument in support of the above objection is now advanced by the opponent [Purva Paksin]

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Ekadesi has mentioned the Akasa utpatti has got the figurative meaning alone. the word sambutih born must be gauna sambavah. This is what ekadesi said. He now assumes an objection to his interpretation. And that possible objection ekadesi answers. What is the doubt that may arise in his interpretation? He says Taittiriya Upanishad says Vayu is born jalam is born, oshadaya is born and there is a series of utpatti is mentioned and Akasa utpatti should not be taken literally and be taken figuratively. Now the purva paksa asks whether it should be taken for ether alone or for all creations, the meaning should be taken figuratively. According to him, all others are real, Akasa utpatti alone is mukya, and space alone is to be taken as figurative. When I use the word lion, for the lion club member it is gouna and at the same time when I use the word to indicate the lion in a zoo, it is mukya arthah. In the case of jalam, pritvi, Agni etc., we should take the mukya arthah. How can you give two different meaning in one context. It is sristi prakaranam and you take figurative sense in one case and literary sense in another case. It is an objection to the ekadesi. Ekadesi says that there is nothing wrong in taking one part in figurative and another in primary case. We have to take the meaning while deciding what sense we should take and that there is no dosha. He also says that in Veda we do interpret one and the same word in gaunarth and mukya artha also. he he says go to III.ii.1 says *tapasa Brahma vijijnasasva tapo brahmeti sa tapo'tapyata, sa tapas-taptva* Birgu Valli of Taittiriya Upanishad. And thereafter it is said in the same nanra annam brahmeit vyajanat, annad dhyeva khalvimani bhutani jayante annena jatam jivanti then in the next mantra we see that prano brahmeti vyajanat pranad dhyeva khalvimani bhutani jayante. Now ekadesi says that in the same case we take primary and secondary meaning. There are two statements here. No Brahman through tapas; tapas in the context is enquiry or vicharah. Here we see tapas is sadhanam and Brahman is sadhyam; through tapas may you know Brahma; sadhanam is the cause and Brahman is karanam. Tapas itself Brahman. In the previous statement tapas is sadhanam and here the word Brahman refers to sadhana that is tapas. Therefore, in one sentence, Brahman is the goal and in the next sentence, Brahman is the means. Brahman is sadhyam is the primary meaning whereas when Brahman is sadhanam it is only gounam. One and the same Brahman word is used in the meaning of end as also in the means also. Here itself another thing is to be noted. In one case annam is equated to Brahman and Brahman is equated to prana and finally in the sixth anuvaha Brahman is equated to anandam. Now tell me which one is Brahman. Brahman as annam is figuratively said because through annamaya kosa we reach Brahman so annam, mana, etc., is figurative Brahman or vyavaharika Brahman and the real ananda is never experiential. One Brahma sabda is used figuratively for anna and prana and the same is used for ananda, which is mukyam. Previously we said mukya sahadya arthe and gouna sadhana arthe Brahma sabdah prayuktah. When one Brahman is used differently why cannot we use one sambhuta sabda gouni utappti artha and mukya utpatti artha. It is possible, therefore my method of resolution is correct, there is no utpatti, and there is no contradiction in sruti. This is the general analysis. Now let see word for word analysis.

Cha moreover, syat twofold meaning is possible ekasya for oneword Brahma sabdavat as in the case of the word Brahman; this is the word meaning. The significance of the word is cha

it is possible prayogadvayam or twofold meaning; artha dvyam gouna artha and mukya artha; actual meaning and secondary meaning; ekasya mean one word; one word means the Akasa sambuthah is the one word which has got figurative birth and actual birth; Brahma sabdavat like the word Brahman occurring in Taittiriya Upanishad. With this ekadesi madham is over. Now siddhanta will come in the next sutra.

## Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}

Ether is not eternal but created.

### Sutra 2.3.6 [222]

#### *Pratijna'haniravyatirekacchabdebhyah*

The non-abandonment of the proposition [viz. By the knowledge of one everything else becomes known, can result only] from the non-difference [of the entire world from Brahman] according to the words of the Veda of the sruti texts [which declare the non-difference of the cause and its effects.

The objection raised in sutra 1 and continued in sutras 3,4,and 5 is now replied to.

As I said with the fifth sutra ekadesi madham is over and he has established Akasa is nithya and all pervading. What is Akasa is even now a mystery and it is not known whether it is a substance of it is emptiness is not known to us. Whether it is positive or negative substance is still a mystery to us. The things positive and negatives are born and dies in the Akasa it is said. They talk about the bending of Akasa and expansion of Akasa. Therefore this adhikaranam gives the Vedantic approach to Akasa. The view of Purva Paksi was held by scientists till recently. Therefore purva paksa says Akasa is nithya and it is a positive entity and it is not emptiness. Emptiness is eternal is contradictory. When there is no substance and how can you add attribute to the emptiness, the absence of substance. How can you use adjective for dravya abhava. They say Akasa is nithya dravyam they say. This is held by tarka sastra people.

Now we say Akasa is a positive substance but we say Akasa is not eternal and it is subject to death. Science is also coming around to this idea.

The general analysis of the sutra is this. Vyasacharya says all your confusion will go if you study the definition fully. If you see partially then there will be confusion. If you see the whole it will be clear. The Chandogya upanisad what is the teaching given here. In fact many problems in the Veda is solved only by keeping the totality of the statement or sruti. Therefore in vedic analysis keeping the totality is very important and that is why people study the text by heart. Whatever you do not know by heart then the thing you read will be very small. Otherwise, it will look very big. The interpretations are based on the context. Svetaketu comes back to his father back. Father asks him the question. He say that you seems to be an arrogant body puffed with the extra vedic knowledge. Did you ask for that wisdom from your guru by gaining which everything will be known. Ins hort eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is possible. Did you ask for that eka vijnanam. He gives the answer that I do not think that my guru knew that answer. Anyway, if such a knowledge is there tell me he said to his father. Brahma Vidya cannot be given without asking. Father says that it is possible. When one substance is karanam eka karana vijnanena sarva kayam vijnanam bhavati. Eka

karya vijnanena anya karyam is not possible. This is the answer of uddalaka his father. By knowing the clay all, the pots can be known because pots are non-different from clay. Product is non-different from the cause. This introduction is called pratijna. Eka karana vijnanena sarva karyam vijnanam sambavathi. Having given the pratijna, the teacher starts from Brahman. He wants to say eka Brahma vijnanena sarva Prapancha vijnanam syat and therefore Brahma vijnanam is very great. This is possible under one condition and that is only when Brahman is karanam and everything else is karyam. This is in the mind of the teacher when he talks of boudhika sristi and jagat sristi. Therefore, Akasa also must be a product of Brahman if Akasa is not a product of Brahman eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is not possible. If Akasa is not a product of Brahman and Akasa will be separate entity being not a product of Brahma. You can know not everything about the Brahma karyam by knowing Brahma vidya and you can know Akasa, which is beyond the scope of Brahman knowledge. If Akasa is taken as not a product of Brahman, with Brahma jnanam one cannot know anything about Akasa. Only if we say Akasa is Brahma karyam, one can know about Akasa. If not none will know anything about Akasa. If Akasa is not a product of Brahman the very proposition will be violated that is eka vijnanena sarva nijnanam. For this we have to accept Akasa is non-different from Brahman. This is supported by all the examples given. This pratijna is vey important argument which Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya use in their bashyams. It is not a stray occurrence in Chandogya upanisad alone. It occurs in Brihadharaynaka upanisad also 2.4.5 to 2.4.11. Eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is given. Brihadharaynaka upanisad corroborates the pratijna by giving the logic and says the whole creation is born out of or the product of Atma. By saying that Upanishad says the whole creation is the product of Atma and therefore it is non-different from Atma and therefore Atma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. In Mundaka upanisad 1.1.3 it is said kasmin nu bhagavo vijnate sarvam idam vijnatam bhavatiti the meaning of the mantra is what is that my Lord, having known which all these become known? Is the question asked by the student to his Guru. Then Angiras answers eka karana vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati. It is elaborated in the next two section and it concludes since the whole world is a product of Brahman, Brahman alone appears as the world. This is comparable to the gold alone appears in all the ornaments and the knowledge of gold gives all the knowledge about all the gold ornaments. So also are the Brahman, the world, and its product. The knowledge of Brahman gives the knowledge of all the product of Brahman. The world is a product of Brahman and world is non-different from Brahman and therefore knowing Brahma you know everything about the world. By Brahman knowledge you can know the knowledge of Brahman. Eka vijnanam is easier then aneka vijnanam. So knowing Brahman makes the job easy instead knowing everything. Only if the world is product of Brahman this is possible and if the world is a product of Brahman then Akasa is also the product of Brahman and it is not nithyam. I will give you the word meaning.

Pratijna ahanih the vedic proposition can be maintained avyatiirekat only on the basis of the non-difference of everything from Brahman. Sabdebhyah this is known through the vedic statement. The significance of the word I will give you in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 198

### **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.6 [222]**

#### ***Pratijna'haniravyatirekakacchabdebyah***

The non-abandonment of the proposition [viz. By the knowledge of one everything else becomes known, can result only] from the non-difference [of the entire world from Brahman] according to the words of the Veda of the sruti texts [which declare the non-difference of the cause and its effects.

The objection raised in sutra 1 and continued in sutras 3,4,and 5 is now replied to.

We see the sixth sutra of vyadadhikaranam. In the first two sutras we got the purva pakshi madham and the later three sutras we got ekadesi madham. In the sixth and seventh sutra we get the reply from siddhanta. Sixth sutra negates purva pakshi and seventh sutra negates the ekadesi madham. The contradictions in Chandogya upanishad and Taittiriya Upanishad mantras are being negated. Even though Akasa utpatti is not explicitly mentioned, it should be taken as implicitly stated. Therefore, panca bhuta sruti is given in both the Upanishads. Thus, sruti pramanam is vindicated. The Upanishad has proposed eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam should be possible only under one condition and svarvam should be non-different from one thing and then alone eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena can be validated only if we show that everything is non-different from Brahman. It is non-different from one thing only under one condition and everything must be the karyam of that one karanam and then everything will fit into the place if we put Brahman in its place Brahman is sarva karanam and tasmad Brahma vijnanena .sarva vijnanam. This is explicitly stated mrit is ekam and gata is anekam mrit is karanam and gatas are karyam and pot is non-different from clay. This methodology has been presented in the Upanishad and so that we apply this to Brahman also. Therefore the conclusion is that the entire world must be the product of Brahman which means Akasa is included in the world and Akasa utpatti is implied in creation of the world. There is no question of sruti virodha. This is the significance of the sixth sutra.

The first word is pratijna ahanih hanih means violation; ahanihi means non-violation or vindication or acquittal; pratijna means proposition; it is a statement given in the beginning which is to be explained later. This statement has to be explained by giving the logic. Thereafter we say the statement, which is called nigamanam. It is conclusion after proof. Pratijna and nigamanam will be identical. Here proposition is eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena. The validation of Upanishadic proposition of omniscience is gained through knowing one. Avyatireha means difference separateness bedah; avyatireka means non-separateness. Only by the condition of non-difference from Brahman then alone Brahma jnanam will equal to sarva jnanam. Then Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. Sabdebyah these steps. The sruti vakyams have been given in the commentary. These are the significance of the words of the sutra.



Adhi Sankaracharya adds a few points that by establishing Akasa utpatti through implication we have resolved seeming sruti contradiction. In both the Upanishad panca bhuta sruti is given and there is contradiction at all. All the three contradictions are resolved. First is utpatti virodhah. Taittiriya Upanishad talks about Akasa utpatti, Chandogya upanisad does not talk about Akasa utpatti, and there is contradiction at all. The contradiction with regard to utpatti is between Chandogya upanisad and Taittiriya Upanishad one talking of utpatti of Akasa and the other not mentioning the utpatti of Akasa. The second contradiction is krama virodha. In Taittiriya Upanishad the order of production is given. In the one Upanishad Agni is first to be born and in the other Agni is seen to be born third. This is krama virodha. The third contradiction is karana virodha. In Taittiriya Upanishad the source of Agni is Vayu. In Chandogya upanisad since Akasa and Vayu is not mentioned it says Brahman created Agni. Thus there is contradiction between the two Upanishad regarding the birth of Agni. We say all the contradictions are resolved that there is Vayu and Akasa utpatti. The first one resolved very clearly. The second and third are resolved here itself and these two are to be resolved in a later adhikaranam [4<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam 10<sup>th</sup> sutra] and therefore sruti is pramana. Now some intermediary people come and say we are not satisfied with the answer. They say that you say Akasa is born because only if you accept Akasa utpatti eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is possible. This again is possible only when you accept Akasa is product of Brahman and he says it need not be. He says Akasa is nithyam and all others other than Akasa are Brahma karyam. Therefore, all others are non-different from Brahman. However, Akasa is different from Brahman because it is not a product of Brahman. In addition, he says still I can explain that eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam it means eka karana sarva karya vijnanam. He adds that sarva vijnanam does not have an absolute meaning. Why do you want to include everything in sarva. The sarva means all the sarva karya vijnanam. Suppose I say all of you come here. The word all means the entire student only and it does not include the chennai population. All come means all the invitees only. Advaidins takes everything in the creation and includes Akasa. However, I take all the sarva karya vijnanam excluding Akasa, which does not fall within those created by Brahman. Sarvam means not absolute sarvam but it is relative sarvam. What is the relative sarvam. Every product is known and eka sarva Brahma karya vijnanam and Akasa should not be included in that sarvam is the argument of Purva Paksi. Now Adhi Sankaracharya says that if eka karana vijnanena only if all the products are to be known, why should the Upanishad talk about Brahman at all and even by talking about piece of wood I can say eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam. By knowing wood you know all about the word product. Upanishad can talk about relative karanam. I can say eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena. By teaching relative karanam you will know relative sarva vijnanam. If absolute sarva vijnanam is to be know, Upanishad should teach absolute sarva vijnanam and not relative sarva vijnanam. Absolute karanam means that it should include Akasa also. Relative karanam anyone knows and absolute karanam one should know and this can be known by the study of Vedas alone.

He gives another argument. Eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam possible even by accepting Akasa as nithyam not as product of Brahman. It can be justified in absolute sense. Knowing Brahman knows all the products. It is because products are non-different from Brahma and therefore by knowing Brahman one can know even Akasa despite it is not a product of Brahman. Akasa must be in and through Brahman only. Akasa is sarva anusuyavad and when you see the milk you see water also though water is not a product of milk. When you see milk you see water which being non-different from milk. You cannot differentiate water from milk. Adhi Sankaracharya says that knowledge of water or that knowledge of Akasa will not be a clear knowledge; you may experience knowledge and it does not come under clear knowledge. It is like when I experience milk. I experience water pervading the milk. Eka

vijnanena sarva vijnanam is only a manipulated knowledge and not absolute knowledge. We know it is manipulation. Second argument is if Akasa is not a product of Brahman and if it is nithayam and exist along with Brahman in Chandogya upanishad would not have said 'ekam eva' and Upanishad should talk about two things that is Brahman and Akasa. Since Upanishad clearly says ekam eva advidiyam and Akasa is not a separate one and it is a product of Brahman and therefore our conclusion is that Akasa is born out of Brahman and it is subject to birth and death and it is nithyam. Eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is possible only when Akasa is a product of Brahman. Now ekadesi has to be negated now.

## Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7]

Ether is not eternal but created.

### Sutra 2.3.7 [223]

#### *Yavadvikaram tu vibhago lokavat*

But whatever there are efforts there are separateness as is seen in the world [as in ordinary life]

The argument begun in sutra 6 is concluded here.

After purva paksha nisheda we will negate the ekadesi madham in the final sutra. It occurs in sutra 3,4 and 5<sup>th</sup> sutra. Ekadesi wants to prove that there is no contradiction in the Veda and his method of resolving is a wrong method. He says Akasa is nithyam and says Agni alone is the first product. He says that the Taittiriya Upanishad statement should not be taken seriously. Just as we talk about figurative birth of jiva we should take figurative birth of Akasa. Therefore he says that there is no birth of Akasa. Akasa is not really born because the origination of Akasa is illogical. It is not possible. He gives three reasons are karana asambavat. To talk about origination of Akasa karanam cannot be established. This we have refuted. Secondly prag abhava asambavat. If you talk about origination of Akasa you should conceive a state before origination of Akasa. You cannot conceive what was before the creation of Akasa. Praga bhava prior nonexistence is inconceivable. The third argument is sarva gatavad. Unlike other things Akasa is all pervading and I can conceive of anything except Akasa which is all pervading and nithyam. It is like Atma it is said. Since Akasa is nithya it is not born. Of these three Vyasacharya refutes the third argument and dismiss ekadesi. He leaves the other two and Adhi Sankaracharya gives the argument as to on what basis the first two are refuted. Vyasacharya says if you give one argument, Vyasacharya gives counter argument stating that Akasa is anithyah. He thus weakens the argument of ekadesi. We say that everything distinct object in the creation is born. The fan is distinct from chair. Every distinct object is subject to birth. Akasa happens to be distinct entity from other bhutas. If Akasa is also a distinct entity and it is also born and it is karyam being distinct like Agni etc. It is inconclusive. Then when we go to sruti, sruti says Akasa is sambutah. This is the conclusion of the sutra. Now we will do word for word analysis.

Yavat vikaram every product tu vibhagah is indeed distinct having specific entity that makes it different from other things, this is the running meaning. Yavad vikaram it is a compound word. Yavad mans all or every vikara means product or karaym. Every product tu is for emphasis. There is no exception to this rule. Vibhagah means vibaktah means distinct. Every product is distinct with its own specification from other bhutas. Lokavat means every object

is distinct and every object is universally born. He gives a vyapti yatra yatra vibaktatvam tatra tatra karyatvam. Here you have to accept it is a product. Akasa is karyam. Therefore third argument of Purva Pakshi have been negated. If we are to conclude by our argument, then we have to answer to the next sutra. Akasa is nityam is proved by sruti vakyam also he says. Amritam used to indicate Akasa and Vayu in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Again, there is another quotation that akasavat sargatha nityah. Once we prove logically Akasa is anityam its eternity should be taken as relative longer duration. The immortality of heavenly people is called nityah means it is not that they are eternal for ever. They are subject to death. They have very long life. Akasa nityatva vakyam should be interpreted as longer life and not it is eternal for ever. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 199

### **Topic 1 Viyadadhikaranam [Sutra 1-7}**

Ether is not eternal but created.

#### **Sutra 2.3.7 [223]**

#### ***Yavadvikaram tu vibhago lokavat***

But whatever there are efforts there are separateness as is seen in the world [as in ordinary life]

The argument begun in sutra 6 is concluded here.

We see the seventh and final sutra of this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya refutes ekadesi madham which Akasa is nithyam only. Through this sutra, we refute all the three sutras of ekadesi madham. The first ekadesi is gauni asambavat; Akasa utpatti is impossible and illogical. Akasa is nithya like Atma it was said by the ekadesi. This was refuted by the counter argument Akasa karyam vibhaktatvad gatavad. It is not nithya. Having refuted third we refuted the fourth sutra. Fourth happens to be second sutra of ekadesi. He tries to establish Akasa nithya through sruti pramanam. For that, we gave the answer the nithyatvam is abekshika nithyatvam like immortality of devas. The second ekadesi madham is also refuted. Now we will refute the third ekadesi sutra. This need not be refuted as it is a corollary of the first sutra or the third sutra. What ekadesi said is that Akasa utpatti can be figurative even though other utpatti are real. Akasa utpatti is apparent utpatti and both can coexist and there is no harm. We answer that we accept that both can coexist but the apparent utpatti can be talked about only when mukya artha is possible. We have establish real utpatti of Akasa and there is no need to talk about apparent utpatti. All Ekadesi objections have been negated.

Ekadesi while establishing Akasa is nithyam he wanted to prove that Akasa could not be born. He gave three arguments. One I have refuted and the other two we have to negate now. One argument is that we can never conceive of Akasa utpatti because to think of origination of Akasa you have to conceive of the state before origination and that is called prag abhava. I can talk about utpatti of clip and I can think of prior non-existence of clip. Now ekadesi argues Akasa is emptiness how can I conceive the absence of Akasa which itself being emptiness. How can we conceive of emptiness of emptiness and therefore Akasa is eternal entity in to which all others have come into being. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says why cannot you conceive. If you can conceive of the presence of Akasa why cannot you conceive of Akasa before the existence. It is one of the dravyas as per your own argument. Not only you conceive Akasa as dinstinct padhartha and you talks it is a material and not emptiness., if Akasa is emptiness you cannot talk about it but you say it is a material and how can you not think of Akasa prior to its existence. If you can think of absence of things you can definitely conceive of accommodation required for the presence of such a thing. Location comes when there is located entity comes. Accommodation abhava is Akasa abhava and this is possible when things to be accommodated are absent. This we do experience regularly. This we experience in dream. Therefore, it is conceivable and experiencable also. This has been

mentioned in sastra also in Aksara Brahmaam 3.88 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Brahman is that all properties are negated and Upanishad states Brahman is anakasam. We can therefore surely talk of prior non-existence and utpatti is possible. Thus ekadesi's argument is negated. Next argument ekadesi says is karana asambavat. If you have to talk about the origination of Akasa you have to talk of karanam and karanam is not possible. Consciousness says this problem is there especially for nyaya philosopher because of faulty theory of creation. For that we should understand the fault of his theory. He thinks that all products are assemblage or combination of constituent parts and he thinks that all the constituent parts combine and the combination is the karyam. All bricks are karanam and wall is karyam. Every product is constituent entity, which is karanam he calls as avayava dravyam. Every brick is called avayava dravyam and the wall is called avayvavi dravyam. Brick is plural and wall is singular. In Vedanta we say the cause is singular and the effect is plural but the same thing according to nyaya vaiseshika cause is plural and effect is singular. Aneka avayava dravyepyaha ekam avayvavi dravyam jayate. One is the part and the whole is the effect. This is theory one. Second point he adds is this. Wall is made up of many bricks and every constituent part is brick only and all avayva dravyam belongs to the same species. Similarly cloth consists of fibres and each part is a fibre and all fibres belong to the same species and it is sajadiya species. All the Prithvi paramanus put together produce prithvi and the cause is many plural and all belong to the same species. Sajadiya aneka avayava dravyepyah ekam avayvavi dravyam jayate. Similarly all mud particles put together make the pot. All the jala paramanus put together make the water; all Agni paramanu put together make Agni.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya says this is all cock and bull story. He says that there is no rule that all the constituent parts belong to the same species. Fruit salad is sajadiya aneka avayava dravyepyah and eka avayvavi dravyam jayate. There are some products, which are formed of different species to make one product. Our own body is made up of earth only but our sariram is made up of five bhutas. He says fish sariram is made of jalam. Ghosts are made up of air. Adhi Sankaracharya this is not true, there are so many parts, and he says our body is an example, car is an example and sajadiya adjective is demolished. He says many constituent parts make one part only if it is made of assemblage. Not all products are made up of assemblage. Some products are modified into ornaments. Clay is modified into parts. When one cause is made to modify to make products, the cause is only one and it is not anekam. Here it is not cause is plural and effect is plural. Here cause is one, effect is plural, and this is not correct. Their theory is incomplete, it is partially applicable, it should not be applied to Akasa, and their argument is not acceptable.

Next is that he gave one anumanam that Akasa nityah and sarvagathah. It is all pervading like Atma. For that Adhi Sankaracharya argues that we don't accept all pervasiveness of Akasa. Only in the relative knowable world it is more pervasive than everything we know. The Upanishad says jayan akasah Brahman is more pervading than even Akasa. We do not accept that Akasa is all pervasive and it is relative concept. Also his concept that Akasa is niravyavam we do not accept and it is relatively partless. Vedanta does not accept the partlessness and all pervasiveness. Akasa has got sookshma avayavas. By all these arguments we have established that Akasa is a product although it is very difficult to conceive. Thus we have negated the arguments of Purva Pakshi and ekadesi madham and established Vedantic concepts. And this adhikaranam is over. We will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 2 Matarisvadhikaranam. [Sutra 8]**

All originates from ether.

**Sutra 2.3.8 [224]**

***Etena matarisva vyakhyatah***

By this i.e., the foregoing explanation about Akasa being a product, [the fact of] air [also being an effect] is explained.

The sutra states that air also like Akasa has been created by and from Brahman.

This is an adhikaranam with one stura. I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam. Matarisva means Vayu and therefore it is Vayu adhikaranam and it deals with Vayu utpatti controversy. The controversy is due to seemingly controversial statements in the Upanishads Chandogya upanisad and Taittiriya Upanishad. In Chandogya upanisad it is said Vayu utpatti is not mentioned and Chandogya upanisad the creation of Vayu is mentioned. Vayu is born out of Akasa` it is said in Taittiriya Upanishad. Vyasacharya says that I do not want to deal in detail because it has been dealt with in the previous sutra. You can reconstruct Vayu utpatti also in the same manner as that of Akasa. Vyasacharya asks us to read the previous sutras and understand. This is the general introduction.

Vyasacharya says we have dealt with Akasa utpatti seeming contradiction and on the same lines the creation of Vayu autpatti also be decided. Vayu is anithyam and therefore Vayu is born. This is general analysis. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Etena by this; matarisva the seeming contradiction with regard to the origination of Vayu; vyakyatah is also resolved. Now we will see the significance of these words. Etena by this or by resolving the seeming contradiction of Akasa in the previous sutras; matarisva means Vayu; that which moves in the sky is called matarisva the Vayu; vyakhyatah means resolved or answered, the controversy is settled.

**Topic 3 asambhavadhikaranam. [Sutra 9]**

Brahman [Sat] has no origin.

**Sutra 2.3.9 [225]**

***Asambhavstu sato'nupapatteh***

But there is no origin of that which is [i.e, Brahman], on account of the impossibility [of such an origin].

The sutra states that Brahma has no origin as it is, neither proved by reasoning nor directly stated by sruti.

This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. First I will give a general introduction to this adhikaranam. The intention of this sutra is that Vyasacharya wants to discuss all the five elements. Akasa he has done and Vayu he has done. Here there is a small diversion. Here he deals with a natural doubt that can come in this context. In all these adhikaranam we have been taking Chandogya upanisad which alone has created lot of problems. Taittiriya Upanishad has explained all about pancha bhuta creation. Chandogya upanisad starts with

Agni sristi and that is why there is all problems. We said we have to assume Vayu sristi. In this adhikaranam Brahma sristi is not mentioned. And therefore Brahman is also born. A person may conclude that karanam Brahman is also born. The answer is given in this adhikaranam. Brahma sristi is not mentioned because Brahma sristi has not taken place. This is the essence of this adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Brahma sristi is not there because it is impossible. Purva Pakshi says that even though Brahma sristi we must accept keeping with Vayu and Akasa. That argument is there in the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra. One argument which we gave is used by Purva Pakshi to his advantage. Akasa is distinct entity different from other bhutas. That argument becomes handy for the Purva Pakshi. He says Brahman is different from all other things in the creation. Brahman is chaitanya tattvam. Everything in creation is jada tattvam. Atma is distinct from anatma. Atma is vibaktam and it is distinct from the entire creation. Therefore he says I will make an anumanam that Brahman is karya bhutah. Nithya Atma is janya he says. What is our answer and that is the essence of this adhikaranam which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRAS

Class 200

### **Topic 3 asambhavadhikaranam. [Sutra 9]**

Brahman [Sat] has no origin.

#### **Sutra 2.3.9 [225]**

#### ***Asambhavstu sato'nupapatteh***

But there is no origin of that which is [i.e, Brahman], on account of the impossibility [of such an origin].

The sutra states that Brahma has no origin as it is, neither proved by reasoning nor directly stated by sruti.

Here Vyasacharya deals with bhuta bogtru sritis sthithi virodha pariharah [pancha bhuta and jiva sriti virodha]. We have negated the opponents's views of Akasa and Vayu sristi and normally we should have entered the Agni etc., sristis but Vyasacharya has taken a small diversion about the Self-imposed question regarding the sat Brahma sristi. I had just introduced this adhikaranam in the last class. We have to see purva paksa, ekadesi and siddhanta view regarding Brahma sristi. Purva Paksi says that there is contradiction regarding the Brahma sristi in the sruti; further ekadesi also views that there is something wrong in the sruti statements regarding the sristi and siddhanti has to clear the contradictions of the Purva Paksi and correct the ekadesi's views regarding Brahma sristi. This is being done in this done by Vyasacharya in this adhikaranam. .

Purva Paksi says that with regard to creation of sat Brahman there is contradiction in sruti. First is Mantra 6.2.2 of Chandogya upanisad that says *sat tva eava soumya idam agra asid ekam evadvitiam* the meaning of the mantra is in the beginning this was being alone, one only without second. And according to this sat alone was there in the beginning and from this it is clear that sat Brahman is not a created entity. From sat Brahman everything came and sat was already present before creation. This says sat is unborn. But there is another sruti statement 2.7., of Taittiriya Upanishad reads as *asad va idam agra asid tado vai ajayata tad atmanam svayam akurula tasmad tat sukrtam ucyate*. Here the Upanishad says that non-existence verily was this [world] in the beginning. Therefrom verily, was existence produced? That made itself a soul. There from is it called the well made. This Taittiriya Upanishad talks of origination of sat. Chandogya upanisad sat was unborn. So Purva Paksi says that there is contradiction between the Upanisads regarding the sristi of Brahman.

In the second stage Ekadesi says wrongly that sat is born. You have to talk about sat. Satah anupattihi should not be taken seriously. We have to assume the utpatti of sat for which he gives three arguments for the origination of sat. He says that akasavad; it means even though sruti did not mention the origination of Akasa in Chandogya upanisad, we supplied and said that even though Akasa utpatti was not mentioned we have to supply the origination of Akasa. On the same lines, even though sat utpatti is not mentioned in the sruti, as in the case of Akasa, we have to assume the creation of Brahman also. This is argument number one.



Next he says vibaktatvad it means an argument we ourselves used in the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra. There, we wanted to establish the origination of Akasa logically. And the logic given by is, that Akasa is distinct entity from all other elements like Vayu, Agni and jalam etc. We said the other entities are distinct and the birth is experience by us and Akasa is distinct from other elements and therefore Akasa is not born. Sat Brahman is also distinct from all other things in creation which you have accepted he tell siddhantis. All other thins are achetanam like karana sariram, Sookshma Sariram, other elements etc. All are achetanam and drisyam. Brahman alone drk and drishyam and established that Brahman is distinct and therefore Ekadesi conclusion is Brahman is created. He uses all the argument used by Siddhanti for the establishment of Brahman creation.

Third argument is that he says all the karanams that we see they happen to be karyam; for example Prithvi the earth is a karanam for ocean and all plant kingdom. But we find Prithvi is karyam of jalam; jalam is karanam for prithivi and jalam is karyam of Agni; Agni is karanam of jalam but Agni is karyam of Vayu; thus we have found in the case of other elements and even locally our parents are our cause and they are the effects of grand parents. Therefore yatra yatra karanatvam tatra tatra karyatvam. And therefore I make an anumanam sat Brahma karyam karanatvad akasavad pritivivad. Because of the three reasons Ekadesi concludes that Brahman was also born. Now we will come to the general analysis of this sutra.

Vyasacharya concludes that the Brahman is unborn because of the following reasons. We also give three reasons for non-origination of Brahman. First reason is karana asambavad. The origination of sat requires a karanam. It is not possible. If you say sat the existence is itself born and then I will ask out of what the sat is born. If you say that existence is born, there are two possibilities that it should be born out of existence or it should be born out of non-existence. In the whole creation, these are the two possibilities only. Sat cannot be born out of sat because it is already there. Sat cannot be born out of sat. From elimination it may be sat that out of non-existence the existence came. This also you cannot say because from non-existence nothing can come. This I have discussed in Manudkya Upanishad. Existence cannot be the destination of anyone. An existence entity cannot have the goal of existence because it already exists. Then non-existent entity cannot have the goal of existence because nonexistent entity cannot be a traveler. Therefore sat cannot be the goal of the result of either sat or asat. Then Adhi Sankaracharya suggests one option and he says that is not possible. There is gold and from the gold ornaments are born. The cause of the gold and what is the effect of ornaments and what is the difference between gold and ornaments. Gold is samanya gold and ornament is vishesha gold in the form of ornaments. Ornament is vishesha swarnam that it has special Nama and rupa. From samanya gold vishesha gold is born and in the same way why cannot we say that from samanya sat the vishesha sat is born for which Adhi Sankaracharya agrees. Purva Paksi puts this argument forward. Out of samanya sat vishesha can be born. Siddanti says Brahman happens to be samanya satta and nama rupa rahita general existence is Brahman. *Asad va idam agra asid tado vai ajayata tad atmanam svayam akurula tasmata sukrtam ucyate.*[Taittiriya Upanishad quoted above] Brahma is general existence and vishesha satta alone can be born and Brahman the samanya satta cannot be born.

Second argument is sruti pramanam. Sruti very strongly says that Brahman is not born out of anything. Mantra 6.9 of Svetasvatara Upanishad says *na tasya kascit patir asti loke, na cesita naiva ca tasya lingam, na karanam karanadhipadhipo na casya hascij janita na cadhipah* the meaning of the matra is if Him is no master in the world, no ruler, nor is there any mark of

Him. He is the cause, the Lord of the lords of the sense organs; of Him there is neither progenitor nor Lord.

We have got other srutis also 1.2.18 of Kathopanisad reads as *na jayate mriyate va vipasecin nayam kutascin na babhuva kascit; ajo nityah sasvato 'yam purano na hanyate hanyamane sarire* it the knowings Self is never born; nor does he die at any time; He sprang from nothing and nothing sprang from him. He is unborn, eternal, abiding and primeval; He is not slain when the body is slain.

Also we see in 1.2.14 of Kathopanisad *anyatra dharmad anyatradharmad anyatrasmat krtakrtat, anyatra bhutac ca bhavyac ca yat tat pasyasi tad vada* tell me that which thou seest beyond right and wrong, beyond what is done or not done, beyond past and future. Thus sruti pramana says so.

The last argument brahmanah eva atmatva. Brahman is the very and Atma and Brahman cannot be a product. This argument is given in the seventh sutra. If Brahman is karyam it is subject to destruction and whatever has got origination has got destruction also. You cannot never talk about the negation of Atma and negator cannot be negated. Atma is there after everything is negated. If Atma is negated and I will ask the question who talks about the Atma. Who will talk of the absence of Atma. If there is someone to talk about absence of Atma and there will be another Atma observing or negating the Atma and then this argument will end in nowhere. Therefore, Brahman cannot a product. Then we have to negate Purva Paksi and Ekadesi.

Now I will give you then word for word analysis. First I will take the word tu; satah means sat Brahman asambavah has not origination; anupapattih since it is not possible; this is the running meaning. Then we will see the significance of the words. Asambavah means non-origination or anupattih of sat Brahman. He uses the word satah because our whole analysis centers round sat of Chandogya upanisad. Purva Paksi and Ekadesi also keeps in mind the sat for Brahman. The word tu indicates however and the word however indicates that Brahman is different from pancha bhutas. Akasa and Brahman are close and we see that Akasa is born while Brahman is unborn because such a statement is illogical. Because of illogicality, Brahman is unborn. Now we have to refute Purva Paksi and Ekadesi. First, we will take up Purva Paksi.

Purva paksa says there is contradiction between the Upanisads. Non-origination is said in Taittiriya Upanishad and in Chandogya upanisad sat utpatti is talked about. We have got a huge gata bashyam in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Our answer is that there the world sat refers to manifest universe and asat talks of un-manifest universe. It is like the creation of butter from milk by various processes. But was not created and it is already in milk and manifest curd is created and that we call as sat. Manifest thing alone is called sat because such manifest thing alone is useful for transaction but the un-manifest sun, energy etc. Are useful to us. That is why the sruti talks about the origination of existence but it talks about origination of manifestation from un-manifestation. With this, we have answered Purva Paksi and we have said that there is no contradiction.

Now we have to take the arguments of Ekadesi. First argument is regarding the Akasa is born so also Brahman also will have to be born is their argument for which we say Akasa utpatti has to be supplied. We have given already given the reason that eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena pratijna siddhyartham and you have to accept origination of Akasa and in the case

of Brahman you cannot supply and you cannot quote the above example in the case of Brahman. The second argument forwarded by him is a serious argument. Vibaktatvad Brahman must be created being a distinct entity as all other creation. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says that really speaking we should not talk about difference between Brahman and other creation at all even though we talk of Atma anatma viveka. In fact, we should talk about it at all and then Atma will become one of the creations of the world. Our argument for this stand is that the differences only between two entities with the same order of reality you can talk about difference and you can talk about two people obtaining in waking or in dream. You cannot compare because they belong to different order of reality and difference is a form of relationship. In the beginning of the Vedantic study, we say I am different from all; then we say I am the cause of all and in the end we say I am all. Where is the question of difference at all? There is no matter different from Consciousness we say. Brahman and the world are not different and vibaktatvam nasti. That argument is gone. Then comes the third and final argument. He says that every karanam happens to be a karyam. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says I do not face this problem alone. This is the problem of every system of philosophy. When Samkya talks about creation, he talks about the ultimate cause and he says pradhanam is the moola karanam. In nyaya philosophy it is paramanu is the karanam and he says that they are karanam and they are not karyam. They are moola karanam they say. All religious philosophers says that there is causeless cause. Why Siddhanti should be singled out. All of you have causeless cause, it is an anavasta dosha, and you will not have finality. There will be another problem also. If you say every cause is an effect and every effect being mithya, the cause also will also become mithya; karanam mithya and karyam mithya and sarvam mithya and there will be no sathyam at all. This is not acceptable. Anavastha dosha and sunyavadha prasanga will come. If you can accept causeless cause for me Brahman is moola karanam. We have another reason given in the mandukya Upanishad. If you say Brahman is karanam we will have the logical problem that every karanam being karyam and Brahman also will become karyam and then ultimately speaking Brahman is karanam also. If the Brahman is not a karanam how did the world came. Then they ask how the world came and Gauda pada says that there is no world and the world has not come out of the world at all. Karika 2.32 reads as *na nirodha na catpattir-na baddho na ca sadhakah na ca mumuksur-na vaai mukta ityesa paramarthata* the meaning of this mantra is that there is neither dissolution, nor birth; neither anyone in bondage nor any aspirant for wisdom; neither can there be anyone who hankers after liberation nor any liberated as such. This alone is the Supreme Truth. Brahman is not a karanam and it is not a karyam. Brahman is causeless cause is for teaching alone. With this asambhava adhikaranam is over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 201

### **Topic 3 asambhavadhikaranam. [Sutra 9]**

Brahman [Sat] has no origin.

#### **Sutra 2.3.9 [225]**

#### ***Asambhavstu sato'nupapatteh***

But there is no origin of that which is [i.e, Brahman], on account of the impossibility [of such an origin].

The sutra states that Brahma has no origin as it is, neither proved by reasoning nor directly stated by sruti.

In this third pada Vyasacharya resolves the seeming contradiction found in the vedic statement with regard to the panca bhutas as well as jivas. This is done here because the entire second chapter is meant for resolving seeming contradictions in the Vedantic teachings. In all the discussions the sruti kept in mind is Chandogya upanisad as pointed out earlier. Before going to Agni sristi there is a small diversion as to whether sat Brahman originated or not. Akasa and Vayu sristi have not been mentioned in Chandogya upanisad and therefore the purva paksa asks why not you supply Brahma sristi also. Vyasacharya has established that the above logic you cannot apply with regard to Brahman. Sat Brahma sristi cannot be applied because it is sruti, yukti and anubhava virodha. Now we will enter the fourth adhikaranam.

### **Topic 4 Tejodhikaranam. [Sutra 10]**

Fire originates from air.

#### **Sutra 2.3.10 [226]**

Fire [is produced] from this [i.e., air] so verily [declares the sruti]

The consistency of the two srutis is shown in sutra 13

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya discusses Agni sristi here. As I had said before in the entire pada we have to see three stages like Purva Paksi, Ekadesi and siddhanta madhams we will talk about the contradiction in sruti statements as pointed out by purva paksa and the Ekadesi comes with the noble motive of resolving contradiction and we have to correct him. First we will see the Purva Paksi madham.

He says that in Chandogya upanisad it is said that Agni is Brahma karyam. 6.2.3 and in Taittiriya Upanishad it is said that Agni is born out of Vayu. In one place Agni is Brahma karyam and in another place it is Vayu karyam. Since it contradicts regarding the source of

Agni therefore sruti is apramanam. This is Purva Paksi madham. Then comes Ekadesi and says that Agni is not Vayu karyam and Agni is Brahma karyam or the product of Brahman only. He has his own reasons.

The first reason he gives is sarvasya Brahma karyatvad. Sruti declares that everything is born out of Brahman. Everything etasmad brahmana it is said in kaivalya and Mundaka Upanishad. Sarvam includes Agni also and it is said Brahman alone is the karanam for Agni. Second reason he gives is that the idea conveyed in sutra number 6 that only if everything is accepted as product of Brahman then alone Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam sambavati. If Agni is Vayu karanam, it should have been Vayu vijnanena Agni vijnanam bhavati. It cannot be Brahma vijnanena Agni vijnanam bhavati. Therefore, eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam sambavati and all should be product of Brahman and not a product of Vayu. Third explanation for a possible question from us is that if Agni is Brahman product what should be the meaning of vayoho Agni. We have to explain that. But Ekadesi says vayoho Agni means from Vayu Agni is born. It can also be said that after Vayu Agni was born or created by Brahman. Therefore from Brahman alone Agni came but it should be said that Agni was born after the birth of Vayu. Agni was born out of the parent Brahman after Vayu. Vayoho Agni means Agni is born out of Vayu but is born out of Brahman. Therefore therefore there is no contradiction and Agni is born out of Brahman. For this siddanti has to answer.

Now we will come to general analysis of this sutra. It is pointed out here that Agni is born out of Vayu only. Therefore Ekadesi madham is wrong. Vyasacharya does not give the reason. Adhi Sankaracharya explains reason in his commentary. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Tejah fire is born; atah means out of Vayu; tatha hi aha means sruti says so. We will see the significance of the words. Teja means Agni and fire originates. Atah means from this; here the word this refers to Vayu. Contextually this means Vayu. Tatha means so; aha sruti says so clearly [refer to 2.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad]. Now we have to answer the Purva Paksi and Ekadesi.

Ekadesi's argument is that sruti says that everything is born out of Brahman. Therefore, we should conclude that Agni is born out of Brahman only. Adhi Sankaracharya says that if you accept that statement that everything is born out of Brahman and Agni is born out of Brahman and then vayoho Agni will become meaningless. Sarvam Brahma karyam statement would become meaningless. Therefore, you cannot do that and you have to accept that Agni is born out of Vayu only. Then he asks the question that if you validate sruti statement then the other sruti statement that everything is born out of Brahman becomes meaningless. Therefore if you say Agni is born out of Vayu and everything is born out of Brahman gets invalidated and if you say everything is born out of Brahman, Agni is born out of Vayu gets invalidated. Both are sruti vakyams. Adhi Sankaracharya says that when everything is born out of Brahman means it does not say directly and things can be born out of Brahman indirectly if Brahman is the moola karanam. Some are born directly and some are born indirectly. If Agni is born out of Vayu, there is nothing to stop us from saying Agni is born out of Brahman. Ultimately Agni is born out of Brahman only even when you accept Agni is born out of Vayu. If you take literally everything is Brahma karyam, then what about us. We were not directly born out of Brahman but we are born out of our parents. If sruti says that all are born out of Brahman means we are born out of Brahman indirectly. Therefore Agni is saksat Vayu karyam and Agni is paramparaya Brahma karyam. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Gita vakyam in support of his statement. Verse 4 and 5 of the 10<sup>th</sup> chapter. *Buddhir jnanam*

*asammohah ksama satyam damah samah sukham dukham bhavo'bhavo bhayam ca bhayam eva ca ahimsa samata tustis tapo danam yaso'yasah bhavanti bhava bhutanam matta eva prthagvidhah* Everything existence and non-existence are born out of me alone is the essence of these two slokas. Varieties of emotions and the karanams of all vrittis are born out of me here Brahman. Krishna contradicts anything. Andhakarana vrittis are directly born out of andhakaranam but the karanam of all is Brahman alone.

The next argument is you should accept everything as Brahman product and then alone Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam is possible. Adhi Sankaracharya says for eka vijnanena sarva vijnanena to be correct that everything should be Brahma karyam and everything should be the product of Brahman and it need be direct karyam of Brahman and it can be indirect karyam of Brahman also. In the case of Agni even though we say that Agni is Vayu karanam, it is indirectly born out of Brahman alone.

The statement that from Vayu Agni is born is incorrect. We take Agni is born after Vayu from Brahman. For that Adhi Sankaracharya argues that you cannot take so because the statement starts with tasmad akasat Vayu etc. In this series of creation tasmatva etasmad atmanah sambavah. It is the fifth case in the Sanskrit grammar and it does not mean after but it is our of only. This is argument number one. There is another argument given by Adhi Sankaracharya. Upa padam means additional word is added. When Ekadesi adds after Vayu and it should be supplied vayoho oordvam and it gives the meaning directly. Therefore, vayoho Agni means from Vayu Agni is born and not after Vayu Agni is born. Therefore Ekadesi madham is incorrect. Vayoho Agni means Agni is born out of Vayu directly and when you say Brahmanah Agni means Agni is born indirectly. Thus the contradiction in sruti is resolved.

Now we will enter jala sruti.

## **Topic 5. Abadhikaranam. [Sutra 11]**

Water is produced from fire.

### **Sutra 2.3.11 [227]**

#### ***Apah***

Water [is produced from fire]

The same thing may be said of water.

Now we enter the fifth Adhikaranam and I will give you the general introduction. This sutra talks about the origination of the jalam. This topic is simpler. All are similar to Agni only. Purva paksha says exactly like Agni there is contradiction in sruti. One says agnehe apah water is born out of fire 2.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad. However, Mundaka Upanishad says 2.1.3 that water is born out of Brahman. There is contradiction between the two.

Ekadesi madham says that jalam is Brahma karyam only and it is not Agni karyam. The reasons are the same as given in the case of Agni. Then siddhanta gives his answer that jalam is born out of Agni only. Since the whole thing is the same as above, there is no need to comment further in this regard.

Now we go to the word for word analysis. Apah means water is born out of fire. Sruti says so. The significance is that water is born out of that Agni only. Sruti statement kept in mind is agneh apah. We have covered four elements. Now we will go to the fifth element Prithvi.

## **Topic 6. Prithivyadhikaranam [Sutra 12]**

Earth is created from water.

### **Sutra 2.3.12 [228]**

#### ***Prithivi adhikararupasabdantarebhya***

The earth [is meant by the word 'anna'] because of the subject matter, colour and toher sruti texts.

The same thing may be said of earth.

I will introduce this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here also we find Purva Pakshi, Ekadesi and Siddhanti. Purva paksha says that there is a problem. Chandogya upanisad says that Brahman created Agni. And that Agni created water. The next statement is that water created annam. [6.2.4 of Chandogya upanisad] from here we come to know that annam is born out of water. But if you go to 2.1. Of Taittiriya Upanishad it says that from water prithivi is born and from earth also plants are born and from plants annam is born. From this it is clear that Veda expects us to be vegetarian. According to Chandogya upanisad annam is born out of water. So sruti is not clear about anna sruti. This the purva paksha points out and says Veda is apramanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 202

### **Topic 6. Prithivyadhikaranam [Sutra 12]**

Earth is created from water.

**Sutra 2.3.12 [228]**

#### ***Prithivi adhikararupasabdantarebhya***

The earth [is meant by the word 'anna'] because of the subject matter, colour and other sruti texts.

The same thing may be said of earth.

Analyzing the origination of the five elements Vyasacharya has come to the fifth and final elements, the creation of earth in this sixth adhikaranam. I give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. Here are also there are three stages as Purva Pakshi, Ekadesi and Siddhanta madham. Purva paksha madham is always the same that sruti is not reliable because it gives contradictory statements. Here there are two statements as one is Taittiriya Upanishad 2.1 from water sprang earth; annam is born out of plants; this is statement number one. Second statement is 6.2.4 that says waters produced annam. In one text water is said to produce earth and in another food is produced. The source of annam is consistently revealed by the Upanisads and hence sruti is apramanam.

Ekadesi madham has the noble intention of validating sruti but he always resolves in a wrong manner and according to him, annam is jala karyam as revealed in Chandogya upanishad VI.2.4. He gives two reasons for his conclusions. His first reason is that annam mentioned in Chandogya upanishad should be taken as annam only because that is the primary meaning of annam the food. Primary meaning is always stronger meaning. Therefore, annam means food and sruti clearly says that food is born out of annam. And the second argument that he gives is that annam means food and food is born out of jalam as indicated in Chandogya upanishad by a latter statement. Now the question is what is the latter statement. The latter statement is in the same mantra. The statement says that therefore, since annam is jala karanam wherever there is rains, in that place where the rain is plenty, plenty of annam is produced. Therefore, annam is jala karyam as supported by sruti. Therefore the previous statement means water produced annam and annam is jala karyam only. Therefore the second statement of sruti is valid.

Siddhanti has to resolve the contradiction and also answer the Purva Pakshi and Ekadesi. Siddhanta portion is given by Vyasacharya in this sutra. Now we come to the general analysis of this sutra. Here it is pointed out that from the jalam prithivi alone is born. Prithivi is jala karyam and annam is not jala karyam. Because of this reason Chandogya upanishad statement ta apah annam ahrutanja should be translated as ta apah prithivi ahrutanja. The waters created annam should be translated as water created earth only. Vyasacharya contention is that the word annam should not taken as food. Mukya arth should not be taken and you take only the laksyartha that annam is prithivi. This is Vyasacharya sutram. The word annam occurring in



Chandogya upanisad does not mean food but it represents earth. Vyasacharya gives three reasons to take the implied meaning. This is voting for a weaker meaning. If we have to choose a waker meaning, we require stronger arguments. Three arguments he gives in his sutra. One is the contextual support. Then the second word used us rupam, which means colour. The colour is mentioned in the Upanishad. The colour of each element is discussed. This is to interpret annam as prithivi. The next is sruti support is there to state prithivi is born out of jalam and not annam. Through these three reasoning we support annam relates to prithivi. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

The sutra has two words prithivi and adhikara rupa sabdantarebhyah. Prithivi means earth is meant by the word annam occurring in Chandogya upanisad 6.2.4 adhikara rupa sabdantara rebhyah because of the context, colour and other sruti statements. Now we will take the significance of each word. Prithivi means annam here in this context. First word is adhikarat; context talks about panca bhuta utpatti. In Chandogya upanisad the origination of the elements are talked about. Akasa and Vayu are implied in Chandogya upanisad although they are not actually mentioned in the sutra. First Agni sristi is mentioned and before Agni, Akasa and Vayu sristi is implied. Then the Upanishad says jala sristi is mentioned. Then the next sristi is prithivi alone. While we discuss panca bhuta sristi from where does the annam come. Therefore adhikara context supports prithivi alone and annam should refer to anna karana bhuta prithivi should be the implied meaning. The second reason is rupam. Rupam means colour. To understand the argument you should know Chandogya upanisad sixth chapter where the Upanishad talks about the entire creation being a product of these three elements alone. We know by the fact that these three elements are inherent in the product. And therefore the elements are the karanam. Upanishad says that there are three colours which represents the colours of the three inherent in the three elements. The Upanishad takes a few examples. In the fire, which is one of the products, obtaining in the creation indicates the tejas tattvam. sometimes it is white in colour and sometimes it is reddish. The white represents the jala tattvam. the black or the red colour represents annam. Here Vyasacharya argues that the dark spot represents annam means it refers to prithivi mud alone and you cannot take annam as dark in colour. therefore Krishna varnam belongs to prithivi tattvam alone and not annam. This is the second argument. third argument is that there are other sruti statement that clearly mentions that earth alone is born out of jalam and not annam. Taittiriya Upanishad clearly says [II.1.2] says that water produced annam literally food. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.2.2 also says that what was there as the froth of the water, that was hardened and became the earth. This clearly indicates that from water earth is produced. With this Vyasacharya establishes annam refers to earth.

Ekadesi gave two arguments for translating annam as food. The first reason is mukyarhtatvad. That is the primary meaning. Our answer is annam primarily means food and therefore we should give preference to that meaning only. When it does not fit, we have to give up the primary meaning. the context here is panca bhuta sristi and suddenly anna sristi is not mentioned but the bhuta sristi of annam alone is meant here. In this mantra there is later statement that wherever there is rain there is annam that says annam is born out of earth. Our answer is that even we accept the vakya sesha that plenty of annam is born out of jalam, we cannot say that annam is food because rain can never produce plenty of food. It produces plenty of food alone. You cannot take annam as food and by implication you have to say plants. When you take laksanartha what is wrong if I take laksanartha. And if you want to find out which one has got more strength, because of the various reasons as above, take annam as prithivi alone. Therefore annam should be taken as prithivi and not food. Therefore, Ekadesi madham is not acceptable. Now purva paksa madham has to be answered.

He says that there is contradiction between the two Upanisads Taittiriya and Chandogya upanishad. In Chandogya upanishad alone prithivi alone is born out of jalam, and in Taittiriya Upanishad also prithivi is born out of jalam. Annam mentioned in Taittiriya Upanishad is nothing but earth. The arguments are raised because we cannot question the Upanishad and Vedas but it is our duty explain what is the underlined meaning of the Veda sabdah. Our aim is interpreting the words and sentences and not questioning the Veda's interpretation. therefore there is no contradiction and therefore Veda is apramanam and there is no problem. now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 7. tadabhidhyanadhikaranam [Sutra 13]**

Brahman abiding within the elements is the creative principle.

### **Sutra 2.3.13 [229]**

#### ***Tadabhidhyanadeva tu tallingat sah***

But on account of the indicating mark supplied by their reflecting, i.e., by the reflection attributed to the elements, He [i.e., the Lord is the creative principle abiding within the elements].

The contention raised in sutra 10 is now refuted.

Now we go to the next adhikaranam and I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. panca bhuta srsti was talked about and it is over. we have concluded that five panca bhutas have come in a gradual order. Akasa and all the five elements are born out of Brahman and all others are born out of born directly or indirectly. Brahman is the cause for creation of all the panca bhutas. So eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati.

We have discussed the material cause and what about the intelligent cause of the creation. is Sagunam Brahman is the intelligent cause of all the creation. here also we have Purva Paksi, Ekadesi and Siddhanti. Purva Paksi says there is sruti contradiction. One statement is Taittiriya Upanishad where it says *so kamayata bahu syam prajayeyeti sa tapo'tapyata so tapas taptva, idam sarvam asrjata, yad idam him ca tat srstva tad evanupravisat* [2.6 of Taittiriya Upanishad] maya sahitam Brahman desired and willed and Isvara created everything by his mere sankalpa sakti. Brahman is sarva nimitta karanam or karta. There is another statement in Chandogya upanishad 6.2.3 and 6.2.4, which says Brahman created Agni after visualizing, and then it says Agni visualized and created jalam or water. Therefore according to Chandogya upanishad Agni is supposed to be the creator of jalam. To decide what created the jalam is the question, which we will discuss, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 203

### **Topic 7. tadabhidhyanadhikaranam [Sutra 13]**

Brahman abiding within the elements is the creative principle.

**Sutra 2.3.13 [229]**

#### ***Tadabhidhyanadeva tu tallingat sah***

But on account of the indicating mark supplied by their reflecting, i.e., by the reflection attributed to the elements, He [i.e., the Lord is the creative principle abiding within the elements].

The contention raised in sutra 10 is now refuted.

In the first six adhikaranam Vyasacharya has analysed the panca bhuta utpatti. Whatever seeming contradictions in Vedas have been dissolved and it is established that Brahman alone is upadana karanam of all the creation. All are the clarification of tad padhartha of the mahavakyam. The essence of the entire Vedanta is the explanation of the maha vakyam 'tat tvam asi'. Thus, the Vedanta centers around tat padha, tvam padha or asi padha of the maha vakyam. Brahma is saksat karanam of Akasa and through Akasa all the four other elements are born directly or indirectly through Brahman. whether it is paramapara upadana karanam or saksat upadana karanam, the vedic pratijna eka vjnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati is established. Panca bhuta utpatti prakaranam is over.

Now I will do the general introduction to this adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya discusses the nimitta karanam in general and panca bhutas in particular. Here also we have purva paksa who says that there is contradiction in Upanishad with regard to nimitta karanam and so it is unreliable source of knowledge and thus sruti is apramanam. We discussed the Taittiriya Upanishad 6.2 Isvara or Sagunam Brahman is intelligent cause of creation and Isvara visualized and Isvara created everything through sankalpam and Isvara sankalpam is called tapas. Tapas here means the very visualization of the punya papa karma is sufficient for creation of the entire universe and the panca bhutas. This Chandogya upanisad 6.2.3 and 4<sup>th</sup> mantra says Brahman visualized and created the fire. Brahman viusalised and Brahma created means there is no problem. visualization is the clue for intelligent cause of all the creation. Then Upanishad says tad aiksada the fire visualized the creation of water. Agni is jalasya nimitta karanam. Chandogya upanisad could have kept quiet and for the prithivi sristi, jalam visualized for creation of earth it is said in Chandogya upanisad. The meaning of annam is earth as we had established in the previous adhikaranam that it refers to earth. Therefore, prithivi sristi nimitta karanam is jalam. Therefore, the confusion os jalasya nimitta karanam is Brahman or Agni. because of this contradiction, purva paksa says don't read Upanishad.

Ekadesi wants to establish the validity of the Upanishad and he takes a wrong method and says Brahman is not the nimitta karanam for jalam and prithivi and nimitta karanam is Agni.

and jalam is the nimitta karanam for prithivi. Jalam prithivi ca na Brahma karana paranthu bhuta karanam eva. For this wrong resolution, Ekadesi has his own pramana. First reason he gives is the sruti pramanam. Sruti clearly states Agni produced water and water produced prithivi as is said in the sruti.

Second argument he gives is that is chetanatvat. Agni mentioned in the Upanishad and jalam mentioned in the Upanishad are the visualizers of their products and they are not the inert elements but the Agni or jala devatas. This argument is given that we should to say Agni is inert and therefore he has said Agni devata is the cause of jala and jala is cause of prithivi.

Now comes the Siddhanti and he has to establish nimitta karanam and refute Purva Pakshi and Ekadesi. Here Vyasacharya points out that Isvara or Sagunam Brahman alone is visualiser and creator of all the five elements including jalam and prithivi because Upanishad says clearly in Taittiriya Upanishad. how come the Upanishad refers to Agni and jalam as visualisers in Chandogya upanisad. Agni created water and water created prithivi. Vyasacharya says that Isvara is present everywhere including the five elements. Therefore, Isvara is present in Agni also. Therefore, when the Upanishad says Agni visualized means Agni Antaryami bhuta Isvara alone. Here Agni means it is not Agni devata but Isvara alone. When the water visualized means, it does not mean water devata but Antaryami bhuta Isvara alone. How do you know that Antaryami is in jalam and Agni. Vyasacharya says that I have to take the sruti pramana alone 3.7.5 Antaryami Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad says that *yo'gnau tisthann, aner antarah, yam, agnir na Veda yasyagnih sariram, yagnim antaro yamayati esa ta atmantaryamy amrtah*. the meaning of this mantra is that he who dwells in the fire, yet is within the fire, whom the fire does not know, whose body the fire is who controls the fire, from within, he is your Self, the inner controller, the immortal. When we look at panca bhutas we should know that there are three factors in every elements. One is visible Agni factor, which is jadam, the invisible Agni devata factor which is chetanam and the third factor is invisible Antaryami factor that is Isvara. Isvara is also chetanam. There are two chetanams and one achetanam. We do not see Agni devata and Antaryami Isvara in fire. One is sariram, next is jiva and the third is Isvara we see in jivah. This is clearly said in Antaryami Brahmanam. The Antaryami is very much there within the Agni. That Antaryami cannot be objectified or known even by the Agni devata. Agni devata is only an alpajna jivah only and it is a post acquired by some punyam. Agni devata is not nimitta karanam but is only a karya bhutah and other than Agni devata Isvara is there as inner controller. Tatvamasī we focus and vishistadvaīd focus this mantra of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. When Upanishad says Agni visualized means, we should take the Isvara the Agni Antaryami alone. The same argument is extended to the jalam also. This is the general analysis and now we will do word for word analysis.

Tu saha eva indeed parameswara or Sagunam Brahman alone creates everything; tad abhidhyanat by visualizing the products; because of the reflection; or because of the volition; tat lingāt as indicated by vedic references to parameswara or of parameswara. Now we will see the significance of the words. Saha refers to Sagunam Brahman; eva refers to emphasis Sagunam Brahman alone is nimitta karanam also; in the previous adhikaranam upadana karanam was mentioned and here it is emphasized that Sagunam Brahman is also the creator of everything. Tad adhikaranam consists of two word tad the karyam Agni, jalam prithivi etc., abhidhyanam means visualization; Isvara alone is intelligent cause of everything even when the Agni visualized we should interpret that the Antaryami Isvara in jalam and Agni visualized; tal lingāt consists of two words. Tal refers to Parameswara; lingāt means references;

vedic references means the reference to Brihadharaynaka upanisad Antaryami Brahmanam 3.7.3. With this, the sutra portion is over. Now we have to answer Purva Paksi and Ekadesi.

Agni is intelligent cause for jalam and jalam for earth. Sruti says Agni visualized. When sruti says Agni visualized, you should know which of the three parts it refers to. We argue that we should take only take Antaryami and not achetana Agni and the Agni devata with alpajnatvad. Devata is not sarvajna enough to create the universe. in Bhagavad Gita Krishna says *na me viduh suraganah prabhavam na maharsavah aham adir hi devanam maharsinam ca sarvasah* that means neither the hosts of gods nor the great sages know any origin of Me for I am the source of the gods and the great sages in every way. Therefore, neither the achetana Agni nor the chetana Agni devata can visualize but only chetana Antaryami alone can visualize. Mere chetanatvam is not enough to become intelligent cause then we can also create things. Chetanatva matram cannot create everything and this is not there with Agni devata.

There is no contradiction between Chandogya upanisad and Taittiriya Upanishad/ isavara located in Agni created the universe and therefore there is no contradiction and sruti is pramana. with this 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 8. Viparyadhikaranam [Sutra 14]**

The process of dissolution of the elements is in the reverse order from that of creation

### **Sutra 2.3.14 [230]**

#### ***Viparyayena tu kramo'tah upapadyate cha***

The order [in which] the elements are indeed withdrawn into Brahman during pralaya or dissolution] is the reverse of that [i.e., the order in which they are created] and this is reasonable.

The process of dissolution of the elements is described in this sutra.

Now we enter the next adhikaranam. it is also a small adhikaranam with one sutra. this adhikaranam is only an aside adhikaranam an incidental adhikaranam even though it is not required for the flow of our discussion. If the topic is not require why it is added in this Brahma Sutra. what is not required for flow, it is important. The flow of our discussion is all five bhutas are born out of Brahman. five elements are created in order in gradation and in Sanskrit it is called krama sristi. the third point the krama also is as mentioned in sastra. the incidental question is if this is krama then is there a krama in pralayam. If there is krama what is the krama? This is the incidental topic which can occur in the mind of teacher and the student. In this adhikaranam we do not have three levels are not there. we have only purva paksa and siddhanta. Purva paksa says there is no krama. He says that the whole creation will simultaneously go out of existence. Siddhanti says that there is an order in pralaya also. once we say that there is a krama then the question is what is the krama. Vyasacharya says that the opposite order is the krama. Prithivi resolves first into jalam and jalam into Agni and fire into air and air into space and space finally resolves into Brahman.

Now we will do the general analysis of this adhikaranam. viparida krama has to be accepted. that alone is logical thing to happen. It is logical because we have see Akasa is karanam

Vayu is karyam etc. suppose the resolution also happens in the same order then Akasa will have to resolve first and even after of the resolution of Akasa Vayu has to continue. Vayu being karyam of Akasa and Vayu the karyam cannot exist without the Akasa the karanam. on the other hand Vayu can resolve and Akasa can continue. Logically you have to accept the order. Adhi Sankaracharya says that there may not be Upanisadic vakyam but the Bhagavatam etc. support this order.

Now I will do the word for word analysis. Tu means during pralayam however; kramah the order of resolution; viparyayena athah is opposed to this; or contrary to this; upadyate ca it is reasonable also. now I will come to significance of the words. Viparyayena kramah the order of dissolution laya kramah is contrary; is reverse or opposite to the order of sristi; Akasa Vayu apah etc., is sristi krama and the opposite is in the pralaya krama. Tu however on the other hand etc., upadyete it is reasonable also. jalam cannot dissolve before prithivi and prithivi alone can resolve into jalam and jalam can survive. Smriti support is Maha Bharatam 339.29. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 204

### **Topic 8. Viparyadhikaranam [Sutra 14]**

The process of dissolution of the elements is in the reverse order from that of creation

**Sutra 2.3.14 [230]**

*Viparyayena tu kramo'tah upapadyate cha*

The order [in which] the elements are indeed withdrawn into Brahman during pralaya or dissolution] is the reverse of that [i.e., the order in which they are created] and this is reasonable.

The process of dissolution of the elements is described in this sutra.

We have completed the 14<sup>th</sup> sutra of 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of this pada. this is an incidental adhikaranam, the topic being the process of dissolution of the elements in reverse order from that of creation. laya krama is not the main topic connected with the sristi krama. Laya krama is exactly the opposite of sristi krama. He has not given any sruti support but Adhi Sankaracharya gives the smriti pramanam of Mahabharata sloka 12.339.29. the resolves into the water; water resolves into Agni; Agni resolves into Vayu and Vayu resolves into Akasa and Akasa resolves into Brahman. he also gives the yukti pramana in the last class. Now we will enter into the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

### **Topic 9. antaravijnanadhikaranam [Sutra 15]**

The mention of the mind and intellect does not interfere with the order of creation and reabsorbtion as they are the products of the elements.

**Sutra 2.3.15 [231]**

*Antara vijnanamanasi kramena tallingaditi chet na avisheshat*

If it be said that between [Brahman and the elements] the intellect and the mind [are mentioned and that thereafter that origination and the re-absorption are to be placed] somewhere in the seiries on account of their being inferential signs [whereby the order of the creation of the elements is broken], we say not so on account of the non-difference [of the intellect and the mind from the elements]

A further objection in the causation of the primary elements from Brahman is raised and refuted.

I will give you general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya discusses some of the organs of the body after the discussion of the elements. And in this adhikaranam we see the three levels Purva Paksi, Ekadesi and Siddhanti. The two

sruti statement kept in mind is that from Paramatma panca bhuta sruti is formed and the 2.1.3 of Mundaka Upanishad [*etasmad jayate prano manah sarvendriyani ca, kham vayur jyotir apah prthivi vidvasya dharini* – the meaning of the mantra reads as from him are born life, mind, all the sense organs [also] ether, air, light, water and earth, the supporter of all]. Here the order of creation is described that contradicts the statement of creation of elements described in the Chandogya upanisad 6.2.3 that reads as *tad asksata, bahu syam prajayeyeti, tat tejo 'srjata; tat tejo asksata, bahu syam prajayeyeti, tad apo 'srjata, tasmad yatra kva ca socati svedate va purusah, tejasa eva tad adhy apo jayante*. It thought May I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth fire; that fire thought, may I be many, may I grow forth, may I may I grow forth. It sent forth water. Therefore, whenever a person grieves or perspires water is produced from the fire [heat]. The sruti says that after the creation of the karana utpatti the bhuta utpatti is said. However, in Mundaka karana utpatti is said after the creation of elements. Thus, there is a contradiction and because of this contradiction, sruti is apramanam. The Ekadesi wants to resolve and he asks us to go by the Mundaka Upanishad that first karanas are produced and thereafter alone the elements are produced. Taittiriya Upanishad also indicates the karana utpatti before the creation of the elements. Thus the entire creation is said to be in the order of the karana utpatti followed by the bhuta utpatti.

The first portion of the sutra relates to Ekadesi madham. Then the latter portion relates to siddhanta. Ekadesi says that you have to supply karana utpatti before Akasa utpatti. Between Brahman and Akasa you have to insert karana utpatti like mana, indriyani, prana etc., based on the above Mundaka Upanishad.

Vyasacharya answers no to the Ekadesi madham's argument. in the case of Chandogya upanisad we do accept Akasa and Vayu to be supplied before Agni. Adhi Sankaracharya says that all the karanas are only the products of the five elements. Elementals are karanams and elements are bhutam. Since karanas are born of elements and therefore after elements can be born. The order of the elementals will be the same as the order of elements and after Akasa only srortriya sruti is possible. We need not separately discuss karana krama because it is the same as the bhuta krama. The sruti support for this is taken from 6.5.4 of Chandogya upanisad that reads as *annamayam hi, saumya manah, apomayah pranah, tejomayi vag iti; bhuya eva ma Bhagavan vijnapayyatv iti; tatha soumya iti hovaca*. The meaning of the mantra reads as then my dear, mind consists of food, breath consists of water and speech consists of heat; so it is. In fact, this mantra is repeated several times. Prithivi is responsible for nourishment of mind; water for prana Agni for vag and so on. The three elements alone nourish and maintain the karanam. therefore the order is five elements and thereafter alone the karanam swill come. Ekadesi points out the Mundaka Upanishad mantra. This we will see later. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Anatara means between Brahman and Akasa; vijnanamanasi the intellect and mind originate; kamena means in the order of succession tan lingat means as indicated by such sruti references; na it is not so; avisheshat because of their non-difference; this is the meaning of the sutra. Now we will see the significance of the words; antara means between Brahman and Akasa yoho madhye; the origination of organs need not be separately dealt with but it is identical with the elements or bhutas. It is identical with bhuta utpatti kramah.

Now we have to handle purva paksa and Ekadesi. First we will handle Ekadesi. Mundaka Upanishad talks about karana utpatti first. For that our answer is that you cannot blindly supply but find out whether it is logically correct. In the case of Chandogya upanisad we could supply Vayu and Akasa sruti because both of them were logically correct to say that



they are born before Agni. in the case of karana utpatti, we cannot supply that because logically karanam cannot be born before elements because karanams are modified form of elements only. Can we make idlee before making rice and it is illogical. so also karanams cannot be created before elements because karanams are made of elements only. In Mundaka upanisad the order of creation is not given but it gives the list of elements created. The logical order is not given but it is enumerated here. The logical order is superior to enumeration order. We have to take the correct order of what is given in Mundaka upanisad.

Purva paksa says that there is sruti contradiction. Mundaka upanisad does not give logical order and it is only an enumeration. Why do we say that Mundaka upanisad is not interested in logical order but enumeration? In Mundaka upanisad the question of the student is eka vijnanena sarva vijnanenam and Upanishad has to say everything is product of Brahman whatever be the order and the order is immaterial here. Therefore, Mundaka upanisad does not think of the order. Therefore, there is no contradiction of the order. now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 10. Characharyapayasrayadhikaranam. [Sutra 16]**

Births and deaths are not the soul.

**Sutra 2.3.16 [232]**

***Characharyapayasrayastu syat tadvyapadeso bhaktah tadbhavabhavitvat***

But the mention of that [viz., birth and death of the individual soul] is apt only with reference to the bodies of beings moving and non-moving. It is secondary or metaphorical if applied to the soul, as the existence of those terms depends on the existence of that [i.e., the body]

The essential nature or character of the individual soul is discussed here.

I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. with the previous adhikaranam Vyasacharya has completed the first major task of this pada. the topics are bhuta utpatti sruti virodha pariharah is the topic one and the second is jiva utpatti sruti virodha pariharah. Bhuta utpatti means the origination of five elements and there are seemingly contradictory statements. This has been done from 1<sup>st</sup> sutra to 15<sup>th</sup> sutra. karana srusti also was discussed along with the bhuta srusti.

From this adhikaranam onwards up to the 17<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam deals with jiva srusti sruti virodha parihara that is resolving the seeming contradiction with regard to the origination of the jiva. While dealing with jiva srusti indirectly presents the jiva swarupam also so that it is useful for our grand design of jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. That is the sadhana for moksa praptih. In the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam the topics are similar and very close and Vyasacharya wants to presents three points.

First point is that the birth and death are there in the body in the primary sense of the term. The second point is that birth and death are there for jiva only in the apparent sense and not in the primary sense. Third point Vyasacharya wants to highlight is that jiva does not have janma and maranam in the primary sense. I will deal with it briefly and then we will go to the adhikaranam.

The body has got janma maranam in the primary sense. The body is born and it has death. This is clear as we experience it everyday. Jiva has janma maranam in the secondary sense. Jiva is the Consciousness obtaining in the body reflected in the Sookshma Sariram. jiva can transact only through physical body and the jiva's transaction begins with the jiva's physical body and ends with the physical body. Once the transaction ends, jiva does not end and it goes to another body. Transaction ends and jiva does not end. It appears as though the jiva has ended. It is an apparent end of the jivah. This is the second point to be discussed and there is one more point is there which we will discuss in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRAS

Class 205

### **Topic 10. Charachavyapasrayadhikaranam. [Sutra 16]**

Births and deaths are not the soul.

**Sutra 2.3.16 [232]**

***Charachavyapasrayastu syat tadvyapadeso bhaktah tadbhavabhavitvat***

But the mention of that [viz., birth and death of the individual soul] is apt only with reference to the bodies of beings moving and non-moving. It is secondary or metaphorical if applied to the soul, as the existence of those terms depends on the existence of that [i.e., the body]

The essential nature or character of the individual soul is discussed here.

Up to the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of this pada Vyasacharya analysed bhuta srusti and also the elementals also. he established that there is no sruti virodha at all and also he indirectly he revealed that Brahman is the cause of all the elements and elementals. He also established the maxim jagat karanam Brahman as also gave the explanation for the 'tat' padha of the maha vakyam 'tat tvam asi'. In the following 8 adhikaranams, all the sruti and contradictions regarding jiva srusti and its swarupam is discussed. Directly the topic here is resolution of jiva utpatti is talked about here.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam. here we will see jivasya utpatti. Here three points are stressed which are as under; with regard to body, the birth is used in the primary sense because body is subject to birth and death; this we experience physically. It is taken in primary sense. With regard to Jivatma the word birth is used only in a secondary or figurative sense because Jivatma is not subject to birth and death. Jivatma consists of Sookshma Sariram plus Chidhabasa plus the chit Chaitanyam; we know that Jivatma does not die at all and Jivatma acquires punya papam and exhaust them through physical body and once punya papa are exhausted the physical body. Jivatma does not die but travel from one body to another; or quits the present body and take to another body in the next janma. Jivatma only travels and it does not die. We use the word death to Jivatma because when the body dies, even though Jivatma survives it cannot do any transactions. All sukha and dukha anubhavas are suspended. For experience of karma contact with world is required. World alone can give sukha and dukham. To experience the world a physical body is required and since that body is gone, Jivatma cannot do any transaction or interact with the world with the Sookshma Sariram and the Jivatma soul. Neither can Jivatma contact nor the world can contact with the Jivatma. So the Jivatma is as good as non-existence. Body is dead and therefore in primary sense the Jivatma is as though dead. This is the second point.

The third point is that the word death cannot be used in the case of Jivatma in the primary sense. In reality Jivatma does not have birth and death and Jivatma is nityah bhavati. Since Jivatma is eternal and Paramatma eternal, we say Jivatma is Paramatma. Karana karya sambandha is not possible between the two eternal things. If one is karyam and another is karyam then since karyam is born, one is eternal and the other is ephemeral. Jivatma is not a

product of Paramatma since Jivatma is eternal Paramatma. The relationship is aikya sambandha. Jivatma in the real sense is not born.

The first two points are discussed in the present adhikaranam. here also we have purva paksa, Ekadesi and siddhanta madhams. Here also we are pointed out that the contradictions in jiva srusti. Therefore, Veda is apramanam of purva paksa madhams and he quotes seemingly contradictory statements. I will quote two examples. Kathopanishad 1.2.18 Atma is unborn, Taittiriya Upanishad yathova 3.1 here it says jiva is born out of Brahman; therefore Veda is unreliable. Then Ekadesi comes and tells jivah is born really; and for that he gives the reason of sruti vakyam; the second reason he gives is that Veda prescribes varieties of samskaras which indicates that jivas birth and death; various rituals are prescribed for the baby before and after birth\ and he asks if jiva is not born why should there be so many samskaras. All samskaras are for Jivatma born only. the whole world accepts that living beings are born and gone and it is universally accepted fact. Because of these reasons sruti vakyam, loukika prasiddhi and experience they content jivah is born. Then siddhanta will give his conclusion. Vyasacharya emphasizes two points mentioned in the beginning that the words can be used in primary sense only with regard to the body. The body alone is born and gone in the primary sense. With regard to Jivatma the word Jivatma, the word, birth, and death can be taken figuratively only. Entering the body is taken as birth and only when the body is there, Jivatma can do something and in the absence of the body the Jivatma cannot do anything. Since Jivatma is not useful it is as good as death. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

There are several words in this sutra. tu means however; tadvyapadesah means the usage of the words birth and death is with regard to the moving and the stationary bodies; syat bhaktah means it is figurative with regard to Jivatma; tadbhavabhavitat means since they exist only from the standpoint of the birth and death of the body;

Now we will give the significance of the word. tu means however and it is differentiate the topic from panca bhuta and jivah. Tad vyapadesah means the usage of the word the sabda prayaogah; those two words of utpatti nasa sabda prayogah; the birth and death; characha vyapasrayah with regard to; associated with or connected to or being with; chara means moving body, all the animal and human body and achara means non-moving body that is plants and trees; do not move means do not move from one place to another; the body is the object of the word birth and death; syat bhaktah the word bhaktah means figurative; the word birth and death has only figurative meaning and then you supply with regard to Jivatma; in the context of Jivatma birth and death are bhaktah means gounah; it means figurative sense; tad bhava means the existence of birth and death for the body; janma manara bhavah; the existence of birth and death for Jivatma that means the existence of birth and death for Jivatma is only from the point of body's birth and death and therefore we have a figurative expression. it is transferred birth and death; so we call it incidental and it is not intrinsic at all. Syat means is; it is figurative. Now we have to answer Ekadesi and purva paksi.

Ekadesi says Jivatma is born because of the three reasons. First is Upanishad says Jivatma is born. No doubt, Upanishad says Jivatma is born and it is figurative sense from the point of view of body alone and from the point of jivatma. Thus, there is no contradiction. For the performance of samskara also we say it is only from the standpoint of sariram only. That is why we have no samskaras for the animals. Finally, the loukika prasiddhi and it is also from loka dristi only because everyone looks at jiva from the body alone. Purva paksa is also negated from the same point alone. One talks of seeming birth and one talks of real birth. Unborn and unreally born relates to the same state. Then, Adhi Sankaracharya quotes

Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 4.3.18 swayam jyothi Brahman. This mantra says swaha ayam purusah ayamanah this Purusa is born and the Upanishad says that Jivatma acquires a physical body; Jivatma birth is not the origination but only the acquisition of the body. The same mantra says the death of Jivatma is ukraman and it is not the end of Jivatma but it is leaving the present body; so maranam is only a prayanam and it is only quitting the body and it is not the destruction of the Jivatma. With this, the tenth adhikaranam is over. Now we will enter the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 11. Atmadhikaranam. [Sutra 17]**

The individual soul is eternal; it is not produced.

### **Sutra 2.3.17 [233]**

#### ***Natma asruternityatvat cha tabhyah***

The individual soul is not produced; because it is not so mentioned by the scriptures and as it is eternal according to them as per the sruti texts.

The discussion on the essential characteristics of the individual soul is being continued.

First, I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. this adhikaranam is very closely connected to the previous adhikaranam. In the previous adhikaranam it was said Jivatma is seemingly born; if Jivatma is unrealy born, the corollary is Jivatma is really unborn and Jivatma is nityah.

There are three stages very similar to the previous adhikaranam. Purva Pakshi says there is very much contradiction in the sruti statements. 2.1.1 of Mundaka upanisad which says bhavah the jivas are born out of Paramatma just as sparks are born out of fire. Fire is also prakasa rupam and Paramatma is chetana and Jivatma is also chetana; chetana spark Jivatma is born out of chetana fire Paramatma. Thus Jivatma is born it is declared. 6.3.2 of Chandogya upanisad says anena jivena which means Brahman alone is called jiva when it is functioning in the body; therefore Paramatma alone is Jivatma; since Paramatma alone is Jivatma whatever be the nature of Paramatma should be the nature of Jivatma; Paramatma is unborn and therefore Jivatma also is unborn. Paramatma obtains in the body and therefore Paramatma and Jivatma are identical; this is the idea conveyed by the Chandogya upanisad. One talks of birth and another talks of non-birth and so Veda is apramanam.

Now Ekadesi comes and says that Jivatma is really born. He gives his own reasons. The first reason he gives is pratijna hanih; it means only if you accept Jivatma is a product of Paramatma, then alone eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati; then karana vijnanena karya vijnanam bhavati, then eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam will not be possible; and eka vijnanena sarva vijnana siddhyartham and then you accept Jivatma is born out of Paramatma. This idea is borrowed from the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra yad yad vibaktam tad tad kayam whatever is distinct entity different from all other entity is used to say Akasa is born. akasa is different from jalam. Vayu etc. here Ekadesi says every Jivatma is a distinct individual and vibaktatvat. Jivatma is born. then Siddhanti will give his answer which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 206

### **Topic 11. Atmadhikaranam. [Sutra 17]**

The individual soul is eternal; it is not produced.

**Sutra 2.3.17 [233]**

#### ***Natma asruternityatvat cha tabhyah***

The individual soul is not produced; because it is not so mentioned by the scriptures and as it is eternal according to them as per the sruti texts.

The discussion on the essential characteristics of the individual soul is being continued.

In the first part of this third pada of the second chapter Vyasacharya has dealt with the Prapancha sristi sruti vakyani that too panca bhuta sristi and all the seeming contradiction were resolved in these nine adhikaranam, which form the first part, this pada. from the 10<sup>th</sup> up to the end we get the second part of this pada and jiva sristi is analysed here. Jiva is called bogta and now we see the boktru sristi. with regard to jiva sristi all the seeming contradictions have been resolved here. The entire second chapter is called avirodha adhyaya, the teaching is incidental, and the main purpose is resolving the seeming contradictions in the sruti. Vyasacharya also accomplishes the jiva swarupa is also ascertained jiva is nithya, sarvagatha, asangah, akarta abokta are established incidentally. Once this is established then Jivatma Paramatma aikyam can be established easily. Laksana aykyad vasthu aikyam is the rule. ocne the nature is proved identical, then it is easy to see that both the vastus are identical. Now here it is see that jiva is never born out of Brahman. Jiva nithyatvam is being established here. In the previous adhikaranam jt was said jivah is apparently born and here it is seen that jiva is un-really born. When we say un-really born, it is mithya sristi vadha and when un-really born it is ajadhi vahdah. It is obverse and reverse of the two sides of the same coin. Here it is established Atma is unborn. Here also there are three stages. First is Purva Paksi, second is Ekadesi and third is siddhanta.

Purva Paksi is that sruti makes contradictory statements and therefore sruti is apramanam. jiva is born out of Brahman as the spark emerge from fire is one argument. the other Upanishad vakyam is Chandogya upanisad that says that Brahman itself takes the role of Jivatma; the producer himself is the actor. He is not only the producer but also created the Body Mind Complex himself and entered the body. Brahman itself is jviah and since Brahman is jiva, Brahman has to be nithyam and ajah and Brahma abinnatvad since Brahman is identical with unborn Brahman. thus Chandogya upanisad says jiva is unborn and Mundaka upanisad says jiva is born. Purva Paksi asks not to read the Vedas.

Ekadesi says that the intention of the Veda is that jiva is born is correct. Jiva has to be born as the logic supports this view. Pratijna ahanih only if you take jiva as product of Brahman then alone eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is possible. Jiva is born jagat is born karana Brahma vijnanena karya Prapancha vijnanena bhavati. By Brahma vijnanam cannot take place if jiva is not the product of Brahman. the second reason he gives is that the one we have in the case

of Akasa. we said that Akasa must be born because it is distinct entity from other bhutas. Whatever is distinct and can be differentiated, are subject to birth. Extending this, Ekadesi says that jiva is distinct entity differentiating from all the jada and other jiva. Each jiva is distinct is proved by thumb impression. Ekadesi put forward this argument in support of his statement that jiva is born of Brahman. the second argument is jiva janyah vibaktatvat akasavat.

Siddhanta has to establish that jivah is unborn. We have done the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis. Atma na - means Jivatma is not born; asruteh since there is no sruti support or sruti pramanam; nithyatvad ca since Jivatma is eternal tabhyah according to the sruti statement. this is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Na jayate means not born; Atma is unborn and here Atma refers to jiva only all confusions are with regards to Jivatma only and therefore in this context we have to take Jivatma only and Jivatma is unborn; asruteh means there is no sruti pramanam to support the birth of jiva; second reason is that I have the sruti support; sruti says jiva nithyah and there are countless statements which support the eternity of jiva and what is permanent cannot be born. permanent means it was in the past; it is in the present and it will be there in future. Birth is for one, which did not exist at a particular time; Jivatma being eternal it need not be born. tabhyah means strutipyah and here sruti means countless sruti statements. Now Vyasacharya says many sruti statements and Adhi Sankaracharya gives many quotations. One is 1.2.18 of Kathopanisad; since this mantra is very important Lord Krishna modified in his Gita; next is 2.2.1 of Kathopanisad; the word ajasya is very important and jiva has got eleven holes and the Jivatma ruling in the city is unborn; next is 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad which is repeated in 4.4.25 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. This mantra says sava esa mahan ajah Atma this Atma is unborn; therefore Jivatma is unborn as clearly said by sruti. With this sutra part is over. now we have to negate Ekadesi and Purva Paksi.

Ekadesi said that jiva is born and only then pratijna will be validated the pratijna being eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam that jiva is the product of Brahman is the contention for which we say by Brahma vijnanam you do get jiva vijnanam even though jiva is not a product of Brahman. still Brahma vijnanena jiva vijnanam sambavati. World is a product of Brahma therefore Brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanena. However, we find that in the case of jiva vijnanena sarva vijnanam sambavati. For this Ekadesi asks how is it possible. Advaidins say that jiva and Brahman are identical as revealed in countless maha vakyams and therefore you need to separately know jiva Brahma vijnanenam eva sjiva vijnanam you need not know jiva through Brahman being jiva and Brahman are identical. Then the next argument he gave was that jiva has got distinct entity and for that Adhi Sankaracharya says jiva's distinctions are not intrinsic but superficial distinction caused by upadhi, the body. We have individual body and individual mind and intellect is distinct and karmas are distinct and jiva has got Chaitanyam and there is no individuality for Chaitanyam. There is no difference in Chaitanyam. Once it is said they argue they ask why should Veda prescribe certain karmas for certain people even though Chaitanyam is one and the same. We say Chaitanyam is the same and therefore you cannot say all Chaitanyam can do all karmas because Chaitanyam is akarta and Chaitanyam cannot do anything. If we talk of the body there are distinctions and once you come to anatma there will be beda and all the people cannot do all karmas. Therefore, there cannot be differences in Chaitanyam, differences are there only in terms of properties and since Chaitanyam has not properties, and on what basis you will differentiate one Chaitanyam from the other, you cannot differentiate from the point of location also.

Space is located in the space. Chaitanyam has not time wise property, spatial property and there is no distinction between jivas, differences we talk about is from the container upon the content. Therefore, Adhi Sankaracharya says Jivatma is not a distinct entity. For this we get the support from Upanishad. there is only one nirguna Chaitanyam 6.11 of svetasvara Upanishad. there is another quotation from Gita that 13.16 avibaktanja bhuteshu ; jiva is never differentiated in the body and it is 'seemingly' differentiated. Akasa is one but sit is seemingly plural it is said in the Mandukya Upanishad.

Now left out is Purva Paksi. Purva Paksi says sruti contradicts itself. Mundaka upanisad says that jiva is born. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says that no doubt sruti talks about the birth of jiva and whenever jiva's birth is talked about, it is not the intrinsic birth of jiva and it talks about the birth of the body. It is only 'seeming birth' but intrinsically it is never born. We talk about gata Akasa utpatti [3.3 to 9 Mandukya Upanishad] it is seen as though gata Akasa is born but we only superimpose gata janma to Maha Akasa and similar jiva is born. Again, Adhi Sankaracharya gives the sruti support 2.4.12 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad says that the birth is not of Consciousness and the birth is only of the sariram. Sariram is the manifesting medium and when the body comes alone, it is born the transactable Consciousness comes. Previously it was un-transactable Consciousness and it is as good as non-existence. When the body comes, the un-transactable Consciousness is made the transactable Consciousness. That we call the Chaitanyam is in the body. What comes is transactability of Consciousness comes to the body. Once the body is dead and gone, the Consciousness<sup>1</sup> also seems to be gone. With this, this adhikaranam is over. jiva nityah and eternal is our conclusion. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 12. jnadhikaranam. [Sutra 18]**

The nature of the individual soul is intelligence.

### **Sutra 2.3.18 [234]**

#### ***Jno'ta eva***

For this very reason [viz., that it is not created], [the individual soul is] intelligence [itself]

The discussion on the essential characteristics of the individual soul is continued.

First, I will introduce this adhikaranam with one sutra. this is one of the most important adhikaranam. here alone the jiva's nature is defined as Consciousness which is the most unique aspect of Vedanta. Jiva is defined as chaitanya swarupam. Jiva's nature is defined as Chaitanyam. We know that Brahman is defined as chaitanya swarupam, at the same time, jiva is also defined as Chaitanyam, and thus jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is established. Sruti is based on the nature of jiva is the complaint from purva paksa. he says sruti is vague as to the nature of jiva. At one place, sruti says jiva is jnanam and at another place, the same sruti says jiva is jnata. Is it conscious entity or the Consciousness itself? At one place, it says it is the knower and at another place, it is said to be the knowledge. the first statement the purva paksa takes is 4.3.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad which says *Atmanavayam jyotisaste palyayate, karma hurute vipalyeti iti* that says Atma is the light of Consciousness in which case the Consciousness becomes the very noun called jivah. It is not an adjective or property and Consciousness is the substance or noun. Then another Upanishad vakyam 4.9 Prasno Upanishad says that Jivatma is the knower principle. The mantra reads as *esa hi drasta*,



*sprasta, srota, ghrata, rasayita, manta, boddha, karta, vijnanatma, purusah, sa pare'ksara atmani sampratisthate.* The meaning of this mantra is He, verily is the seer, the toucher, the hearer, the smeller, the taster, the perceiver, the knower, the doer, the thinking Self, the person. He becomes established in the Supreme un-decaying Self. Consciousness is only either a property or function of Jivatma it is said. Talking is not 'myself' but talking is a function located in me. There is a difference between the property and substance. Consciousness is still a mystery and whether it is a substance or the function of the matter is a contradictory. Most of the scientists believe Consciousness is a function and brain is a fleshy matter and Consciousness is property of the brain and Consciousness ends at the time of death and for the many people Consciousness is a dependent property or function of the matter. purva paksa quotes that sruti itself says Atma is a knower. Let us analyse the word knower. Say he is a talker. Talker is a person or substance in which a temporary function of talking arises. One who has the temporary talking function is a talker. Eating walking and talking are the temporary functions that one has at a particular time. at that time he talks or walks, he assumes the role of talker or walker. The functions are temporary subject to the arrival and departure. in eater, eat is one part and 'er' is another part. Eating is the temporary function and it arrives and departs. The second part 'er' part refers to the permanent locus. In all these words, there is permanent locus and there is temporary function walk, talk, eat. Here also 'er' is permanent locus and is called jiva. 'Know' portion of the 'knower' is impermanent; knowing function, being conscious, or Consciousness is only a temporary function of the locus Jivatma. Knowing function or knowledge function or Consciousness or sentiency is a temporary function of Jivatma which means Consciousness or knowing function temporarily comes in Jivatma and Jivatma by itself is un-Consciousness matter. I am, not talker all the time. I am not knower all the time. The knowing function comes and I am un-conscious. The word knower reveals a jada Jivatma that has temporary Consciousness and when the Consciousness arrives, he becomes Jivatma. This is said in the Prasna Upanishad. The meaning of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad that says that Consciousness is not the property of inert Atma and Consciousness is substance of Jivatma and Jivatma is ever Consciousness. Whether Jivatma is a matter temporarily enjoying the Consciousness or Jivatma is Consciousness itself is the question here. The contradictory is there between Samkya and nyaya philosophy also. Samkya says jiva is Consciousness and nyaya philosopher says jiva has Consciousness. is Consciousness a property or is Consciousness a substance is our question. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 207

### **Topic 12. Jnadhikaranam. [Sutra 18]**

The nature of the individual soul is intelligence.

**Sutra 2.3.18 [234]**

***Jno'ta eva***

For this very reason [viz., that it is not created], [the individual soul is] intelligence [itself]

The discussion on the essential characteristics of the individual soul is continued.

The general analysis of this adhikaranam which I started, I will continue now. here different systems of philosophy has different views on Consciousness whether it is a property or it is Consciousness itself of the Jivatma. Nithya sarvagatha chaitanya ruapah Jivatma. Jivatma means I and therefore through these three adhikaranam I will establish that Brahman is all pervading, external Consciousness. Thus, it will establish that Brahma and Jivatma are identical. When Jivatma is a knower, it is an entity, which does the action of knowing, or it is the locus of knowledge or the knowing process. When Atma is knower means Atma becomes the locus of the knowledge. When you say Atma is conscious entity again it means Atma is a locus of the attribute of Consciousness. when you say conscious entity, the conscious becomes an adjective and Atma becomes the noun or the substance. Whether you define Atma is a knower or a conscious entity in both the cases the Atma becomes the locus of the Consciousness property and it is located in Atma. This is one idea conveyed in the Upanishad.

In other places, it is said that Atma is knowledge itself. It is not the locus of knowledge and it the very knowledge itself. Now the question comes as to whether Atma is the knowledge itself or it is locus of knowledge. Atma is defined Consciousness itself. The confusion is whether it is the locus of Consciousness or Consciousness itself. Whether it is knower of knowledge or the knowledge itself is our question. Purva paksa says sruti is very vague. In some places, it says it is drasta, srota etc. it is knower and it is knowledge both are said to be the Atma. So Purva Paksi says sruti is apramanam. Adhi Sankaracharya says that this confusion is there in other philosophies also. is Consciousness is a substance or property. We have two systems of philosophy that has opposite stand. One is Samkya yoga system, which says that Atma is knowledge itself and it is not a knower. It is not conscious substance but Consciousness itself. In Samkya system knowledge is not an action; Consciousness is not a property of Atma; Consciousness is not the property of Atma and the knowledge is Atma and Consciousness is Atma. Incidentally, Vedanta also agrees with that. This is one view that Atma chaitanya swarupam. It is not a property but a substance. However, the nyaya vaiseshika system says that says that knowledge is the property of the Atma. Either it is kriya of nyaya system or guna of vaiseshika system and knowledge should be taken as an action or property is our question. As per their philosophy, it is not Atma and it is located in the Atma. Atma is not Consciousness also. Atma is different from knowledge Atma is different from Consciousness and Atma possesses knowledge or Atma possesses Consciousness. You have a

dog is different from you are dog. Atma has Consciousness is nyaya vaiseshika and Atma is Consciousness is Samkya. Between the two people Vedanta is closer to Samkya yoga system. What does the nyaya vaiseshika philosopher says is that Atma is matter and therefore it is inert in nature just as Akasa, Vayu etc. he has classified matter as nine items. It is similar to brain of the scientists. They say Atma is inert matter and they say that mind is another matter in which Vedanta agree. The problem is with Atma. They say when Atma and mind is combined Consciousness is generated as a property. In scientific language, it is an emergent property. It is electrical phenomenon in the brain, when it is there the brain is alive, and when it stops producing, you are dead. Consciousness is generated property as per the nyaya vaiseshika. Once the Consciousness is generated, it has to depend upon one substance or the other because property cannot exist independently of the substance. As per the Nyaya Vaishesika system, the Consciousness cannot exist independently. It should depend upon some matter or the other. We have two matters are there that is Atma or the mind. it has to depend upon one of the two dravyam Atma or the mind. Nyaya Vaishesika says that he will vote for Atma and thus the Consciousness becomes the temporary inert substance called Atma. This is very similar to the scientist's view of the Consciousness. In fact, scientists call it the brain. However, the Samkya yoga says that Consciousness is not a property and since it is not a property, it need not depend upon anything. Purusa is separate and prakriti is separate as per the Samkya system. Nyaya Vaishesika says matter is independent and Consciousness depends upon matter. Vedanta says Consciousness is independent and matter depends upon Consciousness.

Consciousness depends upon matter is Nyaya Vaishesika; Consciousness is independent of matter is Vedanta. both are independent as per the Samkya system. This confusion as to whether the Atma is Consciousness or the property of Atma is the confusion exists in Samkya and nyaya vaiseshika. this confusion is confounded by the Upanisads also as the different upanisad says differently.

Now Ekadesi says that Jivatma is not Consciousness itself but it is a possessor of Consciousness and by possessing Consciousness, he becomes a knower. In support of his Consciousness he quotes two pramanams. One is sruti itself from Prasnopanisad and the other is Sushupti anubhava where one continues to exist without being conscious of anything. Even I am not conscious of myself as also my surroundings in Sushupti avastha. In jagrat avastha I have Consciousness but in Sushupti I do not have Consciousness. prajnah the sleeper does not know anything. The property or faculty of Consciousness is gone in sleep, or in coma and Consciousness is subject to arrival and departure thus reveals that I am a person who gets Consciousness and lose Consciousness in Sushupti. Now I will do the general analysis of this sutra

Atma is chaitanya swarupam. Atma is not possessor of Consciousness but Atma is Consciousness. Vyasacharya says as a corollary of the previous topic. He said that jiva is not born is the conclusion and he said that body is born and jiva is not born. jiva is not a product of Paramatma. Then how can there be eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam bhavati. We said that even though Jivatma is not a product of Paramatma, it is Jivatma and we said Jivatma is unborn and Paramatma is unborn and therefore jivatma and Paramatma are identical. We quoted a sruti statement in support of that from Chandogya upanisad. Sariram graham and having entered the graham Paramatma itself got the name of Paramatma when it is obtaining within the body. It is like a person when a person enters the Prime Minister's office he is called Prime minister. So also Paramatma is Paramatma, Jivatma is jivatma, and Paramatma is Jivatma. Because Jivatma and Paramatma are identical we find whatever the nature of

Paramatma should be the nature of Jivatma. In several places, it is said sathyam jnanam anatham Brahma. Jivatma is knowledge itself. Prajnanam Brahman. Brahman is said to be jnana swarupam. Jivatma is identical with Brahman and therefore Jivatma is jnana swarupam. Consciousness is not the property but is my very nature. Don't say body has Consciousness and I am that body; say I am the Consciousness with the body. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Atah eva means because of the very reason; jnah Atma is of the nature of Consciousness. now we will see the significance of the word. atah eva because of this reason only. it is a big reason. Many steps we have to go. First jiva is not born of Brahman; and therefore since Jivatma is identical with Brahman, and since Brahman is of the nature of Consciousness, therefore Jivatma is of the nature of Consciousness. all these stages are indicated by atah eva. That Brahman is of the nature of Consciousness 2.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad and 3.9.28 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; 4.5.13 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad etc. jnah in the context means jnana swarupah. Our next job is to negate Ekadesi and Purva Pakshi.

Ekadesi's view is that Atma has the property only. he says Atma has Consciousness in jagrat and lose Consciousness in Sushupti . Adhi Sankaracharya says that in Sushupti chaitanyam is very much there. Why do I not experience that Chaitanyam? I fell I am jadah. Adhi Sankaracharya says only when the Consciousness is associated with specific object, objective Consciousness becomes evidently known and that is called vishesha Chaitanyam. In Sushupti object is not there and therefore objectless Consciousness is there and that objectless Consciousness is called samanya Consciousness. It is not Consciousness is absent and it is the object is absent making the vishesha Chaitanyam into samanya Chaitanyam. Samanya Chaitanyam is un-associated with any object including my own Self, it becomes the Avyakta Chaitanyam, and it is not as evident as vyakta Chaitanyam. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example is that sunlight pervades all over the hall. But where do you detect Surya prakasa? For detecting the sunlight you need an illumined object for recognizing the illuminator sunlight. That is why if I keep the hand like this, the illumined hand is there and illuminator sunlight is appreciated and we see the sunlight is there. but it is not vyaktam in between the hand not because of the absence of the light but because of the illumined object which makes the illuminator evident is not there. an interesting thing we discover is that the hand require sunlight for its illumination. Light depends upon hand for us to detect the light and therefore we say the light depends upon the hand for the detection or appreciation. Similarly object depends upon the Consciousness for the illumination and Consciousness depends upon a medium or object for its manifestation or detection. In Sushupti avastha this object is not there and therefore the Consciousness is in undetected form like defused sunlight that is not detected. Beyond the atmosphere, you do not detect sunlight because there is no object to reflex the sunlight. Therefore, in Sushupti Consciousness is there but the object is not there and that Consciousness is Atma. In support of that Adhi Sankaracharya quotes 4.3.23 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *yas vai tan na pasyati; pasyan vai tan na pastyati; na hi drastur drster viparilopo vidyate avinasitvat; na tu tad dvitiyam asti tato 'nyad vibhaktam yat pasyati*. the meaning of the mantra is verily when there [in the state of deep sleep] he does not see, he is verily seeing though he does not see, for there is no cessation of the seeing of a seer, because of the imperishability [of the seer]. There is not, however, a second, nothing else separate from him which he could see. at no time Atma loses Consciousness because Atma is Consciousness. when the objects are there the Consciousness becomes objective Consciousness and it is evident and in Sushupti it is objectless Consciousness and hence it is not evident. There is another sruti in 4.3.11 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *svapnena sariram abhiprahatyasuptah suptan*

*abhicakasiti; sukram adaya punar aiti sthanam, hiranmayah Purusa eka hamsah* the meaning of the mantra is on this there are the following verses. Having struck down in sleep what belongs to the body, he himself sleepless looks down on the sleeping [senses]. Having taken to himself light, he goes again to his place, the golden person the lonely swan [the one spirit] in the Sushupti avastha Atma is not sleeping losing the Consciousness. On the other hand Atma illumines the sleeping instruments jnanendriyani karmendriani etc., the nonfunctioning instrument by the ever awake Consciousness Atma. The Atma cannot say that I am conscious and to say that I am conscious you require the function of the mind and sense organs and to be conscious Atma does not require any organ. Even to think that I am conscious I need the mind and the Atma cannot do that because of the absence of the mind and the mind having gone to rest. The nonfunctioning of the instruments and in jagrat it functions and to say that it is not functioning in Sushupti the instruments are not there. then the next point is what about the Nyaya Vaishesika philosopher. He said that Consciousness is a property generated by Atma and mind combined together. In Sushupti Atma and mind are detached and therefore you become inert matter. in jagrat you are sentient with Atma and mind combined together. Now we refute this by giving two arguments. First argument accordint to him is Atma is all pervading like space. how can that Atma get associated with anything. Association requires tangibility. Just as space cannot get associated niravayavatvad samyoha na sambavathi. Atma cannot have connection with anything including the mind. even if you assume it has contact, the contact cannot break because Atma being all pervading how can they get separated. Therefore, Atma mind union, separation is absurd theory, and therefore Ekadesi madham is not tenable. We have to negate Purva Paksi madham, which we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 208

### **Topic 12. Jnadhikaranam. [Sutra 18]**

The nature of the individual soul is intelligence.

**Sutra 2.3.18 [234]**

*Jno'ta eva*

For this very reason [viz., that it is not created], [the individual soul is] intelligence [itself]

The discussion on the essential characteristics of the individual soul is continued.

Here Vyasacharya clarifies the seeming contradiction in jiva sristi and he also reveals the swarupam of jiva that will make the jivatma and Paramatma aikyam easy. Jiva's birth is only a figurative from the standpoint of sariram. the nature of jiva here being establish is that jiva is jnana swarupah. Jiva is not a matter or the property of Consciousness but jiva is Consciousness itself and it is matter enclosed Consciousness. it is jnana swarupah and Vyasacharya uses the word jnaha. Normally the word jnah means the knower but in this context it is jnana swarupah or vijnana swarupa or chaitanya swarupa. Jiva is not a knower but knowledge itself. Jiva is not a conscious entity but Consciousness itself. This we have established in this adhikaranam. Now we have to refute Ekadesi and Purva Paksi.

Ekadesi argued that jiva is a knower enjoying temporary Consciousness. When the temporary Consciousness comes jiva is a knower when it is not there he is a non-knower as experienced in the Sushupti avastha. First, we established in the last class that in deep sleep state the Consciousness is very much in existence but is not associated with any object. I am conscious of the fan, pot etc., is called visesha Chaitanyam and visesha Chaitanyam is not there in deep sleep state but the samanya Chaitanyam unassociated with any object is there in deep sleep state. When Consciousness is unassociated with any object it is not evident. Visesha chaitanyam alone is vyaktam and samanya chaitanyam is not evident. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the example that sunlight pervades the whole hall and wherever the object is there it pervades but between the object the sunlight is there and it is Avyakta Surya prakasa. Put your hand and then you will find that the sunlight is there when the avyakatam becomes vyaktam. Therefore don't say you lose Consciousness in sushupti. It can be extended to coma or nirvikalpa samadhi. Therefore Atma is not a knower with temporary Consciousness but Atma is Consciousness itself. If Atma is not a knower but only a knowledge, how come the Upanishad declare in some places that Jivatma is a knower. We have quoted Prasnopanisad where the knower is Jivatma it is said. Jivatma by itself is Consciousness principle and when the mind becomes active, the mind is capable of entertaining thoughts and that becomes a particular knowledge and that particular jnanam and the Jivatma is figuratively called knower. Jnatritvam is aupadhika dharma, it is only an incidental nature, and the Consciousness is the intrinsic nature. Whatever comes and goes is incidental nature and whatever I permanently enjoy is my intrinsic nature. Knower-hood is not my intrinsic nature because it comes and goes. In jagrat, I am the knower and in swapna the knower-hood goes. When I remove the coat of manas, I lose the knower-hood and when I have the coat of manas

the knower-hood comes. Such is the nature of manas, which comes and goes. This is not my intrinsic nature. The nature of Jivatma is jnanam and that is why in Mandukya Upanishad it is said that it is not a knower at all but knowledge.

Finally Purva Pakshi has to be negated. He says that sruti is contradicting itself by saying jiva is knower in one place and jiva is knowledge in another place; or saying jiva is knower in one place and knowledge in another place. Our answer is sruti is not contradicting because at one place it talks of the intrinsic nature and at another place it talks of incidental nature. It is like saying water is hot and sometimes I say water is cold. When the water is having heated, water is incidentally hot and the real nature of water is cold. Sometimes when the water is heated, and when it obtains its incidental nature of heat I call it water is hot and when the property of heat goes I call it cold water which is its intrinsic nature. So also the real nature of Atma is knowledge but at times its incidental nature is knowerhood. Thus there is no contradiction in the sruti. With this the 12<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. now we enter the 13<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and 19<sup>th</sup> sutra.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.19 [235]**

#### ***Utkrantigatyagatinam***

[on account of the scriptural declarations] of [the soul's] passing out, going, and returning [the soul is not Infinite in size; it is of atomic size]

The discussion on the character of the individual soul is continued. From this up to sutra 32 the question of the size of the soul, whether it is atomic, medium sized or Infinite is discussed; the first ten sutras [19-28] state the arguments for the view that the individual soul is Anu [atomic]. The next four sutras give the reply.

First I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam. it is fairly a big adhikaranam with fourteen sutras. Here Vyasacharya establishes the dimension or size of the Jivatma. We have seen the nithya swarupa the dimension in terms of time and now we will see the nithya swarupam in terms of space. Here Purva Pakshi says sruti is full of confusion and it does not say the size of Jivatma and it contradicts itself. He gives three different quotations in which three different sizes are mentioned. 3.1.9 of Mundaka Upanishad. The mantra reads as *eso'nur Atma cetasa vedilavyo yasmin pranah pancadha samvivesa pranais cittam sarvam otam prajnanam, yasmin visuddhe vibhavaty esa Atma* the meaning of the mantra is the subtle Self is to be known by thought in which the senses in five different forms have cantered. The whole of men's thought is pervaded by the senses. When it is purified, the Self shines forth. Here it is said that Atma is of the size of anu. The mantra starts with the word 'esah anuh Atma' that means the Atma is of the size of anuh, the size of atom. Then another quotation is from 3.1.17 of Kathopanisad angusta matra Purusa the Jivatma that resides in the body is of the size of the thumb. This is called madhyama parinamah. Anu parimanah means infinitesimally small. Madhyama parinama means middle size. The third quotation is 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad sava esah mahan ajah Atma; here it is said that Atma is all pervading or the biggest. This is called in Sanskrit vibhu parimanah. One is smallest, second is middle size and the third is the biggest sizer. Any size between the smallest and biggest is

medium sized says the various Upanisads. The conclusion of purva paksa is that Upanishad is definite about the size of Jivatma itself, and so the Veda is apramanam.

Ekadesi says that Atma cannot be madhyama parimanah [middle size] because anything of middle size is perishable. Whereas Jivatma is said to be imperishable in all the scriptures and the madhyadma parimana is ruled out. Hence, either Atma should be all pervading like space, which is eternal, or it should be of the size of the eternal paramanu the atom. Therefore, it should be like eternal space or eternal atom. Now the question is between the two which one we should take. He says Jivatma is anu parimanah. It is of the size of the atom and it is eternal. It is plural in number. As many living beings are there in creation, so are the Infinite atomic Jivatmas are there. Vyasacharya for a change presents the Ekadesi madham itself very elaborately. In 10 sutras from 19 to up to 28 Vyasacharya discusses the views of Ekadesi madham. The next four sutras discuss the Siddhanti's reply to Ekadesi and Purva Paksi's arguments. Incidentally, a note we have to add is that the Ekadesi madham is vishistadvaidam. This is one adhikaranam where we can clearly know the vishistadvaidic definition of Jivatma and Advaidic definition of Jivatma. The rudiments of vishistadvaidam were there even at the time of Adhi Sankaracharya. This is the general analysis of first sutra.

Ekadesi says that the Jivatma must be atomic because sruti clearly talks about the travel of Atma. First travel is leaving the body; second type of travel is having left the body the travel from one loka to another loka; and having traveled all over, the Jivatma again comes back to another body. In pancagni vidya we have seen how the Jivatma travels and goes through five stages to get a new birth. Three fold travels are talked about here. As such Jivatma must be anu parimanam only. If it is all pervading, Jivatma cannot travel at all. If you take it as madhyama parimana, Atma will become perishable. Ekadesi says if Jivatma is madhyama parimana it will become perishable and so madhyama parimana is ruled out. As it travels, vibhu parimana is ruled out. Hence, Jivatma is anu parimana is the conclusion. This is going to reinforced in the following sutras.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Utkrantigatyagatinam is one word. Because of the scriptural mention of departure, travel and the return of Atma, Jivatma is atomic in size. This is the sutra meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. utkrantih gathih ahatih. Coming out of home jiva leaves the body; when he talks about the leaving of the body he quotes 4.4.2 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is quoted. The part of the mantra reads as *tasya hrdayasyagram pradyotate, tena pradyotenaisa Atma niskramati, caksuso va mudhno va anyebhyo va sarira desebyah* the body departs either through the eyes or through the head or through other apertures of the body. And when he thus departs, life departs after him. Some say the Jivatma leaves through the eyes and the eyes become bright when the Atma leaves through the eyes. When Jivatma goes all goes including the prana, indriyani etc. clearly the Upanishad says Jivatma leaves the body and from this it is clear that it is within the body and it leaves the body. It cannot be madhyama parimana when it becomes perishable. Agathi means the arrival of Jivatma. For this also Ekadesi has the sruti quotation. 4.4.6 the mantra reads as *tad eva saktah saha karmanaiti lingam mano yatra nisaktam asya prapyantam karmanas tasya yat kim ceha karoty ayam tasmal lokat punar aiti asmai lokaya karmane* the meaning of the verse is the object to which the mind is attached, the subtle Self goes together with the dead, being attached to it alone. Exhausting the results of whatever works he did in this world he comes again from that world to this world for fresh work. Whatever Jivatma is obsessed with he will gradually forgets everything, one becomes obsessed tad eva saktah, he will think, and he will be born with that feeling. Here we are concerned with travel and the obsession takes the hold of the next birth. He enjoys the karma phalam in new environment



for some duration of time. he again comes back to manusya loka. Jivatma goes to another loka and comes back to our loka is our relevant portion. Because of the sruti mention of departure and arrival of Jivatma, utkraantih anuh eva margathi. Now we will go to the next sutra,

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.20 [236]**

#### ***Svatmana chottaryoh***

And on account of the latter two [i.e., going and returning] being connected with their soul [i.e., agent], [the soul is of atomic size]

An argument in support of sutra 19 is given in this sutra.

First we will do the general analysis. Here Ekadesi says that of the three items travel, departure and return, in the case of departure you can explain without any travel. Abhimana can be interpreted as transcending or going beyond. Going beyond is not a physical travel but losing interest in those things. However, the Gathi and agathi have to be explained as physical travel only. This proves the travel of Jivatma. Uktaranti may not be the proof of travel. Gathi and agathi is the proof of travel of the Jivatma. Therefore it has to be of the size of anu.

Now we will see the word for word analysis. Cha means moreover; uttarayoh means since the latter two are associated with Jivatma; Jivatma comes inside; this is the running meaning. we will see the significance of the words. Cha represents additional support; uttaryoh means the latter two; in the previous sutra three are mentioned and I will take latter two Gathi and agathi sambandhad. Jivatma is associated with two if not three, the two being going and coming. Svātmana means Jivatmana sambandhad; sva atmana is to make the discussion very clear that we discuss Jivatma and do not bring Paramatma here. Advaidin alone can bring Jivatma identical with Paramatma and all other darsanam differentiate Jivatma and Paramatma. Further we have sruti support for going and coming of Jivatma. Here he gives the support that not only Jivatma travels outside the body after death and Jivatma goes inside the body when alive. Sruti clearly talks about the Jivatma traveling within the body also and therefore it must be size of anu only. 4.4.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad says the part of mantra reads as *sa etas tejomatrah samabhyadadano hrdayam evanvavakramati, sa yatraisa caksusah purusah Paran paryavartate atharupajno bhavati* when the body grows weak and he becomes apparently unconscious, the dying man gathers his senses about him, completely withdraws their powers and descends into the heart. Here the travel of Atma within the body is revealed. this Jivatma carries all the sense organs from the golakas and comes to the residence of the heart. Jivatma travels from golakams to hrdayam. Again Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.3.11 the carrying the indriyas from golakam to sushupti and when jagrat avastha comes he carries the indriyas from heart to the respective golakams. Thus Jivatma travels from golakams to hrdayam and hrdayam to golakam and therefore Jivatma must be anu and anu alone. What is the next Ekadesi sutra, which we will see, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 209

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.20 [236]**

#### ***Svatmana chottaryoh***

And on account of the latter two [i.e., going and returning] being connected with their soul [i.e., agent], [the soul is of atomic size]

An argument in support of sutra 19 is given in this sutra.

In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses the size of Jivatma. Jivatma parimana vicharah. The word parimana is different from parinama means modification. Parimana means measurement. Here according to purva paksa the sruti is very vague about the Jivatma parimana. Hence, we should not accept sruti pramanam. Now Ekadesi has come and claims Jivatma is anu parimana, which is the contention of vishistadvaidam also.

Ekadesi says that Jivatma is of the measure of atom but siddhantins say that Jivatma is of the size of vibhu. Here Ekadesi started saying the Jivatma departs, travels and returns and this is possible only by Jivatma of atomic size alone. Going beyond here is not physically traveling but transcending and somehow figuratively interpreted that traveling and returning cannot be ignored. Going and coming is literally taken as a movement associated with Jivatma. You have to necessarily accept the going coming as associated with Jivatma. When Jivatma is all pervading it cannot have going and coming. Sruti talks about the Jivatma traveling within the body itself. In jagrat the Jivatma travels from golakam to hrdayam and hrdayam to golakam. This is internal travel of Jivatma and hence vibhutvam is not possible. the other measurement I talked about is madhyama parimanah. Ekadesi claims between anu and madhyama parimana, the latter is ruled out because middle size is perishable. If it is all pervading it cannot travel. If it is atomic it is eternal. Middle size cannot travel because it is perishable. Eternal traveling Jivatma has to be size of anu only. now we will enter the third sutra.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.21 [237]**

#### ***Nanuratacchruteriti chet, na, itaradhikarat***

If it be said that [the soul is] not atomic as the scriptures state it to be otherwise, [i.e., all pervading], [we say] not so because [the one] other than the individual soul [i.e., the Supreme Brahman or the highest Self] is the subject matter [of those passages]

An objection to sutra 19 is raised and refuted.

The sutra consists of an objection and its answer; the objection portion is '*nanuratachruteriti chet*' and the answer is '*na itaradhikarat*'

We will do the general analysis of the sutra. here the all pervading Jivatma is purva paksa and such a purva paksa is not correct and Ekadesi says that Jivatma is of the size of anu alone. Purva Paksi says that Jivatma should be accepted as all pervading. Here Advaidin is the Purva Paksi here.. this is because of the sruti pramanam. He says that Jivatma is mahan and not anuh. Sruti vakyam is 4.4.22 and 25 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The mantra reads as *sa va esa mahan aja Atma yo'yam vijnamayah pranesu* the mantra says esah Atma referring to Jivatma and this Jivatma is mahan vibhu parimanah and not only Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam is there and Bhagavad Gita also supports this view. 12.24 of Bhagavad Gita reads as *nityah sarvagatah sthanur acalo'yam sanatanah* this sloka says that "He is eternal all pervading, unchanging and immovable. He is the same for ever. Krishna uses the word that the Jivatma is nityah. Here the context is that Jivatma is the context in which Krishna says nityah sarvagatah etc. here Jivatma is vibhu parimanah. Advaidins ask the Ekadesi and this is quoted by Ekadesi. Ekadesi says wherever Atma is said to be manna, vibhu parimanah, it deals with Paramatma and not Jivatma. Do not get confused between Paramatma and Jivatma. Sava esah mahan ajah Atma is talking about the all pervading Paramatma and we have no difference of opinion with regard to all pervading Paramatma. According to Ekadesi Paramatma is all pervading, Jivatma is anuh, according to him Jivatma Paramatma aikyam is not acceptable being one is biggest, and the other is smallest. Nityat sarvagat tanuh means nityah Jivatma is eternal; Jivatma is all pervading; Jivatma is motionless; sthanuh it is static; achalah means motionless; how can jiva be anuh. Ekadesi says that you do not know the Sanskrit grammar. Sarva gadasthah means Jivatma is one he is not all pervading but one located in all pervading Paramatma. The size of such Jivatma is anuh is the argument given by the Ekadesi. Jivatma is different from Paramatma; this Jivatma is not the one but Infinite number. As many living beings are there, so many Jivatmas are there and each Jivatma is of the size of anu and all of them are located in one all pervading Paramatma. In vishistadvaidam that is pervading Paramatma is called vishnuh. In all pervading Paramatma Infinite number of Jivatmas are located and also Infinite number of objects are located in Paramatma the Vishnu. This is the contention of vishistadvaidam. For us the relevant portion is that wherever Atma is said to be mahan it should refer to Paramatma and do not get confused that it is the description of Jivatma. The word Atma should be taken as Paramatma. This is the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Na anu means this is purva paksa for Ekadesi and Advaidin raises an objection to Ekadesi; Jivatma is not atomic in size; atasruteh because of the contrary statement of the sruti; up to this objection; now Ekadesi answers iti chet means this is the contention; na it is not so; itaradhikarati because of the context is different; this is the running meaning of the sutra; now we will see the significance of the words.

Anuh it is very clear supply the word Jivatma; Jivatma cannot be atomic in size is the objection of the opponents that includes Advaidins. atat sruteh that vibhu parimana [opposite of anu parimanah] atat sruteh the sruti statement because of the existence of sruti statement which reveals the all pervasiveness of Jivatma [said by Advaidins] therefore Atma should not be taken by anuh. Here 4.4.22 is of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is kept in mind by the Advaidins. Up to this purva paksa.

Iti chet na if this is the contention of Advaidins it is not true; itadhikarat – the context is dealing with something else; Ekadesi is telling the Advaidins; maha jana Atma deals with other than Jivatma that is Paramatma. Why to take Atma is interpreted as Jivatma, which is wrong on the part of, Advaidins is the argument of the Ekadesi. The conclusion is Jivatma is anu and Ekadesi is still victorious and he has pushed aside the objection of Advaidins that Jivatma Paramatma aikyam and Jivatma is vibhuh.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.22 [238]**

#### ***Svasabdonmanabhyam cha***

And on account of direct statements [of the sruti texts] as to the atomic size] and infinitesimal measure [the soul is atomic].

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. he says that the Jivatma does not require this much elaboration at all. Elaborate explanation is required when sruti reveals the idea implicitly or in a hidden manner. When things are explicit, it does not require so much elaboration. Ekadesi says that atomic size of Atma has been very explicitly or evidently said that Jivatma is anu. When is its so explicitly said where is the need for me elaborate so much in detail. Sruti uses the word anu itself explicitly in some places. The word adhyasa which is crucial for Advaidam is not explicitly stated anywhere in sruti. Anu sabda is used in sruti in 3.1.9 of Mundakopanisad that reads as *eso'nur Atma cetasa veditavyo yasmin pranah pancadha samvivesa pranais cittam saryfam otam prajanam, yasmin visuddhe vibhavaty esa Atma* the subtle Self is to be known by thought in which the senses in five different forms have centred. The whole of men's thought is pervaded by the senses. When it [thought] is purified the Self shines forth. Anupramana means anu size. Sruti need not be more explicit and yet sruti gives a comparison of the size of the Atma in one place. For the minuteness of Jivatma Upanishad gives a comparison in 5.9 of Svetasvara Upanishad says *valagra sata bhagasya satadha kalpitasya ca bhago jivas sa vijneyas sa canantyaya kalpate* the meaning of the mantra is this living Self is to be known as a part of the hundredth part of the point of a hair divided a hundredfold, yet it is capable of infinity. This reveals that the soul is potentially infinite. Take a hair from the body and look at the tip of the air which is smaller than the central portion and that tip is to be divided into hundred bit. Then cut it into hundred that is one ten thousandth of the hair; a portion of the above one ten thousandth part of the hair is the size of Jivatma. This minuteness is supported by the comparative description is supported by the sruti. Now we will take up the word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; svasabdonmanabhyam from the sruti word revealing the size and from the description of its minuteness Jivatma is known to be atomic in size. This is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of the word. sva sabda is one word; unmanam is another word. sva sabdah means an the description of Jivatma's minuteness;anu samba is given explicitly indicating the size of Atma; unmanam means the extreme smallness that which is infinitesimally small. It is immeasurably small; now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.23 [239]**

#### ***avirodhaschandnavat***

There is no contradiction as in the case of sandal paste.

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. here Ekadesi answers the possible doubt of the purva paksa. sometimes doubt as also the answer is given. Here the answer part is given and therefore we have to supply the question. Let us assume Jivatma is anu and if you assume Jivatma is anu by reasons given in the previous sutras. Then we will ave problems our experiences. Therefore anubhava virodha or pratyaksa virodha will come. This is the doubt raised by the purva paksa. Jivatma alone is sentient and the entire Body Mind Complex is insentient. Now Jivatma should be necessarily in some remote part of the body because it is of the size of the atom. That means only that part of the body in which Jivatma happens to be incidentally located and that part will be sentient. Therefore at any time only an anu bagha or minute body alone will be sentient and all other part will be insentient. However, the experiences are felt all over the body. This is the argument of the Purva Paksi. Adhi Sankaracharya takes the example that when you take the dip of part of the body, the whole body feels the icy coldness. If Jivatma is anu, such experience should pertain to one part of the body and not the whole body. This is the question posed by the Purva Paksi. This dosha is called anubhava virodha dosha. this is the imaginary purva paksa. Ekadesi gives the answer and he gives another example that it is like the sandal paste. We apply only a dot of sandal paste on the forehead that sandal is located in one part of the body, and the coolness is felt all over the body. Even though the saithyam-giving sandal occupies only a small part of the body, the function of saithya anubhava is vyapi. Vyapi karyam can be produced by alpa asraya. In the same way sentiency is karyam which is vyapi and it can be produced by alpa asrayah which is anu jivah. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 210

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.23 [239]**

#### ***avirodhaschandanaavat***

There is no contradiction as in the case of sandal paste.

The argument in support of sutra 19 is continued.

In this 13<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the second chapter of third pada Vyasacharya analyses the measurement of Jivatma, the size of Jivatma. Ekadesi comes and says Jivatma is of the size of atomic size. He contents that Jivatma is different from Paramatma. For him Paramatma is vibhu swarupa and Jivatma is anu swarupa. Paramatma is of biggest one, Jivatma is of smallest size, and both anu and vibhu are eternal. Ekadesi very carefully avoids madhyama parinama. He says the madhyama parinama is a perishable one. here there is a small diversion is there. Suppose we accept Jivatma is anu, certain questions have to be answered by the Ekadesi. Ekadesi tries to answer such questions. Jivatma is anu and it will occupy only a small part of the physical body, which is not an anu. It is madhyama aprinamah. Jivatma should occupy only a corner of the body. However, we find that the entire physical body is sentient and sentiency is the function of the Jivatma the physical body being a jada swarupam. Therefore sentiency is experienced all over the body and not from one point o another but is experienced and it pervades all over the body. The sentiency is experienced all over the body simultaneously. The sentiency being pervasive and extensive we use the word vyapi karyam. The locus of the function of is dot but the vyapi karyam is experienced all over the body. For this question, alone Ekadesi tries to give his answer. four sutras are dedicated for this purpose. Sandal bindu is alpa asrayah and it is only in limited locus but it produces an effect and it has got a function of making the entire body cool. The cooling function is karyam of sandal bindu and it is felt all over the body. therefore the cooling function is vyapi karyam. When sandal bindu can do that why cannot the dot Atma bring sentiency all over the body. now I will give the word for word analysis.

Avirodha there is no contradiction; chandanaavat as in the case of sandal paste. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word is this. Avirodhah means there is no anubhava virodha abhavah. There is no experiential contradiction. The Purva Paksi is not mentioned here. We have to supply purva paksa for Ekadesi. You have to assume that there is an objection from the purva paksa that a dip in Ganga and has the effect of coolness all over the body. Jivatma occupies one corner and then how I experience the sentiency all over the body. for this Ekadesi gives his answer of the comparison of sandal paste bindu.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.24 [240]**

***Avasthitivaiseshyaditi chenna, abhyupagamaddhridi hi***

If it be said [that the two cases are not parallel], on account of the specialization of abode [present in the case of the sandal-ointment, absent in the case of the soul], we deny that on account of the acknowledgement [by scripture of a special place of the soul], viz., within the heart.

An objection to sutra 23 is raised and refuted by the opponent or Purva Paksin. The sutra consists of two parts namely an objection and its reply. The objection portion is *Avasthitivaiseshyaditi chet* and the reply portion is *abhyupagamaddhridi hi*.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Ekadesi gives the answer while the purva paksa is his opponents. Ekadesi do not accept the sandal paste example. The sandal paste example is given for that a smaller locus can bring about an extensive function. The problem is that in the case of sandal paste we do find the alpa asrayah doing a vyapi karyam. We have other examples also that vyapi asraya doing a vyapi karyam. I have got the example to show extensive locus causing extensive function. The sense of touch is to know the touch. The asraya for the function is tvag indriyam. The function of sparsa grahanam is all over the body and it is a vyapi karyam the sparsa grahanam. This is done by tvag, which is sarira vyapi asraya. When we take skin example, we see vyapi asraya doing vyapi karyam. From this we come to know that the vyapi karyam can be done by either alpa asrayah as in the case of sandal paste or the vyapi karyam can be done vyapi asraya as in the case of tvak and vyapi karyam itself does not prove the asraya either alpa or vyapi. Now the sentiency of the body is a vyapi karyam and it is an effect produced all over the body and we have to find the Jivatma is an alpa asrayah like sandal paste or vyapi asraya as in the case of tvag. Now our question is how can you get away the sandal paste alone. The sandal paste example you quote and say asraya is alpa and I can quote tvak example and say vyapi asraya. In the case of sandal paste we accept sandal as alpa asrayam not because of vyapi karyatvam not based on karyam at all but we see sandal to be alpa asrayah; sandal's alpa asrayah is based on pratyaksa pramanam. Vyapi karyatvam does not prove alpa asrayatvam. But you cannot say so in the case of Jivatma for Jivatma is not available for pratyaksa darsanam. This is purva paksa for Ekadesi. For which Ekadesi gives his answer. he says that I know vyapi karyam does not prove the asraya as alpa or vyapi because both the possibilities are there. I say Jivatma is alpa asrayah because it has been already accepted by all of us. I do not prove through vyapi karyam. Then there is a logical fallacy. Then the purva paksa is flabbergasted. He asks are you not a vaidhika? He says there are several sruti statements, which says that Jivatma is within the heart of everyone. Therefore, Jivatma is located in the heart as anu and sandal drastanta is not to prove but to understand that alpa asrayah Jivatma can also do the vyapi karyam. Once alpa asrayah is revealed that how can alpa asrayah do vyapi karyam. To understand this only sandal drastanta is given and it is not to prove the alpa asrayatvam. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Avasthiti vaisseshyat because of the experience of its specific location [sandal paste example is inappropriate or improper]. Iti chet if this is the contention na it is not so. adhyupaagamat because the specific location of the Jivatma is already accepted. the sruti clearly places the Jivatma in the heart. This is the word meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Avasthiti means location and vaiseshyam means specific. It is specific location. Because of the specific location is the translation. We should note that the purva paksa refers to specific location of sandal paste is not proved through inference but it is proved through perception and how can you give that for Jivatma which is not available for perception. Itei chet na adhyupagamat means Ekadesi expresses surprise. He says the location of Jivatma is already accepted through Veda pramana. it is regard to the location of Jivatma. Hridihi means in several places Veda has said that Jivatma is located in the heart. so Jivatma cannot be vibhu pramana either it will be of the size of atom alone and therefore Jivatma is anuh. it occurs in Prasnopanisad 3.6 *hridih esah Atma*; second is 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that says *yoyam vijnana mayah pranesu hrdaya antarjyotih purusah* which is there in hridi. From these two quotations, we prove that it is like sandal paste making whole body sentient.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.25 [241]**

#### ***Gunadva alokavat***

Or on account of [its] quality [viz., intelligence as in cases of ordinary experience [such as in the case of a lamp by its light.

The argument in support of sutra 23 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. here he says that if you are not satisfied with the sandal paste drastanta, he gives another example of a substance and a property. Previously it was agent and kriya the sandal paste and its property. Here a flame or a lamp is an example. A lamp is located in a particular room. The light is the property of the flame and the flame is alpa asrayah and light is the vyapti gunah. Alpa asrayahsya vyapi gunah sambavati. This is called deepa drastanta. Deepasya prapha is the present vyapi gunah. Similarly Jivatma is like a flame, a powerful dot of life and the radiant light is like Consciousness that spreads everywhere in the body. if you spread the wall of the house extend, the flame extends and the wall is contracted the flame contracts. So also as even the sariram expands the Jivatma gunam expands and as jiva contracts the chaitanya guna contracts. This is the general analysis. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Va means or; gunat means because of its pervading property [the atomic jiva makes the body sentient]. Lokavat is seen in the world, as in the case of ordinary experiences. Now we will see the significance of the words. Va means otherwise; gunat refers to the extensive property while substance is having extensive property, which is Consciousness; Consciousness becomes the property of Jivatma just as flame of the lamp. The Consciousness extends up to the nail; here Jivatma, which is an anu, has properties of Consciousness. The Consciousness extends all over the body. Above all it has the support of the sruti. If you cannot visualize the extensive property for a located substance you bring to your mind the example of a flame; flame is an example of located substance and light extends all over the earth. Now we will go to the next sutra.



### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.26 [242]**

#### ***Vyatireko gandhavat***

The extension [of the quality of intelligence] beyond [the soul in which it inheres] is like the odour [which extends beyond the fragrant object]

Sutra 23 is further elucidated by this sutra.

Now someone to the Ekadesi raises an objection. The purva paksa says that a substance and the property can never be separated even according to the tarka sastra. Therefore, you cannot say that substance is located somewhere and property exists elsewhere. The colour of the cloth is located in the cloth, the colour is the property, and it cannot exist separate from the substance. Property requires an asraya. The property has to be located in the substance. How can guna and dravyam be ever separated? If the Consciousness is the property of Jivatma and the property will exist only up to the property exists? The answer we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 211

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.26 [242]**

#### ***Vyatireko gandhavat***

The extension [of the quality of intelligence] beyond [the soul in which it inheres] is like the odour [which extends beyond the fragrant object]

Sutra 23 is further elucidated by this sutra.

Ekadesi claims that Jivatma is nithya anu parimana while the opponents claim Jivatma is anu and Paramatma is vibhu the all pervading one. Whether it is vishistadvaidam or others the question is whether Jivatma is anu or vibhu. Ekadesi is elaborately discussed from sutra 19 to 28. Ekadesi tries to establish that Jivatma is anuh.

I said in the last class the present sutra tries to answer an objection raised on 25<sup>th</sup> sutra. 25<sup>th</sup> sutra leads to a question and the answer is given in 26<sup>th</sup> sutra by Ekadesi. Ekadesi pointed out in 25<sup>th</sup> sutra that Jivatma is anu and it is located in one part of the body, the body being bigger and anu being smaller. then this Jivatma has the property of Consciousness chaitanya gunah. This property pervades the body. Jivatma is dravyam and Chaitanyam is gunah. Atma is substance and the Consciousness is the property of Atma, the substance. Dravyam is alpa dravyam and guna is vyapi gunah. Substance is nonextensive and the property of Consciousness pervades the entire body. Even though Atma is in a corner the Consciousness of Atma pervades the body and therefore body is sentient simultaneously and therefore any part of the body can feel the external world.. We talked about the Ganga river. You feel the coolness all over the body. so the property of Atma pervades all over the body although Atma is in one part of the body. Then we gave the example of lamp, the property of the flame, the radiance pervades the entire room and illumines. The flame is alpa dravyam and prabha is vyapi gunah. Atma is alpa dravyam and Chaitanyam is vyapi gunah. This lead to a purva paksa and purva paksa is based on tarka sastra rule, which is proved by our experience also. The rule is that property and substance can never be separated. It has samavaya sambandha inseparable relationship. Because of this reason, the property 'cannot exist independent of its substance'. The cloth cannot be in one corner and the colour cannot be in another corner. It has to be with the substance only. Therefore comes the third corollary that since property cannot exist independent of itself the property can exist as the substance is. Property and substance cannot be separated. Therefore the extension of property and extension of substance should be identical. Alpa dravyam cannot have vyapi gunah. Nonextensive substance cannot have extensive property. The colour of the cloth cannot go beyond the size of the cloth. Because of the anu Atma cannot have sarira vyapi guna is the objection raised against Ekadesi. Therefore anu parimana Atma cannot have sarira vyapi chaitanya guna. for this answer is given in 26<sup>th</sup> sutra. up to this we saw in the last class.

The answer given by the Ekadesi that there is no such rules that property as extensive as substance alone. the property can be as extensive as substance and also the property can be more extensive than the substance also. we do have such cases. Already one example was given in the previous example the deepa dravyam and prabha guna. I gave you the example of sun. Sun is away but the brilliance of sun pervades here. Surya prabha is guna, which is upon the earth, and the sun is far away. There is another example also. that is sandal paste dravyam or any perfume. Perfume is applied over the body but the fragrance pervades all over. therefore you feel the fragrance. Gandha is a property and sandal is the dravyam. Sandana paste is in one corner of the room, the guna is all pervading everywhere. Likewise Atma is likes sandanam. Here the sandal example is for the fragrance. Therefore, Atma can be alpa and chaitanya guna can be vyapi. Therefore Jivatma is paramanu rupah. Now I will give you the word for word analysis.

Vyatirekah independent existence [of the property is to be admitted gandhavat as in the case of smell. Now I will give the significance of the word. vyatirekah means independent existence being away from the substance or from the locus. The remoteness of the property from the substance is called vyatirekam. Physical separateness is called vyatirekah. Dravyam and substance can exist separately is the argument here. The perfume is somewhere and fragrance is somewhere. So also Jivatma is substance and the property can be separate.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.27 [243]**

#### ***Tatha cha darsayati***

Thus also [the sruti] shows or declares.

Sutra 23 is further elucidated by this sutra.

First I will do the general analysis of this sutra. here Ekadesi continues his argument. he says that this contention of mind is not purely based on my personal like but it has the support of the scriptures also. it is given in the scriptures and therefore you should accept this argument. he gives a sruti vakyam which occurs in 8.8.1 of Chandogya upanisad and another is Kaushitaki Upanishad 4.20. ah lomabyah ah nagabhyaha the Consciousness pervades up to the hair or the up to the nail. The Consciousness pervades all over the body. in the beginning the Upanishad has mentioned in the heart. heart location is given in dahara vidya of Chandogya upanisad. Atma is located in the heart whereas the Consciousness of Atma pervades all over the body. Thus it is clearly said that Atma anu pervades all over the body.

Darsayati cah sruti also reveals tatha means so. This is the running meaning. we will see the significance of the words. Sruti also reveals. Tatha means exactly in the same manner as I claim so says Ekadesi. This means Atma is located in the heart the Consciousness the property pervades the body. alpa dravya vyapi gunatvam srutih vathathi.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.28 [244]**

#### ***Prithagupadesat***

On account of the separate teaching [of the sruti] [that the soul pervades the body on account of its quality of intelligence]

The sutra is a defense in favour of the preceding sutra where intelligence is used as an attribute of the individual soul and so separate from it.

First we will do the general analysis. In the previous sutra Atma is located in the heart and the Consciousness pervades the entire body the Consciousness being the property of the Atma. The Upanishad does not clearly say that the Atma is dravyam and Chaitanyam is gunah. How do you know the Atma is substance and Consciousness is the property. For that Ekadesi gives the sruti support. Atma and Consciousness separately mentioned and therefore Atma is substance and Consciousness is the property. That is why sruti mentions them separately. Where does the Upanishad says that the Atma has Consciousness as the property. Two quotations are given. One is Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.1.17 tad esam prananam vijnanena vijnanam adaya Atma vijnanena vijnanam adhaya; Atma withdraws to the heart with the help of Consciousness. It withholds the sense organs and sleeps. Consciousness is the medium used by Atma. From this it is clear that Atma is different and Consciousness is different. Instrument is different from the subject. I use the property of speech so Atma use the property of Consciousness. Atma is in the heart and Consciousness is all over the body. There is another quotation 3.6 of Kaushitaki Upanishad. prajnayh sariram samaruhyā sarirena; Atma mounts on the body or Atma pervades the body; Atma extends itself through Consciousness is indicated by the word prajnyah. Instrument is different from the user the agent. therefore Atma is dravyam and Chaitanyam is gunah. This is the general analysis. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Prithaupadesat because of the separate mention [of Jivatma and Consciousness] Consciousness is the property of Jivatma which is anu parinmanah. It is one compound word pritha and upadesat. Pritha means separate; upadesat means reference. Separate mention of Jivatma and Chaitanyam by presenting one in nominative case and the other in instrumental case. Because of this reason, it is said that Consciousness is pervading property of nonpervading Atma. With this Ekadesi madham is over. therefore sariram becomes sentient because of the pervasion of Jivatma property the Consciousness. the extension of Ekadesi madham is that the extension of this is there are so many Jivatmas are there as there are so many sarirams. Also that Paramatma is different from Jivatma it is stated by the Ekadesi which is close to vishistadvaidam. This Paramatma is only one. it is vibhu parimana that is all pervading and also it is one. one Paramatma that is all pervading and there are many Jivatmas which are atomic in size. Therefore in this madham jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is not possible. now we will go to siddhanta.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.29 [245]**

*Tadgunasaratvat tu tadvyapadesah prajnavat*

But that declaration [as to the atomic size of the soul] is on account of its having for its essence the qualities of that [viz., of the buddhi], as in the case of the intelligent Lord [Saguna Brahman]

The discussion on the true character of the individual soul commenced in sutra 16 is continued.

The next four sutras are the siddhanta sutras which lay down the correct doctrine.

From this sutra we enter siddhanta. This present sutra is considered to be a very important sutra. here Advaitin's approach is based on this sutra. the following sutras are the elaboration of this sutra only. the whole discussion is divided into three portion. First portion establishes that Jivatma is vibhuh, all pervasiveness. Second part of discussion is the negation of the size of the atom of the Jivatma. Third topic is sruti virodha pariharah. The reconciling the seeming contradiction in Upanishad is resolved.

The first two parts Vyasacharya does not do in the sutra at all that is vibhutvam and anutvam. Vyasacharya deals with third part only. we will take up the first two topics.

Adhi Sankaracharya says Jivatma has to be accepted as all pervading only and it cannot be taken as atomic in size. There are several reasons. Adhi Sankaracharya asks what is the relationship between jivatma and Paramatma as revealed in the sruti. You cannot say that Jivatma and Paramatma are very different. If jivatma and Paramatma are very separate, Jivatma will limit Paramatma and Paramatma cannot be all pervading. Plurality limits every member. The Upanishad itself clearly says that as long as one sees difference between jivatma and Paramatma you will be afraid of Paramatma. Brihadharaynaka upanishad 1.4.2 and 1/4/10 says that a person who sees jivatma and Paramatma is ignorant. Then in Taittiriya Upanishad it is said that even if you make slight difference between jivatma and Paramatma you will be afraid of a God, Isvara is also the laya karanam besides being sristi and sthithi karanam. As long as difference is there and as long as mortality comes the fear comes. Can you say that there is karana karya sambandha between jivatma and Paramatma. This is also not possible. Ekadesi as also vishistadvaidins accept Jivatma is nityah. Jivatma has been there from beginningless time and he has been changing the bodies. This is accepted by all the darsanams. If Jivatma can be accepted as karyam. An eternal thing cannot be a product. Eternity and production are contradiction. Whatever is born is subject to death. Jivatma and Paramatma cannot have karana karya sambandha. beda is not possible. karana karya sambandha is not possible., can you say Jivatma is a part of Paramatma. It is not possible because Atma is nishkalah which means Atma is partless. If Jivatma is a part of Paramatma, the problems of Jivatma will belong to Paramatma. Then Paramatma will be a maha samsari. All our problems will go to Paramatma. Paramatma will suffer the problem of every Jivatma. Just as space is partless Paramatma is partless. Since not all these are possible, only possibility is jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 212

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.29 [245]**

#### ***Tadgunasaratvat tu tadvyapadesah prajnavat***

But that declaration [as to the atomic size of the soul] is on account of its having for its essence the qualities of that [viz., of the buddhi], as in the case of the intelligent Lord [Saguna Brahman]

The discussion on the true character of the individual soul commenced in sutra 16 is continued.

The next four sutras are the siddhanta sutras which lay down the correct doctrine.

Ekadesi argued that Jivatma is anuh and Paramatma is vibhuh and Jivatma is different from Paramatma. Jivatma is infinitesimally small and Paramatma is infinitesimally big. Vyasacharya gives his answer. the first portion of the argument from siddhanta talks of vibhutvam and the second topic is anutva virodhah and third point is answering the seeming contradiction in the scriptures. Vyasacharya does the third part but Adhi Sankaracharya gives the first two part of the arguments.

The first part I discussed in the last class and I analysed the relationship between jivatma and Paramatma. I said that Jivatma is not different from Paramatma. Since sruti stongly refute the difference we cannot say Jivatma is different. Similarly, we cannot say Jivatma is part of Paramatma because Upanisads are very clear that Paramatma is partless as given in Mundaka upanisad 3.1.9. Logically also it is true if Jivatma is different from Paramatma and then Paramatma will become a limited entity. If Jivatma is part of Paramatma then Paramatma will be subject to modification. If Paramatma has parts, then we will say Paramatma is savikarah. This leaves us with one option that Jivatma is identical with Paramatma and it is only nama bedah not nami bedah. One Atma has got two names one is Paramatma and the other is Jivatma, different names are possible from different angles. Two different namas are there but they relate to one only. all the maha vakyas support the conclusion. All maha vakyas reveal jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. Once you say jivatma and Paramatma are the same, then you should not have the doubt about the size of Jivatma. Jivatma cannot have small size because Jivatma is identical with Paramatma. All philosophers agree Paramatma is vibhuh and since Jivatma is non-different from Paramatma and Jivatma is vibhuh. Thus maha vakya pramanena Jivatma vibhutvam sittam bhavati. This is topic number one.

Now we go to the next topic that is negation of anutvam of Jivatma. Jivatma is not atomic in size. Ekadesi's contention was that Jivatma is anu and occupies a portion of the body especially hridaya ayadantvam. Also his contention is that this Jivatma is a dravyam which has got property of Consciousness. Chaitanyam is guna according to Ekadesi. He said guna

dravya sambandha. Ekadesi also said that this dravyam is within the heart and it is alpa asrayah and the property is pervading the entire body. alpa asrayah vyapi gunah. Now we say that this contention is not acceptable. According to reasoning and our experience, property has to remain in the substance only for its very existence. Property and substance have inseparable existence. One presupposes the existence of the other. Therefore, it is not right to say that substance is non-extensive and property is extensive. We say that such a rule need not be there and there can be exception be there. Flame is the substance, radiance of the flame is the property, and we experience that the flame is in part of room and flame is everywhere. Then he gave the second example that sandal paste dravyam occupies one corner of the room and the fragrance, which is the property of sandal paste, pervades all over the room. Sandal paste is alpa asrayah and fragrance vyapi gunah. If you accept that property outside the substance then it means the property whichever beyond the substance that part of property will become independently existent. In addition, the moment the property exists independently, it will not be a property but it will become the substance. It is not logically possible. Adhi Sankaracharya argues that the radiance of the flame is not the property of the flame. In fact, radiance and flame are the same substance only called tejas tattvam. We have two different names because where the flame is there the tejas tattvam is densely available and where the radiance is there, the tejas is in brighter form. The flame and radiance have guna guni sambandha at all. As regards the sandal paste where we feel the fragrance, the fragrance substance is there in minute form. The only thing is when the fragrant substance is too minute that the substance is not absent but the nose perceives the gandha and the gandha is not perceived because of the limitations of the eyes. There also dravyam exists. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a Mahabharata sloka in support of his argument. dravya and guna are not separable a sloka is there in Mahabharata. Vyasacharya says here when one smells good or foul smell in water, suppose a person says the smell is there in the water or in the Vayu that is in the air, they are unintelligent people. The intelligent people should know that the smell belongs to the prithivi the minute earth particles only and they are in the in water or in the air. Those earth particles are so minute that we are unable to see and therefore we think that there is no earth. Gandha guna cannot be separate from gandha dravyam and it cannot be more extensive than the dravyam. Atma cannot be property of body pervading Consciousness. Atma cannot have any property at all and where is the question of Chaitanyam property. Atma is nirgunah. Since Atma is, property-less no property exists where is the question anu Atma with property. Even logical support is not there. Reasoning tells me that anything with property is savikaram and the thing will be subject to modification. Therefore, Atma cannot be accepted as saguna dravyam. Just as Atma cannot be accepted as guni dravyam, the Consciousness cannot be accepted as a property. Scripture clearly reveals that Consciousness is a substance and not a property because if Consciousness is a property it will become a dependent entity. Property cannot be swatantram. However, the scripture reveals that the Consciousness as independent. Second reason is that once Consciousness becomes a property it will become perishable when the substance become perishable. The scripture says that Consciousness cannot be a property. Because of these reasons, the Jivatma cannot be taken as atomic substance with pervading Consciousness.

Now we have to go to the third and final topic of sruti virodha pariharah. When Jivatma is all pervading several scriptural statements cannot be explained. One he said was Jivatma leaves the body travels and comes to another body. There is several sruti statement talk about Jivatma leaving, traveling, and Jivatma taking rebirth. How is it possible if Jivatma is vibhu parimana. Second difficulty is that Jivatma resides in the hridayam. If you say the Jivatma is all pervading how do you, say that it is located. Third thing said was Jivatma is clearly said to be anu very distinctly and the measurement is given. Therefore, how do you explain those

sruti vakyams? The fourth problem is that the sruti clearly says that Jivatma has Consciousness for they are separately mentioned saying that Jivatma pervades the body through Consciousness. Consciousness is different from Jivatma and Jivatma travels through Consciousness. These contradictions are to be resolved. Next Jivatma is said to be vibhuh also. Now we will see the content of the first sutra.

Vyasacharya says that we should clearly understand I the Atma am all pervading Paramatma only. This is the main teaching of the Upanishad. Aham Brahma asmi is the truth and the teaching of the Upanishad. There is a problem. Along with the all-pervading Consciousness coexists the anatma buddhi or the mind. This buddhi or the mind is located in the physical body thus physical body is the container, buddhi is the content, and Consciousness pervades all over including the intellect also. Because of the coexistence or proximity of Atma and anatma chetana Atma and achetana buddhi because of the proximity the property of the one is mistaken to be property of the other. For the adhyasa teaching is the second source. Because of the chetana Atma and achetana buddhi the attributes of the one is falsely transferred to the other, which we call adhyasa. For this we give the example of crystal when the colourless crystal and coloured object are in proximity, the crystal seemingly appears as coloured one. The coloured object transfers the colour to the crystal and transference is not the real transfer but an apparent transfer. If you lean on a freshly painted wall, the colour is actually transferred to the dress and we do not talk of this. The colour is falsely transferred and similarly the buddhi guna the anatma property is seemingly transferred to the Atma even though Atma is property-less. The scripture very clearly say that Atma does not have any connection with punyam papam because Atma is asangah. the attributes are never transferred and they are only seemingly transferred. The arrival and departure of the train is falsely attributed to the arrival and departure of the place. Buddhi is located in the body. I am not located in the body. The location belongs to buddhi. I think I am located. Similarly at the time of death buddhi leaves the body and again we transfer the ukranti guna of buddhi is transferred to Atma. Similarly, buddhi comes to another body. All these features belong to buddhi but I think I travel and buddhi is located in the body and I think Jivatma is located. Buddhi alone pervades the body and makes the body sentient through Chidhabasa and I mistake Atma is pervading he body and making it sentient. Atma is all pervading what pervades the body is nothing but buddhi. All these are because of the transference of buddhi attributes to Atma. When I look at myself with falsely transferred attributes I am called Jivatma. When I understand that these are falsely transferred attributes, I know that I do not have the real attributes and the day I know that I do not have the real attribnutes I can claim I am parama Atma. As long as I know the falseness of attributes I think I am Jivatma. This is called adhyasah. Now comes the next question. I take buddhi's attributes to be my attributes and I call myself as Jivatma. I also talk of departure, arrival and travel of Atma I can understand it is due to my ignorance. However, the sruti itself talks of these things. Is it sruti is confused. It is because of my confusion I commit mistake. How do you account for sruti talking of Jivatma traveling? Sruti wants to tell all of us that we are confused. The problem is that the person is so thoroughly convinced that I am traveler etc., and if the sruti starts teaching, the high philosophy the student will not be able to swallow the radical idea. The student will even question the very validity of the sastra and even reject sastra as pramanam. Therefore, sruti wants to willfully come to our level, adds to our confusion, and travels along with us and this temporary acceptance is called anuvadha vakyani. The acceptance of mistake as though correct is called anuvadha vakyani. Sruti accepts the Jivatvam status in the form of anuvadha and not in the form of teaching. Sruti need not teach me that I am small. Sruti should only teach me what I do not know. Then only I will improve myself. By removal of adhyasa, I come to know of my vibhutvam. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 213

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.29 [245]**

#### ***Tadgunasaratvat tu tadvyapadesah prajnavat***

But that declaration [as to the atomic size of the soul] is on account of its having for its essence the qualities of that [viz., of the buddhi], as in the case of the intelligent Lord [Saguna Brahman]

The discussion on the true character of the individual soul commenced in sutra 16 is continued.

The next four sutras are the siddhanta sutras, which lay down the correct doctrine.

We discuss the size of the Jivatma and now we counter the arguments of Ekadesi that jivatma and Paramatma are identical and Jivatma is vibhu and all pervading and not atomic in size. We say that this is against sruti, yukti and anubhava pramanam. Now we resolve the contradiction in the Upanisads. Leaving the body, travel and return of the body is not possible for the all-pervading body. There is a direct word that Jivatma is anuh in the Upanishad. All these sruti statement cannot be resolved is the contention of the Ekadesi. I explained in the last class how we resolve the contradiction. We say that Jivatma is all pervading only because through all maha vakyam sruti clearly says Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. I am all pervading but I feel I am a limited entity because of the antakaranam and mind is a part of the physical body and hence I feel I am the physical body. the mind travels, leaves and mind assumes another body. The mind has all these properties. However, we wrongly think they belong to the Atma. Because of the intimacy the attributes of the one is transferred to the other. This alone we established in adhyasa bashyam. These properties are falsely transferred and they are so intimate that they suppress my wonderful virtues by the transferred virtues. When the film is shown the action-less screen is suppressed and we see the movie. I am moved by the moving characters and it moves me and I shed tears for the eternal hero who seems to be died. The word sara in the sutra we turn as pradhanam and my original attributes are overshadowed and all anatma dharma I claim as my Self. Jivatvam is all transferred buddhi dharma upon the I the paramatma the jivatman is superimposed and I claim as miserable Jivatma instead of realizing that I am the eternal Paramatma. Sruti wants to correct but to utter dismay of sruti, the sruti finds that every jiva is hypnotized that it is so strong that they do not want to give up the jivatvam. It is the dropping the individuality is a tragedy and one want to keep the jivatvam to oneself. Therefore, the sruti to win the confidence of Jivatma initially the sruti temporarily accept Jivatma status of wonderful Paramatma student and the entire Karma Kanda is temporary acceptance of Jivatmatvam. Sruti accepts that you are karta, bokta etc. it indirectly makes the student more and more mature so that sruti can say that you are Brahman. From the point of view of sruti, Jivatma is anuvadhah that is temporarily accepting the Jivatmatvam. This is the first part of the sutra. prajnavad. Here Vyasacharya

addresses Ekadesi and says that you ask a question. If Jivatma is all pervading, how do you account for the sruti vakyam in which the Jivatma is a limited traveling individual etc. Vyasacharya wants to point out that you yourself have contradiction problem and once you solve I can give the answer. Jivatma is anu but according to Ekadesi Paramatma is vibhu all pervading. Vyasacharya addresses and says that you claim Paramatma is all pervading and there are sruti statements in which Paramatma is supposed to be located in hridayam. In every pooja you invite Paramatma for puja and at the end of puja you even request the Lord to your own place. How can all pervading Paramatma can come, can go and reside in the heart. In dahara Upasana Paramatma is said to be located in the heart. There are sruti vakyams where Paramatma is said to be anuh. 3.14.3 of Chandogya upanisad it is said Paramatma is anuh. the mantra reads as *esa ma atmantar hrdaye'nyan vriherva yavad va, sarsapad va syamakad va, syamaka-tandulad va; esa ma atmantar hrdaye jyayan prthivyah, jyayan antariksaj jayan divah, jyayan ebhyo lokebhyah* the meaning of the manta is this is my Self within the heart, smaller than a grain of rice than a barley corn than a mustard seed, than a grain of millet or than the kernel of a grain of a millet. This is myself within the heart; greater than the earth, greater than the atmosphere, greater than the sky, greater than these worlds. Paramatma is smaller than the rice, barley or mustard and even an atom. How are you going to reconcile this statement? They cannot say because they are of opposite attributes. Certainly, you have to accept one attribute of Paramatma and you have to explain away the problem. It is for the sake of meditation the sruti is temporarily accepting certain limitations but there is no tatparyam in the sruti statements. Otherwise anutvam and vibhutvam cannot reconcile. If this is your explanation for your Paramatma, I can give the same reasons for my Jivatma, which is identical with Paramatma according to me. You accept one and the other thing you explain away the problem. on the part of Jivatma temporary acceptance for gaining maturity and in the case of temporary acceptance is for the performance of puja etc. thus it is concluded that jiva is vibhuh only. now we will do the word for word analysis.

Tad vyapadesah tu however the scriptural statements regarding the jiva's limited size, tadguna saratvad is due to the prominence of the transferred properties of the intellect. Prajnavad means as in the case of Paramatma. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word we will see now. tadgunasaratvat means guna, property and dominance or pradanatvam; the buddhi guna transferred to Atma. Atma has two gunas. One is its original guna and the transferred guna. Now Atma appears with buddhi property and we cannot say buddhi is ragi or dveshi. We do not claim our original glory but claim non-existent, so called glories with problems. In simple language, anatma dharma adhyasa because of the superimposition of anatma is property. When we transfer the attribute it is because of ignorance and it is not voluntary action. It is an involuntary intrinsic action., in the case of Veda it is not because of ignorance but for winning the confidence of the student and it is called anuvadhah. Tu, the word indicates purva paksa or Ekadesi madham is not true and we alone are right; tadvyapadesah means jivasya anutvam [limited size of jiva] sruti's mention of limited size of jiva anutvam is temporary. Prajnavat means Paramatma. Just as temporarily sruti accepts Paramatma is located in space and such Paramatma is limited. Paramatma is in vaikunta also. Similarly, Jivatma in hridayam means Jivatma is hridayam also. With this the 29<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. Now we will go to 30<sup>th</sup> sutra.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.30 [246]**

### ***Yavadatmabhavitvacca na doshastaddarsanat***

And there is no defect or fault in what has been said in the previous sutra [as the conjunction of the soul with the intellect exists] so long as the soul [in its relative aspect] exists because it is so seen [in the scriptures]

An additional reason is given in support of sutra 29.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. I am already free of all the problems and all my problems are due to my proximity with buddhi and because of my wrong association. It is buddhi sambandha is the cause of the problem and the buddhi's problem's are transferred to Atma. If it is wrong association, such association should end one day. Any association should end one day on the basis of the norm everything arrives has to go and everything produced is destroyed. Thus buddhi has to die one day or the association with buddhi should end one day. Therefore if it is samyoga dosha moksa will be natural and you need not do any sadhana. One day or the other we all will become a mukta. This is purva paksa's argument. buddhi resolves is also mentioned in the sastra. in sleep and in pralayam buddhi resolves. Buddhi sambandha naturally ends. During sleep buddhi merges with Atma. In pralaya everything gets resolved and buddhi sambandha will be resolved. All will thus get moksa and why should we bother about it. buddhi sambandha is not a physical event but it is caused by ignorance. It is ajnana janyah. Atma cannot have samyoha or association with anything. Atma is asangah and Atma has higher order of reality. Buddhi is vyavaharika sathyam and Atma is Paramarthika sathyam. Dream girl cannot get married with a jagrat boy. Therefore the very Jivatmatvam is because it is ignorance based and it is not because of physical association. The unfortunate problem is no ignorance will die naturally. Everything in creation will die naturally. But ajnanam will never go away even if you go to sleep. Even if you die ajnanam continues. Even in pralayam ajnanam continues. As long as ignorant Jivatma continues buddhi sambandha will continue. There is sruti pramanam and yukti pramanam also. sruti pramana is 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that says *sa samanah sann ubhau lokav anusancarati* he remaining the same wanders along the two worlds seeming to think seeming to move about. Samanah means buddhya sahitah therefore at the time of death you may get detached with physical body but you cannot detach yourself from Sookshma Sariram and so long as buddhi sambandha is there you continue to be there and only jnanam can liberate you finally. As long as ajnanam is there there is no chance of gaining liberation. neither the death nor pralaya will solve the problem and liberate a jiva.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Na doshah there is no flaw in this view; yavat atmabhavitavat since mental connection continues as long as the ignorant Jivatma continues; tad darsanat cha and this is so because it is revealed in the scriptures. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Yavat atmabhavitavat; as long as ignorant Jivatma continues or because of the continuation of buddhi sambandha as long as ignorance continues you cannot get rid of your mind; for a disturbed person mind the burden. If people or house is a problem you can get away but your mind is the problem, you cannot get away from your mind. Even suicide is not a solution to the problem of the mind. You cannot get away from mind. There is only one method, which can free your mind. That is jnanam alone can free the mind. By knowing that I am the higher order of reality and mind is lower of order of reality and until I know the truth I have to suffer. There is no other way except realizing the truth. There is no flaw in our view that only through knowledge buddhi sambandha can be ended. There is no natural end for buddhi sambandha. it is to be ended by positive effort. Even if you avoid in this janma you have to work for it in the next janma.

Sookshma Sariram is not proved by the science. What is all about the karana sariram or about Atma? Scientists are yet to prove the existence of mind other than brain. We have only sastra pramanam. Mind survives even after the brain is destroyed and that alone is available in other body. no what produces the mind? Sastram is pramanam to show that my association with mind will continue even after the present mind is destroyed.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.31 [247]**

#### ***Pumstvadivat tvasya sato'bhivyaktiyogat***

On account of the appropriateness of the manifestation of that [connection] which exists [potentially] like virile power etc.

A proof is now given in support of sutra 29 by showing the perpetual connection between the individual soul and the intellect. The word 'tu' [but] is used in order to set aside the objection raised above.

In this sutra logical support is given to show that mind association continues in sleep and at the time of pralaya. Mind association is not destroyed is proved because at the time of waking up all the problems come back. During sleep all the problems exists in un-manifest form. non-experience is not non-existence and it exists in dormant or un-manifest form. if this be so, at the time of maranam also the problems continues although I do not know anything about it. Even in pralaya kale the problems are in dormant form. this is proved by sleep experience.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 214

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.31 [247]**

#### ***Pumstvadvivat tvasya sato 'bhiviyaktiyogat***

On account of the appropriateness of the manifestation of that [connection] which exists [potentially] like virile power etc.

A proof is now given in support of sutra 29 by showing the perpetual connection between the individual soul and the intellect. The word 'tu' [but] is used in order to set aside the objection raised above.

I have introduced the 31<sup>st</sup> sutra which is the continuity of siddhanta regarding the size of the jiva which started from sutra 29. one cardinal principle of Vedanta must be remembered always and that principle is whatever is intrinsically present can never be eliminated by any effort even by the Lord it cannot be eliminated. This is a very important principle. Gouda pada presents it in his karika. Therefore, Vedanta says if samsara is the intrinsic nature of jiva there is no escape from samsara. The omnipotent can do only what can be done. It is not doing everything and omnipotent means doing what can be done. If samsara is my intrinsic quality, it can never be eliminated. They all ascertain that jiva is really samsari. If samsara is intrinsic dharma only we can suppress temporarily even in pralaya and it cannot be permanently eliminated. The word samsara refers to a set of problems including the location to one place. Mortality is another form of samsara that is kala paricheda; even travel implies desa paricheda. Kartritvam is another form of samsara; kartritvam leads to bokritvam leading to samsara. If moksha is a possibility under only one condition, that samsara should not be swabhavika dharma and it should be an incidental dharma or adhountika dharma or borrowed from somewhere else. Our very introduction to student to create optimism that you will be free from all problem of samsara. Since samsara is temporary in nature or borrowed because of wrong association, it can be eliminated. Because of transference, buddhi is kala paricchadah; desa paricchadah; buddhi is gamana gamanam all those problems of buddhi is transferred to me. Buddhi samyoga is even the cause of limitation of jiva and that is reason why the jiva seems to be anu but it is vibhu is its real nature. How can I disassociate from buddhi. Here also we face a problem. Atma cannot have buddhi samyogah and if Atma gets buddhi samyoga buddhi viyoga also is not possible. buddhi samyoga is not possible because Atma is asanga swarupah. Unfortunately Atma is asangah and it is incapable of sangah. Vedantic untouchability is noble. First thing samyoga is not possible. suppose you accept samyogah [associationship] between Atma and buddhi can never be eliminated. Buddhi cannot go anywhere without Atma because Atma is sarvagatha. Therefore how do we say buddhi samyoga is responsible for incidental samsara and buddhi viyoga is the cause of samsara nivritti. Buddhi samyoga and viyoga is not physical event because Atma is asangatvad and sarvagatvad. Therefore, samyoga and viyoga cannot be physical event, both are intellectual event, and it is a branti. Samyoga is an event if it is an event at the level of

buddhi and samyoga is brantita notional and viyoga is removal of that notion. I have relation with buddhi is samyoga and the removal of the notion is viyogah. Notion has to be displaced by knowledge alone. So Vyasacharya says as long as ignorance continues the branti samyoga [samyoga notion] will continue; so long as the notion of relationship between buddhi and Atma continues, samsara will continue. As long as ignorance is there, so long buddhi samyoga will be there, samsara will continue, and even maranam is not the solution for the buddhi comes with us even after death. Even pralayam is not a solution and even in pralaya buddhi is there in the form of karana sariram. After having given the scriptural support, Vyasacharya now gives the logical support to this view. Samyoga is present as long as ignorance continues. This is to be proved. A doubt comes that in sushupti we do not experience buddhi. we do not experience samsara in sushupti. We do not know whether the buddhi will go away at the time of death. We do not have any proof of the continuance of buddhi after death. This is the question and the question is reimposed by sastric statement. in dreamless sleep buddhi or understanding remains in a potential condition and becomes active in the dream and waking states. This is said in 6.8.1 of Chandogya upanisad. I the condition of deep sleep personal Consciousness subsides and the Self is said to be absorbed in the Highest Self. Buddhi and everything is resolved in sleep and how can you say buddhi samyoga continues is the question. Vyasacharya says in sushupti or maranam or pralayam buddhi samyoga must be present non-experience of buddhi should not be equated with non-existence of buddhi. Non-experience can be due to avyakta avastha also and therefore we claim that buddhi is not destroyed but buddhi becomes dormant. How do you know that it is dormant and it might be destroyed? For that Vyasacharya says that it is dormant, condition is known because during waking it comes back. Non-existence buddhi cannot come back but dormant buddhi alone can come back. It is between not only sleep and waking but also death and new birth. Mothers give birth to physical body, our mind continues, and that is why prodigies are born. It is not only punar janma but also punar sristi also. New minds are not created at the time of creation. All minds are in dormant form and they are born again after new creation. This is the essence of the sutra. an example is given by Vyasacharya. When a child is born, it is not born as a mature adult and maturity physical maturity of the body is lacking in a baby but we know even though they are lacking they are potentially there. When the appropriate age comes, the physical body becomes mature body with dormant feature manifest. That is reproductive power putra utpadana sakti which is not there in baby and physical body matures it comes. So also, voice change, the facial hair, appearance changes, hair grows in the body; etc. They do not arrive afresh. They are in the genes of the baby in the form of information. What is non-existent cannot come? What is existent alone can manifest. This verse is re-assertion of satkarya vadha. Now we will see the word for word analysis.

Abhivyakti yogat – this is so because manifestation is possible; satah tu asya only for a potentially existent one; pumstavadvat as in the case of manhood; this is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of the word. pumstavidvat means manhood that means procreative power which is there in all human beings but it does not manifest in birth itself but comes later; adhi means etc., other physical features; tu means to negate asat karya vadha that is non-existence cannot manifest; if some quality is not there at the time of birth it will not come when old. Asya means buddhi samyagasya; buddhi samyoga should be there either in manifest or un-manifest form; satah means buddhi samyogasya; satah means potentially existent; only potentially existent samyoga can come at the time of re-creation. We have no way of getting rid of buddhi samyaga except through one method that is removal of ignorance and gaining knowledge or at the time of mukti. Abhivyaktiyogat manifestation yoga means possibility. Because of the possibility of the manifestation of potentially existent

alone; therefore this sutra is to prove that unless you remove ignorance you cannot get rid of buddhi samyoga. No other method is workable. This is supported by Upanishad vakyam 6.9.3 says that all the jivas get merged into Atma at the time of sushupti and buddhi is potential form and will be back again. The Upanishad makes a statement the tiger, which enters Atma, again comes out as tiger. Whether it is a mosquitoes or crows they are not newly born and they come to manifestation.

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

#### **Sutra 2.3.32 [248]**

#### ***Nityopalabhdhyanupalabdhiprasango'n'nyataraniyamo va'nyatha***

Otherwise [if no intellect existed] there would result either constant perception or constant non-perception, or else a limitation of either of the two [i.e., of the soul or of the senses.

This is the conclusion of this adhikaranam.

First we will do a general analysis of this sutra. the basic question is asked here. You say buddhi samyoga is samsara or mental association is cause of samsara. Until moksa mind will survive death and even pralaya. the question is whether there is mind at all. This is to show the existence of the mind. If the mind is not there what is the consequences. Let us assume the mind is not there. During the waking state sense organs are there very much alive exposed to sparsa, rasa, gandha etc. I am a conscious principle and Consciousness is there. Suppose the mind is not there what will happen. All of them enter through sense organs simultaneously and none will be there to stop. Even sleep will not be possible and you cannot close other sense organs. There will be permanent perception of everything all the time. if the mind is accepted and mind is capable of switching off and on a particular sense organs. When you listen to the class, you can concentrate on one organ keeping the other organs closed. You cannot do two jobs at the same time for mind has to function behind the sense organs. The mind controls all the sense organs. When two sense organs are wide open, the mind is able to concentrate that sense organ which you are interested to make use of. If mind is not there, there will be permanent perception or permanent non-perception. if the mind is accepted you have switch on and off facility. If you don't accept the mind, when you see the T.V. and you take meals then what happens. at the time of eating and seeing T.V. if you accept the mind, you see the T.V. and you do not much concentrate on the taste of the food. If you do not accept the mind, the tongue will not taste. Two organs cannot function simultaneously. Again the tasting power does not go away and the jiva loses Consciousness for a few minutes and that you cannot say. The Consciousness is there; sense organs faculty is there and the mind acts as switch off and switch on making the job easier. When it is in a state of doubt mind is called manas, when it is in a state of determination it is called buddhi. Now we much necessarily acknowledge the existence of such an internal organ because otherwise there would result either perpetual perception or perpetual non-perception. There is sruti support for the existence of mind. the mantra 1.5.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad says that 'my mind was elsewhere. I did not see my mind was elsewhere. I did not hear for a man sees with his mind and hears with the mind. The scripture further shows that desire, representation, doubt, faith, want of faith, memory, forgetfulness, shame, reflection, fear all this is in the mind alone in the absence of which such faculties cannot be experienced.

Therefore there exists an internal organ, the antahkarana and the connection of the soul with the internal organ causes the Atman to appear as the individual soul or as the soul its samsara state as explained in sutra 29. Therefore, the explanation given in sutra 29 is appropriate one. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Nithyopalabdhyanupalabdhiprasangat there arises a possibility of permanent perception or permanent non-perception; anyatara niyamah va or temporary cessation or temporary cessation of the function of one of them; now we will do the significance of the words. Anyata means otherwise manasah abhave if you do not accept the existence of the mind and its samyoga; nithya upalabdhdi anupalabdhdi prasangah - prasangah means possibility of nithya upalabdhdi permanent perception because Atma and sense organs are always there. jiva is ever conscious and sense organs are ever with the faculty; or anupalabdhdi permanent non-perception will happen if you do not accept the mind. anyatara niyamah the word niyamah means the temporary cessation of the faculty like hearing power, seeing power etc. sakti pratibandhah niyamah of anyatara means one of the two; one is the Atma and the other is sense organs; he will have to talk about the sakti pratibandha of Atma or indriyam; this cannot be done; there is only one way of explanation that the mind is switching on and off; so many cameras function and there must be someone to connect the T.V. audience what should be shown. Therefore, accept the mind. with this the last sutra of the adhikaranam is over. the jiva is vibhu and the limitation is caused by branti buddhi samyoga alone. more in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 215

### **Topic 13. Utkrantigatyadhikaranam. [Sutra 19 - 32]**

The size of the individual soul explained.

**Sutra 2.3.32 [248]**

***Nityopalabhdhyanupalabdhiprasango'n'nyataraniyamo va'nyatha***

Otherwise [if no intellect existed] there would result either constant perception or constant non-perception, or else a limitation of either of the two [i.e., of the soul or of the senses.

This is the conclusion of the adhikaranam.

We have completed the 13<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of this pada. here Vyasacharya established the size of Jivatma as vibhuh. It is neither anu parimana as philosophers including vishistadvaidins claim and nor madhyama parinama as claimed by Jaina philosopher and it is vibhu parinama as claimed by Samkya and tarkika philosophers. Vibhu parimanatvam is intrinsic nature of Jivatma and this Jivatma has got vyavaharika dristi and this incidental nature has come because of anatma associationship. This has happened because of anatma sambandha which we mean as adhyasa. It is otherwise called aupadhika subhava. When we talk about Jivatma we should know whether it is Paramarthika or vyavaharika driisti. Upanishad normally mention whether what it says is Paramarthika or vyavaharika dristi and if this is not known, Vedanta will be most confusing text in this world. Sometimes the scripture says that Jivatma travels and at another place it says Jivatma is all pervading one. Seeming contradiction can be resolved only when we know satta beda or dristi beda. Incidental and intrinsic nature of Jivatma should be known. We have seen three natures of Jivatma. Janma rahitvam ajatvam and jnana swarupam were talked about. In the 13<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam sarvagatha swarupam was talked about. We should know all three features are intrinsic from Paramarthika angle. When you look at from vyavaharika dristi, all the three swarupam will be otherwise. Jivatma will have janma; it is inferior medium and superior janma. Similarly from Paramarthika dristy jnana swarupam and from vyavaharika dristy jnatha. Similar the third one is sarvagatha swrupam is my intrinsic nature and from vyavaharika dristy I am traveling tom and I am alpa gatha swarupa. This you must note carefully to understand the Vedanta. Veda purva deals with vyavaharika features and vedanta deals with Paramarthika angle. With this 13<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. Vyasacharya does another job of sruti virodha pariharah. All seeming contradictions with regard to Jivatma is also resolved. The second chapter happens to be avirodha adhyaya. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam..

### **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

**Sutra 2.3.33 [249]**

### ***Karta sastrarthavativat***

[the soul is] an agent on account of the scriptures having a purpose thereby.

Another characteristic of the individual soul is being stated.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. this is a fairly big adhikaranam with seven sutras. Here also Vyasacharya deals with another feature of Jivatma and that too an important feature. In the next adhikaranam also the same topic is dealt with. Vyasacharya analyses whether Jivatma is karta, bokta or not. This is very important because the Samkya philosophy has a very peculiar approach to this topic. For Vyasacharya the primary opponent while writing Brahma Sutra is Samkya philosophers. Samkya philosophy is close to Vedanta not only in context and with regard to certain words too. Many concepts are common. Both Samkya and Vedanta accept Veda pramanam also. Vyasacharya wants to differentiate the two in his Brahma Sutra. for Samkya philosophers Jivatma is akarta and he does not do any karma but a bokta the enjoyer. Anatma or prakriti is the karta according to Samkya philosophers. Purusa rupa Atma is karta and prakriti rupa anatma is bokta according to the Samkya philosophers. Purusa rupa Jivatma kevalam bokta bhavati. Prakriti acts Purusa and reaps the results. If someone is a lazy person and does not do anything but takes all credit is called Samkya Atma. First this particular concept we have to break \. According to our sastra kartrtvam and boktrtvam are two sides of the same coin. One who sows the seed ahs to reap the crops. Otherwise there will be confusion in the society, one person will do akrama and the other person will be arrested. There will be so much confusion and we will never have incentive to do anything. This is a very important norm. that is why we do not blame anyone for our sufferings. For our past karta I am the present bokta. The world and people are only the conveyer belts to pass on my karma phalam to me. Punyu papams comes through parents, wife, friends and others. In short, the law is kartrtvam and boktrtvam go together. In this context, Samkya is wrong. If you say both of them will be together, presnt together or absent together. If you say both are together and absent together, in the case of Jivatma also they either present or absent together. When we talk of sastra there is dristi dvayam and you should note whether it is vyavaharika or Paramarthika dristya. From vyavaharika dristya we have both boktrtvam and kartrtvbam. from Paramarthika dristya we will negatge kartrtvam but we will negate boktrtvam also. from vyavaharika dristi if we compare Samkya and Vedanta, from vyavaharika dristya we agree with boktrtvam. Here we agree. When we come to vyavaharika dristi Jivatma has kartrtvam. Samkya do not agree on this score. This adhikaranam establishes the kartrtvam of Jivatma from vyavaharika angle. This is the general introduction.

Further, I said in all this adhikaranam of the third pada we have three level purva paksa, Ekadesi and siddhanta. Purva paksa says sruti and Veda is contradicting. In one place, Jivatma is karta, at another place, it says bokta, and thus the sruti is apramanam.1.2.1 of Mundaka upanisad says *tad etat satyam mantresu karmani kavayo yany apasyams tani tretayam bahudha santatani tany acaratha niyatam, satyakama, esa vah panihah sukrtasya loke*. This is the truth that the vaidhika karma can give wonderful results, you can have happy lfie, and may you perform vaidhika karmas. Here sruti means that Jivatma is karta. Therefore, from that mantra we come to know that Veda looks upon jivatma as karta. 1.2.19 of Kathopanisad *hanta cen mayate hantum hatas cen manyate hatam ubhau tau na vijanito nayam hanit na hanyate* it says if a person thinks that I am the killer of something or doer of some action that person is a confused person for Jivatma does not do any action at all. That means Jivatma is akarta. that means Veda is confused. Therefore, purva paksa do not study

Vedas. Then comes Ekadesi the Samkya philosopher says that Veda is not confusing. Wherever kartritvam is occurring in Veda it should be taken figuratively. However, really speaking Jivatma is akarta only.

Then siddhanta says Jivatma is not akarta and Jivatma is karta. It is from vyavaharika dristi. And that athe Samkya is vyavaharika plane how do you know because he says Jivatma is bokta. It is very clear you are from vyavaharika plane accepting the boktritvam of Jivatma accept the kartritvam also.

Now we will see the general analysis of this sutra. if Jivatma is not a karta the entire Karma Kanda is a waste because he is akarta. he cannot do the various rituals and ceremonies. The very fact that Veda has a huge Karma Kanda, indicates that Jivatma is karta only. this is called srutarthapatti pramanam. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Karta Jivatma is to be accepted as akarta or a doer or an agent. sastrathavattvat because of the validity of vedic injunctions or commandments; the significance of the words is first word is karta; Jivatma is karta from vyavaharika dristya; Samkya talks of boktritvam of Jivatma and so we talk of Jivatma as a karta; sastravartat because of the pramanyam of Vedas or vidhi vakyani; arthavatvam means pramanyam; sastrasua Veda vidhi vakyani pramanyam. Any number of vidhi vakyam we can take. 1.2.1 of Mundaka upanisad it is said you perform the vaidhika karma. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

### **Sutra 2.3.34 [250]**

#### ***viharopadesat***

and on account of [the sruti] teaching [its] wandering about.

An argument in support of sutra 33 is given

First, I will do the general analysis of the sutra. Jivatma is biggest tourist. He tours within the body; he travels in jagrat avastha in the physical body; in swapna avastha he travels within the mind; Jivatma travels internally in waking, dream and sleep. During swapna, it travels through the nadis and during sleep it goes back to the hridayam. Within one janma itself, Jivatma travels from one place to another. After maranam Jivatma travels from one loka to another. Travel is a karma and it is a movement and it is a kriya. Since Jivatma is a kriya asraya he does the action. Jivatma is gamanakriya sanjarkriya viharakriya asraya. He moves all the time. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Viharopadesat means this is known from the vedic teaching of Jivatma's travels also. now we will see the significance of the word. viharah and upadesat. Upadesat means vedic statement; viharah means sancharah travels. Vedic statement deals with travel of Jivatma. Go back to sutra 18 where the vedic statements quotations are given there.

## Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]

The individual soul is an agent..

### Sutra 2.3.35 [251]

#### *upadanat*

[also it is a doer] on account of its taking the organs

another argument in support of sutra 33 is given

I will do the general analysis of the sutra. Jivatma has to be accepted as karta since Veda talks about taking to varieties of instruments of accessories and actions. All instruments are useful only when you do action, any karanam is grasped by karanam alone. akarta need not grasp the karanam. karanam grasping is two types. In one janma itself Jivatma takes the instruments in jagrat and swapna avastha and drops all the instruments in sleep state. From one birth to another birth Jivatma carries the instruments. The indriyas are not changed and the same sense organs are carried on to another body. body is dropped and another body is taken. All these are required and all are possible only if Jivatma is a karta. Now I will do the word for word analysis.

Upadanat since Jivatma resorts to the instruments it is a karta. Now we will see the significance of the word. The word upadanat means grasping the instruments. Karana upadanat. The conclusion is Jivatma is a karta. Instruments are required by the user ir karta alone. We have several sruti statements 2.1.17 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad all the sense organs are folded and dropped and Jivatma resides in the hridayam. Jivatma takes all the seventeen karanams of Sookshma Sariram because it wants to be a karta. It also takes the physical body and it indicates that it is a karta. Body is the ayatanam where the hectic activities go on.

## Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]

The individual soul is an agent..

### Sutra 2.3.36 [252]

#### *Vyapadesaccha kriyayam na chennirdesaviparyayah*

[The soul is an agent] also because it is designated as such with regard to actions; if it were not so, there would be a change of designation.

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

First, we will do the general analysis of the sutra. here Vyasacharya says in certain portions of the Veda it is clearly said that Jivatma does action. The quotation he takes is from 2.5 of the Taittiriya Upanishad says vijnanam yagnam tanude is the relevant portion. Yajnam means karma and tanute means perform. Sruti clearly says that Jivatma performs karma and therefore Jivatma is karta. That is the first portion of the sutra. now we will take up the

quotation vijnanam yagnam tanude; we analyse vijnanam yagnam tanude. Adhi Sankaracharya says vijnanam means Jivatma; Samkya philosopher says that the quotation supports me. He says vijnanam is used in the sense of buddhi. vijnana maya kosa means buddhi and it is an instrument of knowledge only. Samkya says that buddhi alone performs yajna and buddhi is prakriti and therefore prakriti alone performs yajnam and jiva does not do anything and he enjoys as bokta. For which Adhi Sankaracharya gives his answer. first we accept that vijnana can refer to buddhi as well as vyavaharika Jivatma also. from the context we have to find out whether it refers to buddhi or Jivatma. Adhi Sankaracharya gives a grammatical answer. in sanskriti when a thing is used as an instrument and it occurs in the third case. When a thing is an agent of an action and it should be in nominative case. Then it is subject; if it comes in instrumental case it refers to instrument. based on that you have to interpret properly which we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 216

### **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

**Sutra 2.3.36 [252]**

#### ***Vyapadesaccha kriyayam na chennirdesaviparyayah***

[The soul is an agent] also because it is designated as such with regard to actions; if it were not so, there would be a change of designation.

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

We see the general analysis of the 36<sup>th</sup> sutra which is the fourth sutra of this adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya establishes that Jivatma is a karta from vyavaharika dristi. Samkya philosopher says Jivatma is a bokta but not a karta. He says Purusa is a kevala bokta and prakriti alone is a karta. We want to establish that as long as you see Jivatma as bokta you are in vyavaharika plane. In addition, as long as you are in vyavaharika plane you have to accept that Jivatma is karta also. Vyasacharya takes pains to establish that Jivatma is a karta from vyavaharika dristi. In support of that Vyasacharya quotes various sruti statements particularly vijnanam yajnam tanude. Karmani refers to non-vedic worldly actions also. vijnanam vaidhika loukika karmani tanude. The word vijnanam refers to Jivatma and from sastram we come to know Jivatma is karta. This creates a problem, which I introduced, in the last class. The popular meaning of vijnanam is buddhi. How can it be interpreted as Atma? Therefore, Samkya contends that vijnanam should be translated as buddhi only and not Jivatma. Buddhi is a product of prakriti and the sruti statement is that buddhi with prakriti does action. For that Vyasacharya gives the answer in the sutra itself. The second part of sutra resolves the problem; he says the word vijnanam can refer to chaitanya rupa Jivatma also. Vijnanam in another derivation can refer to intellect also. Once we accept both meanings are possible then we should know which meaning should be taken when. Vyasacharya says when an object serves as an instrument it should be put in an instrumental case. in English we sue the expression 'with'. When the instrumental case comes we come to know that he user is used in nominative case. He cuts with a knife; he is subject and a knife is used as instrumental case. we find that the word vijnanam is sometimes used in nominative case and sometimes in instrumental case. The word vijnanam refers to the instrument, the instrument here is intellect, and that is why we call it anthakaranam. Whenever the word vijnanam is used in nominative case it refers to something other than intellect. Other than buddhi is Jivatma alone. Where do we find nominative case and instrumental case? instrumental case is there in 2.1.17 what happens to Jivatma at the time of sleep. The mantra reads as *yatraisa etat supto bhaut esa vijnamayah purusah, tad esam pranam vijnanena vijnam adaya ya eso ntar hrdaya akasah tasmin chete, tani yada grhnati atha haitat purusah svapiti nama, tad grhita eva prano bhavati, grhita vak grhitam caksuh grhitam srotram grhitam manah*. The meaning of the mantra is when this being fell asleep thus then the person who consists of intelligence having by his intelligence taken to himself the intelligence of these breaths [sense organs] rests in the space within the hear. When the person takes in these [senses] he is said

to be asleep. When the breath is restrained, speech is restrained, the eye is restrained, the ear is restrained the mind is restrained. Jivatma is the karta the agents and the sense organs are the objects, to withdraw the sense organs Jivatma has to use an instrument, and that is the mind, which is used, in the third case. Jivatma anthakaranena indriyani adhaya. The mind is the instrument that carries the organs from one place to another. Your mind has to carry the ears to the talk and when the mind acts as instrument it is vijnanam is put in nominative case and vijnanam does not refer to buddhi but to Jivatma alone. now we will see word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; vyapadesat jiva is presented as an agent or doer or karta. Kriyayam with regard to action. Nachet otherwise; nirdesaviparyayah the way of presentation with be different. We will see the significance of the words. Vyapadesat means presentation, introduction, or mention. Presentation of Jivatma as a karta; Jivatma is presented as karta in vijnanam yagyam tanude. It is presented as karta by using nominative case. cha is and or moreover; therefore also if Jivatma is not a karta or an instrument then what would have happened is the presentation would be different; nirdesaviparyayah; it will be different instead of using the vijnanam in nominative case instead of instrumental case of it used vijnanam in instrumental case. therefore our essential argument is vijnanam in nominative case is Jivatma only. now we will go to the next sutra.

#### **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

#### **Sutra 2.3.37 [253]**

#### ***upalabdhivadaniyamah***

as in the case of perception [there is] no rule [here also]

the argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

First we will do general analysis of this sutra.

Vyasacharya answers a possible question from Samkya philosopher. For him Jivatma is a bokta. Karta is defined as swatantra an independent one. karanam the instrument is never swatantra and it is to go as directed by karta. Karta swatantrah. Based on this definition, Samkya argues if you say Jivatma is a karta Jivatma should do only good action or punya karmas, which will give him good results. But even though Jivatma you claim as karta he does not only punyam but also papams also. why a jivah should do papa karyams. Therefore if you say Jivatma is a karta and swatantra why he does evil karmas. for that Vyasacharya gives a counter question. He asks a question if Jivatma is a bokta, why should he suffer painful experiences? Bokta means he should ever enjoy. Why he should have negative experiences and why cannot he have only sukha anubhava? What will be the answer from Samkya philosophers? He experiences dukha because his bogha depends upon various factors, which determined bogha. If bogha is dependent on various factors, his karma also depends upon various factors and therefore he can be the doer of good and bad actions. Therefore, Jivatma has to use various factors as buddhi, sense organs etc. when buddhi has wrong information; he tends to do bad actions in spite of his desire to do good actions. Now Samkya asks the next question. You say Jivatma is a karta and he can do good and bad

actions because of various instruments involved like misleading buddhi. His buddhi takes right or wrong actions as per his whims due to other factors. Samkya asks you say Jivatma is a karta and various factors or accessories are used by him means Jivatma depends upon the various accessories and instruments and Jivatma is a dependent person or an entity, Jivatma cannot be called a karta at all. He bases on the argument of grammar definition of karta. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives an important definition of what is meant by swatantra or independent. When you say a karta is an independent person, it does not mean he does not use the instrument. A swatantra karta also uses the instrument. It is not the absence of instrument we call it swatantra. Any karta has to use an instrument. Even Bhagavan uses various instruments for doing creation. Bhagavan cannot create anything without the karmas. Fourteen lokas are created based on punya karma and the lower lokas are created based on papa karmas and misra [punya and papa] karmas are the cause for the creation of the earth. Even though Bhagavan is a creator, he also requires an instrument for creation. If he is dependent on instrument, we cannot call him swatantra. Definition of swatantra is in handling the instrument and the instrument should not handle the agent. it is not the absence of the instrument that makes him free and independent but the actual control over and proper handling of the instrument makes one independent. Karta can handle all the other instrument and the instrument should not handle the karta. One should direct the instrument and instrument should not direct the person. jiva is a karta and he should handle the instrument. he commits mistake when the mistakes are confused. Just as boktrivam is possible for Jivatma, so also kartrivam is possible for Jivatma. This is the general analysis. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Ualabdhiavad means as in the case of experience [bogha anubhava] aniyamah there is no rule. now we will see the significance of the words. Upalabdhiavad means bogha anubhava of the boktra Jivatma; he quotes bogha anubhava because Samkya philosophers say Jivatma is bokta and there is no rule that he will experience only good, he experiences both good and bad. As a bokta he can experience pleasurable and painful experiences. Exactly like that upalaptavad aniyamah there is no rule for Jivatma as karta to do good action only and he may do good and bad action depending upon the other factors. The essence of the sutra is if Jivatma is a bokta he can be a karta also.

## **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

### **Sutra 2.3.38 [254]**

#### ***saktiviparyayat***

on account of the reversal of power [of the buddhi]

the argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says for argument sake let us take buddhi as karta. According to Samkya prakriti is karta and karta is buddhi and also take Atma as bokta. In Vedanta, buddhi is anthakaranam. If buddhi is karta, buddhi will have the faculty and power of being a karta and by being a karta it will stop to be an instrument because karta and karanam are necessarily two separate factors. Agent cannot be an instrument and instrument cannot be an agent. if I become karanam I am no more a karta.



Therefore, Vyasacharya uses the word kartu sakti and karana sakti cannot be located in the same thing. If you become a karanam you are no more a boss. An employee cannot be an employer and an employer cannot be an employee. If buddhi is taken as karta it will have kartru sakti and it will not have karana sakti. The next consequence once buddhi loses the kartru sakti and karana sakti and buddhi will require another karana sakti to do the job. Unfortunately, there is no other instrument available and who will do the thinking function. Sense organs cannot think; body cannot think. Therefore buddhi cannot be a karta and it can be only a karanam. Consciousness obtaining in vyavaharika plane is karta and inert buddhi is only an instrument. this is the general analysis. Now we will do word for word analysis.

Saktiviparyayat because of the reversal or change of faculty buddhi or intellect cannot be an agent. therefore Jivatma alone has to be a doer. We will see the significance of the word. it is a compound word sakti and viparyaya. Sakti means power; he means kartru and karana sakti. Faculty of being an instrument or doer. They are two separate faculty and they cannot be located in one locus. Viparyayah means change or reversal. Sakti viparyaya means there will be a change in the sakti and the change kept in mind is karana sakti of buddhi will be change to kartru sakti if buddhi is taken as karta. If buddhi gets kartru sakti, what will be the karanam for the karta which we do not find any. Since I look the mind as an instrument, I am not the mind. I the employer of the mind has to be different from the employee the mind.

#### **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

#### **Sutra 2.3.39 [255]**

#### ***Samadhyabhavaccha***

And on account of the impossibility of samadhi

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Suppose the buddhi is not an instrument and is taken as karta, first problem is it will not obey me. We think our children are our instrument. Our instruments obey our command. We think that our children are also belonging to us and first time the child chants the mantra the whole day and the swamiji comes the child will not chant. It does not work because child is not karanam but child is an independent karta. If it obeys you, thank all the stars. If it does not obey it is a natural phenomena of the world. If buddhi is an instrument Veda cannot ask you to practise modification. Dhyana vidhi becomes redundant if buddhi is not an instrument. According to Veda buddhi is an instrument and you can think of using the instrument as you want. Therefore, the sutra says dhyana vidhi proves the mind is an instrument and if the mind is an instrument I am the user of the instrument and I become the dhyana karta. The mind is the dhyana karanam. if the mind is not dhyana karanam Veda cannot give modification commandment. This is the general analysis. The word meaning I will give in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 217

### **Topic 14. Kartradhikaranam [Sutra 33-39]**

The individual soul is an agent..

**Sutra 2.3.39 [255]**

#### ***Samadhyabhavaccha***

And on account of the impossibility of samadhi

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

This sutra happens to be kartuadhikaranam. In all the adhikaranam beginning from 10 Vyasacharya analyses jiva swrupam. He has resolved various sruti contradiction with regard to the jiva swarupam. Jiva is established as chaitanya swarupam, ajatvam, vibhutvam. Here the nature of jiva with regard to kartrutvam is being established. In Samkya philosophy Jivatma is a bokta and it is not a karta. As long as we look upon jia as bokta we are in vyavaharika plane and we do not discuss Paramarthika dristi. From vyavaharika plane, we have to accept jiva as karta also. In the adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes jiva is karta from vyavaharika dristya because Jivatma is a bokta also. As per Samkya philosophy jiva is bokta and prakriti is the karta. Prakriti here means buddhi. We negate their cnotnentio0n that buddhi is a karta. We call buddhi is not a karta and we call it vyatirikta Chaitanyam and we call buddhi is karanam. As per Samkya philosophy buddhi is an inert entity. In Vedanta, buddhi has got reflected Consciousness and buddhi is a live entity because of abasa Chaitanyam. In Vedanta, buddhi can function as chetanam but in Samkya philosophy they don't accept reflected Consciousness. Therefore, buddhi is an inert Consciousness like the car or a bus. But our question as the car cannot run by itself being jada and how can buddhi being jada can ever become a karta. When anybody says car is coming, car is not a karta. Car does not move. What is the meaning of the car is coming is equal to a man is coming by the means of the instrument of the car. Similarly, buddhi thinks means jiva thinks through buddhi. Sariratriya vyatirikta vyavaharika chetana jivah ankikarah. You have to accept aham pada vachyārtha and it is the primary meaning of aham and the lachyārtha aham is the Paramarthika jivah and it sis the saksi Chaitanyam which is different. You ahjve to accept sarira triyam the instrument and office; vyavaharika jiva functions as karta and Paramarthika is saksi the Brahman. The problem of Samkya philosophy is that they want to manage with two, Sarira triyam and Paramarthika Chaitanyam. We require two Chaitanyam and they are one vyavaharika Chaitanyam and Paramarthika Chaitanyam. We cannot manage with the two. We have to accept buddhi as an instrument and not as a karta. If it is accepted as a karta and there will be no instrument for buddi to function. We should have another karana to function. This is not possible. See buddhi not as a karta but as karanam an instrument. To conclude buddhi as karanam we have sastra pramanam. For performinga the sadhanas, we use buddhi as an instrument. The main sadhana is samadhih means modification in this context. Otherwise, it is called nididyanam. Such an instrument is there in 2.4.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Atma vo nididyanam tavyaha. For mananam and nididyanam we require an instrument and the mind is the instrument for nididyanam and mandah. There

is another quotation in 2.2.6 of Mundaka upanisad. Thus the mind has to function as an instrument, if it functions as karta it cannot be a karanam, and if it is a karanam it cannot be a karta. If it is a karta and it cannot have any other, karanam and it cannot do any other function with mind as karta. In Vedanta, I am the meditator and mind is the instrument. With this 14<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over and jiva from vyavaharika dristya is karta and bokta. We have to answer Ekadesi and purva paksa now. Jivatma should be taken as a bokta and wherever Jivatma is a karta, it should be taken as a figurative expression, and we should take sruti statement that Jivatma is akarta. That Ekadesi we refuted yatra yatra kartrutvam tatra tatra boktrutvam. Both must coexist we pointed out there. Purva paksa says sruti contradicts itself by saying Jivatma is karta in some places and Jivatma is akarta in some other places. 1.2.1 of Mundaka upanisad says that Jivatma is karta and 1.2.19 of Kathopanisad says Jivatma is akarta. This contradiction is resolved by saying that Jivatma is karta and jiva is akarta. From vyavaharika dristya it is karta and from saksi chaitanya dristya akarta; vachyartha dristya karta and lachyartha dristya Jivatma is akarta. There is no contradiction at all and therefore sruti is a reliable pramanam.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis. Cha moreover; samadhyabhavat means because of the impossibility of modification [such vedic injunctions will become invalid. Hence Jivatma which is different from buddhi should be accepted as karta and buddhi should be accepted as karanam or the instrument. Now we will see the significance of the words. Samadhyabhavat means modification or dhyanam abhavat means asambavat impossible; samdhyabhavat means because of the impossibility of modification if mind is a karta; cha is a conjunction which adds this logic to the previous reasoning. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 15. Takshadhikaranam [Sutra 40]**

The soul is an agent as long as it is limited by the adjuncts.

#### **Sutra 2.3.40 [256]**

#### ***Yatha cha takshobhayatha***

And as the carpenter is born

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

Now I will introduce this important adhikaranam. It has only one sutra. The significance word in this sutra is taksa ubhayatha. Because of the word taksa it is called taksadhikaranam. Taksa means carpenter. The significance of this sutra is this. Vyasacharya wants to establish the kartrutvam of Jivatma is not the intrinsic dharma of Jivatma. It is incidental nature of Jivatma. It is borrowed nature of Jivatma. The intrinsic nature is akarta. Therefore only it is identical with akartru Brahman. This is conveyed in this adhikaranam. Jivatma is both akarta and abokta one from Paramarthika angle and another from vyavaharika dristya. Samkya accepts boktrutvam and not kartrutvam. Kartrutvam according to Samkya relates to prakriti. First we will go to purva paksa view. Purva paksa is the same of the previous adhikaranam. Kartrutva akartrutva sruti virodhad apramanyam. Sruti quotation is the same as given in the last adhikaranam. This is the purva paksa madham. Now Ekadesi comes. In the previous adhikaranam Ekadesi is nyaya philosopher. This is important because we differentiate Vedanta from other systems. In this adhikaranam naiyayika says what I say is correct and says that jiva is karta. He says jiva is intrinsically a karta just as heat is the nature of fire. If

jiva is a karta how will you account for sruti vakyam 1.2.19 of Kathopanishad where it says jiva is akarta. Naiyayika will have to do that because he accepts Veda pramanam. He says that wherever sruti says jiva is akarta and you should take jiva in moksa avastha. By doing various sadhana as prescribed in tarka sastra, jiva will attain moksa and moksa avastha and the kartrutvam will become non-functional. He will not say that it will go away because kartrutvam is intrinsic with Jivatma. That is indicated akartru sruti vakyam. Jiva is intrinsically akarta. Naiyayika madham calls jiva karta. Because of the association with anthakaranam Jivatma has got temporary kartrutvam like a crystal has got temporary colour because of the proximity of flower. This kartrutvam is vyavaharika kartrutvam or mithya kartrutvam. There is no question of kartrutvam in moksa avastha. The falsification of this incidental kartrutvam by knowledge alone is moksa. Falsification of superimposed kartrutvam is moksa. In Vedanta, moksa is not an event but recognition of the eternal fact. Crystal was colourless, is colourless and will be colourless. In between, the crystal was mistakenly taken as coloured one and this mistake rectification is called the real knowledge. So also, the mistake rectification regarding the jiva's real status is called the moksa. That is why the problem is intellectual and solution is intellectual. It is not a spiritual problem. It is spiritual problem. It is not a problem located in spirit. Spirit problem is not one located in spirit in Atma. Spiritual problem is one located in the intellect with regard to the Atma. It is an intellectual problem connected with Atma. Problem is about Atma but it is located in the intellect. When buddhi is active in jagrat and swapna, the problem is active and when buddhi is dormant in sushupti, the problem is dormant. For naiyayika moksa is an external event. However, in Vedanta moksa is an intellectual event of recognition of moksa within the mind. Now we will come to the general analysis of this sutra.

Vyasacharya says here jiva's kartrutvam because of the association with buddhi. Once the buddhi sambandha is gone, kartrutvam will not be there. The very fact that it arrives and departs it is an incidental faculty and not intrinsic. Kartrutvam is there in jagrat and partially in swapna and totally absent in sushupti because of the dormant state of the mind in sushupti. When the mind is active in jagrat, Jiva is karta because of its active participation with buddhi.

Carpenterhood is associated with his instruments; when he uses the instruments, he enjoys the carpenterhood. When he does not use the instruments he is no longer enjoys the carpenterhood. Carpenterhood is not intrinsic with the carpenter. The carpenterhood is incidental with the association of the instruments. Carpenter is both carpenter and non-carpenter. Carpenterhood is incidental non-carpenterhood is intrinsic. Similarly kartrutvam is incidental. Whenever you drop the buddhi, you are not karta. Once he goes to sleep kartrutvam and ayasa goes away. During sleep he enjoys temporary moksa. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Yatha cha just as taksha a carpenter ubhayatha is both similarly jiva is both karta and akarta. Now we will go to the significance of the words. The word cha is in the meaning of tu the negation of nyaya. Unlike the naiyayika's view, taksha means the carpenter. Ubhayata plays both roles; carpenter and noncarpenter also. He is a carpenter with instruments and not a carpenter without instrument. Adhi Sankaracharya refutes the nyaya philosophy by giving both sruti and yukti pramanaam. First, we will go to the logical part. If kartrutvam is intrinsic with jivah, it will not go away from him. What cannot go away is intrinsic. By definition, what is intrinsic cannot go away. The idea of holding on to kartrutvam and enjoying moksa is impossible. It is the ignorant person who claims I am a karta will not be able to gain moksa. For that naiyayika answers saying that he has answered already. He says in moksa the kartrutvam stops functioning and kartru sakti is stopped by sadhana. Kartrutvam continues

but the function stops. If kartru sakti is stopped in time by, the sadhana it will become a sadhyam, a product for your efforts and it will become a karma phalam and whatever is karma phalam will get activated. During pralaya all the activities, during maranam, during coma all saktis are stopped but what happens again the kartrutvam comes back. What happens in time will not permanent and you may enjoy moksa for sometime, kartru sakti will be activated, and you will again have to start from the beginning. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 218

### **Topic 15. Takshadhikaranam [Sutra 40]**

The soul is an agent as long as it is limited by the adjuncts.

#### **Sutra 2.3.40 [256]**

#### ***Yatha cha takshobhayatha***

And as the carpenter is born

The argument in support of sutra 33 is continued.

Vyasacharya establishes that the kartrutvam of Jivatma is not intrinsic kartrutvam or swabhavik kartrutvam but it is incidental in nature. Thus, Vyasacharya differentiates us the Vedantins from both the Samkya philosophers and naiyayika philosophers. Vedantins is between the most powerful systems of philosophy. Both of them claim vedic support. One set of philosophy is called Samkya philosophy and the other is called Nyaya Vaishesika philosophy. Vedantins is sandwiched between them and shows how he is different from both. In the previous adhikaranam Vyasacharya showed how Vedantins is different from Samkya philosopher. Samkya philosopher says Jivatma is only a bokta vyavaharika dristya but Jivatma is not a karta. You should add vyavaharika dristya clause. Advaidins says if you accept boktrivam of Jivatma, simultaneously you should accept kartrutvam also. Advaidins adds either you have to reject bokrutvam and kartrutvam from Paramarthika dristi or accept both from the vyavaharika dristi.

But your problem is that you accept only one of them, which means you accept bokrutvam of Jivatma and reject kartrutvam. From the vyavaharika standpoint. Of rejection of kartrutvam you are in Paramarthika dristi and from the standpoint of acceptance of boktrivam you are in vyavaharika dristi. That means you mix up the two levels indiscriminately. But, Vedantins is very clear we take Jivatma is both karta and bokta from vyavaharika dristi and is neither from Paramarthika dristi. The Samkya vilaksantvam was shown there.

Here Vyasacharya, in this adhikaranam shows how Vedanta is different from the Nyaya Vaishesika philosophy. Nyaya Vaiseshika philosopher also accepts karturtvam of Jivatma. From this point of the acceptance of kartrutvam nyaya and Vedanta are friends while the Samkya becomes the enemy.

After having accepted the kartrutvam, we see the internal difference between nyaya and Vedanta come to surface. Nyaya vaiseshika says kartrutvam is intrinsic whereas Vedantins says it is Adyastikam or aupathikam or agantukam or mithya or vyavaharikam are all the words that convey the same thing.

In the last class, I gave the logical and scriptural support in support for our view. The logical support we gave was that if kartrutvam is intrinsic to Jivatma, moksa is never possible

because what is intrinsic cannot be given up. It is intrinsic like the heat of the fire which can never be given up by fire. Kartrutvam can never be given up..

According to Vedanta kartrutvam is equal to samsara. You don't even say that kartrutvam produces samsara. Kartrutvam is synonymous with samsara. Therefore intrinsic kartrutvam means intrinsic samsara and intrinsic samsara means that it is not escapable which means anir moksa prasangah. One cannot get permanent freedom from such samsara. Maximum benefit one can get is if kartrutvam is intrinsic is the temporary freedom from kartrutvam just as you get temporary rest during sleep, samadhi, pralaya or marana avastha, etc. Similarly your moksa also will become a temporary state wherein kartrutvam will be dormant and you can never get permanent moksa. Your moksa will become impermanent moksa and impermanent moksa is contradictory to the views of moksa which all the philosophers have agreed that word moksa should be used only for permanent freedom from samsara. All the philosophers have uniformly agreed that moksa must be used only for permanent solution of samsara and if you say temporary moksa it is a contradiction and therefore, it is illogical. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Now we will give sruti support to show that kartrutvam is not intrinsic for the Jivatma. The first reason is or the first sruti statement is 4.37 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad, which says jayati iva lelayati iva Jivatma is disturbed as it were mentally and therefore Jivatma meditates as it were to remove the disturbance. Here what is the word to be focused is iva. Iva means 'as it were'. Once you say Jivatma meditates 'as though' then it means it is not really meditating. You are as though beautiful means it is not a compliment. Thus, ivakara indicates that kartrutvam is incidental and adhyastam and only vyavaharika dristya. The next sruti vakyam is again 2.4.14 of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad wherever there is 'seeming duality' all the transactions exist like seeing, hearing, thinking etc.. It is followed by the statement that when a person discovers everything is Atma where is the question of any transactions? Therefore, transactions are only in avidya avastha. Therefore kartrutvam also during avidya avastha only and that means it is superimposed kartrutvam. This is the second sruti support.

The third one is the entire swayam jyoti Brahmanam of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Here the Upanishad talks about the three avasthas. During the jagrat avastha the Jivatma does many things and experiences many things but Jivatma is not related to or associated with anything during that happens in jagrat avastha. It is called nanvagatha sruti which is a very important vakyam. Ananvagatham means nothing sticks to jivatma. It repeats the words several times 'ananvagatham tena bavathi asangoham Purusa'. This Jivatma is totally asangah unconnected with anything, that it seemingly does which includes the punya and papa karmas also. This asangohi ayam purusah is repeated several times in swayam jyoti Brahmanam and asangatvam means freedom from punya and papa karmas. Thus we can take one statement here asangoham ayam Purusa 4.3 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad..

Lastly one more powerful sruti support is that the Upanishad repeatedly talks about jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. We know that Paramatma is akarta [indirect method] and Jivatma and Paramatma are equated. Therefore, Jivatma must be akarta. Otherwise, aikya sruti will become incongruous. That Paramatma is karta I need not prove because if Paramatma is also a karta Paramatma will also will become a samsari. Therefore akartru Paramatma abhinnatvad Jivatma abhi akarta bhavati. This is the fourth sruti support because of these reasons our conclusion is Jivatma is karta and that too vyavaharika karta. Here this adhikaranam is over, you have to reconcile, and you have to answer the Ekadesi and purva

paksi madham. Ekadesi madham pointed out that is Naiyayika pointed out that Jivatma is only karta primarily and akartrutvam is only temporary in moksa avastha. We answered the Ekadesi madham by saying that temporary akartrutvam cannot be moksa and therefore we have to interpret it, as Jivatma is vyavaharika karta and Paramarthika akarta. **It is permanently akarta Paramarthika dristya and it is permanently karta vyavaharika dristya.** Then we have to answer the purva paksa madham also. Purva paksa madham says that sruti talks about Jivatma kartrutvam in some places and akartrutvam in some places and sruti contradicts and therefore sruti is unreliable. For this our answer is that sruti does not contradict but sruti talks about in two different levels vyavaharika and Paramarthika and therefore there is no contradiction. Or we have to say that from uttama adhikrari dristi and mandha and madhyama adhikrari dristi. Veda purva is meant for mandha and madhyama adhikari and for them Jivatma is karta and Vedanta is for uttama adhikari and for them Jivatma is akarta. you decide whether you are mandha or uttama. With this takshadikaranam is over and we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 16 Parayattadhikaranam. [41-42]**

The soul is dependent on the Lord, when he works.

#### **Sutra 2.3.41 [257]**

#### ***Parattu tat sruteh***

But [even] that [agency of the soul] is from the Supreme Lord, so declares the sruti.

A limitation to sutra 33 is stated,

Fist I will introduce this adhikaranam with two sutras. The topic analysed here is the nature of Jivatma further. We have said that Jivatma is ajah, vibhuh, vyavaharika karta., Paramarthika akarta, Jivatma is chaitanya swarupam, various features of Jivatma have been talked about. Now the question discussed is does the karta Jivatma depend upon Isvara to function as a karta. Is Jivatma Isvara apeksaha Isvara adhinah Isvara ayathah. Ayathah means dependent. Is Jivatma the karta dependent on Isvara or not. To put it in another language is Isvara the cause of Jivatma's kartrutvam. We discuss this from Paramarthika angle the question itself does not arise because Jivatma does not have kartrutvam at all and where is the question of finding out that is the cause of kartrutvam. The question does not arise from Paramarthika dristi. From vyavaharika dristi, the question is accepted. For vyavaharika kartrutvam Isvara is cause or not is our problem here. We have handled Samkya, yoga philosophers to establish kartrutvam; we have handled Nyaya Vaisesika philosopher by establishing for establishing agantuva kartrutvam and now we have to handle Purva Mimamsa philosophers. Only then, Vedanta will stand separate from all the other five asthika darsanas. The Purva Mimamsa philosopher is a peculiar philosopher and his philosophy is based on Veda and he gives very high status to Veda. he can be compared to sikh people who look upon the guru grandha book as god and everything. In the temple, they don't keep any god and the grandha itself becomes the god. The book itself is worshipped. They will do puja etc, to the book alone. Daily morning they bring the grandha and keep and in the evening they take the book on head. For them grandha itself is god and there is no other god other than grandha. Purva Mimamsa is very close and does not accept Isvara. He accepts Veda pramanam; accepts all rituals; he accepts swarga everything he accepts except to god. After all, you want moksa. Moksa requires karma, Veda gives karma, and we do not require Isvara



for karmas will produce the phalam by the laws of creation. Laws are there; Veda is there; Jivatma is there; karta is there; desires are of course there. We keep Veda and o the ritual and attain permanent swarga. Swarga lokah amritatvam bajante in swarga one is free from asanaya and vibhaga hunger and thirst, no sorrow, no delusion; it is eternal also. Thus based on Veda purva bagha Purva Mimamsa claims Jivatma can attain moksa through karma and Isvara is a totally redundant and irrelevant concept. What about all devatas mentioned in Vedas like Indra, sarasvati, brahmaji etc. He says all of them are only sabda swarupa. We saw this in Devatadhikranam, there is no devata existent as a person, and they are only verbal or wordy existence. Nama matra satta only unlike a clip and when I use the word clip there is a padam and there is padhartha and Purva Mimamsa argues in the case of devatas they are only padams and there is no padhartha. Do not imagine there is Indra who is satisfied with the ritual and Indra is producing result. There is no such person or deity called Indra and what produces result is the sabda uccharanam and karma anustanam. There is no question of any devatas intervention. In the same way, Isvara also is not there and therefore he says Jivatma kartrutvam does not require the blessings of Isvara. Vedantins strongly refute the Purva Mimamsa view and establishes that you have to accept an Isvara other than Jivatma and the jagat. Purva Mimamsa tries to manage with jiva, jagat and Veda. He thinks that there is no need of Isvara but Vedantins say jiva, jagat, Veda is not enough but need an Isvara, which is different from Jivatma, different from jagat, different from Veda. There is a creator of Veda; jiva has not created the Vedas and jagat has not created the Veda and therefore we require a creator of the Vedas who is other than the jiva and jagat and that creator is Isvara. If you ask the Purva Mimamsa who is the creator of the Veda , he will say that Veda is anadhi. Jada jagat cannot create Veda; ignorant jiva cannot create Veda. Why should we bother about the creator of Veda, which is anadhi. However, we say that other than jivah, jagat and Veda we require an Isvara. The pramanam is sastra yonitvad. When I say all these things I hope you will not have confusion and some students may raise their eyebrows and ask silently are you an Advaidin when you say that there is an Isvara different from jagat and jiva. You strongly advocate jivatma and Paramatma aikyam and you shamelessly say that there is an Isvara different from Jivatma who is different from jagat etc. You may ask whether you have forgotten the Advaidic principle. It is eternal problem. Many people think and have written \that Adhi Sankaracharya is confused. We are comfortable because we have got a basic system of vyavaharika and Paramarthika plane and until you understand the principles of vyavaharika and Paramarthika the advaidam will be ununderstandable. We have talked about kartrutvam of jiva in the previous adhikaranam and therefore we are vyavaharika plane and in vyavaharika plane I am an individual and I am a karta; I am Chidhabasah; I have got sambandha with Sthoola Sooksma Sariram; I have got punya papam; I am in the midst of everything and I am in trouble and I need the grace of Lord and therefore we want to establish an Isvara first. Once we have accepted an Isvara and Jivatma with regard to kartrutvam of Jivatma what is Isvara's role is our question. This is very important. Here also so many confusions are there; there are one set of people who say Isvara alone does everything; without Isvara nothing in the world can move it is said. There is no such thing called freewill at all; freewill is a myth and we do not do anything; we cannot do anything and there is only one doer and that is Isvara and we are all puppets in His hands. This is one extreme called fatalistic philosophy which totally negates the freewill and they attribute the Jivatma kartrutvam to Isvara. Prostrate before Isvara for anything to be done. This is one extreme the fatalistic approach in which Isvara's role is highlighted and jiva's role is completely ignored. There is the other extreme called Purva Mimamsa extreme wherein Isvara's role is completely ignored. Even most of the atheistic people how completely ignore Isvara's role and they say Jivatma is karta and he is not controlled by anyone and he does everything and he is the result. Therefore you should take charge of your life; your are

responsible for everything and don't put the blame and anyone and therefore everything is in your hands. Everything is god's hands is one extreme and everything is in your hands is the other extreme. First is called fatalism and the second extreme is materialism the nasthika vadha. And here in this important adhikaranam we are going to reconcile. What is the reconciliation that both play important roles. Do not ignore Jivatma's freewill and at the same time do not ignore Isvara's grace or blessings; both are unbalanced views. Isvara and Jivatma's freewill both are require for kartrutvam. Both are equally important for kartrutvam. Isvara is set to be samanya karanam for all the actions of jiva and Isvara is supposed to be the general cause for jiva's action and Jivatma is supposed to be the visesha karanam, the specific cause. Isvara provides the infrastructure and Jivatma decides to use, abuse or disuse the infrastructure. Infrastructure alone is not enough for anything to take place. Both Isvara and jiva's freewill are required. If a person wants to start an industry, we know government has to provide the infrastructure; roads should be there; phones must work; everything government must provide and without them nobody can start anything. At the same time provisions alone are not enough and the individuals have to decide to make use of the appropriate provisions and make his life or mar his wife. Similar Isvara gives the infrastructure the universal laws. All the laws of karma is Isvara's provisions and it is the order; it is the infrastructure and you can boil the water if there is a law that water boils in 100 degree centigrade. More in the next class.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 3  
By Swami Paramarthananda

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 219





## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 220

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.43 [259]**

*Amsa nanavyapadesad anyatha chapi dasakitavaditvamadhiyata eke*

[The soul is] a part of the Lord on account of difference [between the two] being declared and otherwise also [i.e., as non-different from Brahma]; because in some [vedic texts] [Brahma] is spoken of as being fisherman, knaves etc.

This sutra shows that the individual soul is different from as well as the same with Brahman.

We see in the general introduction to the 17<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam known as amsadhikaranam which is the final adhikaranam of this third pada with 11 sutras. As I discussed in the last class in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya points out that Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma. And we saw that we can perfectly agree with this point of view because here the context is vyavaharika dristi which is very clear from the flow of topic the 14, 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam that talk about Jivatma as karta and jiva requires the blessings of the Lord to do his karmas. Therefore, Jivatma has to be necessarily a soupathika Purusa otherwise there is no question of kartrutvam; and once the topic of kartrutvam etc., comes we should know that we are in vyavaharika level. Keeping that vyavaharika level if somebody asks what is the relationship between Jivatma and Paramatma, we should answer that Jivatma is only a part of Paramatma. We should never use the word aikyam in vyavaharika dristi. Talking of aikyam from vyavaharika dristi is a gross mistake because from vyavaharika, dristi Jivatma has vyasti upadhi and from vyavaharika, dristi Isvara has samsti upadhi. The micro upadhi has to be necessarily a part of the macro uadhi. Visva has to be necessarily a part of the virad. Taijasa has necessarily to be a part of Hiranyagarbha. Prajna has necessarily to be a part of Antaryami. Turiya has to be necessarily not a part of Brahman and because once you come to turiyam or Paramarthika dristi. Vyavaharika dristya Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma. That is why in vyavaharika dristi the amsatvam is indicated by surrender. Surrender is indicated by namaskara in which I declare that I am a part of you or I belong to you. Adhi Sankaracharya in one of his works states that let me not be arrogant with you; let me not claim that I am big; let me be a humble and simple servant of you; the waves belongs to the ocean and we can never say ocean cannot belong to the wave. Smaller one belongs to bigger one. Oh Lord I am taranga and you are a samudra. Let me remember this. I am part of you. The very same Adhi Sankaracharya who vehemently establishes jivatma and Paramatma aikyam could very comfortably write Vishnu satpathi stotram because of channel difference. One is Paramarthika channel and the other is vyavaharika channel. This sloka belongs to the vyavaharika channel. This amsa topic is introduced for the sake of seemingly contradictory sruti statements or the beda sruti and abeda sruti. Beda sruti means that statement wherein jiva is said to be different from god. Abeda sruti means that statement wherein jiva is said to

be identical with god. We reconcile this by saying that in vyavaharika dristi we do it as amsa amsi sambandha part whole relationship bedam also can be accommodated and abeda also can be accommodated. Because part is neither totally identical with the whole nor it is very different from whole. It is different because it is small; identical also because it is not away from the whole. Thus amsa is brought in to resolve the seeming contradiction between beda abeda sruti. Up to this, we saw in the last class.

Now we have to represent this adhikaranam in our format that is Purva Paksi, Ekadesi and siddhanta. Purva Paksisays sruti contradicts by giving beda and abeda vakams. Beda vakyam is from Mundaka Upanishad that says *dvasuparna sayuja sakhaya samanam vrksam parisvajate taylor nayah pippalam svadv atty anasnann anyo'bhicakasiti* two birds companions [two are] always united cling to the self same tree. Of these, the one eats the sweet fruits and the other looks on without eating. Jivatma and Paramatma are compared to two birds perched in a tree and here clearly the beda is talked about. There are number of maha vakyam points out abeda sruti. Tat tvam asi Chandogya upanisad 6.8.7 and because sruti is contradicting by talking about identity in one place and difference in other place Purva Paksi says sruti is not a reliable source of knowledge. You better give up sruti. This is Purva Paksi madham

Now we will come to Ekadesi and his motice is good and he does not know how to reconcile in a wrong way. He say beda sruti alone should be taken as pramanam. Do not negate the Veda and do not throw the baby with bath water. Retain Veda and take only that relevant and valid beda sruti that is Jivatma is different from Paramatma alone we have to accept. The reason he gives is this alone is in keeping with our direct experience. We clearly know that we cannot be gods. We do not have any power at all. We do not have power even over mosquitoes, all other animals we put them in cage, and they put us in a cage. When we do not have power even on mosquitoes how can we claim, we are gods. Such an ordinary mortal how do you claim to be god? Beda sruti is supported by pratyaka pramanam, which is the most powerful pramanam. That means it is superior most pramanam even if you have to study Vedas you require pratyaksa pramana and sense organs are require even studying the Vedas. I will not say they should be thrown out after all they are vedic statement and put them in a decorative case and take all of them as artha vadha or glorification so that Jivatma will feel nice. Once in a while Jivatma is glorified. Abeda sruti apramanam and beda sruti is pramanam and therefore relationship between jivatma and Paramatma is binnah and they are distinct totally. This is Ekadesi madham.

Then comes siddhanta and he says the relationship is amsah which can be translated as beda abeda ubhaya sambandha. Beda is there and abeda is also there; beda abeda sambandha alone is called amsa sambandha. I hope you understand the part and whole have got beda also; part is part and the whole is whole and therefore they are different. Beda is athere. Abeda also is there; part does not exist away from the whole. When I say I am coming I don't have to say I and my head also is coming. Head is included. Therefore beda abeda sambandha is equal to amsa sambandha. If you use the amsa sambandha and stop it it is vishistadvaidam; if you write amsa sambandha and put vyavaharika dristya then it is Advaidam. The previous adhikaranam indicates that the topic is vyavaharika dristi. This is the general introduction. Now we will come to general analysis of the first sutra.

Here Vyasacharya says that Jivatma has to be taken as amsa because Vedas talk about both beda as well as abeda. Nana vyapadesad means beda or difference is pointed out and anyata means otherwise; it means abeda vyapadesad. Since difference is also talked about, identity is

also talked about, and hence we conclude Jivatma is amsa. Vedantic does not give beda vakyam in this sutra because we feel we have got any number of beda vakyam. *Tasmin yad antah, tad anvestavyam tad va va vijijnasitavyam* In Chandogya upanishad 8<sup>th</sup> chapter it is said that Jivatma we must search out that it is we must try to understand. It is very clear that Paramatma is the destination and Jivatma is traveler and he has to search and attain Paramatma and here beda is evident. Even the well know Brahma vid apnoti Param is beda upadesa for Upanishad says the knower of Brahman. Brahman is known and Jivatma is the knower. According to vishistadvaida interpretation Brahma vid means Brahma upasaka. Whether you take knower or whether you take to meditator duality is clear Brahma is object of Upasana and jiva is meditator and all sruti statements talk about bedas. So Vyasacharya does not give beda vakyam. But he gives sruti support for abeda vakyam. In this sutra Vyasacharya quotes a mantra occurring in Atharvana Veda. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the quotation Brahma dashah Brahma dasah brahmaiva ime kithava Vyasacharya hints the quotation and Adhi Sankaracharya gives the quotation. But Brahma suktam is not available now. Between Adhi Sankaracharya times and our times lot of quotations are not available and we only know that they are mentioned in Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam. The meaning of the sruti statement is Paramatma alone is in the form of all the living being. Dasah means fisherman; even the ordinary fisherman an uneducated people are also none other than Brahman only; then Brahma dasa all the labourers are also Brahman only. Brahman here is Paramatma. Brahma kithavah means gamblers. They are also Paramatma only. In short Paramatma alone is everything and here abeda between Paramatma and the world or the living beings is talked about. Beda and abeda vakyams are there. We reconcile that Jivatma is part of Paramatma. I am Paramatma and you are also Paramatma. Everyone becomes a part of Paramatma. This is the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Amsah Jivatma is a part of Paramatma nana vyapadesad means since the scriptures declare them to be different cha anyata means and otherwise. Eke some vedic portions adhiyate declare Brahman or Paramatma to be dasa kithavaditvam. Fishermen gamblers etc. This is the running meaning. Now we will go to the significance of the words. Hamsa means a part. We have to supply that Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma and technically this relation is called amsa amsi sambandha. It is the whole and part relationship. Nana vyapadesat – vedic statements and nana means bedah. There are different views or beda sruti vakyams are there. Because of the existence of beda vakyams in the sastras. Anyata should be translated as abeda vakyad cha. Because of these two there is only one way of reconciliation and we should combine and we call it beda abeda which means amsah. He gives the quotation of dasa krita vaditvam. Dasa means angler [fisherman] and kithava means gambler. Brahman is identical with every thing.

Shiva is identical with all is the conclusion in this sutra. Eke adhiyate means some vedic portion; some braches of the Vedas. He refers to the atharvana saka. Each Veda is supposed to be a saka. Here it is atharvana saka. There is a portion called Brahma sukta sakinah. Adhiyate they declare or they reveal or they teach the Brahman to be everything. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes another mantra also 4.3 of Svetasvatara Upanishad. Tvam kumarah uthava kumari hey Paramatma you are in the form of woman also. You are in the form of man also; you are in the form of a body; you are in the form of a girl. All idnciate that Paramatma keeps everything. Vishvarupa darsana is dvaita only. Only difference we add is visva rupa, vyavaharika dristyam. If you don't add vyavaharika dristi it is vishistadvaidam and if you add vyavaharika dristi it is Advaidam.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 221

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.44 [260]**

#### ***Mantravarnaccha***

Also from the words of the Mantra [it is known that the soul is a part of the Lord].

An argument in support of sutra 43 that the individual soul is a part of Brahman is given.

Here Vyasacharya says that I have reconciled beda vakyam and abeda vakyam by using amsa amsi sambandha. That is the only logical midway Dvaiddam and Advaidam. This is only logical reconciliation. Then Vyasacharya that is not only logical solution but also it is one given by the Veda itself. Amsa amsi sambandha is not my invention and Veda suggested vishistadvaidam as a reconciliation between Dvaiddam and advaidam. So vishistadvaidam is vedic proposition because it is given in the mantra itself. Advaidins say that I accept but we will add 'vyavaharika the vedic proposition' to take it as mantra varnas. Now the question is where we find amsa amsi sambandha. We find it in the well known Purusa sukta. Padosya visva bhutani 3<sup>rd</sup> mantra that reads as *pado asya visva bhutani tripad asyamrtam divia* and this mantra makes it clear that all this is only a description of His greatness, the Purusa himself is much greater than this. . And also it occurs in 3.12.6 of Chandogya upanishad that reads as *etavan asya mahima, tato jayama ca purusah pado'sya sarva bhutani tripad asyamrtam divi* the one fourth is visva bhutani all the living being or the entire cosmos occupies a part of Isvara. So purusah not only pervades the whole creation Paramatma and then ten inches Paramatma stands outside. That means Paramatma is taller than the creation. Paramatma is bigger than the creation that man's creation occupies only a part of Paramatma. In Krishna's mouth the whole cosmos was seen by yasodha. All these things show the creation is a part of Paramatma. Jivatma must be still smallest part of Paramatma. For vishistadvaidam for amsa amsi sambandha not only logical support but also the scriptural support is there. Adhi Sankaracharya says that I accept but I will add vyavaharika dristya. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Mantra varnad cha from the sruti statement also we know this. Now we will see the significance of the word. Mantra varnad padosya visva bhutani or Chandogya upanishad 3.12.6 and 2.1.1 of the Mundaka upanishad where the fire and the spark example is given. Every Jivatma is like a spark and Paramatma is like a huge conflagration. You know spark is an amsa of the total. Everybody says that spark of divinity is within you. This is nothing but amsa amsi sambandha. We know this means we know this fact that the Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.45 [261]**

***Api cha smaryate***

And it is stated in the smriti.

The argument that the individual soul is a part of Brahman is concluded here.

Not satisfied with sruti support Vyasacharya gives the smriti support also. When sruti support is there smriti support is not require because sruti more powerful. The smriti support is the most famous sloka 6 of 15<sup>th</sup> chapter of the Bhagavad Gita *mamai 'va'mso jivaloke jivabhutah sanatanah manahsasthani'ndriyani prakrtisthani karsati* the meaning of the mantra is a fragment [or fraction] of My own Self, having become a living soul, eternal, in the world of life, drawn to itself the senses of which the mind is the sixth, that rest in nature. Vishistadvaidins revel in this vakyam. Advaidins will add vyavaharika dristya to the meaning of this sloka. 15<sup>th</sup> sloka talk about Jivatma traveling from one body to another and the whole context is Jivatma from vyavaharika angel karta bokta traveler. In vyavaharika angle the relationship between jivatma and Paramatma is amsa amsi alone. There is another Gita statement 10.42 that reads as *athava bahunai'tena kim jnbatena tava'rjuna vistabhya 'ham idam krisnam ekamsena sthito jagat* the meaning of the sloka is but what need is there O Arjuna, for detailed knowledge by you? I support this entire universe pervading it with a single fraction of Myself. Whatever glories are there, they belong to Me alone says Krishna. He says the whole creation occupies a small portion of Mine. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Apicha moreover; smaryate this is stated in the smritis also. Now coming to the significance of the word apicha is moreover conjunction to the previous support. First sutra gave logical support, the second sruti and the third gives smriti support. Smaryate means it is remembered. Wherever the verb remembered is used, it refers to the smriti vakyam. This is revealed in smriti means that Jivatma is a part of Paramatma is revealed in the smriti as given above.

**Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.46 [262]**

***Prakasdivannaivam parah***

The Supreme Lord is not [affected by pleasure and pain like this [individual soul] just as light [is unaffected by the shaking of its reflections]

The specialty of the Supreme Lord is shown in this sutra.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya answers a possible serious doubt that can come to a student relating to amsa amsi philosophy or vishistadvaidam philosophy.

We say that the whole world is part of Paramatma. That means not only achetana Prapancha is part of Paramatma and in this context we say every Jivatma is a part of Paramatma and we all know that Jivatma is full of doshas or defects. Each Jivatma is a bundle of papams. Not only that he has got raga dvesa, kama krodha, loba and moha and each one is a bundle of pollution. And all these Jivatmas are part of Paramatma. Now, naturally if Paramatma includes all Jivatmas that means Paramatma should necessarily include all the impurities also and Paramatma will be an embodiment not limited impurities but cumulative impurities of all of us. It means the Paramatma deserves our sympathy for carrying on the impurities of all Jivatmas because of our association with Paramatma. He becomes a maha samsara. We are supposed to join Paramatma for the sake of moksa. Here the doubt is by joining the Paramatma is my lot improved or worsened. Logically speaking it seems to have worsened because as long as I stand separate I carried my impurities and now on joining with the samasti I carry the impurities of all the people. Then we tend to avoid moksa. Here dvidains come and he says Jivatma is separate and Paramatma is away from Jivatma and therefore Paramatma is untouched by the impurities of Jivatma. Dvidains claim our Paramatma is safe without coming near us. How does the siddhanta solve the problem we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 222

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.47 [263]**

#### ***Smaranti cha***

The smriti also state [that]

The specialty of the Supreme Lord is shown in this sutra.

In this 17<sup>th</sup> and final adhikaranam of the third pada known as amsadhikaranam the relationship and Paramatma is discussed. We should remember that the relationship discussed here is from vyavaharika dristi only. That this is from vyavaharika dristi we come to know by seeing the flow of the adhikaranams, [in the last four adhikaranam onwards Vyasacharya talks about Jivatma as karta etc.] From Paramarthika dristi Jivatma is akarta only. Jivatma is Paramarthika dristiya akarta and Jivatma from vyavaharika dristiya karta. Vyasacharya says that Jivatma is karta and therefore dristi is vyavaharikam. The latter adhikaranam also continues in the same place. Hence we should know that this relationship also sambandha amsa amsi bhava sambandha and to establish this relationship he gave sruti, smriti and logical supports. Logical support is that Jivatma is talked as different from Paramatma known as beda sruti; Jivatma is talked about identical abeda sruti; if you try to logically reconcile beda and abeda sruti only recourse we can take to amsa. Amsa alone logically fits in beda and abeds. This is the logical support in 43<sup>rd</sup> sutra. In 44<sup>th</sup> sutra he gave the sruti support. The Jivatma is or all the Jivatmas are supposed to be one pada one-quarter one part of Paramatma. Then he gave the sruti support in 44<sup>th</sup> sutra the well-known sloka [15.7] thus in the first three sutras Vyasacharya said that Jivatma Paramatma aikyam from vyavaharika dristly. In 46<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya answers a possible doubt. The doubt is a serious dobut if Jivatma is a part of Paramatma then Paramatma also will be int trouble. Whatever the problems belonging to amsa. The problems of the part belong to the whole and the condition of the whole is worse than the part and each part has to carry its problem whereas the whole carry the problem of all the parts. Chief minister may worry about problem but the Prime minister has the problem of all put together. Each Jivatma is a samsari Paramatma will become a concentrated samsara and he will be a Maha samsara. What we will gat by attaining that Paramatma and by attaining or become aikyam with Paramatma my journey will be from samsara to maha samsara. Where is the need to do sadhana to become a maha samsara. Let Paramatma remain wehre he is and let us be safely away. This problem does not arise in dvaida philosophy and in dvaida Jivatma is kept safely and Paramatma is away in vaikunta loka and Jivatma will suffer and Paramatma will not be tainted and He can help Jivatma. Advaidam will have a greater problem and vishistadvaidam also will have lesser problem. Now we will clarify. First we will do the general analysis. Of course this question can be approached and answered in different ways. The answer is based on the sutra which will come later. In the 50<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya will give an information keeping that we have to approach the answer. The sutra is abasah eva ca wherein Vyasacharya says when we

say Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma really speaking the word amsa should not be physically taken as a portion because we know that Consciousness is not available for apportioning or division just as Akasa cannot be divided for it is indivisible. Paramatma which subtler than paramaatma cannot be divided and the part should be taken as pratibimba Chaitanyam or abasa Chaitanyam achaiya makes subtle difference between abasa and pratibimba Chaitanyam. We will take abasa and pratibimba as synonymous and therefore Vedanticy says Jivatma is an amsa means Jivatma is pratibimba and Paramatma \is original Consciousness and Jivatma is pratibimba Consciousness. Even though reflected Consciousness is a part of original Consciousness, the problem belonging to reflection will not belong to the original Consciousness. This will be answer that follows in the foregoing sections. Amsa means pratibimba Chaitanyam. Now the incidental question is who can we take the reflection as part of the original Consciousness. Suppose my body get reflected in the mirror and reflection cannot be taken as part of my body and generally we don't take the pratibimba as part of the bimba. This Krishna does it in Bhagavad Gita. How can Vyasacharya do that. We say it is a figurative expression like say that he is a tiger or he is a lion etc. Because of the common features we use the expression. Similarly the amsa and pratibimba has got some samanya guna. Pratibimbam amsatvena upacaryate. It is aupacarika prayogah. The common feature is the part cannot exist separate from the whole and independent existence is not possible and when the hand is separated from body, the hand cannot exist. Pratibimba cannot exist separate from bimba and Pratibimba can be compared as part because it cannot exist separately. Second reason is that a part is neither totally identical with the whole nor does it very different from the whole. It is beda abeda. This we have discussed before. My hand is not very different from me nor does it identical with me. Pratibimba is not very different from bimbam nor does it identical with the original. Pratibimbam is binna abinnam from bimbam and amsah also binna abinna neither very different nor identical with the whole. Pratibimba is figuratively said a part of bimba. Jivatma Chidhabasa or Pratibimba is seen as Paramatma the original Consciousness. Once you know this you will the answer that the Pratibimba Chaitanyam will be affected by the reflecting medium, if the reflecting medium is small the Pratibimbam will be small, and if the reflecting medium is dull then the Pratibimba will be dull. Whatever be different features of reflecting features they will not affect the original. The sun is not affected even though the reflected sun may be disturbed in water and undisturbed in clear water, the original is not affected when the reflections are affected. Similar the Jivatmas are affected because of the reflecting media and upadhis whereas the Paramatma the original Consciousness is not affected. This is the answer and now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Parah na Paramatma is not a samsari; evam like the Jivatma are in the case of Jivatma; prakasadvat as in the case of light etc. This is the running meaning. The significance of the words is first word is prakasadvat is the example and the word prakasa should be taken as Surya or chandra prakasa which have got two version one is bimba prakasa up above in the sky; Pratibimba prakasah in a mirror or water surface etc. We should note from this example the reflection is a part of the original and original is not affected when the reflection is affected. If you have a convex or concave mirror you see two faces one is flattish and another is longish. Even though your face is terribly disturbed, you are unaffected, you are not disturbed, you are Paramatma, and the mirror image is Jivatma. Jivatmas are affected due to upadhis like Body Mind Complex but Paramatma is unaffected by the upadhis of Jivatma. Paramatma is asangah, Adhi Sankaracharya gives one more example. Even the reflection on enquiry is not distorted and distortion belongs to the mirror and reflection is 'seemingly distorted'. That is the ultimate stand and maximum you can say that the distortion is relates to the image but the 'I' the original, is not at all affected. This is the significance of prakasa

dristanta. Then there is adhi pada relates to etc. The etc., can be Akasa because these are the two examples we give in this regard. Prakasa and Akasa. In Akasa dristanta, a conditioned space seemingly polluted due to the dirty content. Pot space which is an amsa of the total space is seemingly polluted because of association with the content. Although the pot space is polluted dot the dirt in the pot, the entire space is not polluted. There is only one space, the total space should be polluted, and we do not say that. Even though the amsa of the space is seemingly polluted, the maha Akasa is not polluted. Similar in then case of Jivatma Chaitanyam even though he is a samsari Paramatma is not a samsari. Adhi Sankaracharya gives several examples. One of them is yaga Agni is supposed to be auspicious. But the Agni which is used for cremation or chita Agni is supposed to be inauspicious. Now Adhi Sankaracharya says Agni by itself is neither pure or impure or it is ever pure only and still that Agni because of the sambandha is taken as polluted [sambandha with dead body] you cannot say the total fire is polluted. That prakasadvad. The next word is na and add to this samsari – Paramatma is not a samsari even though all the Jivatmas are samsaris. Evam here means samsari. That is to be understood in this context. Speaking whether Paramatma or Isvara the total Consciousness is samsari or not cannot be arrived logically at all. We should never logically analyse this topic because of which the Paramatma the total Consciousness is samsari or not. Purva Pakshi analysed used logic and we also argued with logic which we should not have done. He took an example and we also took another example. When the part is affected or the whole is affected [body] the limb is affected the body is affected. This is their example. We took another example when the reflection is affected the whole is not affected. We used the example in a field logic should not have used because Paramatma is apouruseya vishayah. You cannot infer Paramatma is a samsari for Paramatma is not available for inference. In fact really speaking the other Jivatma is samsari or not I can never know. When I look at the so called liberated person and so called samsari I don't see any difference physically. When it is not available for pratyaksa or anumana how can I say you are liberated person or a person with bondage or samsari. You can only talk for yourself whether I am a samsari or not but I can never say whether you are samsari or not. Sometimes people ask the question whether Adhi Sankaracharya is a liberated person or Ramana Maharishi is a liberated one. Was Ramakrishna a liberated person. We can only have a common understanding but we cannot prove this way or that. When I cannot find out whether another jiva is samsari or not and how can I know whether Isvara is a samsari or not and sastra alone introduces Isvara and sastra alone can tell me whether Isvara or Paramatma is liberated nor not. Therefore, Vyasacharya gives sastra pramanam. Previous sutra is yukti pramanam, which is more a supportive pramana and that is not a main pramana which is given in this sutra. Here we mean both sruti and smriti. Sruti is Mundaka upanisad 3.1.1 reveals Paramatma the original consciousness is asamsari and Jivatma the reflected Consciousness is samsari. Then smriti pramana Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a strotra from Maha Bharatham. Tatra yaha Paramatma that Paramatma is nityah nirgunah; na lipyate palaisati padma patram ivam amsah just as lotus leaf is not affected by water so Paramatma is not affected by samsari. Krishna in Gita sloka 4.6 says *ajo 'pi sann avyayatma bhutanam Isvara 'pisan prakrtim svam adhisthaya sambhavamy atmamayaya* the meaning of this sloka is though [I am] unborn, and My Self [is] imperishable, though [I am] the Lord of all creatures, yet establishing Myself in My own nature, I come into {empiric} being through My power [maya]. In another sloka again Krishna says *'bahuni me vyatitani janmani tava ca 'rjuna tany aham Veda sarvani na tvam vettha paramtapa'* the meaning of the sloka is I have taken avataras and I remember all of them indicating that aham sarvajnah not limited by knowledge or power. Thus, sruti and smriti support proves that Isvara is asamsari. This is the general analysis. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Cha moreover; smaranti there are smriti and sruti statements in support of this. People remember is the literal meaning; but here it should be taken as authors of smriti remembers means they write. It means there are smriti statements. Now the question is that the sutra refers to smriti statement and how do you take sruti statements although it is not said in the sutra. The word cha indicates the sruti statements also.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.48 [264]**

#### ***Anujnapariharau dehasambandhajjyotiradivat***

Injunctions or prohibitions [are possible] on account of the connection [of the Self with the body, as in the case of light, etc.

The necessity for observance of mandatory and prohibitory rules is explained.

Here Vyasacharya explains all the transactional phenomena as to how they take place among the Jivatmas. Vyavaharika phenomena is explained. Even though Paramatma is one, reflections are many due to many reflection media. The plurality of reflections are due to reflecting media. If someone asks Atma is one or many, we should ask are you asking about bimba Chaitanyam or Pratibimba Chaitanyam. If you talk about original Consciousness, it is one but from vyavaharika dristya it is many. Plurality of Atma has to be explained. You will understand the seriousness of issue when you make a comparative study of all the systems of philosophy. Experientially we see the plurality of jivas and therefore one fundamental question asked is Atma is one or many. We say very serious problem when you study different systems. If you are confined to Advaidic Vedanta only one is in view. When you study vaisesika or nyaya. They say Consciousness are many and for them there is vyavaharika or Paramarthika dristi and therefore therefore Consciousnesses are many. They talk about many Atma and therefore Vyasacharya has to present our view. The Paramatma the original Consciousness is one and reflected Consciousness are many. Not only they are plural and they are different in attributes even though the original Paramatma is attribute-less and once the Consciousness is reflected through medium, the attributes of the medium get transferred to the medium and nirguna Pratibimba Chaitanyam becomes saguna Pratibimba Chaitanyam. And when the mirror is disturbed moving the reflection moves. When the mirror is steady, the reflection is steady. When the mirror is dull, the reflection is dull; when the mirror is bright the reflection is bright. Therefore, we find all the jivarasis are different layers of intelligence. If you take sthavara their intelligence or Consciousness is very dull Consciousness and they can be aware only gross; if you take a buffalo for a carnatic music programme it cannot appreciate or understand even though the Consciousness is the same. As the medium becomes subtler and subtler the Consciousness seems to get more and more evolved Consciousness and that is how the people say the jnani is in higher state of Consciousness. Original Consciousness does not have taste at all but when the mind of a jnani is evolved the Consciousness is in higher state. Yoga vashista they talk about 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> etc., states. The states belong to the medium and not to the Consciousness but it is transferred to and referred. The features and the properties are different; not only that there is also status difference like the higher lower strata or classification also comes. People ask how can you classify the human being; how can you talk of higher and lower castes; how can you

allot various karmas to each caste; after one Atma alone is there in all the jivas how do you classify and how can Veda permit certain Jivatmas to certain karmas and how can Veda prohibit certain Jivatmas from certain karmas. Vyasacharya says there are differences in Jivatmas even though the Jivatmas are from one Paramatma alone. From vyavaharika dristya you have to accept various classification and vidhi nisheda should be followed. Jivatma is different, they are different because of the reflecting medium, and the reflecting medium is Sthoola Sooksma Sariram. The essence of the sutra sarira bedah Pratibimba bedah vidhi nishedha bedah vartate vartate vartate. Do not talk Advaidam in Karma Kanda. Once you come to ritual whatever Veda says, follow and don't try to reform or innovate in the enthusiasm. You cannot say in Vyavahara. Adhi Sankaracharya while writing commentary he says in Karma Kanda even among Brahmanas various Brahmanas are there like chaturvedi, ekavedi etc. Adhi Sankaracharya says Advaidam and therefore all of them in the same manner you should not and if you treat them equally it is a papam. One who should not be given higher honour if you give; one who is to be honoured if he is not, in that family three adversities will take place as poverty, maranam, and bhayam will be there. Never talk Advaida when you come to karma or puja etc. Veda says you have no adhikara. Accept that when you talk of vyavaharikas. Even a sannyasi does not have a right to do any of the karmas belonging to brahmachari, grahashta or vana prasthas. Sannyasi cannot do ritual. More details in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 223

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.48 [264]**

#### ***Anujnapariharau dehasambandhajjyotiradivat***

Injunctions or prohibitions [are possible] on account of the connection [of the Self with the body, as in the case of light, etc.

The necessity for observance of mandatory and prohibitory rules is explained.

In the initial three sutras 43 45 Vyasacharya defined Jivatma as the amsa of Paramatma, amsa being a part for which the reason was given. Only when Jivatma is taken as Paramatma then alone beda and abeda vakyams also can be properly. In vishistadvaidam amsa vakyam is called gatah sruti or the reconciling statement. Amsatvam of Jivatma reconciles both Jivatma from Paramatma and also the non-difference of Jivatma from or with Paramatma. But Vyasacharya did not make it very clear what is meant by the word amsa. Is it apportioned part of Consciousness is amsa or divided Consciousness and then it will raise the question that the Consciousness cannot be divided when space itself is indivisible. Therefore there seems to be a vagueness with regard to the word amsa and therefore Vyasacharya clears it later by indicating that the amsa is not a physical part because physically Consciousness cannot be divided. You can say amsa of part because body is divisible; flats are the amsa of the land. Anything niravayvam cannot have amsa and therefore it cannot be a physical part. Vyasacharya makes it clear that it is abasah which means a share, reflection or Pratibimbam. From sutra 46 onwards Vyasacharya redefines amsa as Chidhabasa or chit Pratibimba. This chit Pratibimba has to be accepted because only when the reflection of Consciousness is accepted we will be able to explain the plurality of Jivatma. With one Paramatma we can never explain the plurality of Jivatma but we experience the plurality of Jivatma. In this hall there are so many Jivatmas and each Jivatma his own personality and not only there are worldly differences among Jivatmas, religious differences in terms punya papa karmani, different Jivatmas assemble here but after death Jivatmas travel in different directions. The plurality of Jivatma is an irrefutable fact. If we are to talk about Paramatma we will not be able to explain the plurality of Jivatma and therefore we have to bring in the reflected Consciousness as vyavaharika sathyam which is as real as the body and which is as real as the world. Enjoying a parallel reality as parallel as vyavaharika jagat or as vyavaharika sariram we require vyavaharika Chaitanyam and that vyavaharika Chaitanyam is called Pratibimba Chaitanyam or Chidhabasa Chaitanyam which is different from Paramarthika Chaitanyam which belongs to different order of relativity and that Paramarthika Chaitanyam is not involved in any vyavahara. This vyavaharika Chaitanyam Pratibimba Chaitanyam Chidhabasa Chaitanyam is here called Jivatma which being vyavaharika can interact with the world. It can become pramata, can become karta, can become bokta. Not only that this Chidhabasa Chaitanyam being a reflection, it is invariably inseparably associated with reflecting medium and th`yatra yatra Chidhabasah tatra tatra upadhih or sarira triyam vartate. You can visualize

Paramarthika Chaitanyam without sariran but vyavaharika Chaitanyam without the sariram is unimaginable. Therefore Chidhabasa ia vyavaharika is vyavaharika sathyam {RC] and Body Mind Complex is vyavaharika sathyam {RM] and these vyavaharika entity can have a sambandha. Sambandha or relationship between two things enjoying the same order of reality. OC and RC cannot have sambandha one is vyavaharika and the other is Paramarthikam. RC and RM are inseparably connected. Any reflection and reflecting media can have connection. The word amsah means you should note that Chidhabasa or reflected Consciousness. This new meaning should trench in your mind. This Chidhabasa in particular or any reflection in particular is always unique. Even the reflection of my face on a mirror is unique. The uniqueness is that it is born out of two causes. They are my mukha Pratibimba requires a mirror and mirror alone is not enough and original face is also required. One is father and the other is mother. Which is father and which is mother you can choose? You cannot imagine a reflection with mirror alone or you cannot imagine a reflection with face alone and both are required. When two give birth to a child, the child inherit the characteristics of both the parents. The truth both parents continue to the features of the child. If that is true, the reflections also will have the features of both the parents some belongs to original mukham but remember the features are not merely confine to face alone some of the features of the reflecting medium are also found in the face. First is the location and if the mirror is dull, the face is dull; if the mirror is convex the face is also convex and the distortions in the face are the contribution of the mirror. The quality of the location of mirror determines the characteristics of the reflection. The plurality of the reflections is there even though the original bimbam is one reflection are many. In the same way, the Paramatma is one and the Jivatma borrows some of the features of Paramatma on the reflected Chidhabasa or reflected bimba Jivatma; now extend this principle to our Jivatma. Here the reflecting medium if the Body Mind Complex. This reflecting medium is plural and in fact the plural is not the word but he number of Jivatma is infinite. It is vyavaharikally infinite. If the Jivatmas are finite in number, the problem will be whichever Jivatma is liberated will not come back again. Each group and group of Jivatmas will get liberated and Jivatma number will come down and Isvara cannot create fresh Jivatma because replenishment of Jivatma is not possible. Fresh jivatma cannot be added to the sristi because karmas will not be there to create fresh Jivatmas. If Jivatma are finite in number there will be a day when the last Jivatma is liberated that means Bhagavan will become unemployed. Any number of Jivatma will get liberated sristi will continue because Jivatmas are infinite in number. Jivatma's features belong to Paramatma and some to the reflecting medium of Body Mind Complex. Which aspect is borrowed from Paramatma is chetanatvam or sentiency or Consciousness of Chidhabasa is borrowed from the chit? For this we say that when you have the reflected sun, the brightness of the reflected sun is borrowed from the original sun. It is not borrowed from the mirror, which is luminous. The luminosity of the reflected sun is borrowed from the original sun because the mirror can not give the luminosity of sun because it does not have that features. Similarly Body Mind Complex cannot lend chetanatvam to Chidhabasa and it has to be taken from chit only whereas all the other features other than the luminosity are lent by the Body Mind Complex which being kartrutvam, anekatvam, paricchinnatvam, boktritvam, duality, doership, knowership, enjoyership, localization and travel etc., which belongs to Chidhabasa and given to the body. Each Jivatma has its own features and the entire Karma Kanda belongs to Chidhabasa and don't bring this when you discuss jnana kanda. Since this Chidhabasa rupa Jivatma has different features its qualifications are also different, adhikaritam also is different and therefore vidhi nisheda of Karma Kanda also will have to vary. You should not ask I am Brahman and we are all Brahman and why cannot all we do all kind of karmas. If we are all Brahman where is need for doing karmas. But the moment you talk about doing karmas we have become Chidhabasa and from Chidhabasa

handle comes brahmachari, grahastha, vanaprastham, sannyasi, sthree, Purusa, all bedas we have to accept and therefore anijna pariharou permissions and prohibitions are relevant from the point of Chidhabasa rupa Jivatma. Vedanta says 'tat tvam asi' that you are that Paramatma and at that time you should not think of Chidhabasa because Chidhabasa is never identical with Paramatma. How can the reflection be identical with the original, how can vyavaharikam be identical with Paramarthikam, and how can the mithya be identical with sathyam. When sastra says that you are Paramatma and you should note that behind Chidhabasa at the adhistanam there is original Consciousness. In the mirror example the original face and reflected face has got a distance. Jivatha mukham the reflection and original are physically away in the example but in the case of Consciousness remember that chit and Chidhabasa are not physically away, where there is Chidhabasa there is chit also. Where there is, vyavaharika Chidhabasa there is chit inherently. Vidyananya gives an example. Imagine there is a wall where [chapter of pancadasi] the general sunlight falls because of which the wall is bright. Imagine also you take a mirror and direct the reflection of the sun of the mirror towards the wall which is already bright with direct sunlight in one particular area. How 'many sunlights' are there. Vidyananya says that there are two sunlights and he says one is samanya Surya prakasa and the other is vishesha Surya prakasa. Eyes cannot see the two lights distinctly. When you remove the mirror, the reflected patch of light is brighter one and when that brighter patch goes away the samanya Surya prakasa is available there. Similarly in the jagrat and swapna the samanya chaitanya is there, vishesha Chaitanyam and when you go to sleep the vishesha Chaitanyam disappears and localized patch of Consciousness disappear, and what remains in sushupti is samanya Chaitanyam non-individualised Consciousness. When I use the word I, in that I Chidhabasa is there and also chit is also there; vyavaharikale Chidhabasa is pradhanam and therefore during therefore during vyavaharika kala Jivatma is defined Chidhabasa pradhana jivah and that dominates. If chit can listen to the class, the advantage is that you need not come to the class and even if you come you can happily sleep. Chit will teach and chit will listen. In vyavahara Chidhabasa is defined as jiva and jiva is seen to be the Chidhabasa pradhanah. At the same time Jivatma is chit also because Chidhabasa includes the chit also. Wherever there is Chidhabasa, chit is there. Jiva should not be called Chidhabasa and jiva should be called Chidhabasa pradhana jiva. In short form we call it Chidhabasa. In sastra, when I say 'tat tvam asi' then if you ask how can I be all pervading Paramatma. At the time of Vedanta sravanam Chidhabasa must be withheld and pradhanam should be chit because underneath the Chidhabasa the chit amsa otherwise called saksi amsa is there. Saksi pradhana jiva should listen to Vedanta. Chidhabasa should be preferably left outside alongwith the 'chappal' when you come to the class. If Chidhabasa should not be dominant one should have sadhana chatustaya sambatti. The qualifications are important so that you can forget Chidhabasa or ahankara or ego or your fatherhood, motherhood etc. Therefore the ego or ahankara or even the relative roles of relationships are obstacles to Aham Brahma asmi. Aham Brahma asmi is impossible if you are Chidhabasa pradhana. Vyavahara is impossible if I am not Chidhabasa pradhana. Therefore do not mix Karma Kanda and jnana kanda and Vyasacharya reconciles both. Chidhabasa pradhana Jivatma dristya maha vakyam chit pradhana Jivatma dristya. Therefore do not mess up and get confused and this is Vyasacharya's advice and this is the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Anujnapariharau permission and prohibition; deha sambadhad – due to the association of the Jivatma that is Chidhabasa with the body; jyotiradivat means as in the case of the fire etc. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Anujnapariharau a compound word consisting of two words. Anujna means permission or probation that raja suya yaga can be performed by only ksatriya etc. Agni hotra can be done only by a

grahastha; this is called anujna; pariharah means prohibition; simply anujna means vidhih and pariharah means nishedaha; this will be confusing when I say Atma is one. If Atma is one why should we differentiate at all. Vyasacharya says that Atma is one but Atma Pratibimbas are many and different. Actions are done by the Pratibimba and not bimba. Vidhi and nisheda given by the Veda. Dehasambadhat means body Sthoola Sooksma Sariram; sambandha means relationship. It is the relationship with the Chidhabasa and not chit. Therefore varna beda is different; asrama beda is different; sthree Purusa beda is different all this you have to accept and do not argue with Karma Kanda after partial study of Vedanta. Separate Karma Kanda from jnana kanda. Because of the body relationship you have to accept differences. Jyotiradivat means as in the case of fire etc. Here jyoti means fire; I had talked about this in sutra number 46 as to how fire remaining the same one type of fire is considered holy. The other type is considered to be unholy that is chita Agni or preta Agni or funeral pyre and it is because of sambandha. Similarly Consciousness does not have any beda but once it gets reflected there is differences of Brahmana. Ksatriya etc which one has to accept etc., here it refers to the space. Space is neither holy or unholy when it is associated with the location a garpagriha or a space in which a death has happened. The very entry into the house, you have to take bath. You cannot say space is pure. Adhipadad akasah originally pure but because of association it turns impure etc.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.49 [265]**

#### ***Assantateschavyatikarah***

And on account of the non-extension [of the soul beyond its own body] there is no confusion [of results of actions]

The discussion on the special characteristic of the individual soul is continued.

First, we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya answers one of the main objections raised by all other systems of philosophy and that objection is that Atma is one and the Consciousness is one and that Atma is in all the sarirams. You say that there is one Consciousness that pervades all the bodies and the charge they attribute is that if sorrow or pleasure in one individual then simultaneously the joy or sorrow must be experienced by all of them because there is one Consciousness and one Atma. When one Atma cries, all should cry. Upto certain age the dehabimana is not there amongst the children and the ego is not crystalised and they are not clear about their body and other child's body and hence one child starts crying other also cry. All the other systems of philosophy say that Advaidam is impractical and improper system. In Samkya and yoga etc., atmas are many and each Atma suffers and enjoys its comedy and tragedy. In Advaidam you cannot explain the different experiences of different people with one Atma and one Consciousness. When one Jivatma enjoys or suffers others should also enjoy or suffer. When one Atma is liberated, all should be liberated. All the problems will come if there is Advaidam. This is the charge given by dvaidins and vishistadvaidins. We repeatedly answer but the answer they do not listen to. The question is deliberately raised and answer is not deliberately listened to. We say that original Consciousness is Advaidam whereas the reflected Consciousness is not Advaidam. It is dvaidam. Chidhabasa anekah. It is vyavaharika satham. Advaidam is Paramarthikam. Sukha

dukha is vyavaharikam. Sukha and dukha do not belong to Advaita Chaitanyam and they belong to dvaita Chaitanyam. Dvaita Chaitanyam is Chidhabasa Chaitanyam. Pratibimba Chaitanyam and therefore how many Chidhabasa pradhana Jivatmas are there and they are infinite. Not only it is dvaitam and each is one is paricchinnam also. Each Chidhabasa Chaitanyam is limited. My Chidhabasa pervades only my body. Your Chidhabasa pervades only your body because the rule is that the reflection as extensive as the reflecting medium. Whatever be the size of the mind that will be the extension of Chidhabasa and my mind pervades only my body. If my mind pervades your body, I will feel your pain and pleasures. I do not know what is happening to your body not because of chit but because of Chidhabasa and therefore Chidhabasas are many and each Chidhabasa is a karta and kartas are many. bogtas are many and which Chidhabasa is karta that Chidhabasa alone becomes bokta. Chidhabasa means Chidhabasa pradhana jivah. When Chidhabasa is there chit also is there. We focus on Chidhabasa and each Chidhabasa is finite and each Chidhabasa does its own karma and each Chidhabasa enjoys its own karma phala and each Chidhabasa has to do its own karma yoga its own Upasana and its own sravanam. Whichever Chidhabasa does Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam that alone get mukti. Therefore, the essence of this sutra is each Chidhabasa is non-extensive and therefore it does not experience the other body's pleasure and pain. Each Chidhabasa is confined to its own body and therefore it cannot experience the pleasure and pain of other bodies. Then how do you say aham Brahma asmi. Chidhabasa goes to the background and chit comes to the forefront. When I say I am fat you refer to the body part. Mind is not fat. It is sarira pradhana jiva says that I am fat. I am happy and happiness is not the property of the body but of the mind. It refers to the mind part of me. Similarly chit dristya aham Brahma asmi and Chidhabasa dristya aham dasoham asmi. This I do without any conflict. This you should know clearly and until then one should do Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam. Now we will do the word for word analysis, which we will do in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 224

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.49 [265]**

#### *Assantateschavyatikarah*

And because of the non-extension [of the soul beyond its own body] there is no confusion [of results of actions]

The discussion on the special characteristic of the individual soul is continued.

We have done the general analysis of the 49<sup>th</sup> sutra in which Vyasacharya points out that even though Chaitanyam is only one, the chaitanya Pratibimbams obtaining in the mind is many. It is because the minds are many in each mind Pratibimba Chaitanyam is possible; otherwise it is called Chidhabasa; these Chidhabasas are many in number. These Chidhabasas alone are called Paramatma amsah. When we say Jivatma is amsa of Paramatma the meaning of the word amsa is abasah eva and abasah means Pratibimba or reflection. Even though Chaitanyam is all pervading the chaitanya Pratibimbam is not all pervading because each Pratibimba is confined to the reflecting medium the mind. The mind is not all pervading and as many bodies are there, so many minds are there as many minds are there so many Pratibimba Chaitanyams are there. This mixture of Body Mind Complex plus the Pratibimba Chaitanyam alone we call prmata, ahankara, karta, bokta etc. Each ahankara has different types of punya papam and in keeping with that different types of phalam also. Therefore there is no question of confusion regarding karma and phalam. This is the essence of this sutra. As an aside topic I pointed out when we discussed this idea a dbout may come if Jivatma is Pratibimba Chaitanyam with the reflecttng medium the mind and if it is called ahankara how do you explain aham Brahma asmi iti maha vakyam. You will say that I am ahankara and what right the Chidhabasa has to claim aham Brahma asmi. This will be the question and it is not dealt with in this sutra. It is dealt with in other literature. Even though Chidhabasa cannot be ever identical with chit we should remember all pervading chit is there inherently present in the Chidhabasa also as the adhistanam. This adhistana chit alone is called sakti. While Chidhabasa is called ahankara [the mind reflecting medium] is inherently pervaded by the all pervading chit which is called saksi Chaitanyam or kutastha Chaitanyam or adhistanam Chaitanyam unlike the example of the sun and the reflection. In the sun example there is physical distance between sun and the reflecting sunlight. In this case you cannot extend the example to reflected Chaitanyam and Chidhabasa Chaitanyam. There is no distance between the reflection and the original. Where there is ahankara there itself there is saksi. Therefore Vedanta says initially you learn to say I am the ahankara backed by saksi. Because you are more comfortable to identify with ahankara. Then gradually you should learn to say it is not the I the ahankara backed by saksi but I am the saksi functioning through ahankara. Ahankara pradhana I will have to change the emphasis to saksi pradhana aham. Then I should learn to claim I am the all pervading Brahma and it is through the mithya ahankara I am temporarily doing mithya action and experience mithya result. First one is

ahankara pradhana aham and second one is saksi pradhana aham. As long as you are in ahankara pradhana aham you can never say that I am Brahman and you have to say I am blessed by Brahman. This will suit vishistadvaidam principle. Existence is given by saksi and Chaitanyam is given by saksi. If you lean to switch from vachyārtha to lachyārtha from vyavaharika chit to Paramarthika chit. This shift has to be done by the student and the teacher is helpless. The student should know that is saksi pradhana aham and then tat tvam asi will fall on to him. Ahankara pradhana tat tvam asi will not be there. Then you have to say I am ahankara backed by saksi. I am blessed by saksi is correct or I am the saksi is correct. It depends upon what you mean by the word I. I have got ahankara as also the saksi amsa. Nor ahankara can say I nor the saksi can say I and it is a mixture of ahankara and saksi is I. Ahankara cannot say I because your ahankara cannot exist itself without saksi. The very existence of ahankara leads from saksi. There is no question pure ahankara saying I or can the saksi say I. Saksi cannot say I because it cannot have any body or mind. Neither pure saksi says I nor the pure ahankara says I. It is the mixture which says I vyavaharika Paramarthika mixture makes the Jivatma. Since it is a mixture of vyavaharikam and Paramarthikam it is for you to claim which amsa you want. If you claim the vyavaharika amsa I am karta bokta and if you claim Paramarthika amsa aham Brahma asmi. Here Vyasacharya explains the kartrutvam from the standpoint of vyavaharika amsa, which is called amsa. This is the general analysis. Now we will see word for word analysis.

This sutra has three words. Asantateh means due to the non-extension [of the Jivatma the Chidhabasa] avyatikarah cha there is no mixing up of karma and phalam. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. Asantateh means non-pervasion of Chidhabasa. Each Chidhabasa is confined to only one body and my sukha and dukha will belong to me and your sukha and dukha will be confined to you only the Chidhabasa and there is no question of mixing up. Mixing up problem will come only when the sukha and dukha is going to be attached to chit and chit being all pervading sukha and dukha obtaining in one body will go to the chit which is all pervading and therefore everyone will simultaneously experience sukha and dukha. Since sukha and dukha never to chit and only be confined to Chidhabasa vyavaharika will go to vyavaharika only and therefore there is no problem. Cha is a conjunction which joins the previous sutra. Avyatikarah non-mixing up of karma phalam and there will be no confusion.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.50 [266]**

#### ***Abhasa eva cha***

And [the individual soul is] only a reflection [of Paramatma or the Supreme Lord]

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya gives the meaning of the word abhasah. In the beginning, Vyasacharya said that Jivatma is abhasa of Paramatma leading to lot of doubts and confusion. How can the part-less Paramatma have parts? Vyasacharya must have felt the need for clarification and he says part does not really mean part and part means only an abhasah, which means an image. An image is called abhasah because it appears like the original. Therefore, only abhasah means an appearance also. Every reflection is an abhasa because it shines like the original. Your own shadow is an abhasa of you. That is why



the word *chaya* is used in *Prasnopanisad*. *Chaya Pratibimba abasah* all mean the same. Here *Vyasacharya* says *Jivatma* is *Pratibimba* of *Paramatma*. Therefore, whatever happens to *Pratibimbam* will not touch the original or the *bimbam*. Original is ever free. If you identify with original you are *nithya mukta*. If you identify with reflection, you are *bandhah*. Reflection comes in waking and dream and the reflection resolves in the *sushupti* or deep sleep. This is the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

There are three words. *Cha* means that in fact *abasah eva Jivatma* is a reflection of *Paramatma*, the *chit*. Now we will see the significance of the words. *Abasa* means *Pratibimba* and this alone has created confusion in some people. When we say *Jivatma* is *Pratibimba* and how can the fake one be identical with the original one. How can the fake claim that I am the original. When we say that I am the reflection, it is that I am the reflection *pradhana* from *vyavaharika dristi*. If we take that I the reflection only, then *mahavakyam* will not be correct. If you say that I am the reflection and therefore reflection cannot be original. This may the doubt in some people. When I say I am *Chidhabasa* only then you should note that I am *Chidhabasa pradhana* from *vyavaharika dristi* and behind the *Chidhabasa* the very content of *Chidhabasa chit* is also included in the *Chidhabasa I* and I am that *chit* from *Paramarthika dristi*. I am *Chidhabasa* from *vyavaharika dristi* and I am *chit* from *Paramarthika dristi*. Therefore, I can claim as *chit* or *Paramarthika*.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.51 [267]**

#### ***Adrsihtaniyamat***

There being no fixity about the unseen principle [there would result confusion of works and their effects for those who believe in many souls, each all pervading.

The discussion begun in sutra 50 is continued.

With the previous sutra, *Vyasacharya* has said everything about *Jivatma* which he wanted to say. *Jivatma* is a *karta* from *vyavaharika dristi*; *Jivatma* is subject to birth and death from *vyavaharika dristi* and *jivatma* is *Brahman* from *Paramarthika dristi*. The following three sutras are the negation of *Samkya nyaya* philosophy with regard to their concept of *Jivatma*. What is *Jivatma* according to *Vedanta* has been revealed. *Jivatma* is talked about by *nyaya*, *Samkya* philosophy is discussed, and *Vyasacharya* wants to say their concept is wrong. It is *para madhana kandanam*. *Vedanta* is established and now it is *para madha kandanam* with offensive argument. If I have to refute *Samkya* and *nyaya* first I have to learn what is their concept of *Jivatma*. Generally we do not know what is *Samkya* and *nyaya* and why should I negate what I do not know. Since the sutras occur, I have twofold task now. I will tell you what they think and I will put their false ideas and then negate all of them.

Here *Vyasacharya* criticizes more of the *nyaya darsanam* and by extension, he criticizes *Samkya*. It is *nyaya kandana pradhanam*. First, I will summarise the *nyaya* approach. This is the general introduction to all the three sutras. The *nyaya* and *vaisesika* philosophers say that *Atma* is a *jada dravyam*; it is an inert substance. This is concept one regarding *Jivatma*. Next is that this *jada dravya Atma* is plural. It means there are many *jada Atmas*. *Jivatmas* are

as many as there are atmas. Advaidin talks about one Atma and all the people are sharing. Why not give one Atma to each jiva. Point three is that his Jivatma is vibhuh all pervading. Each Jivatma is all pervading. My Jivatma pervades all of you and your Jivatma pervades me. And fourth point is Jivatma is sagunah and it is capable of having attributes. All these are nyaya vaiseshika's view. Jadah, anekah, vibhuh and sugunah this is the bio data of Jivatma. What happens to Jivatma during life's transaction? When the transactions begin what happens is that Atma joins the mind or combines with the mind and according to tarka sastra mind is of the size of the atom. There are many minds you have one atomic mind, I have got one atomic mind and everyone has got one mind each of atomic size. The mind combines with the sense organs in general. Sense organs contact the world and there is a serial contact Atma with mind; mind with organs and organs with the world. When the serial contact or interaction takes place certain experiences are generated like sukha and dukha; misram and all the experiences like pleasure and pain are attributes or the properties. This is called vyavahara. When in sleep not contact takes place and hence there is sukha and dukha and pleasure and pain. This vyavahara alone produces sukha and dukha./ this pleasure and pain are attributes or properties and they are not substances. Atma is substance, mind is substance, world is a substance, sense organs are substance and by the serial contacts produced are sukha and dukha and they are the properties and they are not the substance. In tarka sastra they say that the properties exist not independently and they have reside in some substance. Gunah dravya asritah. In fact, the very definition guna is that it is dependent on dravyam. The Self-Knowledge or pleasure and pain are dependent and have to reside on some substance Atma, indriya or mind etc. This is very different from Vedanta. They say Atma becomes sukhi and dukhi. Atma has nine properties they say. Raga dvesa is another property of Atma. When objects generate sukham I develop raga and when it develops dukha I develop dvesha. All the actions developed by organs is called prayathnah. Punya papas are generated by Atma. This is their argument. This much information is required for us to understand for refutation of their argument. Vyasacharya asks that you say that Sukha and dukha is generated by the mind, sense organs etc. All of them are finite and located. When Sukha and dukha wants to reside in Atma, it has got to be with the mind. Vyasacharya asks behind the mind how many atmas are there. Every Atma being all pervading Vedantic asks sukha and dukha will go to which Atma. Therefore there will be vyatikara doshah mixing up and confusion problem and it will not be in Vedanta but you will have the problem in explaining the sukha and dukha anubhavba because sukha and dukha can never decide which Atma it relates to. There will be confusion and there will no vyavastha. For that tarka philosopher tries to give some solution. He says sukha and dukha will go to the specific Atma. How this can be decided. Here he says that there is a method to decide. He says sukha and dukha is caused by punya papam. Punyam is responsible for sukha and papam for dukhadam. In whichever Atma punya gunam is there the sukham will rush to it. Where there is problem is there papam will rush to that Atma. Therefore sukha and dukham will go to a particular Atma which is determined by the cirerien of punya papa or otherwise called adristam. This Vyasacharya calls it as adhrista niyamah. Therefore, the problems seem to be solved. Vyasacharya asks how is the punyam generated and and punyam has to sit on a particular Atma to which sukham will go. He asks how is punyam is generated and is generated by the serial contact. Punyam also comes under the guna or adhristam. Adhrista beinga property and it cannot exist without a support and therefore Vyasacharya asks the question and the punyam should reside on a substance and tell me what substance. Then he says punya is an exclusive property that can reside on Atma only and then Vyasacharya asks the question that the generated punyam should go to a particular Atma and to which Atma it will go? All the Atma being all pervading again the question comes to which Atma punyam will go. To whichever Atma iccha is there to which the punya papa will go. To that Atma sukham and

duksham also will go. Desires decides punyam and punyam decides the sukha and dukha. Vyasacharya asks how the desires will be generated. Therefore, when then serial contact takes place there is an iccha, again iccha is a property, therefore property has to rest on a dravyam, and he says it does not rest on dravya. It has to rest on Atma and Vyasacharya asks the question when the iccha is generated there are so many atmas are there and to which Atma iccha will go. You can never establish which Atma will have which guna at all and all atmas are being all the atmas, all the minds, and all the produced attributes. Therefore there will be utter confusion whereas in Vedanta there is Chidhabasa and my Chidhabasa is behind my body alone. My Chidhabasa explains everything properly and your Jivatmam does not explain anything. One more argument he gives to solve the problem. He says my Atma is behind mind and sense organs. But my Atma is enclosed within my body also. There is an enclosed portion of my Atma obtaining within my body. He says my enclosed portion of Atma experiences only the pleasure and pains generated by my body. And your Atma the enclosed portion of your Atma even though your Atma is all pervading, will experience the sukha and dukha generated by the enclosed body. Each enclosed Atma experiences the sukha and dukha generated by the respective enclosures. Vyasacharya says how is it possible. My Atma is there within my body and at the same time within my body the enclosed portion of your Atma is also there because your Atma is within my body also. Therefore that also does not solve the problem. Hence you listen to me says Vyasacharya. This is the purva madha kandanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 225

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

**Sutra 2.3.51 [267]**

#### ***Adrsihtaniyamat***

There being no fixity about the unseen principle [there would result confusion of works and their effects for those who believe in many souls, each all pervading.

The discussion begun in sutra 50 is continued.

In this adhikaranam from sutra 43 to sutra 50 Vyasacharya established the nature of Jivatma and also karma phala bogha vyavastha how jiva becomes karta and bogta, the scheme of action and results were establish. From Paramarthika dristi there is only one Atma. Even though Atma is one at vyavaharika level or empirical level one Atma has got several reflections called Chidhabasas. This Chidhabasas are many in number and the Chidhabasas are only finite and Chidhabasas pervade only the body and they are all non-extensive pluralistic one. It is this Chidhabasa which becomes a karta and it is Chidhabasa which becomes a bokta also. Since each Chidhabasa has a distinct individuality all the karma phalam will go to only the respective Chidhabasa. There will not be the problem of vyakarah is not there at all. The individuality of Chidhabasa will be determined by its manifesting medium consisting of Sthoola Sookhma Sariram dvayam. This is otherwise called upadhi. Thus the determined by the sarira dvayam Chidhabasa will have its individuality plus kartrutvam and bokrutvam and pramatritvam and all the karma phala bogha vyavasta is well settled. While a person is in Karma Kanda we will emphasise the Chidhabasa aspect of jiva whereas when one comes to jnana kanda the emphasisis is shifted from Chidhabasa aspect to chit aspect which is very much inherent in the Chidhabasa in the jiva. Chidhabasa pradhana jiva is karta chit pradhana jiva is akarta. Kurvan is Chidhabasa pradhana jiva dristya na karoti is chit pradhana jiva dristya. Vachyatha dristya karta lachyatha dristya akarta. This is the Vedantic approach and by which jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is vindicated and Jivatma kartrutvam plurality travel etc., are vindicated in Karma Kanda. Karma Kanda jiva is also explained properly jnana kanda jiva is also explained properly. This Vyasacharya established and the Chidhabasa was named amsah. That is the only point to be noted and that Chidhabasa is amasa and amsa is Chidhabasa we come to know by tallying sutra 43 and sutra 50. Sutra 43 has the word amsa and sutra 50 has got the word abhasah. With that sutra our siddhanta has been established and in the next three sutra Vyasacharya refutes the Samkya nyaya theory of Jivatma. By corollary he dismisses Samkya also. The primary problem with the nyaya philosopher is he accepts many all pervading Atma. Therefore he has problems that Atma enters into contact with mind and mind to indriya and through the seriel contact sukha and dukha arise. Vyasacharya question is this sukha and dukha will go to Atma according to you [nyaya philosopher] and to which Atma it will go and under the mind all the atmas are there. To solve the problem he answered whichever Atma has punya papam that Atma will sukha and dukha and for that Vyasacharya asks how punya papam comes and for that also he has to

come to the serial. Again Vyasacharya's question is that this punya papam has to rest on Atma. To which Atma it will go is the question from Vyasacharya. Whichever Atma has got the desire for punya, the sukha and dukha will go is their reply. Vyasacharya raises the same question as to how do the desires arise. If the desires rise independently then the serial can be brought in. To which Atma the desire will go to. Therefore, sukha and dukha can never belong to any particular Atma and punya papa cannot belong to any particular Atma raga dvesha cannot belong to any particular Atma. Finally, he tried to give a particular solution that my Atma is enclosed portion within my body, your Atma has an enclosed portion within your body, and the enclosed portion of Atma will receive the sukha and dukha generated by the enclosure body. For this Vyasacharya gives the answer that when you say enclosed portion of my Atma is itself a problem and within my body there is not an enclosed portion of my Atma and all my Atma is your Atma as well. In every body Atma is there and you cannot say a particular Atma belongs to particular Atma. Atma occupies body and every Atma is all pervading. Every body has got Atma enclosed in it. This is the essence of these three sutras. In this portion, we have not questioned the theory itself, we have assumed the theory as correct theory, and then we point out even if the theory is correct the punya and papam generated will have problem to choose the Atma. The Vedantic people question elsewhere as to how can the Atma combine with the mind. Then comes the final question as how can there be many all pervading atmas. These questions we do not raise here. Having introduced these three sutras I will come to the sutra 51 where Vyasacharya refutes the theory that Atma will get sukha and dukham based on its punya and papam. Atma will get sukha and Vyasacharya refutes dukha depending upon its punya papam here. The punya papam itself you cannot explain as to which punya papam belongs to Atma you cannot determine. This is the answer here. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

There is only one word here. Adrishtaniyat because of the invalidity of the criterion of adhrishta [there is mixing up of karma and phalam] in nyaya sastra. Now we will see the significance of the word. It is a compound word adhrishta and niyama. Adhrishta means punya and papam and niyama means the criterion for determining which sukha and dukha will go to which Atma. Aniyama means the invalidity of that criterion is stated here. The punya papam itself belongs to which Atma you cannot arrive at and therefore how can the indefinite criterion decide a definite event. Aniyama means niyama abhavat.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.52 [268]**

#### ***Abhisandhyadishu api chaivam***

And this is also the case in resolutions., etc.

The discussion begun in sutra 50 is continued.

First, we will do the general analysis of this sutra. The idea I have already given in the previous sutra. Punya papam going to particular Atma is determined by another criterion is the argument forwarded by the Purva Paksi. It is desire of the Atma is the criterion raga dvesha is the criterion. Thus, he has introduced a new criterion, which is the criterion for the old criterion. Vyasacharya says that here also there is some problem. Raga dvesha are created

all right but to which Atma will they go because behind the indriyam and mind all Atmas are there. Therefore, you will require another criterion for determining raga dvesha. It will become anavastha dosha. Therefore, with regard to raga dvesha also we will have the same problem to which Atma they will go you cannot ascertain. This is the general analysis of this sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Abhisandhyadishu in the case of desire etc., also evam this is the same all in the case of nyaya sastra. Now we will see the significance of the words. Abhisandhyadishu consists of two words abhisandhi and adhisu. Abhisandhihi means desire or ragah; after raga etc., means raga and dvesha. This your present as criterion for punya papa and punya papa is criterion for sukha and dukha. With regard to raga and dvesha also vishya saptami with regard to evam means the same problem persists. The problem is raga and dvesha is generated by mind, sense organs and it comes from guna and attribute and it does not rest on objects, sense organs or the mind but it rests on Atma as per nyaya sastra. If they are to rest on the mind then there is no problem. Since they don't rest on the mind and rest on the Atma and we have to choose all Atmas are different. The same problem persists as shown in the previous sutra. Now we will go to the final sutra.

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.53 [269]**

#### ***Pradesaditi chenna antarbhavat***

If it be said [that the distinction of pleasure and pain etc., results] from [the difference of] place, [we say] not so, on account of the Self being in all bodies.

An objection to sutra 52 is raised and refuted. This sutra consists of two parts viz., an objection and its reply. The objection portion is pradesaditi chet and the reply portion is 'na antarbhavat'

Here naiyayika gives a solution to the problem, which we have attributed. In addition, the solution given by them is negated by Vedantins. Even though all Atma is all pervading, each Atma has an enclosed portion in my body and your Atma has got an enclosed portion within your body and the enclosed portion of each Atma will receive the raga and dvesha generated by the enclosure body. Pradesad means the enclosed portion. Vyasacharya gives his reply to the above argument. The loophole here is that even though you say enclosed portion of Atma within my body is a fine statement but the enclosed portion of your Atma is also in my body is the problem. Therefore my body enclosure not one Atma and my body encloses all the Atma and therefore body enclosing cannot be the criterion to determine raga and dvesha choice. This is the answer. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Pradesat means because of the presence of the enclosed portion [there is no mixing up avyatikara] of karma phala pr punya papa or raga and dvesha is not there. This is the solution given by the naiyayika. Now Vedantins gives the answer iti chet if this is the contention or solution, na it is not so; abtarbhavat because all the atmas are enclosed in every body. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Here pradesat means the enclosed portion or the body; because of the existence of the enclosed portion we get the

criterion to determine the location of raga and dvesha. There is no problem. Iti chen na if this is your view or naiyayika view it is not acceptable to us because antarbhavah means sarvesham atmanam ekasmin sarire antarbhavah because || the atmas are enclosed within my body and all the atmas are enclosed within your body creating the confusion/ if it is by choice or accident there is no vyvastha. Then a mosquito bite anywhere I will get a jerk because my Atma is within the body of another one whose body is bitten by the mosquito. Therefore, it is not acceptable. With this naiyayika theory is refuted. Adhi Sankaracharya says through these arguments themselves Samkya theory is also refuted. What was the jiva Atma according to nyaya? In nyaya theory Jivatma is jada dravyam and it is inert matter and Jivatma anekah it is pluralistic and Jivatma vibuh it is all pervading and all the Jivatmas are all pervading. Fourth one is Jivatma is sagunah it is capable of taking the attributes like raga and dvesha, punya papa, sukha and dukha all of them. Therefore, jadah, anekah, vibuhu and sagunah and how the gunas are produced and it is done by Atma's samyoga. According nyaya theory Atma can have sambandhah with mind. Atma is not asangah but sasangah in nyaya philosophy. All of them Vedantins refuse except that Atma is jada, Atma is saguna Vedanta rejects; Atma can combine with the mind that also Vedanta rejects. This is naiyayika Atma. Now let us come to Samkya Atma.

In tarka sastra this kind of study is called compare contrast study. It is one method of study for thoroughness of understanding and for clarity of vision. Now we will study Samkya philosophy. Here Jivatma is chaitanya rupah unlike tarka sastram. They said it is jadam but Samkya says it is chit rupah which Vedanta accepts. Next is they say Jivatma is anekah there are many atmas which Vedanta refutes. If you take Jivatma as Chidhabasa it is anekah; vyavaharika dristya nekah Paramarthika dristya ekah. Next is Jivatma is vibuh that is all pervading; naiyayika also says Jivatma is all pervading; Samkya says it is all pervading. We also say all pervading Atma from Paramarthika dristya. Jivatma has got nine gunas according to nyaya whereas in Samkya and yoga philosophy Jivatma is nirgunah. Nirguna Chaitanyam is Jivatma as per Samkya also. Then finally they said Atma joins with the mind and mind joins with sense organs and therefore Atma is capable of combination in nyaya sastra whereas in Samkya sastra Atma asangah. It cannot combine with anyone and it is purusah. Vyasacharya says Samkya philosopher also will have all the problems that naiyayika faced because when sukha and dukha are generated behind the sukha and dukha all the atmas are going to be there. My Atma is behind your mind; your Atma is behind your mind and since all atmas are behind every individual and when sukha and dukha is distributed there will be difficulty in choosing the sukha and dukha. Behind punya papa there is Atma. Tell me which Atma will receive sukha and dukha, raga and dvesha etc. This primary problem similar to naiyayika and in addition to that Samkya will have another new problem which naiyayika does not have. They say Atma is sagunah and sasangah and therefore Atma can receive sukha and dukha in nyaya philosophy. Only in choice there is problem but it has the difficulty of receiving the sukha and dukha. It is possible because Atma is sagunah and sasangah. Under Samkya philosophy, it is asked how can asanga Atma receive the sukha and dukha. Samkya shamelessly says Atma is asangah and he says Atma is bokta. Atma is not a karta but it is bokta says Samkya. Atma is sukha and dukhal bokta by receiving sukha and dukham. We ask the question as to how can the asanga Atma become a bokta. All the four systems of philosophy are refuted here. Therefore our theory alone is correct Atma is ekah, sarvagathah and there is vyavaharika Chidhabasa and this alone become skarta bokta and from Paramarthika dristya I am nithya akarta and nithya abokya. With this amsadhikaranam is over.

Now we have to refute the purva paksa and Ekadesi madham. You should note what is purva paksa and Ekadesi. There are beda sruti and abeda sruti and therefore sruti contradicts and therefore sruti is apramanam. Beda sruti is jivatma and Paramatma are different and abeda sruti is jivatma and Paramatma are identical. How do you reconcile? They are mutually contradictory and therefore Veda is apramanam. By amsa sruti we reconcile it is neither beda nor abeda but Jivatma is amsah of course at vyavaharika dristya.level. Amsah is Chidhabasah. Chidhabasa rupa cit Pratibimba rupa amsah Jivatma Paramatmanah from the vyavaharika dristya.

Ekadesi asks to remove the abeda sruti from the Vedas. He says that such sruti statements are arthavadha statements. For this he gives the reasons also. He says only the beda sruti is keeping with the pratyaksa pramana which is the most powerful source of knowledge. But abeda sruti is pratyaksa viruddha and perception is the best pramanam and even sastram is subservient to pratyaksam. Even to study the sastram you need pratyaksam. When the ears give trouble you cannot hear Vedanta and Vedanta depends upon pratyaksam and to pratyaksam depend upon Vedanta. Therefore pratyaksa should be accepted as sathyam and therefore bedah eva sathyam and advoidam has to be rejected. For the Ekadesi we can give several arguments. If you say pratyaksam is valid and therefore sathyam all the samsara and limitations and experiencing of samsara also will become sathyam. Anger, disease etc., will become sathyam. If pratyaksa pramana is sathyam then samsara will be taken as sathyam and whatever is sathyam is as eternal as Brahman. Samsara nityah sathyatvat Brahmavad. If samsara is nityah animoksa prasangah there is no moksa at all. If moksa is not there, all the sadhanas will become redundant moksa sastram will become redundant and Bhagavan has created a redundant moksa sastram. We have to take both the statement and reconcile and the reconciliation is amsavadha. The second method of mimamsa I will explain in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 226

### **Topic 17. Amsadhikaranam. [43 - 53]**

Relation of the individual soul to Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.3.53 [269]**

#### ***Pradesaditi chenna antarbhavat***

If it be said [that the distinction of pleasure and pain etc., results] from [the difference of] place, [we say] not so, on account of the Self being in all bodies.

An objection to sutra 52 is raised and refuted. This sutra consists of two parts viz., an objection and its reply. The objection portion is pradesaditi chet and the reply portion is ‘na antarbhavat’

With the 53<sup>rd</sup> sutra amsadhikaranam is over. We saw how the purva paksa and Ekadesi are answered by the Siddhanti. I will make some general remark about this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam is meant to resolve seemingly contradicting statements in the sruti beda and abeda sruti which talk about jivatma and Paramatma beda and abeda vakyams. We also get abeda sruti that Jivatma Paramatma is aikyam. The abeda and beda sruti appears to be contradictory and the entire amsadhikaranam resolves the seeming contradiction. It is resolved by logical and mimamsa approach. The analytical method is the correct approach. Vyasacharya has approached through the logical approach. Now we will discuss the mimamsa method.

The logical approach is called amsa approach. You make use of gatah sruti that Veda has got reconciling statements that reveal that Jivatma is the amsa of Paramatma. This method works because when you say Jivatma is a part of Jivatma you can say that Jivatma is identical as also a part both look to be correct. You can see different from the whole also seems to be correct. Jivatma is part of seems to be correct. Vyasacharya says that Jivatma is neither identical nor very different and he says that Jivatma is part of Paramatma. If you put a full stop, it is vishistadvaidam and if you take, it from upadhi angle Jivatma is a part of Paramatma from vyavaharika angle. Vyasacharya sees the problem when Jivatma is said to be a part of Paramatma there is a technical problem that Paramatma is said to be partless and how can the Jivatma be part of partless Paramatma. Vyasacharya takes amsa as the reflection or Chidhabasa and Chidhabasa can be said to be identical with chit and it can be said to be different from chit. Chit is identical with original because there cannot exist the reflection independent of the original and therefore reflection can be seen as identical with original. The reflection can be seen as different from original also. When you take the group photo you tell me where am I. The person says here you are. In the photo you are not there, photo is image of you, and generally, we say I am here in the photo although you are the same and the picture is seen as abeda from you. This is called beda abeda vadha and with regard to Chidhabasa it will perfectly fit and therefore Jivatma is an amsa of Paramatma from vyavaharika dristi. This is the Vyasacharya solution to the seemingly contradictory beda abeda sruti. Now we will see the mimamsa approach to this problem. When we want to be

different from vishistadvaidam we will give the second answer. The answer is that we have to reconcile beda and abeda sruti if both the sruti statements are teaching beda and abeda. Advaidins say both do not have equal status at all to see a contradiction; abeda sruti has a higher status for it meant to teach abeda and therefore it is taken as pramana vakyam. It is a vakyam to teach something to you. Beda sruti has got only an inferior status because beda sruti is not meant to reveal beda. Therefore, it is apramana vakyam. All abeda sruti have higher status meant to reveal abeda; Beda sruti are of lower status and it is not meant to teach beda. It is a technical question. How do you know which part of Veda is pramana vakyam meant to teach and which are apramana vakyam meant not to teach. We have two type of vakyams in the sastra. There is prescribed method to determine which is tatparya and which are non-tatparya vakyams. This has been discussed in the fourth sutra. The example is in mathematics class suppose a teacher says one pencil costs 7 rupees and fifty paise what is the cost of 10 pencil. You should not take the statement as a statement meant to reveal the cost of the pencil. There the price of the pencil is tatparya purva vakyam. The teacher is not giving the market price of the pencil. Therefore that statement is apramana vakyam. If it is apramana vakyam why should he say that. It is for the purpose of checking that whether the student knows the multiplication. Here price of the pencil is not tatparya vakyam. Similarly in Vedas there are many tatparya and nontatparya vakyams. Beda sruti is meant to teach anything. Veda does not want to teach beda or dvaidam. Fthere are three main clues to reveal that. The difference is already in the mind of the student even before coming to Vedanta classes. The student perceives difference even before learning Vedas. What Veda teaches must be unknown to me by other pramanas. Vedas need not teach Dvaidam. Next is phalam. Wherever there is phalam is mentioned, then people are interested in phalam. Only where abeda is mentioned phalam follows. If you know, aikyam mukti is mentioned and so many things are mentioned. Beda sruti does not have any phalam and therefore tatparyam nasti. Next is glorification and criticism statement. According to mimamsa wherever glorification is there underscore has to be focused. Criticism has to be taken as tatparya rahita vakyams. One famous Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam is whoever sees jivatma and Paramatma beda is as good as pasuh and is not even worth calling as human being it is stressed there. Whoever is abeda he is liberated and there are thousands of vakyams and therefore beda srutis are apramanam and abeda srutis are pramanam. They do not have equal status to be rivals. Rivalry is possible only between equals. Here one is pramanam and another is apramanam. Therefore, there is no contradiction between beda and abeda sruti and therefore we need not reconcile at all. There is no need to bring in gatah sruti and Vedantins says abeda sruti has no rival at all. How can beda sruti stand against abeda srutis. Abeda sruti alone wins and jiva is not part of Paramatma but is one with Paramatma. Tarka says Jivatma is part of Paramatma. We reconcile saying that Jivatma is one with Paramatma. From Paramarthika dristi Jivatma is Paramatma. From vyavaharika drsiti Jivatma is part of Paramatma. Sutra 48 explains this point. With this amsadhikarana is over. With this third pada is over. Now I will go to the fourth pada.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 2, Pada: 4

Class 226.

### **Introduction**

Now i will give you is the general analysis of the fourth pada of the second chapter. The main title of the second chapter is aviroadadyayah. The purpose of the chapter is to establish the non contradiction of the teaching given in the first chapter. The teaching of the first chapter is known from the title itself samanyadhyayah. The second chapter says samanya is not contradicted. Samanvaya siddhi is the topic of the second chapter. Samanya means all upanishad reveals uniformly and consistently non dual Brahman only. The first pada established samanya is not contradicted by sruti and yukti. The advaidam is not contradicted by logic is established in the first chapter. Advaidam is beyond the logic and logic does not have any qualification to contradict advaidam. Eyes do not have the capacity to confirm or contradict the sound revealed by the ears and logic cannot contradict or confirm advaidam.

The second chapter deals with the refutation of the views of the other darsanas. It is called para madha kandanam. The third pada dealt with the sruti virodha parihara was done and it dealt with the internal contradiction within the veda. Sruti virodha parihara. In the third pada, sruti means sruti vakyam. The reconciliation of sruti statements regarding the creation of five elements, jiva the bokta. The last three sutra of the third pada happens to be the refutation of samkya and nyaya philosophy. Theses sutra can join the second pada. The difference between para madha kandanam occurring in the second pada and samkya madha kandanam in the last three sutras of the third pada is the first three adhikaranam was refuted in creation theory. Whereas here in the last three sutras of the third pada, deals with the jivatma swarupam. Samkya theory of jiva and nyaya theory and vedantins theory are different. With this, the third pada is over. Now we will deal the fourth pada and it deals with sruti vakya parihara. It is from another angle it is discussed. In the third pada vyasacharya dealt with bhuta and boktru sristi. In the fourth pada bhouthika sristi virodha pariharaha is dealt with here. Boudhika sristi refers to various organs of the body. Even regarding the number of organs are discussed here. All seeming contradictions regarding the organs and their number are discussed here. The fourth pada has got 9 adhikaranam and 23 sutras. Since it deals with sruti virodha parihara and here also we will have three stages of discussions. Purva paksi madham, ekadesi and siddhanti madham will be discussed.

### **Topic 1. Pranotpattyadhikaranam [sutra 1 – 4]**

The pranas have their origin from brahma.

#### **Sutra 2.4.1 [270]**

#### ***Tatha pranah***

Thus the vital airs [are produced from Brahman]

The creation of the pranas or senses is now described.

I will introduce this adhikaranam. It is called pranot pattyadhikaranam. This deals with the sruti of the prana. It refers to the sense organs also and this word in the sense of sense organs occurs in mundakopanisad. All sense organs depends upon the prana is established in the chandogya upanisad. It tells the story of the quarrel between the sense organs regarding who is the supreme and it was established that the moment the prana decided to leave the body, all the sense organs lost control and they requested prana not to leave and they accepted the prana to be supreme and sang praise on prana. When the word prana refers to sense organs, it is called gauna prana figuratively called prana because it is blessed by prana. All sense organs belong to prana family. when it talks of the main prana it is called mukya prana like apana udhana etc. We have got purva paksa madham who presents seemingly contradictory statements. One statement is mundakopanaisad statement manah sarva indriyani that all sense organs are born out of Brahman. The third mantra it says from everything is born. Then there is another sruti vakyam occurring in satapatha Brahmana. There it is said that the sense organs existed before the creation. In pralaya kale the sense organs existed it says. The sruti says that there was asat before creation and there it is said 'asat' means rishis. Then the student asks what are rishis and the guru says rishis mean pranah. Sense organs are called rishis in the brihadharaynaka upanisad. The essence of the vakyam is that gouna prana indriyas were there before creation. Thus there is contradiction one says indriya utpatti and another says anutpatti and this is the argument of ekadesi and we will answer him in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 227

### **Topic 1. Pranotpattyadhikaranam**

The pranas have their origin from brahma.

**Sutra 2.4.2 [271]**

#### ***Gaunyasambhavat***

On account of the impossibility of a secondary [origin of the pranas]

A plausible objection to sutra 1 is refuted.

Now that the siddhanta has been given vyasacharya has to handle ekadesi. Ekadesi madham says that origination has to be taken figuratively and really origination does not take place. Vyasacharya says it is illogical to talk about figurative or secondary origination. If you say so there will be logical problems in explaining upanishad. He does not say what is the logical problems. But adhi sankaracharya explains the problem. If you say the origination is a figurative thing, that means sense organs are not born and that means they are anadi and they are not brahma karyam. In the introduction to the upanishad, the teaching said in there will be in trouble that is where the utpatti vakyam has come that is mundakopanisad. Here student asks what is that knowing which everything is known and for that the teacher answers para vidya or brahma vidya. According to the teacher brahma vijnanena sarva vijnanam. Then alone sarva karya vijnanam bhavati. If the sense organs are not born out of Brahman, then sense organs will not be brahma karyam. All these things will be meaningful to you if you know the fundamental law there is no karyam without karanam. Keeping that in mind in the beginning of mundaka, the upanishad says that the sense organs are also born out of Brahman and therefore they don't exist separate from Brahman. Purusah eva idahum sarvam and therefore gauni is not possible. This is the essence of the sutra. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Gaunyasambhavat since figurative meaning cannot be taken [origination of sense organs should be accepted] the logical problem that will come is pratijna hanih eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam will be violated. Then there will be another problem, which we have to tackle. Utpatti of sense organs is born and if we take utpatti is real we have to reconcile the other sruti vakyam satapata vakyam that says sense organs are not born. This says sense organs were there before creation. This statement has to be reconciled. For that adhi sankaracharya says that if we take utpatti vakyam as mukyam we will take anupatti vakyam as gaunam or figurative. That is not born is a figurative given from a particular standpoint. He says pralaya is of different level in vedas and puranas. As a particular level of intermediary pralayam avantara pralayam the entire sthoola prapancha is resolved into sooshma prapancha hiranyagarbha. The total resolution does not take place, sthoola prapancha takes place, and hiranyagarbha continues. From brahmaji's angle he created sthoola prapancha, before the creation of sthoola prapancha the sooshma prapancha existed, and hiranyagarbha was there. This hiranyagarbha existed even before srusti. It existed before sthoola prapancha srusti. We talk about brahmaji existing before creation of the world and even after the resolution of the

world. So brahmaji existed and ti is called avantara pralayam. When we discuss mahantara pralayam everything resolves including hiranyagarbha and sooshma prapancha. All depends upon the statement and satapata Brahmana talks of the existence of sooshma prapancha before the creation of sthoola prapancha. Before the birth of young, elder brother existed. If you accept sooshma prapancha before sthoola prapancha sristi then you have to accept sense organs existed before because sense organs pertains to sooshma prapancha. Therefore, we have to conclude that the sense organs existed before the origination of the world, the sense organs are born of karana prapancha, and we have to accept sense organs utpatti and its anutpatti is figurative. Ekadesi said utpatti gouni and anutpatti is mukya whereas siddhanti says utpatti mukya and anutpatti gauni. This is difference between the siddhanti and ekadesi. Another problem will come if you remember the previous part of brahma sutra. The problem is that this sutra occurs before also 2.3.3. If you go back there adhi sankaracharya has given a totally different meaning and he has taken it as two separate word gauni asambavat. There it is purva pakshi sutra and the very same sutra here is siddhanta sutra. Therefore i have given different meaning. The final thing is the significance of the word gaunyasambhavat. It is taken as a compound word. The illogical interpretation of figurative expression of the secondary origination. We have to take it as primary origination. This is the grammatical significance of this compound word.

## **Topic 1. Pranotpattyadhikaranam**

The pranas have their origin from brahma.

### **Sutra 2.4.3 [272]**

#### ***Tatprakeehrutescha***

On account of that [word which indicates origin] being mentioned first [in connection with prana]

An argument in support of sutra 3 is given.

First i will do the general analysis of the sutra. Here vyasacharya asks us to observe the mundaka mantra which is controversial 2.1.3. Etasmad jayate is the beginning of the upanishad mantra. 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 Brahman has been talked about. Two verses talk about Brahman. From this Brahman is born. The question is what is born. Upanishad gives a list pranah, manah, sarvendriyani ca, then followed by all the fiver elements. All are born out of Brahman. The verb jayate must be added to everything. So originates each one. The verb jayate is mentioned only once. First prana and sense organs are mentioned and the second line five elements are mentioned. Now vyasacharya argues that in the third pada we have established that the panca bhuta utpatti is in primary sense of the term. Panca pbuta utpatti is seen to be mukya and not gauna. We have already shown that panca bhuta is primary and not secondary. Vyasacharya says the same jayate is used for the sense organs also. Therefore the verb of origination commonly used for sense organs and the elements. From the previous pada we know the verb used for the elements are from primary sense and the same verb is used for sense organs and that jayate also must be mukyam and not gaunam. Therefore elements are also born in the primary sense and the sense organs are also born in the primary sense. Now we will do word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; prakruteh since the origination of the sense organs is mentioned earlier in the mantra [the origination must be in the primary sense]. Sutra looks very vague. Now we will see the significance of the word. Tad means tatra means in the mundaka mantra 2.1.3. That is the mantra of contention here. Prakruteh means prakravanat is heard earlier. Sruti means sravanam. It is mentioned or it is heard. The sensory origination is before the origination of the elements as the sense organs is mentioned before the origination of the elements. Here the verb is common. Sense organs utpatti is also primary because we have already concluded that the elements are born of Brahman. Both should be equally taken, as mukhya and then only it will read correctly. Cha is the conjunction for it is an additional argument in continuation of the previous sutra.

## **Topic 1. Pranotpattyadhikaranam**

The pranas have their origin from brahma.

### **Sutra 2.4.4 [273]**

#### ***Tatpurvakatvadvachah***

Because speech is preceded by that [viz., fire and the other elements]

Another argument in support of sutra 2 is given.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Now ekadesi comes and argues. He asks the advaidins that sense organs are unborn based on the saying in the satapatha Brahmanam. You want to prove that sense organs are born out of Brahman and you quote mundaka manta, which is favourable to you. Now ekadesi says why cannot you look at some other upanishad vakyam. In chandogya upanishad it is said form Brahman indriya utpatti is not mentioned 6.2.2 etc. Here it is categorically states that the organs etc., are the products of the elements. The elements in their turn originate from Brahman. The upanishad does not talk about indriya utpatti at all. How do you say sense organs are born of Brahman? Now vyasacharya says that if you look at the upanishad proper that sense organs are born out of the elements. Instead of saying that they are born out of brahma it says they are born out of elements and elements are born out of Brahman and ultimately sense organs are born. In one Brahman is said to be direct cause and in another place it is said to be secondary cause. The ultimate mula karanam is Brahman and sense organs are born directly born out of elements and indirectly born out of Brahman. This is said in 6.4 of chandogya upanishad. Therefore, vak means sense organs. It is born out of agni tattvam and agni is born out of Brahman and therefore all the sense organs represented by vak originate. This is the essence of this sutra. Now we will see word for word analysis.

Vachah means since the organs of speech is a product of the fire element [it is indirectly born of Brahman]. Now we will see the significance of the word. Vachah means vak indriyam tat purvakatvat tat stands for agni bhutam; tad karyatvat means vak indriyam being a product of agni element and agni being a product of Brahman therefore vak indriyam is born out of Brahman only ultimately is said in the mundaka upanishad. Lastly adhi sankaracharya introduces another point. Chandogya upanishad 6.5.3 says that the mind is anna mayam prana is apo maya and vak is tejo mayah. Here we will hairsplit on the suffix mayah. Mayah means a product. Mind is the product of earth elements; mind of water element and vak is the product of agni elements. Purva paksi argues how can you take the meaning in such a way. If



mind is the product of water elements, i will not have the mind. Before eating food i will not have the mind; if prana is product of water before drinking water i will not have prana. How can you say that the mind is product of food; prana is product of water and vak the product of agni. You should call it a nourisher and not born out of water etc. Vak indriyam, mind etc., are not the product of the elements but they are nourished by the elements like earth, water, agni etc. This is the argument of the purva paksi. Adhi sankaracharya gives a reply for that which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 228

### **Topic 1. Pranotpattyadhikaranam**

The pranas have their origin from brahma.

**Sutra 2.4.4 [273]**

#### ***Tatpurvakatvadvachah***

Because speech is preceded by that [viz., fire and the other elements]

Another argument in support of sutra 2 is given.

In the first adhikaranam of this pada vyaacharya analyses the origination of the sense organs and here sense organs are called prana and to avoid confusion we call sense organs as gauna prana. Mukya prana refers to prana, udana, abana etc. All of them originated from Brahman is the view of siddhanta. All the sense organs originate from Brahman and then the purva paksi raised a doubt that you quote mundaka mantra and why cannot you see chandogya upanisad where bhuta sristi from Brahman is mentioned where sense organs are not said to be originated from Brahman. Eventhough in chandogya upanisad sense organs are directly originated from Brahman but they indirectly originated from Brahman only. Refer to 6.5.4 of chandogya upanisad where it is said that the organs are born out of the elements and the elements are said to be born of Brahman thereby it is made clear that the sense organs indirectly born out of Brahman. Vak indriyam is born out of agni tattvam and agni is born out of Brahman and Brahman is the mula karanam for the birth of the sense organs. The suffix maya we focused and according to sanskrit grammar, maya refers to the product. Prithvi karyam manah and agni karyam vak. When this interpretation was given, a purva paksi raised a question. At this point, i stopped the last class.

The purva paksi says that you say Brahman produces the elements and the elements produce the sense organs. However, on analysis we find that the suffix maya cannot mean a product. It is purva paksi contention. Suffix maya can mean product but here in this mantra you cannot take it as a product. If the mind is product of food and before eating food mind should not be there. Annam may produce anna maya kosa and you cannot say annam produce the mind. Similarly, you cannot say water produces prana because to drink water i should have prana and how can you say water produces prama. The suffix maya should be given another interpretation that annam nourishes the mind and similarly jalam nourishes the prana. Therefore, these are not products but are nourished by the annam etc. In chandogya upanisad the guru asked the students not to eat food for fifteen days. Then the students came back and they were asked to chant the vedas. Tjey were not able to do so. From this we come to know that annam is the nourisher of the mind and not the cause of the mind. Therefore, sense organs are utpatti rahitam and this is the purva paksi contention.

Adhi sankaracharya now gives his answer. In this context the word maya does not mean the product and it has got gouna artha and it does not have the primary meaning of the product. Even though this sentence says primarily elements are nourishers only but the by implication

the sruti wants to say that the sense organs are born out of Brahman only. Therefore, the conclusion is that the sense organs are born out of elements, elements are born out of Brahman, and ultimately sense organs are born out of Brahman. Elements produce sense organs how do you know is the question posed by the purva paksi. We find svetaketu completes his education and as comes back home after education, the father asks the question did you ask for that knowledge by knowing with everything is known eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam. This is the essence of chandogya upanishad sixth chapter. In both of them eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is the upanishad intention and that is possible under only one condition that ekam vastu should be the karanam and everything else must be karyam directly or indirectly. Everything other than Brahman must be born later which means that even space must be a product. If space is eternal eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam will not be possible and therefore he has to prove that space is a karyam. It is karanam with different vesham appears as karyam. If the space is a product what to talk of miserable sense organs. How can you argue that sense organs is original but accept they are born out of Brahman. By implication should mean all organs are born out of Brahman only and therefore pranah abhi jayante. With this that purva paksi has also been answered and with that fourth sutra is over and the first adhikaranam is over. Before going to the next adhikaranam we have to answer ekadesi and purva paksi madham. In the second sutra ekadesi madham has been answered. Purva paksi madham is that they say there is contradiction and therefore the sruti is apramanam. We say that sense organs are born and any statement that they are not born should be taken as gauna vakyam. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## Topic 2. Saptagatyadhikaranam [sutra 5-6]

The number of the organs.

### Sutra 2.4.5 [274]

#### *Sapta gatervisheshitatvaccha*

The pranas [organs] are seven on account of this being understood [born scriptura; passages] and of the specification [of those seven]

The number of the pranas [senses is now discussed].

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. Here the subject matter of discussion is regarding the number of organs and adhikaranams. We have purva paksi, ekadesi and siddhanta.

Purva paksi says that the upanishads are full of contradictions. It never mentions one particular number of organs in different context and the lowest mentioned is seven and the highest mentioned is thirteen. Mundaka upanishad 2.18. Mentions seven sense organs are there; brihadharaynaka upanishad 3.2.1 place the number as eight [eight grahas and eight adhigrahas]; taittiriya samhita v.3.2..3 says they are nine seven are the pranas of the head, two the lower ones; prasnopanishad 4.8 places the number as thirteen 'the eye and what can be seen; thus the scriptural passages disagree about the number of the pranas [organs in this context]. Purva paksi says that sruti contradicts and therefore sruti is apramanam. Our siddhanta says that the number of sense organs are 11. Ekadesi takes the view that we should accept the number as seven. Sutra number 5 relates to ekadesi and sutra 6 relates to siddhanta.

Ekadesi says that the number of organs are seven in number because sapta has been mentioned in several places particularly taittiriya samhita it says that the pranas are seven in number very clearly. The most of the organs are in the head the above quotation states. Suppose if you ask how do you explain other numbers. He says that the other numbers should be included in the seven. To or three functions are included in one organs it is argued. He also argues that wherever there is lesser number choose the lesser number. Therefore the organs are seven. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Sapta the sense organs are seven in number since that is understood from the sruti statements. Visheshitattvat since that is specified elsewhere. Now we will see the significance of the words. Sapta means seven; gathih means our understanding. Gathih means jnanam. We understand this number from mundaka sruti statement 2.1.8. Visheshitattvad means that has been further specified. This is given in taittiriya samhita 5.1.7.1. This indicates that the sense organs are in the head in the forms of eyes nose etc. An additional reason is that taking the lesser number is better.

## **Topic 2. Saptagatyadhikaranam [sutra 5-6]**

The number of the organs.

### **Sutra 2.4.6 [275]**

#### ***Hastadayastu sthite'to naivam***

But [there are also in addition to the seven pranas mentioned] the hands and rest. This being is settled matter. Therefore [we must] not [conclude] that [viz., that there are seven pranas only].

Sutra 5 is refuted and ther actual number of the pranas [senses] is ascertained.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that ekadesi's conclusion is wrong being not comprehensive. Vyasacharya says seven is wrong but he does not give the number of organs according to him. But adhi sankaracharya mentions them to be eleven. When you take seven numbers, the problem is that the seven even does not include<sup>4</sup> the jnanendriyas. The two eyes, two ears. Two nostrils and one mouth are taken to be seven organs according to ekadesi this talks of seven apertures found in the head. In fact the seven apertures relates to only four jnanendriyams. The skin is not included in it. If skin is included the number will become eight. None of the four indriyas can function as skin indriyam. Secondly for argument sake let us assume that the four jnanendriyas include skin also and then the karmendriyas are not included in the spata prana. If you include karmendriya then the mind will find no place the function of which cannot be done by any sense organs. Then you arrive at eleven organs. Each one of them is born out of each element as well. The mind has unique function and in the mind, we have four functions. All the four make one andhakaranam. Within the eleven other numbers can be justified with reference to the context. If the number is twelve, one mind can be counted as two and if thirteen mind can be taken as three manah. Buddhi and chittam etc. Lesser number is mentioned for it can always be included in the higher numbers. Lesser then eleven means it is included in the eleven and if it is more the andhakranam is counted instead one to more than one.

Now we will do the word for word analysis. Hastadayah all the rest is taken as the sense organs; sthite hence they cannot be included in the seven; they means hands etc. Athah therefore evam such a condition na is not proper. Now we will see the significance of the words. Hastadayah means the hands etc., referring to other karmendriyas also. Other karmendriyas also are mentioned in the sastra which cannot be included in the seven sense organs. Tu indicates the negation of purva paksa. Sthite means because of these reasons this being so; the significance of that the seven \numbers are comprehensive because it includes only jnanendriyam and not karmendriyams. Athah evam and therefore your conclusion that seven are the organs is not comprehensive at all. All the five sense organs are important because one cannot do the function of the other. If i say eyes are meant to see rupam, and rupam means not form and it should be translated as colour only. Nama rupa means name and colour. The eyes are unique in seeing the colour. Each sense organs has to be enumerated and each karmendriya is to be enumerated and mind is to be enumerated and adhi sankaracharya says mind has a unique function all the \organs only sense the present things or the varthamana kala prapancha, the hand cannot touch the object which was in the past or the child which will be born at a future date. So also are the eyes. Mind can know the past and it can know the future. The mind alone contacts the existence of the past and also what is to come in future. Thus the eleven is the ideal number. You remember the ekadesi we have answered. We have also answered purva paksi. The next one i will introduce and stop.

### **Topic 3. Prananutvadhikaranam**

The number of the organs.

#### **Sutra 2.4.7 [276]**

#### ***Anavascha***

And [they are] minute

The nature and size of senses is now ascertained.

First i will introduce the general introduction of this adhikaranam which has only one sutra. This is called prana anutva adhikaranam. The subject matter in this adhikaranam is the size of the sense organs. In the scripture the measurements are discussed as three anu, vibhu and madhyama smallest, biggest and the medium sized. Indriyas have madhyama parimanah is the view of vyasacharya. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 229

### **Topic 3. Prananutvadhikaranam**

The number of the organs.

**Sutra 2.4.7 [276]**

*Anavascha*

And [they are] minute

The nature and size of senses is now ascertained.

In this fourth pada of the second chapter vyasacharya deals with boudhika sruti virodha pariharah the sruti which seemingly contradictory particularly with regard to the sookshma sariram. First he has taken up prana which means here the sense organs. Prana is taken in the secondary sense of the term. In the first adhikaranam he dealt with prana utpatti; in the second he talks about the number of sense organs and now he talks about the size of the prana. Prana samkya we saw to be 11 pancha jnanendriyas five karmendriya and one andhakaranam only consisting mano, buddhi, citta and ahankara. In the last class, I introduced the third adhikaranam the prana parmana. All measurements are classified into three anutvam, vibhuttvam and all the other measurements in between smallest and biggest come under madhyama parimana. All sense organs have madhyama parimanah. But vyasacharya uses the word anuh, which means madhyama parimanah. In this adhikaranam, we have purva paksi ekadesi and siddhanta.

Purva paksi says that sruti is self-contradictory. In some place, it says sense organs are all pervading and in some places it says the sense organs are finite in nature. First one is 3.9.4 of Brihadharaynaka Upanisad te yatha asmad sarirad ukramanti the sense organs go out of the body at the time of death. When they go out it is the time of death and one who dies also cries and those nearby cry. Since 11 sense organs go and the people cry they are symbolically sense organs are called rudrah. So according to Brihadharaynaka Upanisad ekadasa rudra represents ekadasa indriyas only. From the sruti vakyam it is clear that the sense organs leave the body. If they are to leave the body and travel they are necessarily to be temporary in nature. They are madhyama parimanah only. There is another Brihadharaynaka Upanisad vakyam 1.5.13 which says te ete sarve eva samaah sarve nantaha sarve anantah; this mantra says that all the sense organs are samah; anantah means that all sense organs are finite. In one place the Upanishad says they are finite and at another place they say they are infinite. Ekadesi says that sense organs are all pervading and this is the view of samkya philosophers also. Ananta sruti is the mukhya sruti and it is the primary meaning. If you say that sense organs are all pervading how do you explain 3.1.4 where sense organs are to move about. Here it is said that the meaning here is gauni sruti and the meaning should not be taken. Ekadesi says that sense organs do not go out but the golakam the physical body, the physical part of sense organs die away and the very same similar body is created and the conditioned sense organs body is gone and sarira avachinna indriyam is elsewhere. It is exactly like chaitanyam body enclosed chaitanyam alone is recognizable and not the chaitanyam

unenclosed one. Similarly sense organs are all pervading body enclosed sense organs function and body enclosure is everywhere when the enclosed body is gone. It does not functioned as sense organs but exists but the sense organ when they get the body the sense organs functions. The travel belongs not to the sense organs but the golakam only. This is ekadesi samkya madham.

Now siddhanta gives its reason. Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that the sense organs are not all pervading and sense organs are finite only. Every physical body has got set of separate sense organs of its own and there is no question of one all pervading sense organs. Vyasacharya does not give logic or reasoning. For the reasoning we have to go to sankara bashyam. Before that we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Anavah cha means they are of medium size also. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Anavah means plural number. It is used because sense organs are many. Gauna pranas are many and they are of medium size. Then the question comes why should vyasacharya use the word anu a confusing word. Why he had not used the word 'madhyama parinama'? The significance for using the word is anu is not only they are of finite but also they are not perceptible and they are of indriya agocharatvam. Sense organs are not perceptible to sense organs. My sense organs i cannot see; i cannot see your sense organs also. You may ask we see others eyes, tongue, nose etc. Then how do you say that we see them. For this you refer to tattva bodha, where it is said the physical part of sense organs, are not indriyam but they are called golakam and golakam are visible. They are in the dead body also. But as a part of sookshma sariram behind the golakam the sookshma sariram there is prana indriya agocharatvam. If the sookshma sariram is visible then we can see the sense organs going after death. It is because sookshma sariram is invisible, then we can see the sookshma sariram going after death from the body. You cannot a jnani's sookshma sariram traveling or karana sariram traveling or atma traveling etc. Therefore remember all the light going on the death of a jnani has not relevance. Therefore, sookshma sariram must be sookshma. Hence vyasacharya uses the word anavah. Anu has two meaning and indriya agocharasya. Cha means and it is just for combining the previous sutra that states the pranas are eleven and are finite. Now we have to answer ekadesi and purva paksi. Adhi sankaracharya answers that the sense organs statement occurs very rarely and we have many number of statements that the sense organs leave the body. Therefore we have more sruti pramanam that the sense organs travel after death and therefore we have to give primary meaning for the travel for sense organs and if we give the primary meaning that the sense organs are finite in nature. Wherever it is said that sense organs are infinite it is said in the context of upasana and always for the sake of upasana we have atasmin tad buddhi. 1.5.13 of brihadharaynaka upanisad sense organs are said to be anantah. It is for those who practice upasana that the sense organs are seen to be infinite. Paricchinna lokam is the phalam. Anantatvam upasnatvam and therefore it is secondary and finitude is mentioned in most of the places.

He says that why cannot we take sense organs as all pervading and divide the sense organs as two one is sarira avacchinna indriyam and sarirra avarichinna indriyam that means one enclosed by the physical body and the other not enclosed by the body. He says that indriyam enclosed one you can perceive and unenclosed one you cannot perceive. The enclosure moves place to place and hence the enclosed 'sense organs' also seem seem to move. For this adhi sankaracharya says, suppose you perceive enclosed sense organs and you do not see the unenclosed sense organs. You imagine enclosed sense organs, you imagine unenclosed sense

organs, you say unenclosed sense organs you do not see, and this is far-fetched imagination. Hence, adhi sankaracharya concludes that sense organs are finite and sense organs travel and this is the view of siddhanta. Then we have to refute purva paksi madham.

Purva paksi says that sruti contradicts itself saying infinite in some places and finite in some other places. Finitude is factual, infinitude should be taken as gauna vakyam for upasana, and therefore there is no contradiction in the sutra. With this the third adhikaranam is over. Now we go to the fourth adhikaranam.

#### **Topic 4. Pranasraishthyadhikaranam.**

The chief prana has also an origin from Brahman.

#### **Sutra 2.4.8 [277]**

#### ***Sreshthascha***

And the best [i.e., the chief vital air or prana is also produced.

The chief prana is being characterized now.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. In this adhikaranam vyasacharya comes to the mukya pranah. In the previous three adhikaranam we dealt with gauna prana the sense organs. Now he comes to the main meaning of the prana and that is why he has used the expression shreshtah. This adhikaranam can be called shreshta prana adhikaranam or mukya prana adhikaranam. Here also vyasacharya deals with prana's origination, number and its nature whether visible or invisible. We have three stages here also purva paksi, ekadesi madham and siddhanta.

Purva paksi finds 'seeming' contradiction in two sruti statement regarding the origination of mukya prana the life in general or physiological system. One is from mundaka 2.1.3 says that prana is born. There is another statement which says that the prana existed even before creation along with Brahman. This statement comes in rg veda 8.7.17 and it is called nasa diya system. There is one sentence in the suktam, anid a-vatam svadhaya tadekam. In this statement the most important statement is anid which means breathed or exhaled. Anidi means to breathe. From this root only apana, udana, prana etc., have come. Ana means to breath live, which refers to inhalation exhalation. It means before creation nothing was there and only Brahman was breathing. One was Brahman, Brahman was breathing, and Brahman was alive and breathing. Because of the breathing by Brahman before creation, it is concluded that prana was there before creation. Svadaya means mayaya. Therefore, prana was also there before creation. Brahman, maya and prana were there before creation. Since prana already existed, there is no question of prana taking birth. Hence, it is sruti virodha. Therefore, there is no need to study of brahma sutra.

Then comes ekadesi. He says that prana is eternal only because Brahman has to be alive and it is clearly said that the Brahman was breathing before creation and therefore prana is nityah. What about other sruti vakyam prana utpatti. It is only secondary and gouni utpatti and do not take it seriously. Vishistadvaidins and dvaidins would say do not take tat tvam asi seriously. For advaidins he wants only one statement tat tvam asi. The whole gita is only an



explanation of tat tvam asi. All vedic interpreters face the problems and focusing difference comes and therefore utpatti vakyam forget it.

Siddhanta says that you should take utpatti vakyam alone seriously. That is gouna vakyam this is our siddhanta. Now we will come to general analysis of this sutra. Here he says mukya prana jayate. That is the essence of the sutra. Now i will give you the word for word analysis. Shrestaha cha the primary prana also [originates from Brahman] this is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. Shreshtah means mukya or primary prana, which is one. Shreshtah means mukya prana, which is only one. Just as andhakaranam is one with four different functions so also prana is one and the function is five. Cha ayate means prana is also born like sense organs. Vyasacharya does not give reason and also refute ekadesi and purva pakshi. Adhi sankaracharya says we have to take prana is born because majority of sruti vakyams talks of prana utpatti. Brahman breathed is a rare expression occurring somewhere but we have several sruti vakyam talking of origination of prana. So you have to accept our view.

Eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam is the pratijna. This is possible only if Brahman only eka karanam and everything is karyam and then alone karana vijnanena karya vijnanam is possible. Suppose prana is nithyam what will be the problem. Prana will not be karyam of Brahman. If prana is not Brahma karyam then brahma vijnanena prana vijnana na bhavati. Upanishad tells in the beginning eka vijnanena sarva vijnanam, that sarva includes prana also, and that is possible only if prana is born. The third argument is if prana is there in addition to Brahman then there will be dvaidam. Because prana will be one and Brahman will be one and there will be two. Therefore, we have to take pranasya utpatti alone. How to reconcile with rg Veda mantra that Brahman breathed even before the origination of the world. There the word breathed means only it existed. A live person alone breathes and therefore it is an idiomatic expression to say Brahman existed and it does not mean Brahman was breathing prana. Anid means breathed prana alone is the objection from purva paksha. For this siddhanta says that we do not twist but you only make the question with focus. There the statement says anid and there is another word avatham is the most important word and vatham means vayuh or prana. Prana rahitam brahma anid and therefore the verb anid should not be taken in conventional sense and therefore Brahman was without prana and prana was born later. This is clearly stated in another place that Brahman does not have prana at all refer 2.1.2 of mundaka upanishad. Brahman breathed without prana means Brahman existed without prana and from that Brahman which existed before prana was born later. Our conclusion is that pranah abhi jayate. With this shreshta prana adhikaranam is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 230

### **Topic 4. Pranasraishthyadhikaranam.**

The chief prana has also an origin from Brahman.

**Sutra 2.4.8 [277]**

#### ***Sreshthascha***

And the best [i.e., the chief vital air or prana is also produced.

The chief prana is being characterized now.

In the first three adhikaranam of this pada indriya utpatti, indriya samkya and indriya parimana have been analysed. In the word indriyam we have included anthakaranam also. The word indriyam includes the five jnanendriyas, five karmendriyas and the mind with four divisions. After discussing the indriyam vyasacharya has come to prana. In the fourth adhikaranam it is established that prana is also born out of Brahman. Prana here is one principle with five function. This prana is called mukhya prana. It differentiates from it amukhya prana which are the sense organs. Vyasacharya translates the word mukhya to shrestah. This prana upasana is prescribed both chandogya upanisad and brihadharaynaka upanisad. Jyestasya shrestasya upasana is prescribed in brihadharaynaka upanisad the word shreshta is used and in the upanishad the prana is glorified as jyestasya shrestasya both in brihadharaynaka upanisad and chandogya upanisad. Now we enter the fifth adhikaranam.

### **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

**Sutra 2.4.9 [278]**

#### ***Na vayukriya prithagupadesat***

[the chief prana is] air or function, on account of its being mentioned separately.

The nature of the chief prana is discussed in this sutra.

First i will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with four sutras. Previously while discussing prana which was called indriyam or karanam, we mentioned that they are eleven in number. In this eleven karnam we did not include the prana at all. From this we come to know that the prana does not come under karanams. Thus prana does not come under karta also as karta is defined as sentient and independent one. Prana cannot come under karta because it is neither independent nor chetanam. Prana does not come under instrument of transaction nor it comes under the subject or karta that uses the indriyams. Prana is not an object or the part of the world also. It is not the field of interaction; nor it is the objective

world also because it is in the body. It does not come under the triputi subject object and instrument. We know that for all the transaction the most important factors required are karta and karma and the instrument. Now the question is whether should we accept prana as separate principle at all since it does not play any prominent role as karta, karanam or karma. Should we accept prana as separate principle? It is prana independent category or club as part of prominent factors as karta, karma and karana? Should we accept prana tattvam as separate category? Some people want us to include prana in some other tattvam without giving independent status. But we want to say that it is a separate tattvam. Should mukhya prana ipt category status or not is the question. Other systems of philosophy say that independent status should not be given and we want to say we may give it a independent status. We have here ekadesi, purva pakshi and siddhanta.

One sruti vakyam says that prana is not a tattvam at all. Another one says it is separate tattvam. Therefore sruti is apramanam. This is the argument of the purva pakshi. One sruti vakyam is aitareya aranyakam. The aitareya upanishad comes at the end portion of the veda. 2.33 of the aranyakam is yaha pranah saha vayuh is the mantra of aitareya upanishad that is prana can be included in the vayu tattvam. Enclosed vayu is prana and outside vayu is vayu. In this approach prana is included as karma category the object give universe. The other one is wellknown mundaka upanishad yeh tasmad jayate prana [mantra 2.1.3] here prana is taken as separate tattvam. Mantra says in the second line vayu utpatti is mentioned and both are separately enumerated they must be of separate category. Therefore these srutis are contradictory. Therefore purva pakshi conclusion is that sruti is apramanam.

Ekadesi madham is samkya philosopher and he says that there is no contradiction in the sruti and you have to accept prana is a tattvantaram. He says yaha prana sa vayuh is to interpreted differently. He says prana is a separate tattvam alright but is nothing but a name of the total function of the ekadasa karanani. It refers to not ekadasa karana which has karna vrutti vyaparaha are that function or vyaparaha is called pranah. If you analyse samkya sruti, prana is separately mentioned but it is taken as the function of the substance and as the function is different from substance, it can be taken as a separate function. In samkya sruti even though prana is not included in 24 tattvam and here he says that prana should be taken as karana vyapara rupa. This is ekadesi madham.

Now you will ask the question to samkya if you take prana as separate tattvam how will you account for aranya sruti where it is said prana is vayu. For this samkya philosopher answers that there vayu represents chalanatmakam tattvam and the very word vayu is derived from vathi [constantly in motion]. Therefore it means prana vyapara rupa karma rupa pravrutti rupa it is ekadasa karanam eva. This is ekadesi madham.

Siddhanti would say that prana is neither vayu nor it should come under indriya vyapara and it should be taken other than vayu and indriya kriya. It is separate tattvam and this is the essence of this adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. Here vyasacharya says that prana is neither vayu tattvam part of karma nor it is a kriya an activity a part of karnam. It is a separate tattvam. It is so because it is separately enumerated in the mundaka upanishad. Now we will go to word for word analysis/

Na vayukriye the primary prana is neither vayu nor the function of the sense organs. Prithak upadesat because it has been mentioned separately. Now we will come to the significance of

the words. Na means not; primary prana is not vayukriye the vayu tattvam. Nor is it kriye that means the function of the sense organs; kriya here means karna vyaparah. Prithagupadesat distinct vedic statement is there that is mundaka upanishad 2.1.3 pranah jayate since prana is distinctly mentioned we have to accept it as separate tattvam. Adhi sankaracharya makes it clear if prana tattvam is vayu itself, prana need not be mentioned separately. If prana is the function of the sense organs then adhi sankaracharya argues if prana is a function of sense organs once upanishad talks about origination of sense organs it need not talk about the origination of the functions of sense organs. When you say someone comes, the function automatically comes and function need not be separately mentioned. Since prana utpatti is separately mentioned it is indriya vyaparah. This is argument one.

There is another argument that is if prana is the function of the sense organs then during sushupti all the organs resolve. Jnanendriyas, karmendriya, mind and nothing function in sushupti except prana. If karna vyapara is sleep, then sleep will be equal to death but we find even when all sense organs resolve prana is alive and active and keeps us alive and therefore prana must be a separate entity.

Then there is another argument on special theory of prana. Samkya defines prana as sensory function or activity. He says all the sense organs have got twofold functions. One is independent function of each organ and the other is the cumulative function of all the organs together. Vyasti vyaparah and samasti vyaparah. For example many people are doing work to lay the work and each has got different function. Suppose on the road a car stops and all the people come and push the car. Now the pushing of the car is not done by one person and when all the five cumulatively do the work then only the car will go. They all must function unidirectional function. Then we have twofold activities. Pancara chalakriya. Pancara means a net. Imagine there are many birds in the net. Each bird has got separate function. One may be eating one may do some other job. All the birds together decided to carry the net. One bird cannot do that. If all the bird cumulatively function to carry the net, that function is called pancara chalana kriya and it is function of no single bird but it is the function of all the birds unidirectional task. Why not accept that all karanam have got cumulative function of sustaining the body. Sarira dhana kriya. If this is said we do not have to accept separate prana tattvam. This is samkya approach.

For this adhi sankaracharya says if the cumulative activity of the karnamas has to be taken as prana tattvam there must be pramanam to prove the separate function. In the case of man pushing the cart i have got a pratyaksa pramanam. In the case of the bird we can see the function but can you show the jnanendriya having unidirectional function and we have no pramanam to show this. Main argument is prmana abhavat.

Then there is antoehr argument. If you take prana is common function of all karanam. Karanam becomes the subject, the activity rests on the subject, and the activity comes and goes. However, the 'i' the actor or the subject continuously exists. Function is a property and karanam is a substance. If prana means a function of karanam, who depends upon what is our question. Function depends upon substance or substance depends on function. If is a function of the karanam, prana becomes dependent on the karanam. Prana depends upon the karanam according to samkya philosophy. Which will be mukyam and which be gaunam according to samkya philosopher is our question. Therefore who will be sreshtah and karanm will be sreshtah and on the other hand it is said that prana is mukyah and we know the story of the upanishad that without prnaa no sense organs functions. When prana is about to go out all the sense organs are also pulled along and there is prana sruti in the prasnopanisad. Sense organs

depend upon prana and prana is not dependent upon sense organs. According to samkya prana will depend upon sense organs for its existence. According to samkya, sense organs are mukya and prana is amukya. According to vedanta prana is mukya and sense organs are amukya as supported by the upanishad story that when the prana decided to pull out of the body all the sense organs began to become weak and inactive and they decided to persuade prana not to go out and in fact all of them chanted prana sruti. Therefore na vayukriye kritak upadesat. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

#### **Sutra 2.4.10 [279]**

#### ***Chakshuradivattu tatsahasishthyadibhyah***

But [the prana is subordinate to [the soul], like eyes, etc., on account of [its] being taught with them [the eyes, etc.,] and for other reasons.

The characteristics of prana are continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. In the previous sutra we establish that prana is not vayu, prana is not the ekadasa karanam also. We also said that it is not karana function. It is not element it is not karanam, it is karana funtion, and it is a separate tattvam. A doubt comes if it is not an external world of object, it is karanam also it is not karana vyapara also then if it is neither karana nor karma by parishesha nyaya only principle of triputio remains. Then prana must be a karta one may have a doubt. For this vyasacharya makes it clear that it is not a karta also. It is not karta because karta is swatantra chetanah and it should have a will and be sentient. Prana is neithet swatantra and in sushupti it does not have freewill. Prana is achetana tattvam only and it does not come under karta. If prana were karta it would have will power of its own. In this sutra vyasacharya will say it does not have a will of its own and for all practical purposes it is like a karanam but it is not a karanam. It is not karanam for we have not included in the eleven karanam. It does not have the freewill of its won. Then prana is vyartam and for this vyasacharya do not say that and you attend the classes. Vyasacharya explanation we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 231

### **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

#### **Sutra 2.4.10 [279]**

#### ***Chakshuradivattu tatsahasistyadibhyah***

But [the prana is subordinate to [the soul], like eyes, etc., on account of [its] being taught with them [the eyes, etc.,] and for other reasons.

The characteristics of prana are continued.

Vyasacharya defends the vedanta darsanam, which he has arrived at through pradhama adhyaya the extraction of vedanta darsanam. Of the four padas of this chapter in the first pada vyasacharya defended vedanta against all objections raised through smriti and yukti. Second pada is an odd pada, which will not fall in this line, and it does not defend vedanta darsanam but it talks of the defects of other darsanams. Second pada is offensive pada. First pada defends against smriti and yukti and third and fourth pada defends contradictions in vedanta darsanam. Third pada we have completed by resolving all the seemingly contradictory sruti statements regarding panca bootha sristi and boktru sristi. By the word bokta we mean jiva. Now we enter the fourth pada where boudhika sristi viridha pariharah is being done. The various products of the elements are called boudhika sristi. Out of them vyasacharya takes up gouna prana and mukhya prana. The word gouna prana means ekadasa bashya andhakaranani. Bashya karanani means external sense organs panca jnanendriyas and panca karmendriyani and andhakaranam. Bashya karanam ten and andhakaranam one and we have eleven sense organs which is called gauna prana and this was discussed in the first three adhikaranam of this pada. Three topics were discussed one is utpatti [origination], smakya [number of\karanas] and gauna prana parimanah [the size]. Now in the next three adhikaranam the fourth fifth and sixth vyasacharya deals with mukhya prana mukhya prana utpatti, mukhya prana samkya and mukhya prana size. Fourth adhikaranam we have completed. We are in fifth adhikaranam. The present adhikaranam is called vayu kriya adhikaranam which has got four sutra of which i have introduced the second sutra. As i said the main purpose of the adhikaranam is mukhya prana samkya that is the number. The answer will be given later in sutra 12. Mukhya prana is one but we count as though five prana, udana, samana apana, etc. Now we discuss what exactly is the mukhya prana is the discussion here. The final conclusion of this discussion i will give you first. Vyasacharya not only will give our definition of mukhya prana and also negates the suggestions given by other systems also. Each system of philosophy has its own approach of prana. The definition of prana is not common to all. Different systems have different opinion. Prana is the life supporting system whose function is maintenance of infrastructure of the whole body, which is the office premises, and all the instruments of transactions. One is physical body as well as 11 instruments of transaction gauna prana and the maintenance of gauna prana is the function of mukhya prana. This maintenance of infrastructure should continue right from conception up to the death of the individual 24 hours a day. This maintenance system should function without

fail and once it fails, the person is no more. Only if the infrastructure is maintained, all the transactions can take place. The triputi the transacting karta, transacting karanams and transacting objects call the world. This is possible only when the mukhya prana maintains the infrastructure. Transactions are many and varied. There is also temporary resolution of transaction in sushupti avastha; transacting gauna prana are temporarily resolved and transacting world or karma is temporarily resolved and even when the transactions are resolved, triputi is resolved and the maintenance of the infrastructure which is the job of mukhya prana should continue even when the functions of gauna prana is resolved. Maintenance function is different from transaction. Maintenance is not one of the transactions. Because transactions can resolve; transacting triputi can resolve but maintenance function should continue. When the triputi resolves in sushupti, if the maintenance function resolves; other people will be busy in cremating you for you will be considered dead. Gauna prana is associated with the functions and mukhya prana is associative with maintenance function. Mukhya prana is associated with maintenance. Using the infrastructure and maintaining the infrastructure are different. Karta uses the karanam and prana maintains the karanam; karta contacts the world and it is called karma; prana does not contact with the world. Prana has got connectrion with karanam and karta has got connection with karanam. Karta uses the karanam and through karanam contacts the world but prana does not sue the karana prana only maintains the karanam and vyasacharya wants to establish that the prana is different from triputi and therefore prana does not transact at all because of prana alone all transactions are possible. We prove that prana is different from triputi and different from triputi transaction. We prove that in sushupti prana does not resolve although triputi and triputi functions resolve. Other systems of philosophy commit the mistakes. One mistake committed by them is that when then take as vayu, the mistake committed by them is vayu becomes one of the triputi. It becomes part of the world karma; samkya philosophers commit another mistake and they say mukhya prana is nothing but transactions done by the gauna prana; vyasacharya says that mukhya prana is neither gauna prana nor is it the functions of the gauna prana. It is not the activities of the gauna prana. The final mistake is that mukhya prana can be taken as karta. Vyasacharya says that the maintaining company is different from transacting company. Transacting company may stop transactions but the maintaining company will continue the maintenance. Similarly the karta the jivah will suspend the transactions in sushupti and even when the karta jivah suspends the transaction triputi is gone; transactions are gone; but the prana continues to maintain the infrastructure of the eleven gauna prana although they have suspended the transactions in sushupti. Here we are told of the story in the prasnopanisad that it is proved how the sense organs are dependent of prana. When the maintaining function of prana is about to stop, the sense organs began to weaken and they realized and started chanting praise of prana without which they cannot function. Prana is life-supporting system. We are alive because of the inbuilt life saving system in the form of prana provided by the god. In the ninth sutra vyasacharya has established that the mukhya prana is neither the instrument nor is it the function of the instrument. Karma rejected karanam rejected and karana vyapara is rejected. In the tenth sutra vyasacharya says that the mukhya prana is not the karta or jivah because karta resolves during sleep. Karta with freewill resolves in sleep while the mukhya prana does not resolve in sleep. If free will belongs to mukhya prana in sleep also we will have freewill. If you are going to reject freewill in jagrat i have nothing to say. In our tradition, it is said that rejecting freewill is a papam. Freewilled karta is there in jagrat and that karta is resolved in sushupti. The mukhya prana alone keeps the body alive. Vyasacharya gives one more argument in this sutra to establish mukhya prana is not the karta jivah. He says here that whenever mukhya prana is enumerated in the sastra, it is listed alongwith the other eleven instruments called gauna prana. Gauna prana is instruments and instruments are not karta and therefore since

mukhya prana goes along with the karanam vyasacharya says mukhya prana is also similar to karanam. It is similar to karanam in being different from karta. It is not a karta is our conclusion. Karanas have got transacting function and prana has got the maintenance function. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

The word tu means however; chakshuradivat means the primary prana is like the eye etc., tatsaha sishtyadibhyaha because of their proximate reference and other reasons. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Chakshuradivat means eye etc., eyes etc., means eleven karanas; the gauna pranas' chakshuradivat similar to gauna prana; mukhya prana is comparable to gauna prana in being different from karta. Gauna prana is used for transactions and mukhya prana gives the life supporting system for gauna prana to function. Tatvat means similar to. Tu means to differentiate this from the previous sutra. Previous sutra gives the opinions of other systems of philosophy; but here we give our view of prana. Tatsaha sishtyadibhyaha means gauna prana is proximate reference gauna prana saha sristi is the meaning of this compound. Mukhya prana has got reference close to the reference to of gauna prana. It is different from karta; now the question is where do we find the reference together. One is kenopanisad mantra 1.1 that reads as *kenesitam palati presitam manah kena pranah prathamah praiti yuktah kenesitam vacam imam vadanti, caksush srotam ka u devo yunakti* the meaning of this mantra is by whom willed and directed does the mind light on the objects; by whom commanded does life the first move; at whose will do people utter this speech; and what god is it that prompts the eye and the ear. Here mana, prana, caksu, srotam all the transacting organ is gauna prana. Kena prana prathamah means mukyah pranah. There is another example is mundaka upanishad 2.1.3 that says ye tasmad jayate pranah there etasmat pranah refers to mukhya prana because vayu and others are separately mentioned. On the above lines we refer that mukhya prana is different from gauna prana. One point i have given you in my general analysis that prana has no freewill.

There are two more argument given by the commentators. Prana is boudhika tattvam born out of panca pbutani whereas jiva the karta is noe one of the products of panca bhutas. The second argument is that prana na jivah jadatvad sariravat. Prana is a jada tattvam like sariram. Sariram is not intrinsically chetanam and it is intrinsically jadam and it ahs got borrowed chetanatva. But jivah is not jadah but jiva is chaitanyam. Jiva has got mixture chaitanyam that is abasa chaitanyam. Chidhabasa and chit pratibimba chaitanyam and bimba chaitanyam; pratibimba chaitanyam because it is dependent on bimba chaitanyam. Therefore also mukhya prana is different from karta jivah. It is not triputi and it does not do any transaction and it is but a maintaining system. More in the next class,



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 232

### **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

**Sutra 2.4.10 [279]**

#### ***Chakshuradivattu tatsahasistyadibhyah***

But [the prana is subordinate to [the soul], like eyes, etc., on account of [its] being taught with them [the eyes, etc.,] and for other reasons.

The characteristics of prana are continued.

After dealing with the gauna pranas in the first three adhikaranams, now vyasacharya deals with mukhya prana in this adhikaranam. Gauna prana means sense organs plus one andhakranam which ten bashya karanam and one andhakranam we call it as gauna prana throughout in this context. Mukhya prana is the system which maintains the infrastructure. It does not come under the eleven instruments of transactions. It keeps the infrastructure worthy and itself does not transact with the external world. Since mukhya prana is not directly involved in the transaction mukhya prana is different from triputi karta jiva the subject; the gauna prana the instruments and external world the object krama. Its only function is to keep the triputi active and in functional condition. Mukhya prana is comparable to gauna prana in one respect is that gauna prana is different from jiva and mukhya prana is different from jiva the karta ahankarah. Gauna prana is different from jiva is proved that the instrument is different from the user of the instrument. In the same way mukhya prana is different from ahankara jiva. It has to function in all the avastha and it continues but the karta jiva is active in jagrat and swapna but resolved in sushupti. Mukhya prana functions all through the lifetime and it is closer to karana the instrument. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

**Sutra 2.4.11 [280]**

#### ***Akaranatvaccha na doshastatha hi darsayati***

And on account of [its] not being an instrument the objection is not [valid]; because thus [scripture] declares.

An objection against sutra 10 is refuted.

First we will do a general analysis of this sutra. In the previous sutra it was mentioned that the mukhya prana is similar to ekadasa karanam. Why do we say mukhya prana is si` to

karanam and why cannot we take mukhya prana is a karana? There are two reasons. One is if mukhya prana is also a karanam an instrument, during sleep mukhya prana also will stop transactions. When karta resolves karanam also will resolve but we find that ekadasa karanam resolve but mukhya prana does not resolve. The second reason is that the eleven karanam has an external field to interact. If you take the jnanendriyam each one is connected with the corresponding vishaya. Thus ekadasa karanam has got contact with external world but the mukhya prana does not have any contact with external world but its only function is maintaining the body transactions worthy. That is why as long as prana function properly you can take all actions but once the prana is down all transactions are suspended. In this sutra, vyaacharya says the mukhya prana is unlike karanam and it does not have contact or transaction with external world. Eating is the function of the organ but digesting and distribution etc., comes under prana function. For mukhya prana there is no vishaya no object of transaction. Then you may ask is it redundant. Its role is to make the body transaction worthy. The final doubt is if the mukhya prana keeps the body transaction worthy it has to function right from conception up to death. It is an essential service and in all the avasthas it has to function. Karta and karana does not function in sushupti. Therefore it appears that the prana should be given superior status even the karta jivah. For this i can give one example. One rich man who does not have any idea of music but he wanted to show to the society that i am the promoter of music. He arranged a nadasvara kaccheri. The main vidwan and two tavils were there. Behind one fellow the sruti person was there and plays all through the kaccheri. The moment the concert began the sruti vidwan started and he continuously he plays whereas the main vidwan plays a few minutes and taval vidwan plays. This promoter saw that there was only one person continuously played while all other played not continuously. The promoter paid award to the sruti vidwan and he said the sruti is important and prana is comparable to sruti vidwan. Jiva is nadhasvara vidwan and prana is tambura sruti. Prana is the care taker and he does not have vishayah. Now i will give you the word for word analysis.

Akaranatvat since mukhya prana is not an instrument na doshah there is no flaw in the form of the absence of a field of interaction; hi because; darsayati sruti reveals tatha so; now we will go to the significance of the words. Akaranatvat means mukhya prana is not a karanam gauna pranas are karanas; karanam means sense organs including nntakaranam. Na doshah means there is no flaw at all; in the previous sutra mukhya prana was compared to gauna prana; based on that a doubt can come. Gauna prana has a vishaya and mukhya prana is similar to gauna prana and the mukhya prana should also have external field but mukhya prana does not have an external field and how can you compare to karanam. This is the doubt. For that the answer is that it is similar to karanam and it is not a karanam. Therefore the field is not require. The next question is if mukhya prana does have, a field of interaction is it not redundant to be imagined and the answer is that it is not redundant and even though it does not interact with the world, it maintains the system being a caretaker it is not redundant. It is known from the sruti vakyam. The final question what are the sruti vakyam that tell you this fact. One is prasopanisad 2.3 where the prana says to all the other instruments *aham evaitat pancadhatmanam pravibhajyaitad banam avastabhya vidharayami iti* which means do not cherish the delusion i alone dividing myself fivefold sustain and support the body. The next sruti vakyam is from brihadharaynaka upanisad 6.1.7 where there is a story given where all the instruments go to brahmaji and asks who is the most powerful fellow among all of us. Then brahmaji gives an experimentation and after that he says that you will come to know who is the superior to of all. Then the sense organs go one by one for an year holiday eyes, ears, mind and so on and when prana is about to go all the sense organs find that they are not able to function. That it is established the prana is superior to all the sense organs. Now comes the final sutra of this adhikaranam.

## **Topic 5. Vayukriyadhikaranam[sutras 9-12].**

The chief prana different from air and sense functions.

### **Sutra 2.4.12 [281]**

#### ***Panchavrittirmanovat vyapadisyate***

It is taught as having a fivefold function like the mind.

The description of the characteristics of the chief prana is continued.

First i will give you the general analysis of this sutra. This only gives you the answer to the question raised by the purva pakshi etc. Here alone is said the number of the mukhya prana. Mukhya prana utpatti is talked about and now in the fifth adhikaranam the number is the main topic and it is discussed here. Jnanendriyas are five karmendriyas are five and prana is one says vyasacharya like anthakaranam. It is not exactly five prana but there is one prana with five different functions. With regard to each function five names are given. Anthakaranam is one and it is known as mana, buddhi, chittam and ahankara. If we consider anthakaranam as four then karanam will be fourteen but we say only eleven. In the same way prana should be counted as one with pancha vrittih. That is called fivefold physiological system. Prana refers to respiratory system; apana to the evacuation system; vyana to circulatory system samana digestive system udanah to reversal system whenever required. These fivefold prana we do not consider as transactions. Breathing is not considered as transaction. Breathing is survival. Breathing is not any function, it is not a transaction; transaction is one done by any of the sense organs and anthakaranam. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we go to word for word analysis.

Panchavrittih manovat vyapudisyate means the primary prana is said to have fivefold functions like the mind; panchavrittih means the instruments; the system is one and the functions are five. Vyapadishyate means it is said in the sastra. Prana, apana, vyana, udana and samana are five; even though mana, chittam, buddhi and ahankara names are there but it relates only to the andhakaranam. Manah should be understood as chaturvidha anthakaranam. Here a doubt can come? The possible doubt is vyasacharya says that the prana is fivefold as in the case of the mind., we know the mind is fourfold and how can we say that the prana is fivefold like the mind. Adhi sankaracharya gives two answers here. One answer is here the fivefold prana and fourfold mind is compared for the particular purpose. It is not to show that here it is five and there it is five. Here the comparison is that one system has one name with pluralistic function. This is the purpose of example. The comparison is only to show the plurality of the function and to show the number. If you are so particular the comparison is perfect, i would say the mind is also fivefold. For that purpose i will go to the yoga sastra. There mind is said to have panchamukhi or fivefold function. Vyasacharya temporarily borrows from yoga sutra. 1.1.6 says that mind has five types of thoughts. Vrittayah panca daiyah is yoga sutra. Incidentally you may get a doubt as to the fivefold vrittis. They are pramana, viparyaya, vikalpa, nidra and smritayah. All our thoughts are categorized as five. Pramana means right knowledge or right cognition; see the rope as rope; viparyaya means wrong cognition pranti jnanam mithya jnanam see the rope as snake; we call it adhyasa; vikalpa means the knowledge of a nonexistent thing that abhava jnanam; somebody asks is there a horn for a rabbit; do i have a pot on my hand. I say no; now you have the knowledge the knowledge of the absence of pot; a very peculiar phenomenon. Object of knowledge is the

absence of pot on the hand. You have the knowledge for which object is not there. Nonobject is the object here. This is called vikalpah in yoga sastra. Fourth one is nidra. Nidra is sleep is a state wherein we have continuous cognition of a particular type. It is a continuous experience of a particular type. This is i do not know anything. I do not know anything. It is called nidra vrittih. How do you know you had such an experience. After waking up you say i did not experience anything which is a unique function of the kind and we call it is the function of dormant mind. It is karana sastra vritti. It is particular function of the mind according to the yoga sastra. Fifth is memory which is nothing but the recollection of an event already occurred. Remembrance does not come under pramana and any of the four thing. Controlling fivefold vritti is yogah. The mastery of the fivefold vritti is yogah. Therefore adhi sankaracharya says pancha vritti is perfectly all right. Prana is also pancha vritti and manas is also pancha vrititi. With this fifth adhikaranam is over. The topic left out is parimana or the dimension of the prana in the next adhikaranam. I will introduce the new adhikaranam.

### **Topic 6 sreshthanutvadhikaranam [sutra 13].**

The minuteness of the chief prana.

#### **Sutra 2.4.13 [282]**

#### ***Anuscha***

And it [chief prana is minute.

The description of the characteristics of the chief prana is continued.

This is the sixth adhikaranam with only one sutra.

It can be called anu adhikaranam also. Third andhakaranamm is also anuscha and here also it is anucha third deals with gauna prana adhikaranam and this adhikaranam relates to mukhya prana adhikaranam. In the third adhikaranam the word prana means gauna prana adhikaranam. Here it is mukhya prana adhikaranam. Here prana is anuh it is said. Eka vachanam is used to indicate that the mukhya prana is one. There plural is used because gauna prana is fivefold. The word anu is madhyama parinamah means finite in size and it is as big as the body. It is neither small nor is it big and it is medium sized. There are three stages purva paksi madham, ekadesi madham and siddhanta the details we will deal in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 233

### **Topic 6 sreshthanutvadhikaranam [sutra 13].**

The minuteness of the chief prana.

#### **Sutra 2.4.13 [282]**

#### ***Anuscha***

And it [chief prana is minute]

The description of the characteristics of the chief prana is continued.

This is the sixth adhikaranam with only one sutra.

I give you the general analysis of the sixth adhikaranam. It is an adhikaranam that establishes that mukya prana has got medium dimension neither small like anu or big like akasa. The word here is anu but the meaning is madhyama parinama. Here we go through three stages purva paksi, ekadesi and siddhanta madhams.

Purva paksi take a mantra 1.3.22 of brihadharaynaka upanisad that says the dimension of prana is mentioned and it says prana has the dimension equal to a white ant. It is so small as though of the size of an ant. It has got dimension equal to a mosquito. It further adds the prana is of the dimension of an elephant. Prana is as big as three lokas it is said. It concludes that it is equal to samasti prana hiranyagarbha vibhuh. It means it is vibhuh parimana. It starts with small ant and ends up with hiranyagarbha. Purva paksi says that in one mantra the size is contradicted from anu to vibhuh. Therefore, sruti is apramanam. The contradiction is not revealed in one mantra itself.

Now comes ekadesi who comes to reconcile the two. His conclusion is that prana is vibuh. It is all pervading like akasa. The pramanam is previous mantra itself [the last portion]. He says it is aupadhika pariccheda and the limitation is not intrinsic and it is conditioned by the enclosure. The gatakasa appears as small conditioned by the pot although akasa is not small. Such different is an imaginary limitation caused by conditioned by the enclosure.

Siddhanta gives the answer in the sutra. Through this sutra vyasacharya establishes that the prana is not vibuh but madhyama parinamah. The reason may that anu is a smaller word and madhyama is a bigger word. Adhi sankaracharya gives the significance for the choice of the word. The word anu conveys the idea of the indriya sookshmatvam also. Anumanam conveys two ideas one is sookshmah. The next is paricchedahcha in this context means madhyama parinamah. Vyasacharya does not give the reasoning for using the word anu to denote madhyama parinamah. If prana is considered all pervading the sruti talking about leaving the body at the time of death cannot be explained. Prana leaving the body is talked about in several places and also we normally use the word prana is gone. That sruti vakyam is 4.2.2 of brihadharaynaka upanisad talks about prana leaving the body. Then the second reason is that if prana is all pervading prana will not leave the body; chaitanyam also will not leave the

body; both are vibhuh; the consequence will be that the death will never take place. Pratyaksa anubhava of death also proves that prana is not all pervading. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Anuh and cha are two words. Cha means moreover; anuh means it is subtle and of medium dimension. Now we will see the significance of the word. Anuh means madhyama parinamah. This is called gauna prayogah. There is some common feature from both anu and madhyama parinamah. A boy can be called lion if he has got the features of a lion bravery etc. It is allowed when both have certain common feaures. Anu and madhyama parinamah have common feature that both of them are not vibhu. We should not take this literally. Cha means the conjunction to combine the two topic given in the previous two adhikaranam. Finally we have to answer the purva pakshi and ekadesi.

Ekadesi has already been answered. Ekadesi said that prana is all pervading and we have already answered that the death cannot be explained if the prana is all-pervading. Now we will take up purva pakshi madham who says there is contradiction. Prana is of medium size depending upon the size of the physical body. Prana maya has the same kosa as anna maya kosa. Just vayu expands and contracts; prana also expands and contracts depending upon the container. Jaina and buddhism say atma contracts and expand which we do not accept. Only problem we have in explaining is where prana is equated to sarva gatha hiranyagarbha. Adhi sankaracharya says it is for sthuthi artham and for upasanartham. Even in taittiriya upanishad it is does for upasana. The meaning should not be taken literally. Thus, purva pakshi is answered.

Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 7 jyotirdyadhikaranam {sutrass 14-16}**

The presiding deities of the organs

### **Sutra 2.4.14[283]**

#### ***Jyotiradyadhishthanam tu indamananat***

But there is the presididng over by fire and others [over the organs]. Because of such statement in sruti.

Now follows a discussion on the dependence of then organs or the presiding deities.

First i will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam with three sutras. The topic of this adhikaranam is with regard to the gauna prana or the karanams which are eleven. The topic is can the eleven independently interact with the respective field or do they require the grace and blessings of the respective devatas. Ekadesa karanam is called adhyatmam; the field is called adhibootham and life is the interaction between adhyatmam and adhibootham; now the question is can the adhyatmam directly interact with adhibootham independent or do they require adhideivams or devatas for interesting with the adhibootham. Krishna says in gita 18.14 and 15 *adhistanam tatha karta karanam ca prthagvidham vividhas ca prthakcesta daivam cai'va'tra pancamam sariravan manobhir yat karma prarabhate narah nyayam va viparitam va pancai'te tasya hetavah* which means the physical body or the seat of karma, the doer or the guna, various instruments or the organs, various pranas or bio-impulses, and the

fifth is the presiding deities or the five basic elements. Whatever action, whether right or wrong, one performs by thought, word, and deed; there are its five causes. Right or wrong we require deity we wish to establish. Our experience is that we have eyes, colour and form and why we require a devata is our contradictory. Siddhanta says that devata is required. Here we have purva paksi, ekadesi and siddhanta. Purva paksi says sruti is confused and in some places devatas are mentioned and some places devatas are not mentioned and hence sruti is apramanam. One is 1.2.4 of aitareya Upanishad that declares that there is caksur indriyam and surya devata in the eye. Fire having become speech entered the mouth. That senses are inert. They cannot move by themselves. Therefore, the pranas and the senses are dependent on the presiding deities. There are series of mantras talking about the devata amsa plus indriyam put together in the sense organs etc. That is why in mundakopanisad says at the time of death the devata amsa goes back to original devata. There is another mantra quoted by brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.2.5 caksusahi rupani pachyathi a person sees the form with the help of the eyes. In this statement, the Upanishad does not mention the devata at all. Therefore, it appears the eyes are enough to see the things. There are many Upanishad quotations in support of this statement also. Because of these differences, purva paksi says sruti has differences and therefore sruti is apramanam. Ekadesi says eyes are independent and we do not require any devata. Indriyam is swatantram is his argument and the pramanam from his the one from brihadharaynaka upanisad. We will ask if you say indriyam is swatantram how do you justify the previous statement. He says devatas are mentioned for upasana purposes and devatas are not required. Now siddhanta has to come and answer the objection.

The general analysis of the first sutra is that devatas are required and only with the blessings of the devata the sense organs function. There is no logic for that because devatas are apourusheya vishaya and we can give only sruti pramanam only. In several places there are various srutis supporting this view. Without devata the adhistana devata, no transaction can take place. That is why when the organ has problem there is propitiation of the relevant devata. If their blessings are not required then why surya namaskaras are prescribed for better eyesight.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Tu means indeed; jyotiradhyadhishtanam means fire etc., agni devata etc., are the presiding deities [of the sense organs gauna pranah] tadamananat it is revealed by the sruti; now we will see the significance of the words. Jyotiradhi means all the devatas including agni devata in this context; adhishtanam means adhisthana devatas; tu means meant to negate the purva paksi. To say you do not require an adhisthana devata you cannot even say that there is no devata. On several occasions, even doctors are not able to say why something happens with the sense organs. All this happens due to purva janma karmas only. Devatas are therefore important. Tadamanat sathya amananam devata adhishtanatvam is a fact that every organ is presided by the devata. This includes smriti also. The Upanishad references are given in the above analysis. In maha bhārata also there is a reference of adhyatma adhi bootha and adhideiva with regard to the creation. The next question is how do you answer the ekadesi and purva paksi. Esi says it is swatantram because we do not see the devatas. We have already answered that sruti pramana do not require any other pramanam because it is apourusheya vishaya. For devatas only the sruti is the reference or pramanam. Therefore you should accept the pramana of Upani. Purva paksi asks how do you answer the brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam that the organs function independently. It has not mentioned the devata alright and nonmention of the devata is not the negation of the devata. Mention of the caksur indriyam is not the negation of devata but it has not been mentioned. Why did Upanishad not mention the devata

there? For this, brihadharaynaka upanisad portion is a discussion between artha bagha and yajnavalkya and the latter is the student and he asked about adhyatmam and adhibootham and there is no reference to the adhideivam there. Hence do not misquote the □panishad vakyam and say that the □panishad is apramanam. More we will see in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 234

### **Topic 7 jyotirdyadhikaranam {sutras 14-16}**

The presiding deities of the organs

**Sutra 2.4.14[283]**

#### ***Jyotiradyadhishthanam tu indamananat***

But there is the presiding over by fire and others [over the organs]. Because of such statement in sruti.

Now follows a discussion on the dependence of then organs or the presiding deities.

Now we are in the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. In the first three adhikaranams gauna pranas were talked about. In the next three adhikaranam mukhya pranas were talked about. In the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam we discuss the gauna prana again as to whether the 11 karanas function themselves or they are blessed by the devatas. Vyasacharya establishes that they function with the blessings of the adhisthana devatas alone. The creation is triangular and all the interaction in the creation involves adhyatma, adhiboota and blessed by adhideivam. If a person asks that i do not see adhideivam blessing the karanam, we say that adhideivam comes under apourusheya vishaya and it is beyond pratyaksa and anumana pramana. The vedas teaches only that which is beyond pratyaksam and anumanam, logic and scientific study. Since there are eleven karanas we say that there are many devatas also. This is the meaning of the first sutra. Now we will enter the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra.

### **Topic 7 jyotirdyadhikaranam {sutras 14-16}**

The presiding deities of the organs

**Sutra 2.4.15[284]**

#### ***Pranavata sabdat***

[the gods are not the enjoyers, but the soul, because the organs are connected] with the one [i.e., the soul] possessing them [a thing we know] from the scriptures.

From the preceding sutra a doubt may arise that the gods who guide the senses may be the enjoyers, this doubt is removed by this sutra.

Then previous sutra lead to a possible question and the question is answered in the following sutras. First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. From the previous sutra we understand that the karanams are blessed by the presiding deities and they are chetana tattvam. We also know all the karanas are meant for the utility of jiva who is also a chetana tattvam. Behind the karanam there is a karta jivah and behind the karanam there is devata

also. Every karanam is backed by two chetana tattvams karta in the form of jiva and adhistana devata. If there are two chetana tattvams behind karanam which one becomes karta and bokta. If the hand is doing a particular action behind the hand there is adhistana devata indra devata as also i, the jivah as a karta. Now the question is who is the karta of the action indra or jiva partially both. Once the question of kartrutvam comes it should be definitely followed by bokrutvam also. Whether indra is bokta of good and bad karma of the hand or the jivah is bokta of good and bad karma. How the kartrutvam and bokrutvam are explained? Whether the karanam are directly connected to jivatma the karta or connected to adhisthana devata? Whether jiva or devata is accountable and responsible for the actions of the hand or for that matter sense organs? Vyasacharya answers even though adhisthana devata is responsible for action, adhisthana devata is not accountable for activities and it does not become or incur punya papam for the action of the sense organs even though the blessings of the devata is required for action. Surya prakasa is required for our action but surya devata is not accountable for good and bad action. Jiva alone is linked to all the karanams. Jiva alone is the operator of the karanams, jiva alone is karana prayokta, jiva alone is karta, and jiva alone has to face the music. This is the essence of this sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Pranavata the sense organs are connected to the jiva only. Sabdat means this is revealed by the sruti [therefore the jiva alone is karta and bokta] now we will see the significance of the words. Pranavata with the jiva alone; then we have to add with the jiva is the connection of the eleven sense organs eleven karanams are connected to jiva alone and not to the adhisthana devatas. Vyasacharya says sruti pramana itself makes it clear that jivatma is connected to the sense organs and to the devata. Refer to 8.12.4 of chandogya upanisad *yo veda idam digrani iti saha atma; gandhaya granam*; whoever says whichever jivatma says i smell this object, that jivatma alone is the karta the subject, the agent of the action and the grana indriya is the jivatma's instrument and not adhisthana devata's instrument. Therefore, i am the subject as both karta as well as bokta. Adhi sankaracharya gives some additional reasons also. Suppose we take adhisthana devata as the subject of the action there will be two problems. One is in every individual there are eleven organs. Therefore, eleven activities are there as hearing eating etc. The adhisthana devatas are also eleven. How many subjects will be there in every individual? Behind every body there will be eleven subject and therefore the meaning of the word i will not be one but eleven different subjects occupying the body. How are we to manage the eleven subjects? There will be plurality of kartas and boktas and that is the dosha number one. Second problem is since each activity is done by different subject backed by each devata, no devata will know the activity of the other one because each one different one. One cannot know the activity of the other. If hearer and writer are different there is problem of coordination. One subject for cooperation should govern hearer and writer. This can be done by one subject alone and not by the adhisthana devatas. There is constant i that connect all the sense organs and that is done by one jivatma. Therefore one jivatma alone is karta and bokta.

## **Topic 7 jyotirdyadhikaranam {sutras 14-16}**

The presiding deities of the organs

**Sutra 2.4.16[285]**

***Tasya cha nityatvat***

And on account of its [soul's] permanence [in the body it is the enjoyer and not the gods.

An argument in support of sutra 15 is given.

This is the extension of the previous sutra. There jivatma alone is karta and bokta it was said there even though adhisthana devatas bless the sense organs. Here vyasacharya says jivatma is connected to the organs not only in this birth but eternally in every birth. That is why at the time of death the jivatma quits the physical body all right but when jivatma vacates the house jivatma is careful in taking away the eleven organs. Here gita says *sariram yad avapnoti yac capy utkramati'svarah grhitvai'tani samyati vayur gandhan iva'sayat* as the air takes away the aroma from the source [or flower] similarly, atma takes the six sensory faculties from the physical body it casts off [during death] to the [new physical] body it acquires [in reincarnation by the power of karma]. Jivatma holds on to the karanams while living and later after death during traveling it carries and when it takes new body. The jivatma keeps the karanam in the new respective golakams and the experiences are new feelings are new but the karanams are the gathered karanams and jiva` is permanent karta and bokta and adhisthana devata never becomes karta and bokta of the jiva. The adhisthana devata even temporarily borrows kartrutvam or bokrutvam. therefore jivatma is connected to the eleven organs. Jivatma with karanams alone chooses the body for gathering the specific experiences. The very travel, the loka or sariram it chooses for jivatma's experience of that. It is not acceptable i choose the body and the adhisthana devata have it some other choice different from i the jivatma. Therefore jivatma alone chooses all these things for its own experience and therefore jivatma is karta and bokta. Now we will do word for word analysis of the sutra.

Cha means moreover; nityatvat means due to permanence tasya of that connection [jivatma is always the karta and the bokta] now we will see the significance of the words. Nityatvat means because of the permanence tasya means of that; here tad means jivatma karana sambandha which we have to take from the previous sutra. Cha indicates the conjunction the additional information in addition to the previous sutra. How do we know that jivatma karana sambandha is nityam. In tarka sastra jivatma karana sambandha is not nityam. Tarka sastra opines that at every new birth new body and new organs are obtained but vedanta sastra thinks otherwise that sense organs are carried from one janma to another janma. In fact we will say even the next physical body we carry. That will be the topic in the third adhyaya first adhikaranam. Here we confine to the eleven karanams. The question comes as to how do we know this? In the present janma one may be blind and in the next janma he may have eyesight. This is because of the availability or nonavailability but it is because of the obstacle of papa pratibandha that makes the adhisthana devata withdrawing the sakti. Plant has all the karanams but it does not have the golakams. Jivatma has eleven karanams but whether they function or not depends upon karma. Our confidence that his happens is based on the brihadharaynaka upanisad statement 4.4.2. When jiva quits the body the mukhya prana goes along with jiva. Also the gauna prana the eleven sense organs also travel along with jivatma. We have smriti pramanams also in gita 15.7 as already quoted above. Therefore jivatma karana sambandha is nitya and therefore jivatma is karta and bokta of the particular sariram and activity. Adhi sankaracharya gives some more arguments. He says that if the adhisthana devata becomes kartga and bokta of activities behind the karanam i will live in buloka and therefore my karanams will experience punya phalam as also the

papa phalams also. If the adhisthana devata is a bokta the consequence will be that devatas will experience not only punya phalam but also the papa phalams existing in buloka as also the naraka loka. The same indra and agni are dhisthana devata, they will experience sukha dukha of all devatas, and they will not go to swarga loka. They will experience punya papa sukha and dukham also. Punyam eva mungaccadhi and devas experience only punya phala sukham and they will not experience papa phalam and this statement will be falsified if it is the bokta of my punya papa also. Final argument is that the adhisthana devata cannot experience sukha and dukham through my karanams in my body because because adhisthana devatas have got their own sense organs and punya papam in their higher lokas. By going to swarga loka indra has gone to swarga loka and indra has got his own physical organs. How can he experience sukha and dukha with respect to my punya papa of my karanams. Therefore, jivatma alone is connected to ekadasa indriyani. With this 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 8 indryadhikaranam {sutras 17-19}**

The organs are independent principles and not functions of the chief prana.

#### **Sutra 2.4.17[286]**

#### ***Ta indriyani tadvyapadesadanyatra sreshthat***

They [the othetr pranas] are sesnses on account of being so designated [by the scriptures], with the exception of the best [the chief prana]

The distinction between the chief prana and other pranas [the organs] is now pointed out

First we will see the general introduction to this adhikaranam with three sutras. Here also vyasacharya deals with gauna prana only. Here indriyam means sense organs or the gauna prana. Here vyasacharya deals with more fundamental question and the question is why should we accept that there are sense organs in the individual. Naturally, you will be bewildered as to how is it possible. The purva paksi asks why sense organs be accepted as separate principle. You have already talked about the mukhya prana. We said there all the physiological function as different faculties of one prana. This we did in sutra number 12 before. We said functions are many but the tattvams are many. Now we take all eleven prana as ekadasa vrittayah .of one prana. So prana has 16 different features we say. Why should we have the gauna prana. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 235

### **Topic 8 indryadhikaranam {sutras 17-19}**

The organs are independent principles and not functions of the chief prana.

**Sutra 2.4.17[286]**

#### ***Ta indriyani tadvyapadesadanyatra sreshthat***

They [the other pranas] are senses on account of being so designated [by the scriptures], with the exception of the best [the chief prana]

The distinction between the chief prana and other pranas [the organs] is now pointed out.

I will continue the general analysis of the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. The topic analysed here is whether the sense organs should be considered as separate principle or tattvam or whether we can include all sensory functions of prana itself. Whether gauna prana can be taken separate principle or whether it can be taken as separate feature of mukhya prana. The five features of mukhya prana are not taken as separate tattvam. They are but five vrittis of one prana. Similarly why cannot we take sensory function also take as one prana tattvam. In vedanta what we have done is that the five physiological system we have taken as prana. The analysis is why should we take the functions separate tattvam. The problems in this regard is vague and they seem to contradict and therefore we have three stages of analysis purva paksi, ekadesi and siddhanta. Purva paksi would say sruti contradicts itself and therefore it is not valid source of knowledge; this stand is based on two-sruti statement to show the seeming contradiction. First is the well known mundaka mantra 2.1.3 where the sense organs are taken as separate tattvam.the mantra says 'from him are born prana, mind and all organs. Mukhya prana and indriyana the gauna prana are taken distinctly the mantra says that origination of mukhya prana separately etasmat jayate pranah. Prana is originated separately. All sense organs known as gauna pranas are separately mentioned as originating from Brahman. The very fact that they are enumerated separately reveals that they are separate tattvam. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.5.21 gives a contradictory idea. Te etasya eva sarve rupam abhavan, which means all the sense organs, assumed the form of mukhya prana itself. Before that there is a context which develops is that all sense organs were created by lord and each one got tired after functioning for sometime. The kala tattvam attacked every sense organs [eyes get tired if you use them continuously and so also the other sense organs] and all of them get tired when used continuously. But prana tattvam that maintains life never gets tired after constant use and it goes on and on during the entire jagrat avastha, swapna and also in sushupti avastha when the sense organs get tired and take rest in sushupti. Mukhya prana constantly goes on and on. Sense organs decided that if we takes the prana rupam they can also work tirelessly. Sense organs took the form of mukhya prana and therefore only they got the name gauna prana. This is the story occurring in brihadharaynaka upanisad.therefore sense organs should not be taken as separate tattvam and should be taken as prana. Brihadharaynaka upanisad equates prana with sense organs while mundaka shows they are separate. Purva paksi says as there is contradiction veda is apramanam.

Ekadesi says the second option alone should be taken. All sense organs must be included in panca prana. They should not be counted as separated tattvam based on the brihadharaynaka upanisad statement. We ask ekadesi how do you reconcile mundaka vakyam. For that ekadesi says it need not say that upanishad casually enumerate them separately. The usage of a word is meant for the purpose of clarity alone it is said. Man is a thinking living being. If we use the word man is living being it includes the female also. There is a man and woman and when we say man it includes female also. Similar ekadesi says that prana includes indriya and indriya is sometimes separately enumerated. All sense organs are different functions of prana and they are not separate tattvam. This is ekadesi madham.

Now comes siddhanta and now we will see the general analysis of the sutra. Here vyasacharya says that sense organs should be taken as separate tattvam. The argument in its favour is that they are given separate name in the upanishad. The specific name is that they are not called prana but they are called indriyani. Sense organs name cannot be applied to prana. This is the significance of the first sutra.

Now i will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. Te means the secondary pranas [are specified indriyani as sense organs] tad vyapadesat because of this specification as sense organs anyatra means they are distinct [gauna prana] shreshtat mukhya prana. Now we will see the significance of the words. Te refers to gauna prana eleven in number; indriyani are sepecified we have to supply; they are specified as sense organs in 2.1.3 of mundaka upanishad. Tad vyapadesat means because of such specification as sense organs. Anyatra means distinct. The gauna pranas are distinct from mukhya pranas.

### **Topic 8 indryadhikaranam {sutas 17-19}**

The organs are independent principles and not functions of the chief prana.

#### **Sutra 2.4.18[287]**

#### ***Bedasruteh***

[on account of the] scriptural statement of difference.

An argument in favour of sutra 17 is given.

In this sutra he says the upanishad distinguishes the sense organs from prana. The name is separate and discussions are also separate and because of separate discussion they have got separate status. This sutra talks about separate discussion in the sastra. Here 1.3.7 of brihadharaynaka upanisad is quoted here. Devas and asuras fight continuously. Devas wanted to have adhista phalam and they wanted to do the omkara upasana. Each organ wanted to do this upasana. Vak indriyam did upasana and other organs followed the practice. When they practiced upasana, the asuras got worried because with the extra strength the organs cannot be defeated. Therefore, asuras disturbed the sense organs not to practice the upasana. Because of the attack from asuras, the sense organs did papas at times. With ears we hear good things and also we hear bad things. So also is the case with other organs like eyes etc. In 1.3.7 the upanishad says after exhausting all the resources they requested the prana to do upasana and hwne prana was doing the upasana, the latter destroyed asuras and made the asuras incapable of attacking them. If you throw a clod of earth on a stone, the stone will not get destroyed but eh clod will be broken to pieces. Here sense organs are elaborately discussed and latter prana

is discussed separately. This indicates that they are distinct tattvam. Therefore the conclusion is that the sense organs are separate and the pranas are separate.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of this stura. Bedasruteh means because of the differentiating scriptural texts [they are different]. Now we will see the significance of the word. Sruti here means vedic portion. Beda means differentiating or discriminating or separating sruti portion . Prana and indriyas are separated. In sastra the word atha generally refers to prakarana beda. In english we start a new paragraph when we take to new topic. Here atha indicators that indriyas are separate tattvam and pranas are separate.

## **Topic 8 indryadhikaranam {sutras 17-19}**

The organs are independent principles and not functions of the chief prana.

### **Sutra 2.4.19[288]**

#### ***Vailakshanyaccha***

An on account of the difference of characteristics

The argument in favour of sutra 17 is given.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya gives the third reason that prana and sense organs have separate function. They have two different functions. Mukhya prana does the maintenance function and survival is not considered as one of the transaction. .survival does not come under transaction but survival is the main deed for the function. The indriyas are meant for transactions in life. That is why the superiority and inferiority of the living being is measured in terms of transaction but on the basis of the survival. All living beings are graded uniformly but the differences amongst living beings are based on the functions or transactions. The gradation is possible by transactions and therefore transactions are totally separate functions where alone triputi comes, adhyatmam, adhideivam adhibootham function come. Because of this only we find another very important difference. The transaction can come and go; in jagrat we have transactions; in swapna we have dream transactions and in sushupti we have no transactions at all. But prana and its functions continue. One is essential service and the others are secondary service but they are needed for survival. Function difference is the third reason for their distinction.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Vailakshanyat cha because of the distinct nature also they are different. Then i will give you the significance of the word. Vailakshanyam means distinct nature.sense organs can afford to stop in sushupti but not prana. Before we conclude this adhikaranam we have to refute purva paksi and ekadesi.

Esi says that they should be taken as one principle. For that purpose, he told the brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam as the support. It says all sense organs said that let us assume the nature of prana. Here adhi sankaracharya points out that sense organs assumes the nature of prana and it does not mean that they have become one with prana. Since sense organs are not active in sushupti, we say that the sense organs borrow kriya sakti from prana just as the electricity lends power to different gadgets.

Then we have to refute purva paksi and they said that they are contradictory brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam should be taken as though prana because they borrow kriya saksi. Prana is born out of rajo guna and therefore it has kriya saksi and lend kriya saksi to all the sense organs. With this 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over. 8<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam the purva paksi and ekadesi try to do one job. There is slight difference. In fifth adhikaranam ekadesi said that prana is one of the aspects of sense organs. Here sense organs become independent tattvam and prana is taken as part. But in 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam ekadesi talks of the opposite. They say prana is independent tattvam but the others come under different plane. This is the attempt of ekadesi and siddhanta establishes that neither prana is an aspect of sense organs nor the sense organs is an aspect of prana. This is the essence of this adhikaranam. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 236

### **Topic 9 samjnamurtikiriptyadhikarnam {sutras 19-22}**

The creation of names and forms is by the lord and not by the individual soul.

**Sutra 2.4.20[289]**

#### ***Samjnamurtikiriptyistu trivritkurvata upadesat***

But the creation of the names and forms is by him who does the tripartite [creation], for so the scriptures teach

First, i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. In the previous eight adhikaranam various topics regarding the sookshma sariram were taken. They dealt with either mukhya prana or gauna prana or indriyani. All of them come under boudhikam. We can say that they belonged to sookshma boudhika sristi. The previous pada the bootha sristi was talked about and here boudhika sristi is talked about. This boudhika prapancha itself can be divided into two portion one is sookshma boudhika prapancha and sthoola boudhika prapancha. Now we deal with sthoola boudhika prapancha sristi. With regarding to this topic whatever seeming differences are to be resolved. This is the subject matter. Here also we will have purva paksi madham, ekadesi madham and siddhantah. The first sruti vakyam occurs in chandogya upanisad 6.3.2 and the mantra says *seyam devataiksata, hantaham imas tisro devata anena jivena 'tmana'nupravisya nama rupe vyakaravaniti* that divinity thought 'well let me enter into these three divinities by means of this living self and let me then develop names and forms. The essence of the sentence is like this. Brahman alone was there with maya sakti and this Brahman decided to create and he created three elements. We should three is equal to five elements. Upanishad talks about sookshma bootha sristi and not sookshma prapancha sristi that you have to supply. Now what is left out is the gross universe has to be created. Before creating the sthoola prapancha, Brahman thinks that let me enter the sookshma prapancha in the form of jiva. Sookshma prapancha implies all the sookshma sariram also. Brahman thinks let me enter the sookshma sariram in the form of jivah. Having entered the sookshma sariram as jiva let me create the sthoola prapancha. The expression used for sthoola prapancha is nama rupa. Nama rupa is equal to sthoola boudhika prapancha. Vyakaravani means let me create. If you read the sentence it looks let me enter sookshma prapancha in the form of jiva and let me create sthoola prapancha. It appears as jiva Brahman created sthoola prapancha and it appears that Brahman is not the creator but the jivah seems to be creator of sthoola prapancha and therefore the chandogya upanisad creates an impression that the jiva is sristi karta of sthoola prapancha. There is no confusion about the sookshma prapancha sristi. After the sookshma sristi having entered jiva created and it seems to be the karta of sthoola prapancha sristi. The name used for sthoola prapancha sristi is nama rupa vyakaranam. This is vakyam number one.

There is another vakyam from brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.4.7.that says *taddeham tarhy avyakrtam asit tan nama rupabhyam eva vyakriyata asau nama, ayam idam rupa iti tad idam apy etarhi nama rupabhyam eva vyakriyate, asau nama ayam idam rupa iti*. Here the avyakritam refers to Brahman the isvara the creator or maya sahitam Brahman. That Brahman

alone projected expanded all the nama rupas which included sthoola prapancha sristi. Brihadharaynaka upanisad says that Brahman created all the nama rupas or the sthoola prapancha. Whereas nama rupa vyakaranam is done by jiva as per chandogya upanisad. The controversy is since the upanishad is contradicting itself do not study the vedas is the purva paksa madham.

Then comes ekadesi and he wants to resolve and sruti should be vindicated and validated. He says chandogya upanisad alone should be correct jiva alone is the creator of sthoola boudhika prapancha. Isvara can be the creator of sookshma prapancha. Jiva should be taken as the creator of sthoola prapancha. Therefore jiva is the karta. Ekadesi has to explain the brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam. He resolves the seeming contradiction in his own way. He says when brihadharaynaka upanisad says isvara is the creator of sthoola prapancha you have to split the vakyam into two. Isvara is the direct creator of the sookshma prapancha whereas with regard to sthoola prapancha isvara is the indirect creator. Isvara comes down in the form of jiva and as jiva he creates the sthoola prapancha. Therefore isvara is the creator of all one directly as isvara and the other indirectly as jivah. Ultimately god is the karta of everything. Thus, there is not contradiction at all.

Now comes siddhanta and he answers in sutra 20. Now we will do the general analysis of sutra 20. He says isvara or Brahman alone is the creator of this sthoola prapancha also. Vyasacharya asks us to observe the chandogya upanisad vakyam clearly. He says let me enter jivah and create the sthoola prapancha. Vyasacharya says study the next sentence to get the clarity. The next sentence is this that Brahman wanted to enter the jiva and create sthoola prapancha. Remember sthoola prapancha can be created only after creation of sookshma prapancha. Gross elements are not born before the creation of the subtle world. First he creates gross elements and then he wants to create the sthoola prapancha. Therefore he creates the gross elements. Here there is jiva reference. Let me grossify and create the gross universe. We come to know from this that isvara alone is the creator of gross universe also. The second part of chandogya upanisad vakyam resolves the confusion caused that the jiva created the universe. Let me create means that me refers to the isvara alone and not jiva. Since Brahman thought in the beginning, the let me refers to Brahman alone and not jiva. Jiva thus is neither the creator of elements nor the elementals.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samjnamurtikiription means the creation of the gross names and forms tu means indeed the function; trivritkurvatah of Brahman who created the gross elements; upadesat means since it is mentioned in the sruti statement; now we will go to the significance of the words. Samjnamurti means nama rupam; here nama rupa refers to the gross or the gross universe or sristih; tu means this word is for negating the purva paksi ekadesi; tirvrit kurvatah ; it means the one who grossifies; the grossification takes place in the case of subtle elements each one is pure without the mixture of others; all are mixed in particular proportion; when the elements get mingled together grossification takes place and every element is mixture of five elements. This grossification process in taittiriya it is called pachekaranam and in chandogya upanisad it is called trivritkaranam. The lord who brings in this sristi is called trivritkarman. It is the function of the lord. The creation of the gross universe is the function of the lord who creates three gross elements. The last word is upadesat because of the clear statement [second statement of the chandogya upanisad] in the first statement there is some vagueness and in the second statement jiva reference is not there and it is clear that Brahman alone created the universe also. Then adhi sankaracharya in his commentary gives two more reasons. Adhi sankaracharya says in the first statement also there is no vagueness at all if you study the

sentence clearly. The first sentence is having entered sookshma prapancha as jiva, let me create sthoola prapancha. Adhi sankaracharya argues that as jiva the expression is associated with the entry alone. It is not associated with the verb of creation. There are two verbs of which one is entered and the second one is created. Jiva is not associated with sthoola sristi and jiva intervention is not there with regard to sthoola sristi. Adhi sankaracharya gives one more argument and that if you say as jiva i enter the sooksma prapancha and as jiva i created the sthoola prapancha. It is not logical because jiva is not capable of creating the prapancha when he is not able to create even a small house in his lifetime. He cannot even understand the creation and how can he create the world. He give one more sruti support. He says let us search elsewhere whether there is any clarity. 814.1 of chandogya upanisad makes it clear without any doubt that Brahman created the sthoola prapancha. We have analysed this point in 1.3.2 of brahma sutra. Therefore sthoola prapancha sristi is done by Brahman and no jivah.

We will also see the refutation of the ekadesi and purva paksi to the ekadesi our answer is that jiva does not have the capacity to create sthoola prapancha. Therefore jiva is not the creator. If jiva is not the creator why should upanishad talk about entering the jivah? Upanishad need not introduce the topic of entry of jiva and what is the purpose of anupravesa. This is ekadesi's question. For this adhi sankaracharya answers that the entry of jiva is mentioned because sthoola prapancha sristi is meant for jiva. Isvara does not require any sariram or the prapancha for clearing the punya papam. It is clarified in 2.16 of the mandukya karika. Brahman entered as jiva and Brahman himself created the world for jiva. Finally purva paksi is also not correct because there is no contradiction between brihadharaynaka upanisad and chandogya upanisad vakyam as Brahman alone is the creator as per both the vakyams. With this the adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 9 samjnamurtikiriptyadhikarnam {sutras 19-22}**

The creation of names and forms is by the lord and not by the individual soul.

### **Sutra 2.4.21[290]**

#### ***Mamadi bhaumam yathasabdमितarayoscha***

Flesh, etc., originates from earth according to the scriptural statement and [so also] in the case of the other [elements viz., fire and water]

In the previous sutra sthoola boudhika sristi was talked about and here sookshma sarira sristi is talked about and it is born out of lord alone indirectly. This is discussed in 6.5.1 to 3 of chandogya upanisad. There the upanishad points out as to how three elements are responsible for the sookshma sariram and it talks about three parts of each elements. Earth has three parts gross, subtle and subtlest. Out of the three portions, three items are created. From the earth three things are created, gross waste, mamsam born out of subtle part of earth and manah the subtlest part of earth. Mutra, blood, prana from subtlest part and bone, marrow and speech are born out of the three elements. This is indicated here. We will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Flesh etc., bhaumam are the products of the earth; itharayohocha the products of the other two elements also should be known yatha sabdam as revealed in the sruti. Now we will see the significance of the word. Mamsadi mamsam, malam manah are the products of the gross, subtle and subtlest part of the earth; the products of the other two elements. Itara yoga refers to agni and water. Then comes the last sutra.

## **Topic 9 samjnamurtikiriptyadhikarnam {sutras 19-22}**

The creation of names and forms is by the lord and not by the individual soul.

**Sutra 2.4.22[291]**

### ***Vaiseshyattu tadvadastadvadah***

But on account of the preponderance [of a particular element in them the gross elements] are so named [after it]

Sutra 21 is amplified here.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. We pointed out before for creating the gross universe lord mixes all the five elements for grossification. Each gross element will have all five elements. There is prescribed proportion is there for mixing up for the purpose. The confusion is if akasa has five elements why should you say it is akasa even when akasa has all the five elements. Here it is said akasa is predominant and other elements are less. The name is given on domination basis. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Tad vadastad vadah of the particular name of a particular gross element vaiseshyattu is because of the predominant of a particular element. . Then the word tadvada is repeated once again to indicate the end of the second chapter. With this, the second chapter of brahma sutra is successfully over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 237

In the last class we completed the second chapter of Brahma Sutra and before entering the third chapter I have to deal with a few more things to complete the second chapter properly. In the last chapter, I dealt with the general analysis of the sutra and the word for word analysis also but I did not do the significance of the words, which I will do now. The sutra points out that every gross is the mixture of all the five elements the names given to the mixture is in terms of the predominance of the mixture by which we mean the Akasa will have the predominance name of Akasa tattvam as the other elements are 12.5 % of each element. vaisheshyam means predominance. The word tu is to negate the question or doubt or purva paksha niraharthah. The doubt is when the element is mixture of all elements why we call it by name of one element. Sookshma bhutas are called tanmatra and it indicates sookshma Akasa matram. Sthoola Akasa is mixture of all elements in different proportion while one element has the predominance. Vishesh bhutam or pradhana bhootam and vadah in this context is nama and tad vadah means pradhana bhoota nama. Finally, the word tad vadah is repeated to signify the end of the second chapter. This is the first point I wanted to deal with and I wanted to consolidate the second chapter. The first chapter established that the Brahman is the subject matter of Vedanta. this establishment of the tatparya is called samanvayah. What we have to understand the Vedanta vishayah Brahma. This was the essence of the first chapter which we called samanvaya adhyaya. The significance of this chapter is that Brahman can be known only through Vedantic study. No other method can reveal Brahma jnanam. even the Upasanas or meditation cannot give Brahma jnanam. this is the essence of the first chapter. In the second chapter, the teaching of the first chapter was reconfirmed or it was defended. The defending the first chapter is the aim of the second chapter. This was established by negating all the possible objections and it was established that there is no virodhah for our view established in the first chapter. To establish this all possible virodhas or objections were studied first, three and fourth padas. In the first pada sruti and yukti virodha or objections were negated. By sruti we mean all the other darsanams. Nyaya virodha was also refuted that there is no logical objections that can be raised by any philosophers. In the third and fourth padas sruti virodhas were negated that there is no internal contradictions within the sruti itself. Two padas were devoted to sruti virodha pariharah. Therefore the chapter got the title avirodha adhyaya. The second pada alone is an odd pada, which does not fall within the flow of the topic. The topic of the second pada is exposing the fallacies of the non-Vedantic systems. This is taking more a critical attitude. We feel that we should know the deficiencies of other systems only when our reverence for Vedanta will increase. The second pada para madha nirakaranam. With this Vedantic teaching is nicely enthroned. Now we have to go into the third chapter. Before going we will just see where do we stand in the entire study journey.

If you take chapter wise we have done two chapters and two more chapters to study. We are in the middle. If you go by the padas or section, totally there are sixteen padas. We have completed eight padas and we have to do eight more padas. Adhikaranam or topics wise we have 191 adhikaranams are there in Brahma Sutra we have completed 86 adhikaranam, which means we have to do 105 adhikaranams more. Adhikaranam wise we have done less than half. Sutra wise we have completed 291 sutras, we are left with 264 sutras, and we have covered more than half. With this background, we will enter into the third chapter. First I will

give you the general introduction and then I will give general introduction of the first pada and then the general introduction of the first adhikaranam.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 1

Class: 237

### **Introduction to the third chapter.**

This chapter is called sadhana adhyaya. As the word shows sadhana means preparatory disciplines to gain Vedantic teaching which has been established in the second chapters. Therefore it is called sadhana adhyaya. This adhyaya also has got four padas or four sections and all the four section deal with varieties of sadhanas only. the first pada the topic is jiva Gathi vicharah. It deals with the travel of jiva from sariram to sariram from loka to loka because of which alone the life is called samskarah. The purpose of this samsara vichara is to develop vairagyam which is a prerequisite to develop interest in Vedanta. Interest in Vedanta is directly proportional to disinterest in samsara or vairagya sadhanam. . the second pada deals with tat tvam padhartha vicharah the enquiry into tvam padhartha tat padhartha vicharah. Tvam refers to Jivatma swarupam and tat pada refers to Paramatma swarupam. Only if you know the meaning of tat and tvam you can understand the meaning of maha vakyam tat tvam asi. There is a basic law that the knowledge of a sentence requires the knowledge of the meaning of the words occurring in the sentence. Padhartha jnanam is the sadhanam for vakyartha jnanam. therefore padhartha vichara is essential for maha vakya jnanam and therefore tat tvam padhartha vichara is there in the second pada. the third pada deals with varieties of Upasanas. Upasana is required for concentration. Then the fourth and final pada deals with anya sadhana vichara like the role of sannyasa in gaining Brahma jnanam and the role of shamadi shatka sambattih etc. now having introduced the third chapter now I will go to the chapter three pada one.

The first pada deals with jiva Gathi the path of travel after death. this occurs in several places not only in vada anta paga but also in purva bagha. Vyasacharya deals with a particular portion occurring in Vedanta the pancagni vidya. It is dealt with in the entire pada. this occurs in two Upanishad one is Brihadharaynaka upanisad 6.2 and also it occurs in the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter section 3 to 10 of Chandogya upanisad. Vyasacharya takes the Chandogya upanisad portion. Until this pada is over I will request you to go through the Chandogya upanisad prakaranam. I will give you the essence of the panchagni vidya. Here Upanishad talks about the travel of jiva after giving up the body and until it take another body. This sastra alone is to be talked about because it is apourusheya vishaya. Until death what happens I can see. However, what happens after death I do not know what happens to me. The Upanishad points out that the departed jiva goes through five locations before becoming another embodies jivah once again. Each location is called an Agni figuratively. Therefore, five locations are called pancha agniyah. When the jiva passes through each location jiva gets particular transformation. It is not visible to us. apurusheya vishaya gets apourusheya transformation. Such tansformations we see even in our manufacture process. the raw materials go through several stages and ultimately comes through at the end a finished product which is completely different from the raw material fed at the beginning. Similar Bhagavan has got human assembly line with five locations. The five locations are enumerated as swarga, mega, bhoomi, Purusa, and nari.

Jiva enters everyone and goes through transformation with additions and when it comes out of fifth Agni the cooking is complete. Transformation takes place with the help of Agni alone. Baby requires a temperature for ripening. Thus, all the five are like incubators or like womb and each one cooks jiva and well-cooked jiva is ready for the consumption of the



society. vyavahara yogyatvam comes when the baby comes out after the fifth stage. Upanishad presents all of them a subject matter for meditation. Therefore, pancha Agni vidya and vidya here means Upasanam. This comes in the form of a dialogue between jaivali goutama samvadha rupena in Chandogya upanisad. It is all about a story told in the Upanishad. Here Svetaketu, the son of Gautama after receiving complete teaching from his father goes to the king Jaivili and on reaching the king asks the former five questions about pancha Agni vidya which Svetaketu could not answer. svetaketu gets humiliated and goes back to his father and asks him why he did not teach pancha Agni vidya. Gautama tells him that he himself did not know anything about the pancha Agni vidya and he goes to the king and request him to teach him the vidya. Thus the dialogue between Jaivili and Goutama takes place and the outcome of their dialogue is called pancha Agni vidya enumerated in the Chandogya upanisad. Here is an instance where the Brahmana goes to the ksatriya king to learn Pancha Agni vidya. This will be dealt with in the entire first pada. this pada has got six adhikaranams with 27 sutras. This is background of the first pada.

Now we will enter the first adhikaranam. in the first adhikaranam we will find out what is the subject matter and what is the doubt. The subject matter, the doubt, what is purva paksa and what is siddhanta will be used to discuss the first chapter. Here the subject matter is jiva gathih the travel of the disembodies jivah. Therefore it is invisible. The doubt is the jiva travels with what all factors and what is the luggage carried by the jvia. We know certain basic things. Chidhabasa will travel. Chit part of jiva will not travel because it is all pervading. Chidhabasa part of jiva alone travels. The reflecting medium the mind also travels. The mind represents the entire Sookshma Sariram which means prana, andhakaranam, jnanendriya and karmendriyas. Karana sariram though to mentioned it also travels. Now the question is when the disembodied jiva travels does it have the Sthoola Sariram during travel after death. this is the doubt. Then Purva Paksi says that the disembodies jiva travels without Sthoola Sariram at all because Sthoola Sariram is destroyed here. In support of this he gives sruti vakyams also. one example is 4.4.2 of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad quoted by Purva Paksi that says when the Chidhabasa leaves the body along with the Chidhabasa prana also travels. Then the Upanishad says when the mukhya prana leaves the body along with Chidhabasa the gauna pranas also leave. The Upanishad never talks about Sthoola Sariram at all. if you take Bhagavad Gita 15.7 sloka reads as *mamai 'vamso jivaloke jivabhutah sanatanah manah sasthani 'ndriyani praktisthani karsati* the meaning of the sloka is that Atma is indeed, My integral part. it becomes individual soul for Jivatma in the body of living beings by becoming associated with [or attached to] the six sense organs including the mind of perception or prakrti when Chidhabasa leaves the body it carries with it mind and indriyanis. All belongs to Sookshma Sariram. Sthoola Sariram is not mentioned here as also anywhere in the Upanishad. Sruti and smriti vakyam establish that Sthoola Sariram is not there for the disembodied jiva. Disembodied jiva need not carry the Sthoola Sariram because wherever it goes it can get a physical body with the pancha bhutas. This looks like siddhanta and this is the view of purva paksa. siddhanta will give his views that disembodied jiva has got rudimentary version of the next physical body even at the time of travel.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 238

### **Topic 1. tadantarapratipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.1 [292]**

#### ***Tadantarapratipattau rambati samparishvaktqh prasnanimrupanabhya***

In order to obtain another body [the soul] goes enveloped [by subtle elements] [as appears form] the question and explanation [in scripture, chandogya Upanishad.]

I will give you a general introduction to the first adhikaranam of the first pada of the third chapter. It is fairly big adhikaranam with seven sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is jiva Gathi the travel of the disembodied jiva after dropping the present body or after death. the doubt with regard to this topic is whether the disembodied travels with a physical body or without a physical body. Purva Pakshi holds the view that it is evident that the physical body is dropped here and the next body will come only in the next birth. The disembodied jiva travels without a physical body but travels with subtle body. here all agree that the disembodied body has Chidhabasa, chit, karana sariram and sookshma sariram are there. the controversy is that the jiva after death travels with Sthoola Sariram or not and the Purva Pakshi says evidently there is no Sthoola Sariram at all. here Vyasacharya establishes that the disembodied jiva travels with a physical body and only difference is that the body is not tangible and visible body. it is there in minutest form. this travels through five locations and as the minute body travels through the locations called pancha Agni this un-evolved rudimentary body transform into fullfledged physically tangible Sthoola Sariram. this will be established in the first adhikaranam. this will be established in the first adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. in this sutra Vyasacharya establishes the presence of a minute physical body traveling from the disembodied jiva. this discusses the panchagni vidya occurring in the fifth chapter of Chandogya upanisad. In that panchagni vidya Upanishad says that the disembodied jiva is given by the Lord or by the devatas. Appropriate minute physical body evolves into full-fledged physical body in the next birth. The preparation for this starts the moment the present body dies. In keeping with the next fructifying prarapta minute physical body is given and that body is named water. Apah literally means water but in the panchagni context the word apah means the minute un-evolved physical body something compared to DNA the scientist talks about. Whether the new babe should be dark or fair, hair should white or gray or when the heart problem will start etc., can be encoded from DNA which is a dot. The minutest physical body is the blue print of the jiva in the next birth. Each location is called Agni and it is not physical Agni but that assists the evolution. A cooking takes place by which the minute body passes on to the next stage of evolution. Swarga, mega [cloud], bhoomi [earth], Purusa [male], nari [female] are the five stages. The disembodied jiva with jala sariram enters swarga gets cooked and comes out to the second stage and enters the clouds; gets cooked and enters the earth; gets cooked and enters the male and gets cooked and lastly gets transferred to the female. In each stage of transformation, there is name difference to indicate the different stages of the body.

now we will find what are the fivefold conversion. In the first stage swarga stage it is conversion of jalam to soma. Jalam is also the name of the body and soma is also the name of the body and the difference between jalam and soma is the latter is more evolved than the jalam. The new name is not based on the transformation of Sookshma Sariram and not based on karana sariram and the transformation takes place on the basis of Sookshma Sariram of the jiva. jalam as also soma have got chit and Chidhabasa. In swarga it is jala soma conversion takes place.

Soma avastha of the Sthoola Sariram is converted into vristi avastha. Literally, vristi means the rainy water. here it refers to the avastha of the physical body and the second conversion is soma vristi conversion. The third conversion is in prithivi boomi and that is vristi avastha to anna avastha by which we means the word annam means the third evolved condition of physical body which will have chit, Chidhabasa, Sookshma Sariram, karana sariram etc. the fourth location is the anna beejam conversion otherwise called rejus etc., the seed in the male body. Anna beejam conversion is the fourth stage. Then finally this beejam in the body of women who is the cooking medium called fire. Beejam is converted into Sthoola Sariram, which is named purusah. Purusa refers to Sthoola Sariram here. Jala soma conversion; soma vristi conversion; vristi beejam conversion and beejam Purusa conversion and this evolution happens in the assembly line of five stopovers as swarga, mega, bhoomi, Purusa, nari of five stages. Whatever enters into Agni is taken as ahuti; jalam is ahuti in swarga ahuti and soma is the ahuti phalam; soma is the ahuti in the mega Agni vristi is the phalam; vristi is the ahuti in boomi Agni and annam is the phalam; annam is the ahuti in Purusa Agni and beejam is the phalam and at the time of conception the beejam is the ahuti in the nari Agni and the phalam is the baby and all the ahutis are done by the devatas or the Bhagavam. The intervention of devatas is requiring as the conversions are to be governed by the karma. The males of the so many species are there and appropriate females are to be there. all these are governed by punya papam. Vyasacharya in this sutra points out that panchagni vidya points out that the jalam alone gets converted into purusah. in support of this Vyasacharya quotes Chandogya upanisad mantra. I talked about the context of the panchagni vidya teaching and the tale of jaivili and Goutama. Among the five questions asked by Jaivili one of them related to panchagni vidya. The full-fledged body comes after the jalam passes the fifth stage The fifth ahuti svetaketu did not know. The jalam transforms itself into Purusa after passing through five stages and each stage is called Agni. Having given the elaborate panchagni teaching Vyasacharya takes as his support and this concluding statement occurs 5.9.1 of Chandogya upanisad. The Chandogya upanisad mantra reads as *iti tu pancamyam ahutav apah Purusa- vacaso bhavantiti, sa ulbavrtto garbhah dasa va nava va masan aniah sayitva yavaa va'tha jayate*. For this reason indeed, in the fifth oblation water comes to be called man. Foetus enclosed in the membrane, having lain inside for ten or nine months or more or less, then comes to be born. in this manner minute physical body travels and becomes the full-fledged physical body and this portion is important for we should know that the mother or father is not fully responsible for determining the type of the body and the type of the body is determined at the time of death in the previous janma itself. The jiva has been associated with the body throughout. This Sthoola Sariram the minute Sthoola Sariram was associated with jiva in swarga also; associated in mega; in bhoomi and even in Purusa the Sthoola Sariram is along with the jiva and similar the foetus is associated with the jiva. Thus we do not know when the jiva comes into the body. panchagni vidya says jiva does not enter in particular month and jiva is there already even before entering the father, mother or prithivi. Therefore, the controversy of abortion etc., has no meaning. However according to sastra abortion is a sin to abort a babe at any time. it is considered to be a maha papam. This is the general analysis of the first sutra. now we will do the word for word analysis1.

Tadantarapratipattau means for the acquisition of another body, ramhati [the jiva] leaves [the present body] samparishvaktah means enveloped by [the ingredient of the next physical body] prasna nirupanabhyam as revealed by the question and answer [occurring in Chandogya upanisad]. Now we will see the significance of the word. tatandarapratipattau – dehantara another body; other than the present body and therefore it is another body; pratipattih means acquisition; it is the acquisition of another physical body; dehantara pratpti nimittam for the sake of acquisition of the next physical body; ramhati means gacchadi leaves starts the journey; the subject should be understood as jiva which has dropped this physical body or the departed soul. It is disembodied jiva. samparishvaktah means surrounded by or enveloped by or clothed in; enveloped by Sthoola Sariram or the minutest ingredient of the next physical body. we take the constituents of the physical body which consists of all the five elements; they are minute parts of the gross five elements. The last word is prasna nirubanabhyam how do we know about the travel of the departed soul; Vyasacharya says the whole thing is apourusheya vishaya and none can prove this thing. A pure non-believing scientist will mock us if we tell the Upanisadic story of creation. This is accepted by the vaidhika and every vaidhika has two eyes one is sastra eyes and the other is physical eye. I know this only through Veda particularly from Chandogya upanisad. Nirupanam means answer. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 1. tadantarapratipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.2 [293]**

#### ***Tryatmakatvattu bhuyastvat***

On account of water consisting of three [elements] [the soul is enveloped by all these elements and not merely water] but [water alone is mentioned in the text] on account of the preponderance [in the human body]

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. in this sutra Vyasacharya says that the Upanishad names the rudimentary body as jalam or apah. Even though the word used is jalam you have to understand the jalam includes all the five elements for all elements are required for the formation of the body. Therefore, whatever be composition at the final stage should be the composition in the first stage also. Sthoola Sariram has all the elements and hence apah jalam should have all the elements. if the rudimentary body has all the elements why should the Veda use the word jalam and confuse us. Adhi Sankaracharya says my job is to comment what is available and do not ask me why such words are available. Why Veda uses the word instead of sariram is the question. We have no way of finding out why Veda uses the words and let us not waste out time asking why Veda uses this word or that. Adhi Sankaracharya says that I will give you the significance of jalam and for this he says sariram is jala pradhanam and even now they say that 70% of the body is water. jalapradhanatvad rudimentary body is called apah. This is the essence of the sutra. next we will do the word for word analysis in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 239

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapratipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.2 [293]**

#### ***Tryatmakatvattu bhuyastvat***

On account of water consisting of three [elements] [the soul is enveloped by all these elements and not merely water] but [water alone is mentioned in the text] on account of the preponderance [in the human body]

We are doing the general analysis of the second sutra which answers two questions based on the first sutra. in the first sutra it was pointed out that disembodied body will have the minute form after death and the physical body alone becomes the next physical body in next birth after going through panchagni vidya. The jalam alone goes through panchagni, jalam alone ultimately is converted into the next Sthoola Sariram, and the Sthoola Sariram alone is called purusah. This is very clearly said in panchagni vidya portion in Chandogya upanisad. Based on that two question may arise. If the disembodied body is to take minute form and become the next physical body, it should have the rudimentary form of the bhuta Sthoola Sariram. the question that can come is how can Vyasacharya say that disembodied jiva goes with the next physical body with all five elements because panchagni vidya uses the word apah only. how do you interpret as all the five elements when apah alone is mentioned. The answer is that mere water alone cannot get converted to the physical body with all five elements. The composition of the material cause and the effect should be identical. The final physical body has all the elements and therefore Vyasacharya argues that apah should have all the five elements. the composition of cause is the composition of the effectual body. if it has all the elements why should Upanishad use the word apah instead of five elements. Here Vyasacharya says \the predominance of the body is jalam alone although it has all other elements also. this is the analysis. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Tryatmakatvattu since the body has the three ingredients [the word water should include the other elements also]. bhuyastvat means because of the predominance in the body [water alone is mentioned]. Now we will see the significance of the words. Tryatmakatvat which means physical body consists of three factors. In keeping with Chandogya upanisad three ingredients refers to Agni, jalam and prithivi. In Chandogya upanisad five elements are not mentioned and three alone are mentioned. But we should know that three elements means five elements. since the body has got five elements, the water that travels along with jiva should have all the five elements. that is the water which is supposed to travel with disembodied jiva which becomes the physical body after going through panchagni. This is the first interpretation. the second one is that the three ingredients the well know ingredients referred to in ayur Veda tattva of Vada [Vayu], pittam [Agni], and gapa [jala]. All are born with these three ingredients, everyone will have one dominance, and that alone decides the types of diseases. Since the physical body has vada pitta gapam, the corresponding jalam should have all the three ingredients at the time of death to make the final product of the

physical body in the next janma with the same ingredients. This is the significance of the triatmkattvat. Tu indicates the negation of purva paksa objection. Bhuyastvat means because of the predominance; since water is predominant in the body the Upanishad uses water alone as the ingredient of the body at the time of death.

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapratipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.3 [294]**

##### ***Pranagatescha***

and because of the going out of the pranas [the sense organs] with the soul, the elements also accompany the soul

First, we will do the general analysis of the sutra. The original objection of Purva Paksi was that after death only sookshma sariram travels and the Sthoola Sariram is acquired later. We also have in the initial stage of Vedanta that the present Sthoola Sariram is dropped at the time of death and the next Sthoola Sariram will be acquired later and during the intermediary state Sthoola Sariram is not there. Vyasacharya establishes that Sthoola Sariram will be there in blueprint form and not in full form. he has given panchagni pramanam to accept the Sthoola Sariram also is there after death. now he gives the reasoning also. he says that Purva Paksi agrees that the Sookshma Sariram travels after death. Sookshma Sariram consists of pancha mukhya prana and eleven gauna pranas travel along with jiva. Vyasacharya argues when we are alive that we don't find that prana traveling alone dropping the physical body. Vyasacharya says our experience is yatra yatra prana gacchanti tatra tatra sasarika eva gacchanti and pranas go with container of the body during alive and after death also Sookshma Sariram can travel with minute Sthoola Sariram the container of the Sookshma Sariram. since prana is talked about you have to accept Sthoola Sariram traveling with the Sookshma Sariram on the basis of the anubhava or experience. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Cha means moreover; pranagate since pranas travels [the accompaniment of a physical medium is inferred]. Now we will see the significance of the word. prana refers to pancha mukhya prana and eleven gauna pranas. Travel of pranas is non-controversial as per 4.4.2 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. When the jiva leaves pancha prana also leaves. Also eleven gauna prana travels along with the body at the time of death. because of the travel of all the pranas the travel of the container is also implied and the container here is minutest form of Sthoola Sariram. this is indicated by apah in Chandogya upanisad. This sutra gives the yukti pramanam.

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapratipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.4 [295]**

***Agayadigatisruteriti chet na bhaktatvat***

If it be said [that the pranas or the organs do not follow the soul] on account of the scriptural statements as to entering into Agni etc., [we say] not so, on account of its being so said in a secondary sense [or metaphorical nature of these statements]

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. here another Purva Pakshi raises a fundamental question. Now the Purva Pakshi argues that Sookshma Sariram itself does not travel. He does not agree with the travel of pranas themselves. Whether it moves or not we do not see and all are based on Vedas alone. one should have full faith on Veda with regard to the statements that the travel of Sookshma Sariram and Sthoola Sariram etc. Purva Pakshi claims that he has a Veda vakyam and that clearly states that all the sense organs go back to the respective devatas and they do not travel along with jiva. we do not talk about the death of jnani where the sense organs merge with devatas. Here we talk about the death of ajnani. In the previous sutra we have assumed that sense organs and pranas travel and to travel we need a physical body. the Purva Pakshi quotes the mantra 3.2.13 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad artha bagha Brahmanam wherein it is clearly said that after the death of an ajnani as to what happens to the organs and pranas etc. all of them merges into the devatas. Where is the question of the indriyams traveling after the death. in short the sense organs merge into devatas. Only when we prove the sense organs travel, we can say physical body travels. The Upanishad itself contradicts. 4.4.2 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad states that the sense organs travel along with the jiva on death. Gita 15.7 also asserts mamai'va'mso jivaloke jivabhutah sanatanab manah sasthanindriyani prakrtisthani karsati where it is clearly stated that the body along with the mind travel after death to acquire a new body in the next janma. The jiva pulls sense organs and travels. In fact, it is a problem, which should have been discussed, in the previous adhyaya. When the Veda itself contradicts how are we to resolve the issue. In this context, we should take one statement as literal and the other as figurative. Here also we should take one as figurative. Then there will not be any contradiction. Purva Pakshi will say his statement should be taken literally and the second statement is figurative. Vyasacharya says the merger of sense organs with devata is figurative in the case of ajnani. Vyasacharya does not give the reason why we should take one as figurative. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the reason. First reason is that jiva enjoys the status of jiva because of the association of the pranas. If the prana merges into devata there will be no jiva at all. Without prana jiva cannot exist. Adhi Sankaracharya says that the very jiva travel requires prana sakti the energy to travel. The prana merges into devata is not correct. Next reason is that if jiva travels without prana, jiva goes into the next physical body will not have any life, sense organs or the mukhya prana or gauna prana. The next physical body cannot interact with the world without the pranas. Jiva goes with the sense organs and places them in the golakas it is said in Gita. The fourth argument is that Adhi Sankaracharya says to look at 3.2.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Adhi Sankaracharya says if you take the latter portion lomani all the body parts of the dead person merge into oshadi the plants and all the head hair merges into vanaspatim kesas [big tree], if you take it literally at the time of death what will you see. the moment he dies all the hairs should start flying and stick to the trees. This statement cannot be taken literally. That sruti vakyam is not pramana vakyam being pratyaksa viridad. It is figurative statement. Therefore, the rest of the mantra also should be taken figuratively. This is the general analysis of the sutra now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Agnyadi gati sruteh since the sruti reveals the merger of prana with Agni devata etc., [the pranas do not travel along with the jiva. this is the purva paksa part of the sutra. itt chet if this is the objection it is not correct; bhaktatvat because the sruti statement has a secondary

meaning only. now we will see the significance of the words. Agnyadi gati sruteh gati means layah or merger of the sense organs or pranas into devata. Sruteh means the sruti statement reveals the fact. Here reference is invited to 3.2.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The conclusion is not said in the sutra and it is that sense organs do not go with jiva but they merge into the devata. Iti chet na if this is your objection it is not acceptable. Bhaktatvat the Brihadharaynaka upanisad sruti cannot be taken literally. The conclusion is that sense organs travel with the jivah.

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.5 [296]**

#### ***Oratgyne;sravanaditi chet na ta eva hi upapatteh***

If it be objected on the ground of water not being mentioned in the first of the oblations, we say not so because that [water] only is verily meant by the word 'sraddha' because that is the most appropriate meaning of the word in that passage.

We have said on the basis of panchagni that the disembodied jiva will have the first body at the time of cremation itself and the jalam goes through five stages and that jalam alone become the future body we asserted. Now a Purva Pakshi says that you study the panchagni closely and there is some problem. pravahana jaivali asked the question as to how the water becomes the body after going through the five stages. He talks of the five stages and traveling through the stages the jalam becomes the body. the first Agni is swarga Agni and should come out as soma; then entering the second Agni soma vrisiti conversion etc. the first conversion should be jalam into soma by passing through swarga. Jalam in this context is the rudimentary body. when I study Chandogya upanisad there is confusion. Jaivili says shraddha enters into swarga and gets converted into soma. Here the word jalam is not used and instead shraddha is used. The corresponding mantra is 5.4.2 of Chandogya upanisad. When he starts reply in 5.4.2 he used the word shraddha and Purva Pakshi asks how the jalam gets converted into body at the fifth stage. This is the doubt and Vyasacharya brushes aside by saying that shraddha means jalam. Therefore he says there is no problem. this is the general analysis of the sutra. now we will do the word for word analysis.

Pradhame in the context of first fire; asravanat since water is not mentioned in the sruti [your conclusion is in correct] up to this is Purva Pakshi. Now siddhanta comes and says if this is the objection it is not valid ta eva means water is revealed through the word shraddha; upapatteh since that is the appropriate meaning. The elaboration of the words we will see in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 240

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapatipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.5 [296]**

#### ***Oratgyne;sravanaditi chet na ta eva hi upapatteh***

If it be objected on the ground of water not being mentioned in the first of the oblations, we say not so because that [water] only is verily meant by the word 'sraddha' because that is the most appropriate meaning of the word in that passage.

Here chit cannot travel and Chidhabasa alone travels after death. With this jiva the next physical body also travels in minutest form and Vyasacharya in this context analysed panchagni vidya portion of Chandogya upanisad. The technical word used for the body is jalam or apah. Jala soma transformation soma vristi transformation; vristi annam transformation, annam beejam transformation and beejam Purusa transformation. Purusa means the fully evolved the physical body that comes out of the womb of the mother. In the second part whether Sookshma Sariram travels or not was discussed because of the doubt caused by the Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam in which Upanishad says all the organs merge into the corresponding devatas. If the organs merge into devata, Sookshma Sariram will not be there. This doubt Vyasacharya clears by saying that the merger should not be taken in the literal sense for Chidhabasa cannot exist without the reflecting medium. . if the Chidhabasa goes elsewhere, the very travel will become redundant. Therefore Vyasacharya says that Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam is only gaunam and what the statement means is the sense organs do not merge into devatas but the power derived from devatas is temporarily withdrawn. We had seen this before if my eyes are able to see it depends upon the corresponding Surya devatga. At the time of death the sakti is withdrawn. In the case of jnani's death, the sakti as also the organ are withdrawn. This sakti's merger alone is mentioned in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad sruti. Therefore do not take this literally. The organs without the blessings of the sakti will travel in the case of ajnani Jivatma. Sookshma Sariram as also Sthoola Sariram travel along with the jiva.

Now we enter the third part of the sutra. there we have introduced the jalam which is the minute Sthoola Sariram enters the assembly line and becomes Purusa the full fledged Sthoola Sariram. 5.4.2 of Chandogya upanisad we get a confusion, instead mentioning the jalam, the Upanishad says shraddha enters the first Agni instead the word jalam. That means in the first stage jalam is not there at all. if jalam is not there, how do you talk about panchagni for jalam and there are only four agnis. The word shraddha in the first fire means water. ta eva hi upapatteh is there. the word hi is pradhame in the context of the first fire. Asravanat then the answer is if it is the objection, it is not valid because water alone is revealed through the word shraddha since that is the appropriate meaning. now I will explain to you how shraddha means water. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the reason although Vyasacharya does not give the reason. The first reason is that the word shraddha cannot be taken in its primary meaning because the Upanishad mantra says [5.4.2 of Chandogya upanisad] that the devatas offer

shraddha in the first fire called swarga. Adhi Sankaracharya asks is it possible for anyone to take shraddha which is only an attitude or faculty of the mind, and this faculty cannot be plucked out by devatas and it cannot be offered into anything. The primary meaning is impossible. The next step is that we have to compromise with the secondary meaning, which will not be dictionary meaning. then which meaning should be taken is our question. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya gives the second reasoning that you should look into the context and the context alone should determine the meaning. if you want to see the context that in the beginning jaivili says water alone go through five stages and in the end also he says water becomes Purusa after five stages. Water here means minute physical body. in the meaning also water alone should be involved. In the beginning and the final state jalam alone is mentioned. 5.33 are not confusing, 5.9.1 is not confusing, and therefore 5.4.2 shraddha should be interpreted as water alone. The third reason is that shraddha by implication lakshana vrittia can refer to water. The word shraddha means Veda pramana the belief of acceptance of validity of Vedas as right source of knowledge. Whoever has shraddha in Veda will have vaidhika karma shraddha. That is the acceptance of vedic ritual as a means of purusartha. Shrardha means shrardham and that is done with all belief. Once I have shraddha in karma and that will be transferred into anustanam. Karma will not produce by study. Brahman will produce result by sheer knowledge. Knowledge must be followed by anustanam for karma to yield result. The interesting thing once you decide to follow vedic karma water is always involved. It ahs to end in water alone. then for purification water is involved. The completion of the ritual also ends with water alone. vaidhika karma is jalapradhanam. Therefore, it is with jalam the person travels after death. jalapradhana karma phalatvad. Therefore, shraddha means water. the fourth reason is that there is sruti statement that says shsraddhava apah. Because of these four reasons we conclude shraddha means water. Now we will see significance of the words.

Prathamah means in the context of panchagni. Devatas are supposed to be ahuti karta. The first Agni is visualized as homa kunda and devatas sit and fire is rising and then this jiva the disembodied jiva is offered into the fire and in that offering ritual, that is swarga agnou; asraavanat means we don't hear and the contextual meaning is that the sruti does not mention. We do not hear that when we do Veda adhyayanam. This is the Purva Paksi argument. the conclusion we have to supply that jalam does not go through five agnis but four Agni and therefore your conclusion is wrong. Then siddhanta portion is if this is your objection it is not valid objection. Then comes the reason. Ta evahi because our conclusion is right because apah eva water is mentioned in the sruti. Naturally, Purva Paksi will get wild and for that he gives the answer upapatteh the shraddha sabda indicates water alone for the reasons explained above.

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapatipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.6 [297]**

#### ***Asrutatvaditi chet na ishtadikarinam pratiteh***

If it be said that on account of [the soul] not being stated in the sruti [the soul does not depart envelopment by water etc.] [we say] not so, because it is understood [from the scriptures] that the jivas who perform sacrifices and other good works [alone go to heaven].

Here Vyasacharya answers another possible objection. When jiva travels after death does the Sookshma Sariram follows or Sthoola Sariram follows or both follow is the question. Both of them follow. The would be Sthoola Sariram in minute form passes through panchagni stages and five stages are the physical body with final stage being fully evolved stage. Now Purva Pakshi comes with a peculiar objection. In panchagni vidya jiva is not mentioned with the physical body. His argument is panchagni talks about the travel of the body and now the question is a reversed question. The travel of jiva was accepted and whether the body accompanied or not was the question before. Now the question is the Upanishad does not mentioned jiva sahita apah. Jiva does not travel through five stages but the body travels is the argument from Purva Pakshi. It is said so because there is no pramanam. Physical body goes through all these stages and jiva will do the grihapravesam at a later stage. That is why people talk about the jiva enters the foetus of the women at a particular month and the people do some rituals etc. The rituals are meant to get good jiva into the foetus. Now the question is whether the jiva travels from the beginning or the jiva enters the body at the fifth stage at a particular time. our answer is no. The jiva travels even from the first stage. Jiva entering the body is not correct statement. This is our siddhanta. First part is purva paksha part. The second part is siddhanta. Vyasacharya says that in the panchagni vidya or in that particular portion you have to search for an answer. Among several questions asked by jaivili one question is what is Krishna Gathi and what is shukla Gathi. Jaivili himself talks about both the gathis. In this context, he says those who do rituals without Upasana, are called kevala karminah. Here they are called ishtadhikarinah. The word ishtam means vedic rituals without support of Upasana. The vedic ritualists will go to higher loka and enjoy ananda in swarga and after enjoying swarga they come back to this loka to replenish punya. While talking about that, jaivili says that path is said to be Krishna Gathi. Krishna Gathi stages are talked about in Chandogya upanisad. It is repeated in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita also. the ritualist path is elaborately mentioned in Gita and Chandogya upanisad as also in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Vyasacharya argues while enumerating the stages of ritualists these five stages are also mentioned which we means panchagni vidya. Panchagni five stages are mentioned and Krishna Gathi the stages of jiva is mentioned. Along with sariram jiva also goes through the stages. 5.4.2 of Chandogya upanisad talks about the stages of physical body. somah raja sambavati is the words used in Chandogya upanisad. 5.10.4 of Chandogya upanisad also talks about eshaha somah raja. The significance of the two is the first talks about the soma stage of sariram; Chandogya upanisad 5.10.4 talks about jiva going through the soma stage. Further stages are also talked about in the above Upanisads. It elaborates rain water stage, annam stage etc. both travel together and therefore there is no question of jiva entering the womb of the mother and they are nonvedic conclusion. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Asrutatvad means since the jiva is not mentioned by the sruti [your assumption is false]. Iti chet now our answer comes if this is the objection, na it is valid; ishtadhikarinam pratiteh because the travel of the vedic ritualists along with water can be discerned from the other sruti statements. This is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of the words. Asrutatvad since it is not heard in the sruti; what is not heard also you should know. Jiva traveling with water is not heard.in prasna nirupana sruti 5.3.3. Water alone is talked about and not jiva. Therefore Purva Pakshi concludes that our conclusion is wrong. If this is your objection is wrong. Ishtadhikarinam vedic ritualists; when you study the travel of the vedic ritualists; the path here is Krishna Gathi or shukla Gathi. It occurs in 5.10.4 of Chandogya upanisad. Here jiva is mentioned and not a body. jiva alone can do the ritualists. Pratiteh means it can be discerned. It is discerned because it is not explicitly mentioned. Both jiva and body travels and we cannot see that because it is apourusesha vishyah and one has to take what is said in Veda as pramanam.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 241

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapatipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.6 [297]**

#### ***Asrutatvaditi chet na ishtadikarinam pratiteh***

If it be said that on account of [the soul] not being stated in the sruti [the soul does not depart envelopment by water etc.] [we say] not so, because it is understood [from the scriptures] that the jivas who perform sacrifices and other good works [alone go to heaven].

We have completed 6<sup>th</sup> sutra of the first adhikaranam. we have establish that the disembodied embody has a physical body in rudimentary form that travels and after going through five stages gets full fledged form in the next janma as stated in the panchagni vidya. Panchagni creates another problem that it mentions the travel of the body and this apah alone gets converted into fivefold thing and finally into a full fledged body. panchagni vidya does not say that the body goes with jiva or not and it is silent regarding the accompaniment of jiva. Vyasacharya admitted that legitimate doubt and he says that the doubt can be resolved not from panchagni vidya but by studying another portion of the Chandogya upanisad itself. It is made clear that ritualist jiva alone takes Krishna Gathi and if you watch the stages of travel of jiva and it coincides the travel mentioned in the panchagni vidya. This has been elaborately discussed in the last class. In panchagni vidya portion body goes to swarga etc., in Krishna Gathi portion the jiva goes through the same stages before taking new birth. Thus jiva and sariram travel together. That is why Vyasacharya uses the word ‘discerned’. If this much mimamsa knowledge is not there you don’t require to attend the class it is implied. Now we will enter into the 7<sup>th</sup> and final sutra of this adhikaranam.

### **Topic 1. Tadantarapatipatyadhikaranam [sutra 1- 7]**

The soul at the time of transmigration does take with it subtle parts of the elements.

#### **Sutra 3.1.7 [298]**

#### ***Bhaktam vanatmavittvat tatha hi darsayati***

But [the souls’ being the food of the gods in heaven is used] in a secondary or metaphorical sense, on account of their not knowing the Self because the sruti declares like that.

The main teaching of this adhikaranam is over and this is only an incidental doubt cleared in this sutra. the present doubt is based on the Krishna Gathi portion of 5.10.4 of Chandogya upanisad which was given in the previous sutra. this talks about how the ritualist goes to swarga loka and enjoys there going through Krishna loka. This is krisnyana description. Then when you read further we get a frightening sentence. Esah somah raja these ritualists will go

to the swarga loka and the body will get necessary conversion and the ritualist will become annam for devas. And the devas consume all the ritualists who are the fresh entrants in the swarga loka. Why does the Upanishad use this type of expression is the incidental analysis of this sutra.

Vyasacharya answers that you have to take the statement in figurative sense alone. Vyasacharya says bhaktam it is only a figurative expression and the ritualists are not really annam. Several reasons are hinted in this sutra. The reasons are the following. First reason is if the ritualists are consumed by devas, Veda will not encourage the ritualists to do rituals. The second reason is in this Chandogya upanisad portion itself if you read the next mantra 5.10.5 the Chandogya upanisad clearly says after spending some time in swarga the ritualists come down for punar janma. From this it is clear that the ritualists are not consumed and if consumed where is the question of coming down again. The third reason is that it is said elsewhere in Chandogya upanisad that the devas do not directly consume anything. In the swarga loka eating action is not there. darsana matrena triptaha bhavanti. It is said in 3.6.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Devas do not eat nor devas do not drink. They see the amritam and by the mere sight, they get the satisfaction. From this it is very clear that they do not eat anything. Adhi Sankaracharya also explains why such an expression annam is used. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two reasons. first one is these ritualists become a source of joy for the devas. Devas welcome all the ritualists and they enjoy their company. Adhi Sankaracharya says when he enjoys a picnic he would love to go along with wife and children. Thus annavad upa bokya vishayatvad since it is a source of joy, we call ritualists as annam. Just as annam helps a person nourishes a person similar all the ritualists become the employee to assists devatas. Ritualists serve devas just like annam serves us in this world. Just an employee is under the controller of the employer, new entrants to deva loka are the employees of the devas. Just as bokyam is para tantra under the bokta, all the ritualists are para tantra under the control of the devas. This fact is said in the Upanishad that all the ajnanis are the servants are gods. [1.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad] therefore paratantratvam is indicated by the word annam. Because of these expressions the word annam should be taken in figurative sense. Now we will go to the word for word analysis.

Bhaktam va jiva is said to be the food of the devatas in a figurative sense. Anatmavittvat since jiva is ignorant of the Atma; darsayati the sruti reveals tathahi so. now we will see the significance of the word. bhaktam means in figurative meaning; the bhakti is used in the secondary meaning. the word bhakti is taken in figurative sense. Va in this context is to negate the Purva Pakshi doubt. Normally the word va means either or but here va means negation; anatmavittvat means Self ignorance. The ritualists who takes Krishna Gathi are termed as ignorant persons. The final meaning is because of the Self ignorance. All Self ignorant persons are the food for the devatas because the latter are under the control of the devatas. This is revealed in the Upanishad. [1.4.10 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad]. With this the first adhikaranam is over. the subject matter is jiva Gathi; the doubt is whether he travels with physical body or not; purva paksa says that jiva does not travel with the body; siddhanta says jiva does travel with a minute invisible physical body which is not used for transactions. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 2. Kritatyayadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

### **Sutra 3.1.8 [299]**

***Kritatyaye'nusayavan drishtasmrititbhyam yathetamanevam cha***

On the exhaustion of good work the soul returns to the earth with a remainder of the karmas, as can be understood from direct statement in sruti and smriti, by the same route through which he ascended after death and differently too.

This the second adhikaranam with four sutras. This deals with jivasya agathih which means jiva's arrival. Previous adhikaranam dealt with the jiva's departure. it relates to jiva's arrival especially those who have enjoyed in the swarga loka. Those who have no punya will pass through the swarga and all cannot enjoy swarga. Some jivas have break journey and travel some continue to travel. If there is punya, there the body will have necessary appropriate transformation and enjoy and return to this loka. The doubt here is whether the jiva comes down with any karma or not. In short whether he would have exhausted all karmas in swarga loka and come empty handed or would he have residual karma at the time of return to the earth. The view of Purva Paksi is that karma rahitah agacchadi. He comes back without any residual karma and he would have exhausted all karmas in swarga loka. In support he quotes sruti such as 5.10.5 of Chandogya upanisad that says *tasmin yavat sampatam usitva 'thaitam evadhvanam punar nivartante yathelam akasam, akasad vayum, vayur bhutva dharmo bhavati, dharmo bhutva 'bhram bhavati* (The meaning of the mantra reads as having dwelt there as long as there is residue [of good works] they return again by that course by which they came to space, from space into air; and after having become the air they become the smoke after having become smoke, they become mist. The relevant expression is yavat sampatam usitva. Here sampatam means expiry or exhaustion. Adhi Sankaracharya translates sampatam as karma ksayaga. Until the exhaustion of karma a person lives in swarga loka and as he leaves swarga loka he would have exhausted all the karmas. then there is a second sruti vakyam quoted by Purva Paksi 4.4.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *prapyantam karmanas tasya yat kim ceha karoty ayam tasmal-lokat punar aiti asmai lokaya karmane* the essence of this mantra is exhausting the results of whatever works he did in this world he comes again from that world to this world for fresh work. In swarga loka he sees to it that all the punya papa karma ends before returning to this world. the Upanishad also says that he comes back to buloka for earning further income in the name of good and bad karmas. this Purva Paksi.

Siddhanta is given in the andhakaranam karma sahitah agacchadi. he gives his support also. he gives sruti and yukti anubhava. sruti given by the siddhanta is 5.10.7 of the Chandogya upanisad *ramaniya caranah abhyasa ha yat te ramaniyam yonim apadyeran* they come down to buloka with punya papa karmas and they are born manushyas. There are some who come down with papa karma and there are some come down with punya karma. In swarga loka we cannot earn punyam or papam if you ask, I would say that in swarga loka some amount of karma swarga prarapta punyams are exhausted. All karmas cannot be exhausted in one life and sanchita karma will continue. That punya which is conducive to swarga alone is exhausted. Only if one has the punyam for manushya janma, he has to come back to this earth and stay longer in swarga. But in some cases the next papa fructifying may be papam and this is decided by Lord alone. details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 242

### **Topic 2. Kritatyadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

#### **Sutra 3.1.8 [299]**

#### ***Kritatyaye'nusayavan drishtasmritibhyam yathetamanevam cha***

On the exhaustion of good work the soul returns to the earth with a remainder of the karmas, as can be understood from direct statement in sruti and smriti, by the same route through which he ascended after death and differently too.

In this second adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes one of the fundamental principle regarding the rebirth of jiva which we have studied tattva bodha portion. In a particular birth one exhausted only a portion of sanchita karma and prarabta alone can affect us in this life. We can always challenge the sanchitam and it cannot touch in this janma. Therefore there is a huge amount of sanchita, which is not ready for fructification, and the part that fructifies is called prarapta. During life, we also acquire \karmas, which we call agami. At the time of death all prarapta would have been exhausted and the agami will be there after some them having fructified in this janma itself. The unfructified agami at the time of death will join the sanchitam and from sanchita agami mixture another set of karma will be ready for the next janma. The next janma will be determined by some part of sanchitam and some part of unfructified agami. This is there only in human janma. All other janmas are bogha janmas. We are capable of adding sanchitam and in the case of other jivarasis with no free will, they will not add agami karmas. Even devas cannot acquire agami karmas as they are considered to be bogha janma. If the animals do not add agami what will determine their next birth. They exhaust their prarapta. Agami avoided. Therefore, moksa will it not come. for that our answer is that animals exhaust prarapta and do not add agami but unfortunately animals also have sanchitam like human beings. Manushyas will add agami and the other jivarasis will not add agami. In this adhikaranam the same situations arise to devas also. they would not add any agami and then how will devatas will come down or will they come with karma or without karma. Devas do not have agami accepted; devas have accepted prarapta accepted. However, devas have sanchita that is responsible for the next birth. It need not be same type of next birth depends upon the next fructifying bunch of prarapta. . if the next fructifying sanchita is papa karma, the deva may land up in padala also. After swarga loka one may come back to life with punya papam. In both the sruti vakyas two sruti vakyas are used sambataka and anthah means exhaustion of karmas. Therefore, Purva Paksi thinks that the heavenly people would have exhausted all the karmas. Unfortunately, he includes sanchita also. agami is avoided and therefore they do not have left over karma. Siddhanta says it is not so and they do come with karma. Now I do the general analysis of the first sutram. Jiva will come with karma in different proportion and for that there are sruti and smriti pramanam and logic also is there which Vyasacharya does not mention but Adhi Sankaracharya gives in his commentary. of them sruti pramanam I have already mentioned in the last class. Devas after enjoying swarga come either with punya or with papa.

Now we will see the smriti pramanam. It is from Goutama gouna pramanam. The smriti says that those who follow varnasrama dharma properly, need not do any extra dharma and scriptural discipline will go to swarga loka. Having gone to swarga loka they will enjoy karma phalam. tathah seshena after enjoying punyam in swarga loka, they will have unexhausted karma will be there. Such karmas are called sesha karma or residual karma. They will take birth in specific jathi. They may be rich or poor; male or female; black or white; all are determined by sesha kramani. Finally, even buddhi largely is dependent upon purva karma. Thus, sruti and smriti pramanas are there. Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that the sruti describes various stages of Krishna Gathi through which one will travel after death. Several stages are mentioned in Chandogya upanisad. After going to swarga loka, the returning stages are also mentioned in the Chandogya upanisad. If you see the various stages, you will find some of the stages are common to both. Some of the stages are there in the onward journey and some are there in return journey. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Kritatyaye when the karmas are exhausted; anusayavan with residual karma yateitam when the return through the same stages ca aneyam also through different stages; drishtasmritibhyam means as revealed by sruti and smriti. Now, we will see the significance of the word. kritatyaye karma especially it refers to going to swarga bogha pradha karma; atyayam means exhaustion; all the punyas do not give swarga sugam. Some give buloka sukham like wealth, health etc. There are different grades of punyams. The next word is anusayavan means residual karma or sesha karma not swarga giving punyam because it is exhausted; not agami because they do not acquire agami; they means sanchita whichever part turns prarapta to be enjoyed at the next birth. Drishta smritipyam that jiva has got residual karma is proved through dristam that means sruti pramanam; through sruti smriti pramana we come to know. Agacchadi is understood. Yatha itam means the stage through which he went earlier; in certain portion he went upward not in all segment but in some way. In some cases yatha itam; anevam in certain segment the segment is taken different path; even in heavenly path, there is oneway traffic system is there. this is the meaning of the sutras. Now we will give the reason that there are certain sanchita karma remains.

The reason is no jiva can exhaust all the karmas in one janma. It is logically impossible to exhaust all karmas in one janma and it requires different experiences, which will give sukha and dukham. Different experiences require different bodies. A male body cannot experience the female body and it can be experienced only when one gets appropriate body. not only we require different body but also we require different environments also. no one can exhaust all the karmas in one janma. The second reason is that if a person exhausts all the karmas in swarga, then Adhi Sankaracharya argues where is the question of coming down because that jiva will be a liberated jivah. The very coming is decided by karma and when karma is not there then he will not come down at all. The third reason is that let us assume that a jiva exhausted all the karmas. he cannot come down. However, for argument sake let us assume a person with zero karma, comes down tell me where we he come down, what type of body the jiva will take. Both are determined by karma and if there are no karmas jiva will not be able to take the appropriate body and environs and without karma if he takes any body that will become reasonless rebirth. It will be chance-based janma. For vaidhika accident does not exist. For vaidhika chance means praraptam. Accident is an incident whose cause which we are not able to trace. As the human knowledge increases the accidents will be converted to incident. This is the third argument. Because of these three argument karmas should be accepted. if they are residual karmas why should Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad say that swarga jiva exhaust all the karmas. Exhaustion of all karmas should be



translated as the prarapta karma alone. That alone is logical interpretation because all the sanchita can never be exhausted in a particular janma or in many janmas. If there is a method of sanchitam, some people may say that I do not require jnanam. Then Purva Paksi comes with one more argument. In the interpretation of yours, there is a defect. You say exhaustion of all karmas means exhaustion of the prarapta karma alone. in your interpretation you reduce the intensity of the word and you say all karma means all prarapta karma thus you restrict the meaning of the word. then Purva Paksi gives another interpretation. he says all the sanchita karmas are as though exhausted. Then there is a different problem, he will get liberated, and he has to come back for getting liberated. Suppose a person empties the oil from a vessel, and keeps the vessel there and on next day he finds oil there the oil that is sticking to the wall of the vessel. Similarly, he says that in swarga loka, he will exhaust all the karmas and then some swarga punyam will be left over like oil sticking to the wall of the vessel and that punya is called anusayah. Now everything is explained properly. Why cannot you interpret like this? Adhi Sankaracharya says I would like to accept but the problem is if the residual karma is the swarga punyam sticking to jiva then sruti would say that jiva comes down with residual karma but sruti says that there is residual papam also. Then the entire coming down jiva will have residual punya alone and the fact that ramaniya karma means that it relates to sanchita that is punya papa and therefore that interpretation is not correct. All prarapta alone is exhausted. Sanchita remains and with that, the jiva comes. Now we will have to go to the next sutra, which we will see, in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 243

### **Topic 2. Kritatyayadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

#### **Sutra 3.1.8 [298]**

#### ***Kritatyaye'nusayavan drishtasmrititbhyam yathetamanevam cha***

On the exhaustion of good work the soul returns to the earth with a remainder of the karmas, as can be understood from direct statement in sruti and smriti, by the same route through which he ascended after death and differently too.

After dealing with jiva Gathi in the first adhikaranam now in the second adhikaranam we take into account those jivas who go to swarga lokas, exhaust their punyas, and come back again on rebirth. The question being discussed is whether all karmas are exhausted and jiva comes without any karma or whether the jiva come back with residual karma. This doubt comes because of certain Upanishad statement where it is said that one exhaust all karmas. Vyasacharya refuted the Purva Pakshi madham and said that in swarga loka one will exhaust swarga punyas alone. thereafter jiva will come down with next bunch of prarapta culled from sanchita which will be either punya pradhana or papa pradhana. thus jiva may be born as manushya if punya is enough to be born as manushya. Also Vyasacharya gave Chandogya upanisad sruti in support of this. That was in 5.10.7 of Chandogya upanisad. Up to this we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 2. Kritatyayadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

#### **Sutra 3.1.9 [300]**

#### ***Charanaditi chet na upalakshanartheti karshnajinih***

An objection is raised with reference to the residual karma, anusaya, stated in the preceding sutra and is refuted.

If it be objected that on account of conduct [the assumption of the remnant of karma, anusaya is not necessary for rebirth on earth], [we say] not so [because the word conduct is used] to signify indirectly [the remainder] so karshnajini thinks.

To establish that jiva comes with either punya karma or papa karma Vyasacharya quoted Chandogya upanisad vakyam 5.10.7 from where two words were taken ramaniya charanah. Kapuya charana means papa karma charanah. Purva Pakshi raises a question in which dictionary you find the meaning that charanam means karma. According to Purva Pakshi charanam means acharanam which means acharah means conduct behaviour or religious life

style or religious customs and manners. This is one meaning and the word karma is different from acharah. Karma and achara are not identical so argues Purva Pakshi. That the word achara and karma are different is proved in the Taittiriya Upanishad *yanya anavadyani karmani tani sevityani no itarani yany asmakam sucaritani tani tvayopasyani no itaraoni ye ke casmacchreyamso brahmanah tesam tvayasanena prasvasitavyam sraddhaya deyam asraddhayadeyam sriya deyam hriyadeyam bhilya deyam samvidadeyam*. [1.XI.3] there the guru is telling the disciple not take as a model. Guru gives the warning to sishya only with regard to good action he should take him as model. With regard to good conduct, you follow us. With regard to good action you take us as model. The relevant portion for us is the sujaritam separately and karmani separately. Here we see charitam and karma are different. Purva Pakshi argument is that chandogya vakyam does not refer to karma at all. Vyasacharya does not answer the question directly but says this question is already answered by two other acharyas. Instead of answering the questions I will quote their reference. Karshnajini is one of the acharyas and another acharya, which Vyasacharya will quote, in the 11<sup>th</sup> sutra. Both these acharyas point out the word charanam means karma only. karshnajini points out that the word charanam means karma in the secondary sense. This acharya agrees with purva paksa that the direct word meaning is conduct only. by implication the secondary meaning is karma. It is so because wherever good acharas are followed good karmas will follow. Achara and karmas are closely interconnected. When sadacharas are dropped, satkarmas also will go away. Satkarmas will be fruitful only if they are backed by sadacharas. If one does not follow sadachara and follows on one day, only the karmas will become blunt if they are not backed by acharas. Therefore, ramaniya charana means ramaniya karmanah. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Charanat means rebirth is because of one's religious discipline. This is the view of Purva Pakshi. Iti chet if this is your objection, na it is not valid. Upalakshanartat laksanam implication secondary meaning implied karmas; this is the view of karshnanini.

Now I will give the the significance of the word meaning of the sutra. Charanat means the word used in Chandogya upanisad mantra is charanam and not karma. So you don't have the right to take the meaning of karma. The siddhanta is wrong the Purva Pakshi says. If such an objection is raised na it is not a valid objection. Upalakshanartha it means implied meaning or implication. The meaning of the word charanam or purpose is giving an implied meaning and not a direct meaning. The word charana is employed to imply karma in a secondary sense. We do not totally dismiss you. We agree that charanam means conduct. This is the suggestion given by the karshnajinih.

## **Topic 2. Kritatyadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

### **Sutra 3.1.10[301]**

If it be said [by such interpretation of the word 'conduct' – good conduct would become] purposeless, [we say] not so on account of [karma] being dependent on that [good conduct].

A further objection with reference to the word 'charana – conduct' is raised and refuted in this sutra.

Now Purva Pakshi raises the question that for the word charanam you have not taken the primary meaning conduct but you take the meaning of karma and then you argue that karma alone decides the next birth. This exposes that the achara has no value. The implication is of several types. Here we are taking ajahal lakshana, which includes the primary meaning also. Therefore ajahal lakshana is to be taken and we should take the karma achara sahita karma is the meaning. It is because Veda says mere karma without support of nithya nymittika karma is not sufficient. If the achara is not followed, no religious karma will bless him including Veda adhyayanam. At the time of death, good karmas will not follow him if it is not backed by achara also. Just as the birds leave the nest, karmas leave you if you do not have the proper achara. Therefore, achara is included in the meaning of karma and it is not jahal lakshana but ajahal lakshana. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Anarthakyam religious discipline would become meaningless; iti chet if this is your objection; na it is not valid; tat apekshatvat because karma depends upon religious discipline. This is the word meaning. The significance of the word meaning I will give now. anarthakyam means purposelessness. If the siddhanta focus on the karma leaving the achara part it will convey the idea that achara is important and karma alone is important and people will give up achara. Iti chet if this is the objection it is not valid. Tad apekshatvat karmanah achara apeksham karma means karma depends upon achara for its efficacy. Most of the karmas should be done before eating. If that is not followed then the karma is supposed to become inefficient. We cannot violate unless on health grounds. Karma includes achara and that is why when we mean ajahal lakshanam only. upalakshanam means ajahal lakshanam. Many of the acharas cannot be followed now. the idea of achara varies from generation to generation and where to draw the line is complicated one and it is not worth arguing on the subject. According to sastra, one should take bath in the morning and change the dress and that is against sastra. Without brushing the teeth you should not take bed coffee etc. this is the suggestion of karshnajinih.

## **Topic 2. Kritatyayadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

### **Sutra 3.1.11[302]**

#### ***Sukritadushkrite eveti tu baadarih***

But conduct [charana] means merely good and evil works; thus the sage Baadari thinks.

Further discussion on the meaning of the word 'charana' is made here. The sutra says that there is no difference between conduct and karma. According to the sage Baadari the phrases 'Ramaniyacharana' and 'Kapuyacharana' mean good and evil works.

The word charanam is achara all right. The word means karma in the primary sense itself. Now the question will come if the primary meaning is karma what about achara, for this Baadari says that achara is also a form of karma only. Therefore we do not make any difference between karma and achara. Karma includes achara and achara includes karma. All of them are activity. How in Taittiriya Upanishad achara and karma is defined separately. For that he says that it is only a incidental differentiation for the general type of karma which is to be regularly practiced but karma is used for specific things that come not so regularly. One is samanya kriya and the other is visesha kriya. Achara applies to all but karma differs to

specific people. This is Baadari's opinion. Now we will do the word for word analysis. Sukritadushkrite punya papa karma alone is the primary meaning of the word charanam occurring in 5.10.7 of Chandogya upanisad. This is the view of the sage Baadari. In support of this, Adhi Sankaracharya gives another sruti vakyam also. The word charanam is controversial word here. He says wherever there is a vagueness you go to corresponding idea where there is no vagueness. He quotes 3.2.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Higher janma comes because of punya karma and inferior janma comes because of papa karma and therefore charanam in Chandogya upanisad must refer to karma alone. Now we will go to the significance of the word. sukritadushrite punya papa karma charana sabda arthah is the primary meaning of the word charanam and not acharah. Eva that alone is the meaning; iti tu Baadari this is the opinion of the Sage Baadari. now the next question is what is the opinion of Vyasacharya. That is not given here. We have to assume that Vyasacharya accepts both interpretation equally and he does not prefer one or the other. he is interested in interpreting charanam as karma. He is not bothered whether it is primary or secondary meaning. Vyasacharya must be favouring Baadari. Whatever be the interpretation, charana means karma and jiva comes down with punya papa karma only and not empty-handed. With this second adhikaranam is also over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 244

### **Topic 2. Kritatyadhikaranam [sutra 8-11]**

The souls descending from heaven have a remnant of karma, which determines their birth.

#### **Sutra 3.1.11[302]**

#### ***Sukritadushkrite eveti tu baadarih***

But conduct [charana] means merely good and evil works; thus the sage Baadari thinks.

Further discussion on the meaning of the word 'charana' is made here. The sutra says that there is no difference between conduct and karma. According to the sage Baadari the phrases 'Ramaniyacharana' and 'Kapuyacharana' mean good and evil works.

Before entering the 3<sup>rd</sup> adhikaranam I would like deal with a topic which I left out while discussing the 1<sup>st</sup> adhikaranam. we thought that the next physical body will come late when it takes birth. The conclusion was that the next physical body coems immediately on death itself even though it is not non-operational or rudimental in nature but it comes into being on death itself. Some people comment that the physical body comes even before death. The first group of people said much later; then some said that the physical body comes immediately on death; but some more people say that jiva come into being even before death. Such people quote trina jala yuga mantra of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. A caterpillar moves on the leaves and when it wants to go from one leaf to another leaf, it catches hold of the next leaf and after having caught hold of the next leaf, it leaves the present leaf. Thereafter it drops the present leaf. In the same way, the jiva caterpillar and this body is the present leaf and it leaves it only after having caught hold of the next body in our case. According to the interpretation, there is time in the case of caterpillar, the front portion is in next leaf and back portion is in the present leaf. So also the jiva while being with the present body, it is only after taking hold of the next body, slowly sheds of its present body says the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Thus keeping the Brihadharaynaka upanisad as pramana some argue the body is received even before the death. this is quoted in sutra 3.1.1. and says that it should not be literally taken. Jiva cannot be there simultaneously in two bodies at the time of late stages of life when one has no strength to hold even one body. it should therefore be taken as mentally going to another place. The minds always think of the place first before we actually go there. stretching of the mind takes place even though physically we do not reach there. when we reach the fag end of life, we think of life of the future. Then it is also said in Brihadharaynaka upanisad that when the person is in the fag end of life the gradual prarapta gets released and during swapna he starts thinking of the future life. He is in a position of able to see the next part of life while experiencing the present life. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says it is not literally leaving the body but the vasanas gets its influence in the present life. Actual getting the body takes place only after we drop the present physical body. with this we have completed two adhikaranam and now we will go to the third adhikaranam.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

**Sutra 3.1.12[303]**

***Anishtadhikarinamapi cha srutam***

The sruti declares that the non-performance of sacrifice etc., also [go to the world of moon].

The movement of persons doing evil deeds is now described. This sutra is that of Purva Paksin.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with 10 sutras. Here also the subject matter is the travel of jiva after death. the travel will continue until it gets a new body in the next janma after rebirth. The dobut here is whether the route panchagni vidya is applicable to all the jivas or is it one taken by some of the jivas. This is the doubt. Purva Paksi says that this is the route to be taken by all the jivas. All have to got heaven, cloud, earth, male and female. In support of this view he quotes manta 1.2 of the Kaushitaki Upanishad .that says all the jivas who leave this sariram and world go to the chandra loka or swarga loka and take the route stated in the panchagni vidya. Then siddhanta points out no and that panchagni is not the route taken by all the jivas. The panchagni vidya is one of the three paths. It only reveals Krishna Gathi, which is not the only path, and it is one of the three paths mentioned in the sastra viz., shukla Gathi through which jiva go to Brahma loka and attain krama mukhti; if upasakas also take the panchagni path, they will have to undergo the birth; in addition to the two paths scriptures talks about the third path athogathi the downward path. They go through neither Krishna Gathi or shukla Gathi but go through athogathi. This is stated in Chandogya upanisad. Those jivas who do not take shukla Gathi and Krishna Gathi, get the third marga which is called athogathi. They take inferior birth in lower loka or take inferior jivas like incests etc. in this regard Gita says *urdhvam gachanti sattvastha madhye itsthanti rajasah jaghanya guna vrttistha adho gacchanti takasah* the meaning of the sloka is those who are established in sattva go to heaven. Rajasika persons are reborn in the mortal world; and the tamasika persons, abiding in the lowest guna, to to lower planets or hell [or take birth as lower creatures. The jivas take all the three paths depending upon the karmas. another sruti vakyam is there in 1.2.6 of Kathopanisad that reads as *na samprarayah pratibhati balam pramadyantam vittamohena mudham; ayam loko nasti para iti mani, punah punar vasam apadyate me* there are some people who do not believe in karma and Upasana they are vitta mohena mooda and are committed to money and commit papams and those papis without karma and Upasana come to me says yama. This indicates that they all go to yamaloka which a place for suffering. Those who do not do karma and Upasana get yamaloka. This is one point established through this adhikaranam. next point Vyasacharya establishes is even those who take to panchagni and be born as manushya and there is no rule that all the five stages must be there. this is said in the puranas. The idea is that the five stages are possibility and not inevitability. Second point is that even Krishna Gathi five stages are possibility and not a compulsory thing. From this we come to know that panchagni does not answer all the questions that says all about the travel of jiva after death. panchagni vidya is not a comprehensive topic but only hints of the travel after death. the aim of panchagni topic is not to teach us where jiva goes after death. there are infinite possibilities are there for deciding which route the jiva goes after death. the death happens only after exhaustion of prarapta or before also. this topic is so big with varieties of jivas and therefore Veda does not want us to know the possibilities. It is so because this has nothing to do with liberation or moksa. There is no use to read books on life after death. if this be the case why should Veda

talk about panchagni vidya. Panchagni vidya is taught only for meditation or Upasana purpose the second purpose is for one to develop vairagyam with regard to punar janma and also the cycle of birth and death. it does not deal with all the possibilities. This is the background of this adhikaranam. now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. this sutra entirely belongs to Purva Pakshi. Purva Pakshi says that all jivas will go through the five stages based on Kaushitaki Upanishad. even if a person is a papa karmi he will go through the five stages of panchagni. This is the essence of the first sutra. now we will do the word for word analysis.

Srutam the travel after death to heaven is mentioned in the sruti with respect to the non-ritualists also; the significance of the sutra is this; anistadikarnam means vedic rituals; adhi means etc., generally ishtam means vedic ritual; karina means the performers of ishtam etc. those who do not ishtam koortham dattam even those who do not do Upasana, good works etc. the final meaning is papa karmina ityarthah. For those papa karmis also panchagni dvara heaven word travel is to accepted. the next word is api cha which means not only punya karmis will go to heaven but also papa karmis also may go to heaven. For him srutam is the kaushitahi Upanishad vakyam. This is the Purva Pakshi. Now siddhanta will come.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.13[304]**

#### ***Sampuyamane tvanubhuvetareshamarchavarohau tadgatidarsanat***

But of others [i.e., those who have not performed sacrifices etc.,] [the ascent is to the abode of yama and after having experienced [the results of their evil deeds] they come down to the earth; as such a course is declaring by the sruti.

Description of the movement of person who have done evil deeds is continued/ the sutra refutes the views of the previous sutra. this is the siddhanta sutra.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. the panchagni route will not be taken by the upasakas who will take Krishna Gathi. That is not discussed in this adhikaranam. the other group of people who will not take Krishna Gathi is papa karmi. The route they take is that they go to yama loka. Panchagni route is taken by those who has done punyam to reach swarga loka. They go to yama loka and suffer and again come back without going through panchagni route. The pramanam for this is 1.2.6 of Kathopanisad already discussed in the previous sutra. Different lokas are there for different people. This is the essence of this sutra. now we will do the word for word analysis. Anubhuya tu having experienced the karma phalam mainly the papa phalam. samyamane means in yama loka; [they come down]. Aroha avarohau the path of departure and arrival [is thus different] itaresham for the others; tat gati darsanat since the sruti reveals their travel towards yama loka; this is the running meaning. Now we will do the significance of the words. Samyamane means the different kinds of yama loka coming under yama. Giving punishment by the Lord of Death punishes Arogant jivas. tu is meant to negate the Purva Pakshi; anubhuya means in that loka they experience their papa phalam by going through different forms of suffering and then they come down; avoha avarohau they have different path of climbing; the destination is yama loka. Panchagni is not



involved here and they will not go to swarga. Tad Gathi darsanat means yama loka that is seen in the Upanishad. now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.14[305]**

#### ***Smaranti cha***

The smriti also declare thus

Description of the journey of persons doing evil deeds is continued in the sutra.

Here Vyasacharya wants to show that papakarmis will go to naraka loka alone and not swarga loka. Here smriti and purana pramanam also there. all pramanams tell us that papa karmis will go to yama loka alone. now we will see the word analyasis. Smaranti cha srutis also reveal this fact. This is the running meaning. smaranti is an idion used to say rishis remember. Here remembrance is written in the forms of smriti grandhas. They declare the fact that all jivas will not go to swarga loaks but some go to yama loka due to papa krama.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.15[306]**

#### ***Api cha sapta***

Moreover there are seven [hells]

Here Vyasacharya gives purana pramanam. This is said in Maha Bharatham. In puranas seven padhala yogas are significant. There are 21 lower lokas. Thus sapta padhala lokas are well known to us.

Apicha moreover; sapta seven lower lokas are mentioned in the puranas. Now we will see the significance of the words. Apica means moreover; it is the conjunction of purana pramanam. Sapta padhala lokas. With this 15<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 245

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

**Sutra 3.1.16[307]**

***Tatrapī cha tadvyaparāt avirodhah***

And on account of his [yama's] control even there [in those hells] is no contradiction.

The same topic continues in this sutra.

This sutra answers a small incidental question based on the previous sutra. In the previous sutra it was said that adharmic people will go to yama loka. There are several lokas. In the puranas they are not called yama lokas. When we look into puranas the lower lokas are presided by other devatas and not by yama. Chitra gupta presides over lower lokas. How can we tally the other lokas with yama loka. For that Vyasacharya says all the presiding deities of the lower lokas mentioned in the puranas function under yama dharma raja only. therefore wherever chitra gupta rules it is the rule of Yama Dharma Raja only. therefore pathala lokas are indirectly presided over by Yama Dharma Raja only. now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. since yama's influence is accepted in those lokas also avirodhah there is contradiction. We will see the significance of the words. Tatra in those lokas in sapta lokas mentioned in the previous sutra; api cha means also; even though they are not directly controlled by Yama. His assistance is there to take care of other lokas; tad vyaparāt yama influences or functions; in this context we take the meaning of influence or power; even though directly chitra gupta controls the seven lokas the ultimate control is with yama only. There is no contradiction between Kathopanisad sruti 1.2.6 and the purana vakyams.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

**Sutra 3.1.17[308]**

***Vidyakarmanoriti tu prakritatvat***

But [the reference is to the two roads] of knowledge and work, those two being under discussion.

In this sutra Vyasacharya answers a doubt which may arise based on the second sruti pramanam we quoted in the beginning. Whether adharmic people travel by Krishna Gathi is our question. They will travel is Purva Pakshi's contention but siddhanta says adharmic people will go to lower loka only as quoted from Chandogya upanisad and kathopanisad. Up to the last sutra Vyasacharya analysed Kathopanisad. but here Vyasacharya discusses Chandogya

upanisad pramanam. This says those people who do not go through these two paths will go through the third path. [Chandogya upanisad V.10.8] we translated the two as shukla Gathi and Krishna Gathi]. Those who do not take to the above two gathis, will go through athogathi to yama loka. Now purva paksa says why not these two means Krishna Gathi and shukla Gathi and atho Gathi meaning for the third if the two refers to Krishna Gathi and shukla Gathi. He asks how you arrived at the above meaning. for that Vyasacharya says when you do not know the meaning of the pronoun you get the meaning by the context. Prakarana pramanena sarva nama sabdah sarva nama arthah nyayate. The biggest maha vakyam you have only pronoun. Tat tvam asi. This maha vakyam has all the three pronouns. How do you arrive the meaning of tat; it is from tat means sat in Chandogya upanisad. Tat tvam asi is sat tvam asi; twam means chit; tat chit asi; the pronoun can be deciphered with the help of prakaranam. In Chandogya upanisad in the previous shukla Gathi has been elaborately talked about. The first devata introduced as part of shukla Gathi is Archih. Then comes other devatas. The Upanishad also mentioned this shukla Gathi is taken by upasakas. With shraddha if one practice saguna Brahma Upasana is called vidya. Saguna Upasana marga is called shukla Gathi. Those who practice yagna etc., karma marga is called krsihna Gathi. Upasana marga shukla Gathi and karma marga is Krishna Gathi. After introducing the two margas, the Upanishad mentions that those who do not practice Upasana and karma will get atho Gathi that is other than Krishna and Shukla Gathi.

Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra. vidyakarmano the path of Upasana and karma iti is the meaning of the word ethayoho; prakritatvat since they are the topic of discussion. This is the running meaning. now we will come to significance of the word. vidyakarmano means vidya marga and karma margah, the marga which is the vidya phalam; vidya karma phala is either shukla or Krishna Gathi. This is the meaning of the pronoun ethayoho which occurs in 5.10.8 of Chandogya upanisad. In the Upanishad ethayoho is in the sixth case and therefore Vyasacharya uses the word vidya karmanoh; ethayoho is equal to vidya karmanoh. Iti arthah means this is the meaning. prakritattvat that is the prakaranam which we come to from the previous sutra.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.18[309]**

#### ***Na tritiye tathopalabdheh***

Not in [the case of] a third place, as it is thus declared in the scriptures.

The fifth oblation is not necessary in the case of those who go to the third place because it is thus declared in the scriptures.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. here Vyasacharya says the third path known as Atho Gathi mentioned in Chandogya upanisad the five stages are not involved and they are involved in manushya janma alone. They are swarga, mega, boomi, manushya and nari. This is experienced by us and all the jivarasis are not born in the same method. The reproduction is not similar in all living beings. In some cases, the father mother mating is not involved. When the jivas come down from swarga loka, the apa sariram get converted to soma sariram and then soma sariram gets converted into vristi the rainy water; then the vristi

falls down on the earth and the water pool is there all over; according to sastra mosquitos are seen to be the moisture born being; in the case of those insects, they do not go through all the five stages; from vristi they become the prani and they do not go through the third, fourth and fifth conversions. Therefore in the case of insects we do not have five stages. To use Vyasacharya expression samshogajam are moisture born being. We shall take another types of jivarasis. When the vristi jalam falls on the earth, the plants are born. vristi jalam coming out through the earth becomes the plant kingdom. Here vristi annam conversion does not take place in the case of plant kingdom. They are beings born by breaking open the earth, the plant jivas come out in the form of trees. Plants do not have fourth and fifth stage of conversion. This is the sastric approach. Even if we study locally without the help of sastra we know several things are born without going through the five stages. In certain pranis males themselves become pregnant and give birth to the baby. In the case of certain plants when we take the branch of the tree, the next plant is born and we do not see several stages. Therefore, we cannot apply five stages in the case of all the living beings. This is the essence of this sutra. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. na tritiya five stages are not relevant with regard to the third path; tathopalabdheh since it is known from the sruti. Now we will see the significance of the words. Na means not there. it means five stages are not there in the third path which is other than Krishna Gathi and shukla Gathi. Tathopalabdheh that is seen or prathyaksa anubhava pramanam or sastra pramanam; Adhi Sankaracharya takes the sastra pramanam. Refer to 5.1.8 of Chandogya upanisad. By saying the words born and gone, they refer to those things, which are instantaneously born and gone with short period of life. It does not refer to the human being. in English we call it mushroom growth. They do not have time for five stages. If you remember Kathopanisad it is said like mushroom things are born and gone. the instantaneousness indicates the absence of the five stages mentioned in the panchagni vidya. Then the Purva Pakshi raises the question if the five stages are not there how come Upanishad says [5.3.3 of Chandogya upanisad] that the rudimentary body becomes the full fledged body only in the fifth stage. Here you say five stages are not required. If you ask Adhi Sankaracharya gives his answer. the word Purusa represents manushya sariram alone. the the rudimentary body is to be converted into manushya sariram it has to undergo five stages. In other cases five stages are not required. Previous sutra refers to manushya janma and here it refers to other cases other than manushya janma. Tatha upalabhdeh means that is found in the Upanishad itself 5.10.8 of Chandogya upanisad.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.19 [310]**

#### ***Smaryate'pi cha loke***

And [moreover the] smritis have recorded also [that] in this world [there had been cases of birth without the course of five oblations.

The argument commenced in sutra 17 to refute the objections in sutra 12 is continued.

Here Vyasacharya says even in the case of human beings this rule of five stages is only a general rule and there are exception here as we see in the puranas. Manushyas require five stage that means womb born. anything born out of mother's womb is called jarayudham. In

the case of human beings five stages are there mentioned in the previous sutra. there are exceptions even in the case of human beings. Dristadyumna was born out of homa kunda without undergoing the five stages. He was not regularly born through father mother etc. similarly Droupathi, Sita are born with exceptional background. Therefore five stages are only samples and not meant for all jivarasis. Five stages should be read as for some jivas and not for all jivas. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. api cha so loke birth of the people of the world without going through the five stages; smaryate is known through the smritis. This is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of the words. Smaryate sruti pramane by which Maha Bharatam, Ramayana etc., were written. In the case of some sages, the Lord directly entered the womb of the mother. Loke means Dristadyumna jiva etc., in this world. they are the special cases of birth without going through the five stages. Five stages are not compulsory for all jivas. For Upanishad and for vairagya sidhyartham the five stages has been mentioned in the Chandogya upanisad. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 246

### **Topic 4. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.20 [311]**

#### ***Darsanaccha***

Also on account of the observation..

The argument commenced in sutra 17 is continued.

Having given sruti and smriti pramana the anubhava pramana is given in this sutra. as the word indicates anubhava pramanena darsanat. Pratyaksa pramanam in this case that jivarasis are classified into four types. Four types of jivarasis mentioned in the 18<sup>th</sup> sutra can be taken for this sutra. the four types of jivarasis are womb born being, egg born beings, the earth born beings like plants etc., and finally moisture born beings all the micro organism including mosquito etc. third and fourth do not have the fourth and fifth stages as we see in the manushya janma. In the case of micro organism also they are straightaway born without any five stages. The regular method of reproduction is not seen in the above cases. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Darsanat cha from observation also [this is known] this means that the five stages are not compulsory for all the jivarasis. Now we will see the significance of the words. Darsanat means seeing or observation or prathyaksa pramanat. Adhi Sankaracharya takes 18<sup>th</sup> sutra as sruti pramana sutra and 20<sup>th</sup> sutra as prathyaksa pramana sutra. cha joins all the three sutras. Cha means in addition to sruti and smriti pramana there is prathyaksa pramana also.

### **Topic 3. Anishtadikaryadhikaranam [sutra 12-21]**

The fate after death of those souls whose deeds do not entitle them to pass to chandraloka.

#### **Sutra 3.1.21 [312]**

#### ***Tritiyasabdavarodhah samsukajasya***

The third term [i.e., plant life] includes that which springs from heat and moistures.

The argument commenced in sutra 17 to refute the objections in sutra 12 is continued.

Here Vyasacharya solves an incidental doubt in this sutra. while dealing with the darsanat he pointed out that there are four types of jivarasis and two of them do not have five stages. How do we know the division. This is mentioned in 3.1. of Aitareya Upanishad. now the doubt that comes is the types of jivarasis is mentioned in Chandogya upanisad also where only three

types are mentioned in Mantra 6.3.1 of Chandogya upanisad. In this portion andajam is same as andajam; jivajam is same as womb born; udvigjam is earth born. svegajam is not mentioned in Chandogya upanisad. Vyasacharya solves this problem by saying that in Chandogya upanisad the fourth one is implied and therefore you supply the fourth one namely svedhajam. Vyasacharya says the word udvigjam can be interpreted in two ways and thereby two types of jivarais can be taken. The earth breaking open or penetrating upwards refers to plant kingdom. In the second interpretation the ud is taken as udhagam and bidva jayate iti udvigjam and udhagam refers to moisture. They are the insects. All the four beings are included and therefore there is contradictory. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Triiyasabdavarodhah Samsokajasya beings born of moisture is to be included in the third expression occurring in the Chandogya upanisad statement. Now we will see the sig of the words. Triiyasabdavarodhah means the third expression that the three are interpreted as udvigjam. Avarodhah means incusion. The inclusion in the third expression itself samsokajasya means svegajam the moisture born being. it should be done within the expression of udvigjam. With this, the third adhikaranam is also over. In this adhikaranam the tridiya Gathi or papa karmi is established. Now we will enter into the fourth adhikaranam.

#### **Topic 4. Sabhavyapattyadhikaranam [sutra 22]**

The soul on descent from the Chandraloka does not become identified with ether, etc., but attains similarity of nature.

#### **Sutra 3.1.22 [313]**

#### ***Tatsabhavyapattirupapattch***

[The soul when coming down from the sphere of moon] attains similarity of nature with them [i.e., with ether, air etc.,] as this only is people.

First, I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The topic here talks about the ritualist people going to swarga loka and coming down in a particular path after exhausting their punya karma. Prarapta can be either punyam or papam depending upon the karma jiva comes through certain particular stages. The Upanishad gives a long statement as to how they descend. Mantra V.10.5 and 6 of Chandogya upanisad reads as *athaitam evadhvanam punar nivartante yathetam akasam akasaa vayum vayur bhutva dhumo bhavati dhumo bhutva bhram bhavati abhram bhutva megho bhavati, megho bhutva pravarsati, ta itha vrihi-yava asadhi vanaspatayas tila masa iti jayante ato vai khalu durnisrapataram, yo yo by annam atti yo retah sincati, tad bhuya eva bhavat* having dwelt there as long as there is residue of good works they return again by that course by which they came to space, from space into air, and after having become the air they become the smoke; after having become smoke, they become mist. After having become mist, they become cloud, after having become cloud he rains down. They are born here as rice and barley, herbs and trees, as sesamum plants and beans. From, thence the release becomes extremely difficult for whoever eats the food and sows the seed he becomes like unto him. They pass through Akasa, Akasa to Vayu, from Vayu to smoke, from smoke to mist, from mist to the rain bearing clouds; from cloud to raining clouds; from raining clouds to rains; from the water they enter plant kingdom and they become vegetable and thus enter the father's body and to mother's body etc. then Upanishad says having become Vayu, it becomes dhumah. First

Upanishad uses the word arrival and then it says it becomes. Now the doubt is does that it comes to Vayu or it becomes Vayu. Similarly all others are also. This is the doubt. Since Upanishad uses the word Vayu bhutva etc., we have to take it as becoming cloud smoke etc. siddhanta says that it does not become but it appears so. it is not becoming but it is only a resemblance. That alone is logically possible. jiva cannot become Akasa because of several reasons. if jiva becomes Akasa then further stages are not possible. jiva cannot become Akasa. then he cannot become any other thing.

One thing can never become another. X can never become Y. one thing is one thing because of its property; another thing cannot be another thing because of the property. One should give up one's property and assume the other's property. Then one question we ask one thing becomes another by taking up another set of property, one may ask whether it gives up the intrinsic property or incidental property to look like the other. if a person says it gives up incidental property to become another, that is not acceptable by giving up the incidental property one cannot become the other. If the hair is lost the incidental property is given up, you do not take or compare with another person. a fat person can become a lean person. Incidental property change does not mean the change of the subject. By giving up the intrinsic property, a thing can become another. Adhi Sankaracharya says that is also not possible. by giving up the intrinsic property because the definition of the intrinsic property is that a thing cannot give up that property. In fact if intrinsic property is given up, the substance itself will disappear. Substance cannot disappear because a thing cannot be destroyed. The final law is that a thing can never become another. It is logically impossible. Jiva cannot become Akasa. If this were the case, chetanam will become achetanam. This is not possible. This is going to be our siddhanta assertion.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. tatsabhavyapattih jiva's assumption of various form similar to them is implied in the sruti. Upapatteh means since that is logical. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Tatsabhavyapattih tad refers to various stages; sabhavyam means resemblance jiva has resemblance to Akasa, Vayu in the sense of subtlety; apattihi means assumption or transformation. We take this meaning by compromising the Upanishad word. the primary meaning becomes we compromise and say that it resembles or similar to Akasa, Vayu etc. upapatteh that is the reasonable interpretation. figurative interpretation alone is reasonable. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 23]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

### **Sutra 3.1.23 [314]**

#### ***Natichirena viseshat***

[The soul passes through the stages of its descent] in a not very long time; on account of the special statement.

Now I will give you the general introduction and general analysis of the sutra. this adhikaranam has only one sutra. here Vyasacharya answers one question that may arise in our mind because of curiosity especially regarding what happens after death. it is based on the mantra 5.10.5 and 6 of the Chandogya upanisad where it is said that jiva comes to Akasa resembling Akasa etc., then jiva comes down through the water resembling water etc. then



the Upanishad says the jiva becomes the plant kingdom. There afterwards jiva becomes the plant kingdom etc. now the curiosity that may come to our mind as to how long it takes for jiva to travel from one stage to another state. It is the duration in each state the jiva takes while moving from one state to another. Purva Pakshi says the duration is unpredictable. Vyasacharya says that there is some predictability. The Upanishad does not mention the time up to the stage of the rains. From plant kingdom, father mother etc., the coming out to the next stage is difficult. It is from rainy water onwards it is difficult. Because it says the later state is difficult by implication, the previous stages are quickly gone. the expression in this connection, it is difficult to emerge through at later stages. This is the essence of the sutra.

Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra. naticheirena jiva crosses the initial stages within a short time; viseshat this is understood from the specific expression occurring in the sruti.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. First expression is natichirene means not very long which means short; that is jiva passes through the initial stages in short period. Viseshat this is known from the specific expression occurring in the sruti. [refer to 5.10.6 of Chandogya upanisad] The stages after rainy water are more difficult to pass through. If the rain falls on the earth, only the jiva can pass the stage. If it falls on the ocean there is no chance of the jiva passing to the next state. Even if it falls on the land, the thing should fall on the eatable plant. Then only the manushya will eat it. Then which type of man it should enter. It should be eaten by the man. The details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 247

### **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 23]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

**Sutra 3.1.23 [314]**

#### *Natichirena viseshat*

[The soul passes through the stages of its descent] in a not very long time; on account of the special statement.

we completed the 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and through this adhikaranam Vyasacharya points out that jiva passes through the initial stages through short period and once it reaches the rainy waters, the latter stages pass through to be born as human being it is relatively more difficult to come to eatable plant, it should reach a male human being and then it should reach the woman through the male. In the case of males, also, there are four ashramas and the jiva should come to human grahastha of comparatively young one ready to father a child. Thus, the stages from rain onwards are difficult. This is expressed in nishparakaram. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 6. anyadhithitadhikaranam [sutra 24- 27]**

When the souls enter into plants etc., they only cling to them and do not themselves become those species.

**Sutra 3.1.24 [315]**

#### *Anyadhithithitesha purvavadabhilpat*

[The descending soul enters] into [plants] animated other [souls] as in the previous cases, on account of scriptural declaration.

The discussion on the way of descent of the individual soul is continued.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with 4 sutras.this is the sixth and final adhikaranam. the siddhanta that is going to be arrived at here is that through panchagni vidya Upanishad points out that jiva goes to heaven, megha, rain, food, male and female is the process through which jiva gets the full-fledged form. once the food enters the human male, you should know that already the jiva has one body and after the consumption of food an external traveling jiva enters the male body at a latter stage and we will call a guest jiva. that jiva who is identifying with the body which is the original jiva we will call it a host jiva. the guest jiva comes from heaven, megha, rain and through plant to the male body. the difference between the host jiva and guest jiva is at the time of consumption the guest jiva gets transferred to the mother. When the guest jiva enters the mother, the story is the same as

in the case of male. Here also we see a guest and host jiva. the guest of father jiva has become guest of mother jiva. that jiva stays for about 10 months and develop itself into full fledged body and comes out and that we call a baby. the difference between two jivas is the host jiva alone will have abhimana with the body because of the karma. Similarly, the host jiva will have the abhimana with female body also and that abhimana is caused by karma. When the guest jiva enters the body it is not connected with karma and therefore guest jiva does not have abhimana with male or female body. if both guest and host jiva have abhimana and then both will have abhimana with the body, so many karma complication will come. the guest jiva occupies the body and it does not have abhimana. Sarira abhimana jiva and sarira antargatha jiva are the two. Suppose there is some wound or injury on the father or the mother, this pain caused by the physical wound will go to which jiva sarira abhimana jiva or sarira antargatha jiva. Sastra says sarira abhimana jiva alone will suffer pains. The guest jiva will not suffer because of the problems of the guesthouse in the form of male or female. It suffers sukha and dukham only when it takes its own body after birth. The full-fledged jiva comes at the end of the fifth stage. That jiva then only start experiencing the sukha and dukham. The Upanishad wants to extend this to the tree body also. in the plant also there are two jivas one is the vriksha abhimani jiva which has come because of its punya papa and within the plant there is an abhimani jiva. the jiva that enters is not abhimani jiva. in the panchagni when we talk in the plant we talk of antargatha jiva and not abhimani jiva. this jiva occupies the plant temporarily and with rudimentary human body occupies the plant and then the rudimentary body goes to the male and then to the female before taking the full-fledged human body. this is siddhanta Vyasacharya wants to establish. The jiva occupying the tree during the third stage of panchagni vidya is an antargatha jiva and not abhimani jiva. Once you say it is antargatha jiva, the next corollary we get is whatever sukha and dukha we get through the plant body will not belong to antargatha traveling jiva but it will belong to another jiva, which is an abhimana jiva, which we call it as host jiva. For this a purva paksa comes. The sastra does not make it clear between abhimani jiva and antargatha jiva. What is the Upanishad statement that contributes to this confusion? 5.10.6 if Chandogya upanisad says that the verb jayante contributes to the conclusion. While talking about the third stage of jiva, from the earth it comes in contact with the plant as guest jiva. However, the Upanishad says that jiva is born as plants and trees. In fact, there will not be panchagni itself. After heaven, cloud and earth if jiva is born as plants it will cross only after three stages. It is going to be born after two stages without identifying as plants and without going through the sukha and dukham of the plants and then it comes to the fourth stage of the male and female body the verb jayante should be used. The verb jayante must be translated as temporary residence of plants without suffering the pleasure and pain of the plant body. jayante verb should be taken as lakshyartha samsvarga prapti and not janma prapti. vishayah is jayante and the doubt is whether the word jayante means becoming an abhimani jiva or antargata jiva. The Purva Paksi says that abhimani jiva bhavati and it is a birth in the form of a plant. Plant is not a vehicle but it is an ayathanam. The logic for this is that he verb jayante has got the mukya artha abhimana jiva. primary meaning and any other meaning mukyartham is stronger. He also gives another logic for that. he says that these people, the jivas who come through the five stages have gone to swarga in form of Krishna Gathi passage because of their vedic rituals. Upasana would have given them the shukla Gathi. Vedic ritual is wonderful all right, punyam all right and since Vedic rituals involves animal sacrifice it has mixture of papams also because of pasu himsa. Because of punya karma he goes to swarga loka and later he may become a human being all right and before human form he must become a plant because of the pasu himsa involved in the animal sacrifice. It is a birth as a plant, suffers for a short while, and then comes to male body, female body etc. it is natural justice. This is purva paksa. siddhanta says that there is no birth as plants. This jiva coming through panchagni

stages is not born as plants and it only travels through the plant body without going through the pleasure and pains of the plant body without going through the pleasure and pains of male body and without going through the pleasure and pains of the female body. When it gathers its own bogha sariram it will experience sukha and dukha. Now we will come to the general analysis of the first sutra.

Here Vyasacharya says that the jiva comes to the plant not as an abhimani jiva but to a plant there is some other abhimani jiva already. However, it comes to a plant in which some other jiva is there already. Vyasacharya says that purvavathu we have been taking the secondary meaning only even in previous cases also. Therefore, you need not be suddenly shocked. We have seen in the 22<sup>nd</sup> stura sabhavya adhikaranam. Vyasacharya says you recollect that and in that adhikaranam we saw that the Upanishad uses the expression that the jiva becomes Vayu, jiva becomes cloud and there we analysed and arrived at the meaning jiva does not become Vayu and you should not take the literal meaning because jiva is a chetana tattvam and where is the question of becoming achetana tattvam. It means it looks similar to the Vayu etc. and there we logically rejected the verb bhutva. Just as we rejected there here also we cannot take the primary meaning and we must take the indirect meaning. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. purvavad as in the case of the previous stages anyadhishtitheshu the jivas get association with the plant bodies which are presided over by other jivas. The other jivas are the abhimani jivas. Abhilapat this is known from the sruti statement. this is the running meaning. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Anyadhisthitesu jiva enters plants etc., which is already identified by some other jiva. teshu into such plants jiva enters as guest; it does not identify with that body and no sukha and dukha will come through the body at all. purvavad means as in the case of the previous stages where we did not take the primary meaning. the next word is abhilapat this we come to know from sruti vakya [5.10.5 and 6 of Chandogya upanisad]. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives another supporting argument also. Adhi Sankaracharya says for argument sake let us assume after the third stage the jiva really becomes a plant and it becomes an abhimani jiva. this abhimani jiva which is in the plant kingdom and in the fourth stage it has to come to the male body. Can the abhimani jiva which is in the plant in the form of food etcf., can it enter the father's body. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is impossible. Normal human being does not consume the plant directly. The plant is tormented and tortured and when it is done beyond the limit the abhimani jiva leaves the body. Therefore, Adhi Sankaracharya argues assuming that it becomes abhimani jiva in the process of cooking, it would have left the plant and by consuming that it would not have got transferred into the male body. whereas if it is an antargatha jiva whatever is done to the plant antargatha jiva will not quit. It does not have sukha and dukha or pleasure and pain. Antargatha jiva even after cooking process will get transferred to the next stage. This is the additional argument given by Adhi Sankaracharya. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 24 - 27]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

**Sutra 3.1.25[316]**

***Asuddhamiti chet na sabdat***

If it be said that [sacrificial work is] unholy [we say] not so on account of scriptural authority.

An objection to sutra 24 is raised and refuted.

In this sutra Vyasacharya answers the second reasoning given by the Purva Paksi to establish that in the third stage the jiva becomes the abhimani jiva in the plant. The question now is whether the pasu himsa in the vaidhika karma is himsa or papa karma or not. It is an important sutra, an aside, or an incidental topic. Himsa is a papam we all know. Now the debate is if there is a ritual involving animal sacrifice naturally involving pasu himsa will it become a papa karma or papa misrita punya karma; whether it is dharmikam or adharmikam. It is not papam is our conclusion. It is Vyasacharya conclusion if it is based on Veda vidhi. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 248

### **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 24 - 27]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

#### **Sutra 3.1.25[316]**

#### ***Asuddhamiti chet na sabdat***

If it be said that [sacrificial work is] unholy [we say] not so on account of scriptural authority.

An objection to sutra 24 is raised and refuted.

In this adhikaranam the Krishna Gathi of the vedic ritualist is talked about. In the third stage it is discussed whether the jiva becomes abhimani jiva or antargatha jiva without going through sukha and dukha of jiva. Purva Paksi says that he becomes abhimani jiva due to the papams acquired due pasu himsa involved in the vedic rituals. Therefore, papa misrita punyam alone this jiva has and it is a temporary phase. However, Vyasacharya says jiva goes through plants and the actual plant jiva undergoing pleasure and pain is different from traveling jiva. Now the question is whether the pasu himsa involved in the Vedic rituals is papa karma or punya karma. Vyasacharya established that it is not asuddha karma at all. That is why several people have several opinions and each group has its own opinions. I will share some of the opinions. The extreme Hindu group is highly critical of animal sacrifice and through that they criticize Hindu religion, Vedas and Vedic priests etc. they say it is uncivilized practice. This is one group. Generally, they tell the story of Buddha in this context calling him to be a most compassionate person in the world. They also take to nasthika vadha and strongly criticize Veda, karma and the practice. But the surprising thing is the group that is against the Veda but they never campaign the slaughter houses that are hundreds and thousands, which treat most cruelly the animals. They talk of vedic ritual and not the slaughter houses. Whether they are against the sacrifice or they are against the Veda is our doubt. Many of consumers of meat belong to Buddhists. The animals saved from vedasala went to patasala. Then comes the next group slightly moderate. They say that the animal sacrifice is wrong but do not criticize the Veda and we should be discriminative and find out the wrong karmas prescribed in vedas and do not reject Vedas and accept the proper karmas. the improper karmas and animal sacrifice we should reject. There is third group is that who asks who are we judge to pass a judgment on the vedic statement. Therefore they say all the karmas are proper only and some of them were relevant in the past and some of them are not relevant in the present and therefore do not criticize them and now we need not practice them. Then there is the fourth group which says that you discuss whether animal sacrifice is right or wrong and the Vedas never say that the animal sacrifice should be done or not. There is no animal offering involved and there is animal images, which they call pishta pasu. What is said is symbolically you sacrifice the animal and the purpose of symbolic sacrifice is that you sacrifice the animal instinct. We want to change animal man to man and man man to god man. This is the fourth group. all of them will fall into one of the four group\s and you may decide what one you should choose. Vyasacharya approach is given here which is different from all the four. Adhi Sankaracharya says when you judge the karma is proper or improper

what is the norm of judgment. Any judgment is based on one norm or the other. In the context of Vedic scripture, all vaidhikas have accepted two types of phalam. Without the basic acceptance of an ampire cricket game is not possible. so we have to accept that all the karmas have visible phalam sand invisible phalam. One is dhrishta phalam and the other is adhrishta phalam the invisible consequences called punya papam. Dhrishta phalam is known by instrument of knowledge and adhrishta phalam is not available for perception. These are the fundamental axioms accepted by the vedic students. The acceptance of such things is called shraddha. The adhrishta phalam cannot have access to adhrishta. The third axiom is apourusheya and can be known through apourusheya pramanam, which is Vedas. When a vaidhika discusses the propriety of an action, he takes adhrishta also. It is even more important than the dhrishta phalam because adhrishta phalam gives him the spiritual growth. The norm of judgment is based on the punya papa criterion. What is punyam and papam yad Veda vihitam tad punya janakam. This is the fourth axiom. Whatever is permitted by Vedas is punya janakam and what is prohibited by Vedas is papa janakam. While debating the issue, we should know what is our norm adhrishta phalam or dhrishta phalam. if a person does not believe in adhrishta or Veda pramanam it is better I am not interested in the topic. Adhi Sankaracharya says for a vaidhika who believes in adhrishta and Veda pramana froma dhrishta dristyasa pasu himsa is suddham. Adhi Sankaracharya also says ahimsa is a samanya dharma but there are occasion where visesha dharma overpowers samanya dharma. Krishna tells arjuna ahimsa is dharma and at the same time Krishna says killing drona bishma is dharmic and that will take to heaven. Pasu himsa is dharma or adharma depends upon the views taken by us.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. asuddham means the vedic ritual is impure. Siddhanta says if this is your view na it is not correct. Sabdat because it is prescribed by Veda pramanam. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Asuddham means impure or wrong or bad. He takes it as the papa janakam based on samanya dharma. He sees it as papa janakam. This is the Purva Pakshi contention if this is the view it is not acceptable; sabdat means Veda itself presents it as an exception to the original law. Ultimately speaking no action is good or bad. Himsa is sometimes good and sometimes it is bad. We always say that dharma is relative. There are many gray areas. We should be careful that dharma is relative and I will do anything I like. You cannot live an yedeshtara life. First follow dharma and when the gray area comes lot of analysis are involved and then you have to conclude. In such situation you should take the right conclusion if you are mature enough. Normally one is not mature enough to take right action when it affects him. Always go to the right person for advice who gives the right advice. There is no absolute punyam or absolute papam. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 24 - 27]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

#### **Sutra 3.1.26[317]**

#### ***Retah sigyogo'tha***

Then [the soul gets] connected with him who performs the act of generation.

The discussion on the way of descent of the soul is continued. What becomes of the soul after its clinging to the plants is now mentioned.

Now we have to come back to the main topic of discussion. Our controversy is when jiva passes through plants and tree does he become antargatha jiva or abhimana jiva. when the jiva is guest jiva or the host jiva? in support of that Vyasacharya gives another argument based on mantra 5.10.6 of Chandogya upanishad. After passing through the plant, the human being consumes the plant and when the jiva is to become a manushya this jiva has to enter the manushya sariram through the food. It has to enter the male and enter the female that is the fifth stage. Of the four ashramas, it has to enter adult male human being who wants to become a father. The Upanishad uses a special word for such an adult. That is retasic. Retah means manushya beejam. Jiva in beeja rupam is in the male body and the would be father to transfer the beejam to the femal body is called retasic. The Upanishad uses a word that the jiva becomes retasic. Vyasacharya asks the question how can you understand this expression. he becomes a retasic and here you cannot take the mukyartha and you have to take the figurative meaning that it does not become adult male but it gets association with adult male. The jiva in plant kingdom becomes an adult male the jiva in plant body gets association with the male body. This Purva Paksi has to agree that jiva cannot straightaway become a male adult. You have to take the figurative meaning in the name of plant kingdom also. This is the argument of Vyasacharya. First, we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. retah sig yoga the jiva gets association with the adult male human being. This is the running meaning. Now I will give you the significance of the words. After passing through the plant body, retah sig yogah as I said ratah sig means an adult male human being, a human being in a reproductive condition would be father human being; yogah means samsarga praptih and not janma praptih. The suffering of the male body will not affect the new jiva. yoga means samsarga in this context. Then comes the last sutra of this pada.

### **Topic 5. Natichiradhikaranam [sutra 24 - 27]**

It takes only a short time for the descent of the soul.

#### **Sutra 3.1.27[318]**

#### ***Yoneh sariram***

From the womb a [new] body [springs]

The discussion on the nature of the descent of the soul is concluded here.

Now coming to this sutra Vyasacharya says that this jiva becomes the guest of the male body. when it is in male's body it does not have sukha and dukha. Then it is transferred to female body and in the female body also it is antargatha jiva and not abhimana jivah. Then when it takes its own body and the new full-fledged jiva is born. that alone is original body of the jiva and it is the owner of the body and through that body alone after it comes out punya papa karma begins. Until now the punya papa karma worked for the transit and bogha begins after the fifth stage. In the previous stages ramaniya carana and kapuya carana is not used. Because of the usage of ramaniya and kapuya carana, hereafter only the janma is counted. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. Yoneh from the womb of the mother; from the womb sariram the human body emerges. This is the running meaning. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Yonih represents the fifth stage. Sariram means the emergence of the physical body, which was received in the purva janma marana kala in rudimentary form. That rudimentary body has become the full-fledged body that we call as janma. In the previous stages, janma should be taken in



figurative sense. Punya papa experience starts now only. With this, the significance of the words is over. The fourth sutra is over. first pada is over. The travel of jiva after death and various allied topics is over. We come to know here getting manushya janma is extremely rare thing. Since it is rare, it is better to cross over punrabi jananam punrabi maranam. I do not know what will be my next janma. So get detach from janma marana prapti. more in the next class.

<b>BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 2</b>			
<b>Classes: 249 to 268 = Sutras: 3-2-1 to 3-2-41</b>			
<b>Page Detail &amp; Content</b>			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
249	45	3 . 2 . 1	319
250	49	3 . 2 . 2 and 3 . 2 . 3	320 and 321
251	53	3 . 2 . 3 and 3 . 2 . 4	321 and 322
252	57	3 . 2 . 4 to 3 . 2 . 6	322 to 324
253	61	3 . 2 . 7 and 3 . 2 . 8	325 and 326
254	65	3 . 2 . 9 and 3 . 2 . 10	327 and 328
255	69	3 . 2 . 10 and 3 . 2 . 11	328 and 329
256	73	3 . 2 . 11 to 3 . 2 . 13	329 to 331
257	77	3 . 2 . 14 to 3 . 2 . 16	332 to 334
258	81	3 . 2 . 17 to 3 . 2 . 20	335 to 338
259	86	3 . 2 . 20 and 3 . 2 . 21	338 and 339
260	90	3 . 2 . 22 and 3 . 2 . 23	340 and 341
261	94	3 . 2 . 24 and 3 . 2 . 25	342 and 343
262	98	3 . 2 . 26 to 3 . 2 . 28	344 to 346
263	102	3 . 2 . 29	347
264	106	3 . 2 . 30 to 3 . 2 . 33	348 to 351
265	110	3 . 2 . 33 to 3 . 2 . 35	351 to 353
266	114	3 . 2 . 35 to 3 . 2 . 37	353 to 355
267	118	3 . 2 . 38 to 3 . 2 . 41	356 to 359
268	122	3 . 2 . 41	359
	124		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 2

Class: 249

Introduction to the second pada.

We have completed the first pada of the third chapter. The third chapter is called sadhana adhyaya a chapter that focuses on vedanta sadhanani. We should now remember sadhyam and that is jivatma and paramatma which is revealed through mahavakya tat tvam asi etc. When we say jnanam is sadhyam we remember the fact that jnanam and moksa are identical because in this context jnanam happens to be the knowledge of the fact that i am ever free. Therefore, knowledge and freedom happens to be identical in vedanta. We cannot say that knowledge gives freedom, it is only a figurative expression, knowledge is freedom, and it is the knowledge of the fact that i am knowledge. The entire third adhyaya four padas are there of which we have completed the first pada where we analysed the journey of jiva after death through panchagni portion and the indirect benefit of this discussion is vairagya praptih. Even though directly it deals with jiva gathi indirectly, it is supposed to generate the vairagyam in the listener. Pramata is defined as that person in whom alone pramana will do its job prama jananam the jananam of wisdom. Pramanam can generate wisdom on pramata. The very status of pramanam as pramanam depends upon the status of pramata. The efficiency of vedanta depends upon not on vedanta but depends upon my qualification and vairagyam becomes an important sadhana for jnana utpatti. Vairagyam makses sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi and sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi makes an adhikari, adhikari makes a pramata, and pramata alone knows pramanam. Pradhama pada highlights vairagyam. Vairagyam is supposed to be the important fourfold qualification. Now we will enter the secojd pada. I will introduce this pada. It has eight adhikaranam with 41 sutras. Tat tvam padhartha sodhanam is the topic of this pada. The word tvam and the word tat occurring in the maha vakyam will be analysed in this pada. It will be seen whether we should take the lakshyartha or vachyartha of the maha vakyam. Now the question is why should we do this job at all. There is a rule that the meaning of a sentence requires the knowledge of the meaning of the words. Padha jnanam \bina vakyartha jnanam naiva utbhavati. Without the knowledge of the words in the sentence, the knowledge of the sentence is impossible. Here our sentence is jivatma and paramatma aikya jnanam. So jivatma and paramatma aikya jnanam is called maha vakyartha jnanam. Therefore, jivatma and paramatma aikyam is equal to maha vakyartha jnanam and vakyartha jnanam presupposes padhartha jnanam, which is tat pada, tvam pada and asi pada. Of the three padas, the most important word is tat and tvam pada and if we understand the two words asi pada will come to play. By saying tat tvam asi the maha vakyam conveys the idea tat pada is equal to tvam pada. Tat padhartha being paramatma and tvam padartha being jivatma that paramatma and this jivatma are the same. Since it is equating the two, we can call it a great equation. The condition for equation to exist is equation is not required if two things are evidently identical. Identity is already evident and known, an equation is meant to communicate the identity, and identity is evident where is the need to equate. Again, an equation is not possible if two things are different. You cannot say eight is equal to seven. If misidentify is evident equation is not possible. Equation requires two important conditions that they must be superficially different at the same time really they must be identical which means superficial difference is evident and the real identity is hidden and not evident. It si covered by or concealed by superficial conceals the real identity. When there is a hidden identity a pramanam is required to discover or unveil or to reveal the hidden identity, which is hidden by superficial difference. Five plus three is equal to nine minus one you can write.

Superficially seeing my eyes shows difference only. Both the numbers are different. Not only the numbers are different but also the mathematical symbols are different and one is in right hand side and the other on the left hand side. This equation is to teach that behind the superficial difference there is hidden identity. Here master accepts the superficial difference exists. Therefore, master does not deny the fact that there is superficial difference exists. There is no two opinions. The master wants to tell the student not dwell upon the superficial difference, which is a non-controversial matter, but communicate the hidden identity. Superficial difference if you keep in mind it is a resisting mind, the teacher has to push the identity, and it is impossible to convey the teaching to resisting mind. Therefore bakti or shraddha, sympathy to teacher is required. Cooperation is required on the part of the student is beneficial to the student alone. In debate often there is no cooperation and no teaching takes place in the debate. Lot of heat is generated then the light. For light to be generated student should cooperate. Therefore in the beginning part of the teaching concentrate on not on equal sides but left hand side focus. First he analyses the left hand side and there after the right hand side. First we focus on tat padhartha or tvam padhartha without bothering about equal sign. First i explain eight is on both sides and then focus on the middle equation and the student then effortlessly nods his head in appreciation. Similarly, jivatma and paramatma are different then we need not discuss at all. Even vedanta need not talk about that. It is an evident fact. Maha vakyam says that jivatma and paramatma beda is there. But i want you to forget the difference aspect and i want to hidden and concealed identity. You should cooperate to analyse the lakshyartha the pure consciousness. Similarly analyse the tat padha laksyartha which is also pure consciousness. When you arrive at the consciousness and also forget the equation sign then you realize that jiva's consciousness and paramatma consciousness are the same. The reaching of the guru the students understood this knowledge in chandogya upanisad. Padhartha sodhanam is sadhanam and vakyartha jnanam is the end. Jivatma and paramatma swarupa vichara is sadhanam jivatma and paramatma aikya jnanam is sadhyam. It is this padhartha vichara that is the topic of the second pada. In this pada the first four adhikaranam deal with tvam padhartha sodhanam jivatma vichara. Then the last four adhikaranams deal with tat padhartha sodhanam or paramatma vichara. This is the general introduction to the second pada. Now we will get into the first adhikaranam.

## **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

### **Sutra 3.2.1 [319]**

#### ***Sandhye srishtiraha hi***

In the intermediate stage [between waking and the deep sleep] there is [a real] creation because [the sruti] says so.

The state of dream is now considered.

I will introduce this adhikaranam with six sutras. The first four-adhikaranam deals with jivatma vichara. The primary feature of jivatma is going through three avasthas. One who goes three-avastha jagrat swapna sushupti avastha? Avasthatriya vichara is nothing but jivatma vichara. The sutra conveys that jivatma is superficially associated with three avasthas. Through the three avasthas, he suffers and he undergoes sukha and dukha bogha. Through enquiry, it is revealed jivatma is not associated with avasthatriyam and it is only an

illuminator of avasthatriyam. Between the two words, there is a gulf of difference. The problems belong to jivatma. When you say avasthathriya illuminator jivatma is illuminator of problem and jivatma is not associated with the problem. Illuminator light is not polluted with the illumined impurity. The light falling on coovam is not polluted sunlight. Avasthathriya saksi is suddha jivatma avasthathriya vishista is asuddhah. If you keep in mind the superficial asuddha jivatma, mahavakyam will not work. You will always challenge the teacher. You will ask how can i be paramatma. It is ridiculous and all you will say. The student whose mind is saturated with asuddha jivatma and suddha paramatma he very strongly resists the teaching. If tvam padhartha sodhanam is kept in mind, the student's mind is in concurrence with the teaching of the teacher. Therefore, in the form of tvam padha vichara we get avasthathriya vichara. In the previous pada in the form of jiva, gathi jagrat avastha has been discussed. Hence, in this pada swapna and sushupti avastha are being discussed. In this first adhikaranam we get the swapna prapancha vichara enquiry into the nature of the dream world. The controversy here is whether swapna prapancha is real or unreal. To put it in technical language, swapna prapancha is as real as jagrat prapancha or less real than jagrat prapancha is our question. Purva paksi claims swapna prapancha is as real as jagrat prapancha and says both are equally real. Everybody knows that the dream is unreal. It is only a mental projection. It is only an appearance. However, there are some philosophers claim that swapna prapancha is real creation and as real as jagrat prapancha. It is not only a real creation and it is created by lord. Bhagavan creates the swapna prapancah privately for my use. It is not my mental imagination but it is the creation of lord. Therefore swapna prapancha is sathyam but siddhanta says swapna prapancha is less real than jagrat prapancha but it is created by jivatma out of his own vasanas. This is going to be conclusion in this adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. First two sutras are purva paksa's. Siddhanta comes in the third sutra. Purva paksi says that swapna prapancha is a real creation. The word sandhyam is used here to convey the idea of swapna avastha. In dream state a real world is created. Purva paksi quotes a mantra from brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.3.10 and here it is said that *atha rathan, ratha yogan, pathah srjate na tatanandah, mudah pramudo bhavanti, athanandan, mudah, pramudah srjate; na tatra vesantah pusharinyah sravantyo bhavanti; atha vesantan, puskarinib sravanti srjate, sa hi karta* there are no chariots there, not animals to be yoked to them no roads but he created [projects from himself] chariots, animals to be yoked to them and roads. There are no joys there, no pleasures, no delights, but he creates joys, pleasures and delights/ there are no tanks there, no lotus pools no rivers but he creates tanks lotus pools and rivers. He indeed is the agent [maker or creator]. There is no object at all and all the objects are created. Therefore purva paksi claims the verb of creation is used in the context of real creation when you imagine something you do not use the word create. He hangs on the word srjate the creation. There is another word sahi karta. It means he indeed is the creator. He is a pronoun and the pronoun requires a noun and that noun you have to supply and the purva paksi says that he is the lord. Therefore isvara is the creator of swapna prapancha like jagrat prapancha. So swapna prapancha is satham. Swapna prapancha is real like jagrat prapanchavat. Hanign on two words srjate and karta he claims that swapna prapancha is real.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Sristih there is real creation sandhye in dream; hiaha because the veda says so; this is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Sandhyam is a technical word occurring in brihadharaynaka upanisad. Sandhyam is defined as swapna. Sandhyam swapna sthanam refer to 4.39 of brihadharaynaka upanisad. Upanishad explains why sandhyam is called swapna. Now

upanishad itself gives the first meaning of sandhyam. Sandhyam means that which is a junction or link between two. Sandhya is link between day and night. Swapna is a junction between what and what. Adhi sankaracharya says one thing is very evident it is junction between jagrat and sushupti. It is between waking and total sleep. It is not total waking because it does not experience the world with the sense organs. It is not total sleep also because it creates inner created world. Therefore sandhou jagrat sushupti sandhou bhavam swapna sthanam. But upanishad gives another meaning, which is not known, to common people. In dream, a person continues to be in this janma only. Swapna is part of experience relating to this janma only. Towards the end of the present janma a person in janma a person will begin to get the experiences of future janma as we say coming events cast the shadow before. Similarly, jivah gets the idea what is in store for him in the next birth in the present birth through swapna. He also has a glimpse into the other janma and therefore it is an intermediary between the next and present janma. Nor all dreams reflect the next janma. Some dreams reflect the next janma. The swapna is the sill of the next janma and the present janma. Therefore varthamana janma bhavi janma sandhou bhavan he is in the sandhi and therefore swapna avastha is called sandhyam. Then the next word is sristi that means the real creation done by the god himself. Aha means sruti aha veda itself clearly says so 4.3.10 brihadharaynaka upanisad. [already stated above]. Sahi karta all the worlds are kept in mind; final hi is the reasoning. The reasoning is the sruti pramanam. The purva paksi in the next sutra further reinforces this. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 250

### **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

#### **Sutra 3.2.1 [319]**

#### ***Sandhye srishtiraha hi***

In the intermediate stage [between waking and the deep sleep] there is [a real] creation because [the sruti] says so.

The state of dream is now considered.

In the second pada of the third chapter an enquiry into the jiva avasthas, different states of experiences are being done. The purpose of enquiry is to arrive at the appropriate meaning of jivatma in the context of mahavakyam. Thus, jivatma should be understood in such a manner that jivatma could comfortably equate to paramatma. We require paramatma equitable jivatma. This is possible only when we know that jivatma is not related to avasthathriyam and jivatma is the witness of the avasthathriyam. If it is associated with avasthathriyam it can never be equal to paramatma. If it is the witness of avasthathriyam alone it can be comfortably equated to paramatma. To show this avasthas are being analysed. First vyasacharya has taken up swapna avastha for our analysis in the first adhikaranam. He finds out whether swapna prapancha is as real as jagrat prapancha. There is no controversy is also not absolute reality and swapna prapancha also is not absolute reality. Between the jagrat and swapna there is equal order of reality or not is our doubt. Purva pakshi says swapna prapancha is as real as jagrat prapancha. He says lord himself creates it. Swapna prapancha is as much isvara sristi as jagrat prapancha. Vyasacharya wants to refute the idea and point out swapna prapancha is only jiva's projection. Therefore, it is less real than even jagrat prapancha. This is the essence of the adhikaranam. First two sutras are purva paksha sutras. Purva pakshi said that swapna prapancha is sathyam. Sruti says in swapna things are created. Thus, it is said that it is not the imagination of the mind. Vyasacharya uses the word sandhyam for swapna. Adhi sankaracharya gave two derivatives because it is a link between ika loka and para loka. This definition is given by the brihadharaynaka upanisad itself and therefore adhi sankaracharya quotes that. During swapna a person is in the present janma but he gets glimpses of future janma also and so he experience both. It is also a sandhi between jagrat avastha and sushupti avastha. This is said in the last class. In mandukya it is said that sushupti is the corridor between jagrat and swapna. Whereas we say swapna is sandhi between jagrat and sushupti. Which one is correct sushupti or swapna. We can resolve the contradiction by translating the word sandhi in appropriate manner. You don't translate sandhi as a link. The word link only when it is said it is a link between ika loka and para loka. When it is sandhi between jagrat and swapna don't say it is a link then it will contradict mandukya. That word is intermediary state. In this context, sandhyam as sandhi between jagrat and swapna is not as a link but intermediary state. Intermediary means that swapna has partial features of sushupti and it has partial features of jagrat. The features common to sushupti and swapna is in both of them one does not operate sense organs and experience the external world. The common

feature between swapna and jagrat in both there is triputi subject object duality and varieties of experiences causing sukham and dukham. Being asleep to the external world is common to both swapna and sushupti. It is misram. Like dawn and dusk, it is totally neither like day nor like night. It has partial darkness and partial light. Now we will enter the second sutra.

## **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

### **Sutra 3.2.2 [320]**

#### ***Nirmataram chaike putradayascha***

And some [the followers of one sakha namely the kathakas] [state the supreme lord is the creator; sons, etc., [being the lovely things which he created.

We know that some of the prarapta is exhausted in swapna also and if karma is to be exhausted in swapna then bhagavan is the giver of karma phalam and therefore swapna prapancha is sathyah. The upanishad does not clearly say bhagavan is karta and upanishad uses the pronoun karta. In the second sutra purva paksi gives ome more argument to say that bhagavan is the creator of swapna. Whenever there is a controversy in resolving some doubt, it is said that we should refer to the parallel idea in some other upanishad or some other sruti vakyam. We have to another upanishad for clarification. Purva paksi says fortunately we have got mantra which supports my conclusion that swapna prapancha is bhagavan's creation. 2.2.7 of the katho upanishad. We have to analyse this kathopansad mantra. The mantra says yaha eshah suktesu kamam kamam nirmimanah asti. Anothet pronoun is used here eshah. This one creates swapna prapancha. Sukteshu when all other sense organs are resolved and external world is not experienced and at that time he creates the swapna prapancha kamam kamam eshah purusah. Purusah does not enlighten because purusa relates to god also and also manushya. This purusa in swapna avastha creates everything. The meaning of the word kama has two main meaning one is desire and the other is desired object. The difference between the first meaning and second meaning is desire is a property of the mind and therefore it exists within the mind whereas the desired object is an object, which is outside you. Desire is intangible and desired object is tangible. He quotes several sruti pramanams. With the help of 1.1.23,24 and 25 he proves that kama in this context is object only. Purva paksi says kama should not be bhava utpattih [desire] and kama you translate as sense object and it ahs objective derivation. Here kama means objective deriavation and therefore it is sense object. Purusa creates dream sense object. This purusa agains is a vague expression. Hecxne purva paksi says continue to read the same kathopanisad mantra. The upanishad in the third line purusa means brahma and brahma means paramatma. Purusa the paramatma alone creates swapna prapancha. Therefore swapna prapancha is sathyam. 2.2.7 of kathopanisad. Also quoted is mantra 4.3.14 of brihadharaynaka upanisad yani ..... Whatever type of experience a waker has the same experience dreamer also have. From this the upanishad equates jagrat prapancha and swapna prapancha and therefore both must be equally real. From kathopanisad and brihadharaynaka upanisad we come to know bhagavan is the creator of the swapna prapancha and therefore it is real. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now i will give you the running meaning.

Cha means moreover; eke some upanishad reveals; nirmatharam paramatma is the creator of the dream; putradayah occurring in the kathopanisad means putra etc., and the word kama



occurring in the kathopanisad means sons etc, this is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. Nirmataram means the creator; paramatma is the creator; who says this eke cha some upanishad says this; some branches of veda and here it is kathopanisad; you have to come to the kathopanisad quotation. Their kama is a controversial word. Here kama means sense organs only like putra poutra etc. In the beginning yama offered several boons to nachiketusa like wealth etc., all of them were called kama. Kama is used there not in the sense of desire but desired object. Therefore putradayah is meaning of the word kama occurring in 2.2.7 of kathopanisad. Because of the reason swapna prapancha is the creation of isvara and therefore it is sathyam. This is the view of vishistadvaidam. Now we will come to siddhanta.

### **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

#### **Sutra 3.2.3 [321]**

***Mayamatram tu kartsnyenanabhivyaktasvarupatvat.***

But it [viz. The dream world] is mere illusion on account of its nature not manifesting itself with the totality [of the attributes of reality].

The thesis adduced in sutra 1 and 2 is now criticized.

In this sutra vyasacharya says that swapna prapancha is maya matram. Here the word maya matram is prathibasika sathyam and it is less real than jagrat prapancha. According to advaidins jagrat prapancham itself is unreal. Between the two swapna is more unreal. It is as a lie told by an unintelligent liar and intelligent liar. Unintelligent liar cannot sustain for long while intelligent liar sustains longer days. So also is the isvara sristi and human sristi in the form of swapna. Isvara creation lasts for several janmas while our creation in the form of swapna lasts for some time only. Here the arguments given by gauna prana in mandukya is reminded here. He gives three reasons one sruti pramanam, yukti pramana and anubhava pramanam. I would connect you to the mandukya and sruti support is mantra 4.3.13 of the brihadharaynaka upanisad and 4.3.20 of brihadharaynaka upanisad. The mantra says that this dreamer enjoys wife, children etc. 'as though'. The upanishad says uta eva 'as though' he eats and enjoys. This is 4.3.13 of brihadharaynaka upanisad. 4.3.20 of brihadharaynaka upanisad says that he runs 'as though', he falls in a ditch 'as though', he is hurt by an enemy 'as though' and at the end of the upanishad it is said everything similar to jagrat he experiences because of avidya. The word avidya and the word 'eva' indicate that swapna is only an imagination and mental projection and is not an event like jagrat.

Then yukti pramana is also given. More clearly it is given in vaitatya prakaranam. The objects do not have required space to really exist because all objects exist within my head within the swapna nadi according to sastra. The events do not have required time to be real because in swapna the experience going all over the world etc. Is few minutes dream. All things happens in a few minutes of dream. Swapna prapancha is mithya uchita, desa kala abhavat. This is the logic.

Third one is anubhava the pratyaksa pramanam. Gauna prana tells this in 4.35 of mandukya upanishad that whatever you acquire in dream whether it is money or house you do not see on

waking up. They disappear in the thin air. If those things were really received after waking up you will be able to use it. Anubhava also proves that swapna prapancha is maya matram. This is the general analysis. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Maya matram tu the dream creation is unreal only. Anabhivyaktasvarupatvat because its features are not manifest; kartsneya in their totality; this is the running meaning. Now we will do the significance of the words.

Tu indicates the negation by siddhanta. The word maya matram means mithya prathibasika sathyam; it is only subjective reality and mental projection and it is not like jagrat prapancha. Jagrat prapancha exists separate from the mind and it is the creation of god but swapna prapancha is only a mental projection. Anabhivyaktasvarupatvat all features found in an object are not found in the swapna objects. It is a very beautiful concept. We say which the scientists also agree space and time never exist separate from the object. They are the integral property of an object. That is why when you talk about a person not only you talk about various features that includes the location also. This location is two fold one is spatial location and the other is time location. They call it in science the fourth coordinate. Therefore an object is full and complete only when you include time space location also and that also is a svarupam of an object. In swapna the objects are there but time space location are not appropriately there. Therefore anabhivyakta svarupam means desa kala and nimittam are not there. For object to come to existence some conditions are there and that is called nimittam. Without cause effect cannot exist. But in swapna these things are not required. Therefore swapna objects are incomplete and this expressed by kartsneya anabhivyaktat. All features are not manifest in their totality and they have name and form and not appropriate time and space. Adhi sankaracharya has elaborated the purva paksi arguments further which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 251

### **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

#### **Sutra 3.2.3 [321]**

***Mayamatram tu kartsnyenanabhivyaktasvarupatvat.***

But it [viz. The dream world] is mere illusion on account of its nature not manifesting itself with the totality [of the attributes of reality].

The thesis adduced in sutra 1 and 2 is now criticized.

As a part of avastha vivekah in this second pada, vyasacharya enquires the nature of swapna. With regard to swapna prapancha there is controversy and some philosopher says that swapna prapancha is sathyam and advaidins claim that swapna prapancha is less real than even jagrat prapancha. It is prathibasikam is our conclusion. That is being established in this adhikaranam. In the first two sutras purva paksi gave his reasons that swapna prapancha is created by the lord quoting brihadharaynaka upanisad mantras. Purva paksi says that isvara creates a private world for jiva to enjoy and also he quotes a kathopanisad mantra, the pronoun mentioned in kathopanisad refers to the lord he contented. 2.2.8 says *ya esa suptesu jagrati kamam kamam puruso nirmimanah tad eva sukram tad brahma tad evamrtam ucyate* is the relevant portion for us. That says that a person who is awake in those that sleep, shaping desire after desire, that indeed, is the pure. That is brahma, that, indeed, is called the immortal. The upanishad clarifies further esah purusah is none other than brahman alone and they argue that brahman alone creates swapna prapancha and it is as real as jagrat prapancha.

Vyasacharya says that swapna prapancha has to be unreal. It is less real the jagrat prapancha. We gave sruti pramana, anubhava pramana and yukti pramana. Vyasacharya gives his reasons that uchita desa kala nimitta abhavat for real swapna prapancha to exist whatever conditions are required are not there. This was explained in detail in the last class. All events and things in dream are created like a magician bringing out things from an empty cap or a jar. That is why the upanishad says that everything is there as though. The ignorant jiva thinks that everything is real. With this sutra part is over. But adhi sankaracharya in \basyam adds some more arguments. Vyasacharya gives his reasons for saying that swapna prapancha is prathibasika. Now adhi sankaracharya negates that the swapna prapancha is real as stated by the purva paksi. He bases his argument on kathopanisad quotation. Now the question is whether the swapna prapancha is the creation of the individual jiva or it is the creation of paramatma. If it is the creation of paramatma it is real and if it is the creation of jivatma it is prathibasikam and it is unreal. The first two lines of kathopanisad mantra says that this purusa produces objects in dream. Our question is what is the meaning of esa purusah and unfortunately esa purusa is as vague as saha hi karta. Both are pronouns and to which the pronoun relates to is our question. It is clearly said that it is brahman. Therefore esa purusah must mean the paramatma. Therefore, you should translate esah paramatma suktesu kamam kamam nirmanah asti. This is the powerful argument of purva paksi. Adhi sankaracharya says

no and he disagrees with this interpretation. He says the very purpose of the mantra and all the upanisads is jivatma and paramatma aikyam. In every mahavakyam there must be jivatma part as well as paramatma part. In tat tvam asi maha vakyam there is jivatma part indicated by tvam and paramatma part in tat and asi is aikyam. The kathopanisad valua, also a mahavakyam and there must be jivatma part and paramatma part. First two lines talks about jivatma part only to introduce the aikyam. This is going to be equated to paramatma later. Esah purusah refers to jivatma only as part of mahavakyam teaching. For this we have several support also. The pronoun esah refers to something closeby. And paramatma is generally referred to he not this one. Esah pronoun the closer jivatma and not only that there is also an expression suktesu. When all the organs are resolved in swapna we deal with jivatma only and sastra does not study the avasthas of paramatma. Suktesu refers to jivatma esah refers to jivatma because of these reasons jivatma alone is the creator of swapna. The second two lines deal with paramatma only to reveal the aikyam. That is why the pronoun is also different. Esah pronoun is dropped and tat pronoun is brought in. Esaha jivatma is tad paramatma and thus aikyam is revealed. Therefore esah purusah refers to jivatma and jivatma alone creates swapna prapancha and therefore in brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra also saha hi karta should refer to that jivatma the waker alone. [4.3.10 of brihadharaynaka upanisad] then adhi sankaracharya argues if this argument has not convinced you i will quote another brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra that clearly states that jivatma alone create the swapna prapancha. That will stop all further argument and that is 4.3.9 of brihadharaynaka upanisad that says *sa yatra prasavipiti asya lokasya sarvavato matram apadaya svayam vihatya svayam nirmaya, svena bhasam svena jyotisa praasvapiit; atrayam purusah svayam jyotir bhavati* the essence of this mantra when the jiva goes to sleep certainly it does not refer to paramatma, jiva takes the memories from jagrat prapancha in the form of vasanas .god does not create but he himself out of his own vasanas creates his own swapna world,. It is the crucial mantra of swayam jyoti brahmanam. Then comes further question. How can jivatma create a swapna prapancha in dream? One reason is which is not possible because all the organs of jiva are resolved. When all instruments are resolved, how do you say jiva creates a swapna prapancha? Adhi sankaracharya says do not take everything in literal sense and it is only the vasanas thrown out in the form of swapna padhartha. It is memory projection. Now the question is who projects the memory. If it is jiva he can happily project wonderful memory. How do you say jiva is the creator, he must have freedom to create what he wants. That means jiva has no freedom to create his own swapna prapancha. Yes. The dream world is created by the punya and papa and that is why i say some of the prarapta is exhausted by punya papam. Then the question comes if swapna prapancha is karma phalam then isvara must create it alone and how do you say jiva is the creator. Adhi sankaracharya answers even though the vasanas are selectively done based on punya papa, which is done under the supervision of isvara. Then again the karta of punya papa is the jiva. Of course backed by isvara alright but because the punya papa is done by jiva, we conclude that jiva is indirectly the creator of his own punya papa and also the swapna prapancha ultimately. Now adhi sankaracharya enters into another discussion. Here another purva paksi comes with a peculiar argument and says that swapna prapancha is real and says it is not a mental projection. He gives another reason. He says that during swapna jivatma leaves the physical body keeping thin thread of connection through prana. Jagrat prapancha is past creation and sathya prapancha and jivatma goes out in sleep and experiences that real jagrat prapancha and then comes back on waking up. He has sruti pramanam for this. He quotes mantra 4.3.12 of brihadharaynaka upanisad that reads as *pranena raksann avaram kulayam bahis kulayad amrtas caritva sa iyate amrto yatra kamam, hiran-mayah purusa eka hamsah*. The meaning of the mantra is guarding his low nest with the vital breath, the immortal moves out of the nest. That immortal one goes wherever he likes, the golden person, and the lonely bird. This

second half is not relevant the effulgent jiva. At the time of swapna leaves the body and travel. Leaves the body means it is death. Therefore upanishad says pranena raksan the pranas are kept in the body to take care of the body and it experiences the real jagrat prapancha.

For this adhi sankaracharya gives the various reasons. The first reason is when we experience certain places in dream that experience does not tally with what actually exists there, the dream kasi experience and the real kasi experience in jagrat do not tally. Discondacne should not be there if the same things are experienced in jagrat and swapna. Sometimes we get up in the middle of an event and naturally the jivatma has no time to come back to the body and when he wakes up he is not in dream place but at the place where he sleeps. Third one is that it is based another mantra 2.1.18 of brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam that clearly says that during dream jiva is in the nadis of the body and it moves within the body. This mantra says jiva does not go out. Fourth reason is if jivatma experiencing the same jagrat prapancha you cannot explain the expression saji karta. Therefore, the existence of swapna prapancha is redundant or contradicted. The fifth point is how do you explain the purva paksi quotation. The purva paksi quotes mantra 4.3.12 of brihadharaynaka upanisad. This mantra says jivatma goes outside the body. How do you explain my mantra is the purva paksi argument. Adhi sankaracharya says that does not mean physically going out of the body but the mantra says giving up the abhimana during the swapna. I disown my physical personality and that is why i do not feel the presence of my body. There is no actual moving out. The conclusion is that swapna prapancha is not created by isvara. Second point jivatma does not go out during swapna to experience jagrat prapancha. Therefore jivatma out of his own punya papa out of his own vasanas the unreal universe in dream and exhaust his punya papa. Therefore, swapna prapancha is prathibasikam. These are the extra bashyam topics.

## **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

### **Sutra 3.2.4 [322]**

#### ***Suchakascha hi sruterachakshate cha tadvidah***

But [though dream world is an illusion] yet it is indicative [of the future], for [so we find] in the sruti, the dream experts also declare this.

First, we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Here a possible question from purva paksa is answered. The question is not there and the answer is there. It is said in both veda and other sastram that the dreams can reveal certain future events. There are investigations on dreams. Even swapna has indicators of future\event we have in the sastra. Refer to 5.2.9 of chandogya upanisad and also mantra in vedic portion. The chandogya upanisad mantra says when a person does a ritual, a kamy karma and he is anxious to know and it is said if a person sees a woman dream, the success of the kamy karma is assured. There is another some other upanishad that if you see krishna purusa [dark comolexioned complextion with black teeth is an indication that he would die soon. This is veda pramanam. Adhi sankaracharya gives swapna sastram pramanam. There it is said that mounting elephant you dream then that indicates that you will get lot of money. In short purva paksi quotes the sastram and says if swapna can reveal future experiences of the real jagrat avastha how can it be unreal. Only if

the swapna is real can only reveal future real happenings. Siddhanta says even unreal can reveal the real world. For this there is sruti, yukti and anubhava pramanam. In fact the real brahman is revealed by the something less real only. More we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 252

### **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

#### **Sutra 3.2.4 [322]**

#### ***Suchakascha hi sruterachakshate cha tadvidah***

But [though dream world is an illusion] yet it is indicative [of the future], for [so we find] in the sruti, the dream experts also declare this.

We see the fourth sutra in which vyasacharya analyses the nature of swapna whether is as real as jagrat prapancha or is unreal or prathibasika sathyam. Many philosophers claim that it is as real as jagrat prapancha. In the last sutra vyasacharya revealed that swapna prapancha is unreal and it is the creation of the human mind and not of brahman. The conditions of space and time are not there for dream objects to be real. This answers a possible doubt, which is based on an information that swapna events can reveal the future event which will happen the future which is known through sruti and smriti pramanam. Mantra 5.3.9 and the second quotation is aitareya aranyaka 3.2.4 says if you see a dark person with dark teeth is an indication that the death is nearby. There is also smriti pramanam the swapna sastra that indicates what the swapna indicates and according to the sastra swapna can reveal the future. Riding donkey indicates poverty. Swapna is a pramanam is revealed by sastram. It is capable of revealing future. Based on information purva paksa is raised. If swapna is mithya how can a mithya swapna unreal can reveal the real jagrat avastha. From the standpoint of swapna jagrat is real. How can an unreal pramana reveal a real event. The purva paksi asks whether guru and sastra are paramarthika sathyam or mithya. The vedantins say that brahman alone is sathyam and guru sastra etc., are mithya. Then the vishistadvaidin asks the question how can mithya sastra how can mithya guru reveal sathyam brahman and how can unreal reveal the real brahman. Advaidin has got several answers to this question. One answer we will see here and vyasacharya does not answer directly but hints the answer. The unreal can reveal the real. There is no illogicality in it. We regularly experience that. The first example is mirror image. When you want to know whether there is black patch on your face and you want to see where it is. You stand in front of the mirror and what you see is pratibimba mukham. The reflected face is unreal and with the help of pratibimba mukhan you know what is there in the real bimba mukham. You see the spot in the pratibimba mukham and you wipe your face. You saw only mithya pratibimba and therefore mithya can reveal sathyam. The second answer is a technical answer. We have got alphabetical letters. Weh you want to represent in script form, which will vary from language to language. The written letter is called in sanskrit rekhaksaram. When you look at the rekhaksaram you know each script has got a particular shape purely because of our imagination. Each person or group choose a particular letter and call it differently. Alphabetical letter is superimposed and the line is itself is not a letter. We have drawn a particular line and we have superimposed 'a on that letter and the imagined letter subjective letter is only mithya. It varies from script to script. Even though rekaksaram is mithya when you look at it, it reveals the sathya sabdaksaram. That is why when i take gita class different people have different book in different language. Even though letters are

different, all of them read dharma ksetre and they read the real gita. Therefore transliteration vary and they are mithya but it reveals sathyam. Therefore mithya can reveal sathyam and therefore dream is prathibasikam and it is capable of indicating vyavaharika future and this is the answer hinted in the sutra.

Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha means though unreal suchakah means [the dream] is the indicator of the future hi sruteh as it is understood from the sruti statement; tat vidah cha means the dream experts also achakshate say so; affirm; this is the word meaning.

Now i will give you the significance of the words. Suchakah means pointer or revealer; dream object and experiences are called suchakam; dream is revealer of the waker's future even though it is unreal. The letter cha indicates even though it is unreal; in spite of being unreal. Sruteh means because of the sruti pramanam. Two mantras mentioned earlier in the commentary. Tadvidah means dream experts; smriti kartarah; the authors of swapna sastram; achakshate they also declare that the unreal dream can reveal the real future of the waker. Veda also declares and smriti also declares.

## **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

### **Sutra 3.2.5 [323]**

#### ***Parabhidhyanattu tiruhitam tato hyasya bandhaviparyayau***

But by the meditation on the supreme lord, that which is hidden [by ignorance, viz., the equality of the lord and the soul becomes manifest], because from him [the lord] are its [the soul's] bondage and freedom.

Adhi sankaracharya and many commentators give a particular vakyanam and there is one author who is not well known named advaida manjari on brahma sutra. This commentary not very popular gives lightly different vakyanam and i find this approach is a simpler version easy for communication and also for you to follow. The word meaning slightly changes. In this sutra vyasacharya answers a possible doubt and this is based what we have seen till now or the previous sutra. We saw in the previous sutra that jagrat prapancha is real or relatively real because it is isvara srusti and then we argued by analyzing kathopanisad mantra that swapna prapancha is unreal being jiva srusti subjective projection. Isvara srusti is sathyam relatively sathyam vyavaharika sathyam and you talk of superiority of isvara the creator of real world while jiva can create only an unreal and imaginary world. Isvara srusti is real because isvara is sarva saktiman and he creates vyavaharika prapancha. But manushya is alpha and he can create an unreal world lasting for only a few minutes. Through all these things you focus on swapna prapancha and jagrat prapancha and in this process you have indirectly establish isvara is superior and jiva is inferior. Now the purva paksi argument and if isvara is superior and jiva is inferior how can you talk about jivatma and paramatma aikyam. He says tht therefore jivatma and paramatma are different. Jivatma and paramatma aikyam is not possible and therefore maha vakyam should not be taken as pramana vakyam. Maha vakyam is not mahavakyam for vishistadvaidins and dvaidins. Tat tvam asi gives only nice feeling they say. How can jivatma and paramatma aikyam is possible when their creative powers are different. This question may be asked. He answers in this sutra. The answer is



really speaking jivatma is as great as paramatma and both are the same only. This is the truth. Jivatma becomes inferior only because of anatma abhimana or wrong identification and the consequent extrovertedness, mamakara and ahankara make the jiva inferior and minus the two jivatma is identical with paramatma. Mama kara is this is my wife and this is my father feeling. I identify with my own body mind complex that produces ahankara and this is the answer given in these two sutras. Now i will give you the running meaning.

Trobitam tu the nature is covered parabhidyanam due to identification with the external world; this refers to mamakara. Bandhaviparyayau misconception and bondage; asya of this jivatma tatha hi means are indeed because of that; this is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Parabhidhyanat the anatma prapancha and absorption or involvement abhimana. Tu indeed; it is not intrinsic difference it is incidental difference from the paramatma; tirohitam means concealed covered unknown or veiled; jivatma oneness with paramatma is concealed or veiled or covered because of mamakara; tatha hi means because of that concealment alone or because of that reason alone is the cause of all the problems. Even though he is creator, he has become a creature because of the veil. The problem is not with paramatma and it is the problem of jivatma. Viparyayah means misconception. It is wrong self-conclusion about myself and i have come away from lord; all the misconceptions are called viparyayah. Bandah every misconception is a bunch of problems. Now in the next sutra ahankara is also mentioned.

## **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

### **Sutra 3.2.6 [324]**

#### ***Dehayogadva so'pi***

And that [viz., the concealment of the soul's rulership] also [results] from its connection with the body.

Sutra 5 is amplified here.

The question is how the mamakara comes and mamakara is absorption in the family and mamakara is the product of ahankara. Ahankara is deha abhimana, which will lead to putra abhimana. Deha abhimana is ahankara. Thus you will find abhimana spread and it begins with that i am the body. I am connected to my mother with the physical body without physical body i have no connection of the body not even sookshma sariram. Ahankara causes mamakara and both causes separation and the separation causes all these things. However, vedas declare 'jivatma paramatma aikyam'. Now i will give you the word for word analysis.

Saha api it is due to identification with the body; deayogah means abhimana; identification. This is different with para abhidhyanam. There it is prapancha abhimanam and here it is deha abhimanam. Prapancha abhimanam is mamakara and deha abhimana is ahankara. Both we call va api indicates twofold abhimana. Saha means that separation and the problems put together is called samsarah. This indicates separation from lord and it indicates misconception, bondage, and these three put together is called samsara. Ajnana kale they are seemingly different and jnana kale they are factually the same. From jnani's angle sastra talks

about aikyam. Vyavaharika dristya we talk of difference. In the context of dream aikyam is not kept in mind and therefore i say superior paramatma takes superior waking and inferior jivatma takes inferior dream and all these is viewed from vyavaharika dristi. Do not get maha vakyam in this context and get confused. With this sixth adhikaranam is over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 253

### **Topic 1 sandhyadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 6]**

The soul in the dream state

#### **Sutra 3.2.6 [324]**

#### ***Dehayogadva so'pi***

And that [viz., the concealment of the soul's rulership] also [results] from its connection with the body.

Sutra 5 is amplified here.

With the completion of the sixth sutra, we have completed the first adhikaranam of the second pada of the third chapter named sandhyadhikaranam. As i said in the introduction this pada is meant for tvam pada vichara analysis of jivatma as a preparation for mahavakya vichara tat tvam asi. Tvam pada vichara is sadhana for maha vakya vichara and which is the sadhana for jnanam and moksa. The jivatma is associated with avasthathriyam and avasthathriya vishistaha. After analysis, we established that it is not associated with avasthathriya saksi and it is the illuminator of avasthathriyam. Being an illuminator it is free from avasthathriyam it is asanga atma. When we see it as avasthathriya vishista it is tvam pada vachyarta and when you say that there is no relationship it is laksyartha. Sanga sahita atma is vachyarta sanga rahita atma is lakshyartha. As a part of that swapna was analyzed in this adhikaranam and it was called by the name sandhya. In this context sandhyam tritiya sthanam means swapna. That swapna is prathibasika sathyam and it is less real than jagrat prapancha. Vyasacharya sees jagrat, swapna as two orders of reality and jagrat is higher mithya, and swapna is lower mithya. Some people argue jagrat also is prathibasika. But we say jagrat is vyavaharika mithya and swapna prapancha is prathibasika mithya. By showing swapna is mithya vyasacharya establish jivatma cannot have association with mithya swapna. How can i be related to unreal thing and therefore atma is asanga chaitanyam. Through swapna vichara jivatma is revealed as asanga chaitanyam. From this we can extend to other two avasthas also jagrat and sushupti. By extension we can say atma is not associated with the other two avastha also. Jivatma is avasthathriya sambandha rahitah. Once i claim i am avasthathriya sambandha rahitah then it is easily be claimed aham brahma asmi. Whenever you feel uncomfortable with maha vakyam what is the reason to be unhappy. Miserable i cannot be happy, you connect yourself with jagrat avastha misery or swapna avastha misery. You detach from avastha aikyam is comfortable. Therefore the essence of this adhikaranam is avasthathriya sambandha rahitah jivatma. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 2. Tadabhavadhikaranam [sutra 7-8]**

*The soul in dreamless sleep*

#### **Sutra 3.2.7 [325]**

### ***Tadabhavo nadishu tat sruteh atmani cha***

The absence of that [i.e., of dreams, i.e. Dreamless sleep] takes place in the nerves [nadis or psychic currents] and in the self, as it is known from the sruti or scriptural statement.

The state of dreamless sleep is now discussed.

I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. In this adhikaranam vyasacharya analyses sushupti avastha. With regard to sushupti avastha, there are some controvercies regarding the sruti vakyams as to where the jivatma is located in sushupti. There is a controversy because different upanishad gives different statements. One is chandogya upanisad 8.6.3 says that *tada nadi su srutto bhavati* at the time of sleep in the nadis the jivatma abides or remains. This mantra says nadi is asraya in this mantra.

Mantra 3.1.19 of brihadharaynaka upanisadm says *puri tati sete puri tat* is the thin membrane that covers hridayam. Jivatma rests or resides or lies puritat becomes asraya for jivatma in sushupti. There is third mantra 2.1.17 of brihadharaynaka upanisad that says [*yaha antar hridaya akasah tasmin sete*] jivatma stays within the space in the heart. According to this mantra hridaya akasa is asraya of jivatma. Then there is fourth one 6.8.1 of chandogya upanisad that says *sata somya tada sambanno bhavati* at the time of sleep brahman jivatma merges into sat brahma jivatma dissolves into sat brahman that means brahman or paramatma becomes the asraya. Four asrayas are mentioned in sushupti and which one is correct is our question. If you take one sruti vakyam as correct, other sruti vakyam will be wrong. One can have one location. Many locations are not possible. If you take one location, the other statement will be falsified. Sleeping is easy. To find out the location of sleep is difficult. Purva paksi says why cannot we accept all the four and at different times. Jivatma thinks where to go to day. This is called vikalpa arthah. It is jivatma's choice in anyone of the four during each sushupti avastha. This is the general introduction. Now we will enter the first sutra.

Vyasacharya says jivatma primarily has to reside in paramatma only because of the following reasons. During sushupti jivatma loses his individuality and it is proved by our experience. Father is not father, mother is not mnther. That we lose the individuality is clear. That means resolution of jivatma. It is called layah also. Then we have to apply a general law whenever a thing resolves it should resolve into the karanam which is its nature. Karane nayah or svarupe layah. Karanam is svarupam and svarupam is karanam ornament is to resolve in gold because gold id the karanam. Wave has to resolve into water because water is karanam. All jivatmas are born out of paramatma only and paramatma is the karanam and therefore jivatma has to resolve in paramatma only. The sruti statement proves this only. During sushupti jivatma resolves all the punya papam.mantra 4.3.22 of brihadharaynaka upanisad says during sleep jivatma is not associated with punya papam and it is possible only if jivatma merges to paramatma for paramatma is punya papa athithah. You can explain the punya papa athithatvam only if you accept jivatma merges into paramatma. Anywhere else jivatma goes it will be punya papa mixture. Therefore, jivatma has to merge into paramatma. This is stated in several other places also. 8.3.2 of chandogya upanisad the mantra says that everyday jivatma merges into brahman during sushupti but not knowing that. It is like a person waling over a place without knowing treasure underneath. However, we do not know. 4.4 of prasnopanisad says that aharahar brahma gamayati jivatma is taken to brahman everyday during sushupti avastha. Because of these reasons jivatma must be abiding in paramatma only during sushupti. Adhi sankaracharya goes one-steps further. In fact, even in other two states

also jivatma stays in paramatma only, which is its svarupam. . Ornaments resides in gold even before ornaments are made. If everything abides in its svaruapm all the time why should upanishad say jivatma resides in paramatma in sushupti. Sushupti is specified because in sushupti alone the notion of difference is dropped. Even though i am ever with paramatma but in sushupti alone i drop the notion of difference whereas in jagrat i am one because of the notion there is a seeming difference. To indicate the absence of the notion, sushupti is taken as an example. Otherwise, jivatma stays in paramatma in all the state sushupti alone is specified. It mayn create an idea they are different. Once you say water in the pot, water is different pot is different water is located and pot is location adhaya adheya comes. When you say jivatma resides in paramatma means you think that jivatma lies over paramatma. Therefore adhi sankaracharya says jivatma resides in paramatma should be understood as jivatma resides as paramatma. Paramatma rupenda avathistate having dropped the notion of limitation jivatma abides in paramatma means jivatma abides as paramatma itself. That is why after sushupti prakriya the upanishad says 'tat tvam asi'. You are abiding as paramatma in sushupti therefore you are really paramatma only. You are in the real nature and so you are paramatma. Then what about four sruti statements. Of the four sruti statement third and fourth are not problem. Fourth one says paramatma is asrayam that is what we agree with 6.8.1 of chandogya upanisad] the third one relate to hridaya akasa and here hridaya akasa is another name for brahman and therefore third there is no problem. In the first and second it is said that paramatma resides in nadi. Adhi sankaracharya says that also should be added. You have to take all the three and you should do the samucchaya. Jivatma is in nadi, in the puritat, in brahman and not vikalpa and samucchaya. It rests in all the three. Now the question comes how can brahman resides in all the three. Adhi sankaracharya say need not necessarily. He gives an example and he sleeps in the house, in the bedroom on the cot. Samucchaya. All the three can be equally correct. First, three are general location and first one is specific location, house and bedroom are general and the cot is specific location. There is puritat membrane, in the puritat and nadi that is enclosed consciousness that is brahman. We call it avacchinna chaitanyam. Just like water is in the pot means water is the general location and water is located in space alone and space alone accommodates water. Water is in the space conditioned by the pot. Similarly jivatma is in the consciousness which is conditioned by nadi and puritat; therefore all the three locations are all right. In the combination of the three, one is specific and the other three are general locations. This is the answer given by vyasacharya and commented by adhi sankaracharya.

Now we will do the word for word analysis analysis. Tadabhavah means sleeping atma [resides] in the nadis cha atmani in the atma; tat sruteh since they are mentioned in the sruti; this is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the meaning. Tadabhavah is taken as sleep and another commentator takes it as sleeping jivatma. Both are correct. It is either sleep or sleeper. Adhi sankaracharya has taken as sleep. Tasya means swapnasiya a state in which there is no dream; yasya saha jivatma tad abhavah. Hence it is sleeping jivatma. Nadisu means in the nadis [is located or is present]. Not only is in the nadis atmani cha paramatma brahman; also in brahman. Because brahman is svarupam and jivatma rests in svarupam alone. Tatsruteh it is because of the sruti statement about the locations. Nadi location, puritat location and paramatma location.

## **Topic 2. Tadabhavadhikaranam [sutra 7-8]**

The soul in dreamless sleep

**Sutra 3.2.8 [326]**

***Atah prabodho'smat***

The mode of waking from sleep is now described.

In this sutra vyaacharya gives a second reinforcing argument to establish that jivatma merges into paramatma alone and not elsewhere in sushupti. The second argument is based on ajata satru brahmanam. There is a dialogue between ajata satru and balaki. The context is ajata satru wants to teach balaki and he goes to a sleeping person and calls him by various names and he violently shakes him up. Then that person wakes up and ajata satru asks that question during sleeping he was not responding and jivatma was residing into some place. Now the waker responds quickly and the sleeper does not responds immediately. That means the jivatma has gone somewhere to rest. After shaking jivatma is out from that place. Ajata satru asks where was that jivatma in sleep and wherefrom he comes out at the time of waking. The confusion is where does he go. Vyaacharya says you find out in the brahmanam where it is said from where does he come out at the time of waking. Question is asked in 2.1.16 of brihadharaynaka upanisad from where does jivatma emerge when he wakes up. The answer is not confusing and the answer is there in the mantra 2.1.20 that jivatma emerges out of paramatma. Etasmat atmanah viccharanti from the paramatma alone jivatma emerges at the time of waking and the nadi is not mentioned, puritat is not mentioned and from this it is clear that jivatma has entered into paramatma. Here the source of emergence indirectly shows the source of resolution and source of resolution is the source of emergence. This is reinforced by another sruti in 6.10.2 of chandogya upanisad, which says jivatma emerges out of paramatma at the time of waking. That is why he enjoys temporary liberation. Then he comes out of paramatma and the poor jiva does not know that he had gone to paramatma and come out of paramatma. No jivatma says so because he is ignorant of his own real status.

Now i will give you the running meaning. Atah means therefore; prabodhah the rising of the jivatma takes place asmat from the paramatma.

Now i will give you the significance of the words. Atah means because i merge into paramatma alone because i emerge out of paramatma prabhodhah means rising, emergence, coming out [of the jivatma]; asmat means paramatmanah sahasat from the paramatma it comes out because it has gone into paramatma. Therefore it is conclusive jivatma goes into paramatma and jivatma comes out of paramatma just rivers goes into ocean and rivers comes out of ocean. With this second adhikaranam is over. Here it is established jivatma abides in paramatma and that is why sushupti is some kind of liberation. Liberation is merger with paramatma and sushupti is temporary merger with paramatma.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 254

### **Topic 2. Tadabhavadhikaranam [sutra 7-8]**

The soul in dreamless sleep

#### **Sutra 3.2.8 [326]**

#### ***Atah prabodho'smat***

The mode of waking from sleep is now described.

We have completed the first two adhikaranam of the second pada of the third chapter. The first adhikaranam dealt with swapna avastha and second adhikaranam dealt with sushupti avastha. While dealing with panchagni vidya, jagrat avastha has already been dealt with. Previous pada is jagrat avastha pada. Thus all the three avasthas have been talked about. If you take three avasthas as intergral part of jiva, it becomes saguna jiva or tvam pada vachyartha. If three avasthas are taken to be unreal or swpana therefore they cannot touch jiva and thatr jiva is called twam pada lakshyartha. To ignorant person jiva is sagunam and for the wise person jivatma is nirgunam. The unreality of the avasthas has been talked about and therefore it becomes the tvam pada vichara, which is part of maha vakya vichara. Therefore it becomes a sadhanam. Seeing the three avasthas as mithya and therefore seeing jiva as nirguna jiva and therefore seeing the aikyam of nirguana jiva with nirgunam brahman and all these have become a sadhana and therefore it has become a sadhana adhyaya. Up to this we saw in the last class. Now we will enter next sutra and next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 3. Karmanusmritisabdavidhyadhikaranam [sutra 9]**

The same soul returns from deep sleep.

#### **Sutra 3.2.9 [327]**

#### ***Sa eva to karmanusmritisabdavidhibhyah***

But the same [soul returns from brahman after sleep on account of work, remembrance, scriptural text and precept.

Here we have to enquire whether the soul when awaking from deep sleep is the same, which entered into union with brahman or another one.

First i will give you a general introduction to this third adhikaranam with one sutra. It has a long name. The discussion in this adhikaranam is based on the previous adhikaranam that during sushupti jiva resolves into brahman and merges into its higher nature of paramatma. Paramatma is the adhara or is the location in which jivatma dissolves losing its individuality. It is brahman merger during sushupti. This leads us to doubt if jivatma merges into brahman and when it comes back to jagrat avastha, certainly there is a waking up in the same body, all

expects the jivatma to come and occupy the same body emerging from brahman. Our doubt is will the same jiva come back or different jivatma comes back because it is dissolved losing its individuality. When a thing is resolved, we cannot get the same. If ganga water has merged into ocean, we cannot get back the same water. Similarly when a pot is destroyed and merges into earth you cannot retrieve the same pot, you have to make a new pot. Similarly does the jiva, which merges into brahman, and if the jiva wakes up should it not be another jivatma. Vyasacharya says if you go to bed with sorrow and come back with sorrow, it is unfortunate. Same thing is with joy. The same jiva comes back after sushupti. Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra.

Vyasacharya gives four different reasons and they are karma, anusmriti, sabda vidhi. Karma means the same jiva must be coming out of sushupti because all the partial work which are done in the previous avastha, the same partial work continues. Because of the continuity of karma, we infer the continuity of karta also. If it some another karta, the partial work cannot be continued.

Anusmriti is the direct reason. Jiva remembers jagrat avastha and hence the same jiva emerges out of sushupti. Always remembrance and experience should belong this possible under one condition to the same locus. It means suppose the experience of a particular object is located in rama and then the remembrance of particular object will also be in rama only and not krishna. If i remember the experience, i should have gone through the experience. Every memory should be preceded by experience and experience should be in the same as the person who remember. If they are the same, the same person continues in the un-manifest form and that is why the same person wakes up after sushupti. We do forget lot of things and we do not think of forgotten matter but we remember some remembrance to prove that the waker is the same.

Sabdah means sruti pramanam. Veda itself directly tells us. The mantra is 6.9.3 of chandogya upanisad tells that the jiva merges into sat or brahman at the time of sushupti and then in the next waking stage the same jiva comes out. In the next section also it is repeated. If the jiva goes to sleep as tiger and it will get up as tiger only. So also lion, mosquito etc. Imagine it gets interchanged what will happen. I get up as mosquito and mosquito as me. Whatever individuality resolved the same individuality it emerges.

The final one is vidhih which means vedic injunctions. Karma injunction and upasana injunctions reveal this. Veda prescribes different karma for us to follow as a akarta. I am interest in practicing the karma because i myself will become a bokta and reap the benefit of karma and upasana phalam. If i am a karta today i will become a bokta tomorrow. If i do punya papa karta i will become sukha and dukha bokta.. If i am a karta, i know i myself will experience the phalam of my good action. I always want to reap the result. Suppose a jiva does a very good karma today as a good karta. He goes to bed. In sushupti the karta jiva is gone and tomorrow a different bogta arises what will happen. Karta is different and bokta will be different. It will create twofold problems. Today one jiva does a karma to morrow another jiva reaps the result, then today's jiva does a karma and disappears without reaping the fruits of karma. But sastra says that jiva can never escape the karma is the moral law of the universe. If one disappears without reaping the phalam karma dies without allowing the karta to enjoy or suffer the fruits of akrma. In the same way a new jiva will enjoy the fruits of another's karma phalam and it is an injustice to the karta. And a dhrmic person suffer for the karma for karma done by another person. All these are important to prove that the jiva



continues from one avastha to avastha, jiva continues from one janma to another and if you don't accept there will be injustice all over. Veda says never it can happen.

Not only that today i do a good karma and tomorrow some other fellow reaps the result and then there will be no incentive for me to do any good karma since i am not the beneficiary of the karma phalam. Vedic injunction *rope yaha karta saha eva bokta jivah sarvasu anuvasthatu* and jiva continues all avastha including marana avastha and punar janma. This is the essence of this adhikaranam.

Now we will see the word for word analysis analysis. *Saha eva tu* the same jiva arises; karma anusmritit sabhda vidhiphyaha means the activity, memory, scriptural statement and scriptural injunction as revealed by memory. Now i will give you the significance of the words. *Saha eva* the same jiva the word *tu* indicates the negation of purva paksi. Purva paksi's argument is when you dissolve a drop of ocean the same drop cannot be retrieved. The same jiva cannot be retrieved. His logic and conclusions are negated by the expression *tu*. Karma means the activity the remaining part of partial activity left behind the previous day. Activity means the continuation of the activity. Anusmriti means memory i experience yesterday and i remember to day.

The third one is *sabdah* which means *sruti vakyam*. And the fourth word is *vidhi*. Karma upasana are not possible if you are not there to reap the benefits. With this third adhikaranam is also over. It is not a part of *avasthathriya viveka* but an incident topic.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranam [sutra 10]**

The nature of swoon.

#### **Sutra 3.2.10 [328]**

#### ***Mugdhe'rddhasampattih pariseshat***

In the swoon [in him who is senseless] there is half union on account of this remaining [as the only alternative left as the only possible hypothesis.

The state of swoon is now discussed.

Here we have to enquire whether the soul when awaking from deep sleep is the same, which entered into union with brahman or another one.

First i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. This is also an incidental adhikaranam not require for the flow of our enquiry. You do talk about different state of experience like *swapna*, *sushupti*, and *jagrat*. Now the question is totally how avasthas are there for the jiva. This is being analysed. Vyasacharya concludes that jiva has five avasthas. They are as follows. In *jagrat* one experiences the external world; *swapna* is a state in which one experiences internal world of dream; *sushupti* is a state in which jiva neither experiences the external world nor experiences the internal world. Jiva remains resolved in brahman in the *sushupti* state. The fourth state is the *marana avastha* that is an avastha experienced after dropping the body until one takes to another fresh body which is similar to the sleep with no karma phala anubhava or which is the condition of jiva and jiva survives the fifth avastha and it is called *moorcha avastha* which is called *mukta avastha*. It is

a state of coma or unconsciousness, swooning or fainting. Five avasthas are established in this adhikaranam. Should we say moorcha is distinct or can we add it in one of the existing mode? Similarly, we have youvana, balya, kaumara etc., avasthas. However, we do not count them separately and similar why not add this into one the other seven or four. You may what do you get out of this. We should have clear-cut policy which regard to the various suggestions made by scholars. Therefore, let us confine to some avastha or the other. Soubt is moorcha avastha and it is distinct from the four and purva paksi says it is one of the four and siddhanta says it is distinct from the four. This vyasacharya says it is a unique state and cannot fall in any of the four. Can we take moorcha as jagrat, because jiva in this state never experience the external world? Can we take as swpana avastha and it is not possible because we never experience the internal world as we experience external world in swapna. It cannot be sushupti avastha. Here we get serious doubt and possibility. Adhi sankaracharya says it cannot be sushupti avastha because cause, nature and effect are different from sushupti state. The nature of sushupti and cause are different, the effect and consequences are different. The cause of sleep is natural and healthy cause. Body is tired and it goes to sleep for the rest. The coma or unconscious state comes; the cause is some problem in the system. Cause is ill health. We talk of treatment when one goes to unconscious state. Health is the cause of sleep and ill health is the cause of coma. Sleep is a wanted state and in which body is refreshed. If one does not get sleep, we call the doctor. Its absence it becomes a cause of concern. The state of unconsciousness is an unhealthy state. In one absence creates worry and in the other presence creates worry. Even in external look, there is difference in a person in coma and one in sleep. One damage health and the other not a cause of worry the consequence are rest and refreshment. Sleep comes as a regular cycle but unconscious state is not a regular cyclic process. Finally, sleep is universal phenomenon. Every one-experience sleep and none can say he has not sleep. Without sleep, you cannot survive. Even dream is universal whereas moorcha is not universal. One common feature between sushupti and moorcha, the individuality is resolved. Sat sambatti is common whereas in all other respect both are different. Finally, can moorcha be included in marana avastha? It cannot be included due to two reason. One is biological functions of the body continues in moorcha whereas biological condition of the body ceases. In moorcha there is a possibility of jiva coming back to the same physical body. But person after death cannot retain or come back with the same body but he will take to a new body that is called rebirth. Death by definition is the permanent leaving of the body. Therefore marana avastha also it cannot be. Moorcha avastha resembles marana avastha because jiva here loses individuality. In sushupti also individuality resolution is there and in moorcha also it is there. But moorcha cannot be included in maranam or sushupti. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 255

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutra 10]**

The nature of swoon.

#### **Sutra 3.2.10 [328]**

#### ***Mugdhe'rddhasampattih pariseshat***

In the swoon [in him who is senseless] there is half union on account of this remaining [as the only alternative left as the only possible hypothesis.

The state of swoon is now discussed.

In the previous adhikaranam vyasacharya has discussed swapna, sushupti and jagrat avasthas and it has been established that all the three avasthas are mithya supported by aitereya upanishad vakyam. Since all these three are mithya this cannot be included as jivatma chaitanyam as integral part and it is out of ignorance we include them as i the jivatma. It is out of ignorance i include them and i become a samsari. Once i know them as mithya i am not associated with them and i am only a saksi. Brihadharaynaka upanisad takes pain to point out that i am only a saksi and i am not associated with them. I am nirvisesha chaitanyam then i am able to claim identity with paramatma and this claiming presupposes the disclaiming my association with avasthatriaym. With this tvam pada lakshyartha is revealed. Now vyasacharya enters into an incidental topic. How many avasthas are there is being discussed now. We saw that four avasthas are common and well known. They are jagrat, swapna, sushupti and maranam. Maranam is avastha of jiva between one janma and other janma. Now a fifth avastha is suggested called moorcha avastha a state of unconsciousness and vyasacharya wants to find as to whether it can be called a fifth one or can be included as the four available one. Your liberation is dependent on knowing this. In sastra we should have clear cut idea about this. The moorcha avastha cannot be included in any one of the four. It cannot be included in sushupti because the cause, the nature of sushupti and the consequence of sushupti are different from the nature and consequences of moorcha avastha. Can we call it marana avastha, we cannot because the vital signs of life cease to exist but in moorcha avastha all the signs continue to exist. From moorcha avastha one can come back to the same body but in marana avastha a new body is taken after death. It is by law of exclusion all the four are excluded and we have to take as pancami and vyasacharya gives a technical name artha sambattih. In sushupti jiva loses individuality and merges into brahman. Therefore sushupti avastha is called sat sambattih. Sat means brahman and sambatti means layah. This is said in chandogya upanisad. That paramatma is swam that means swarupam. At the time of maranam also jivatma dissolves into brahman and therefore maranam is also another form of sat sambattih in the sixth chapter of chandogya upanisad. When a person dies, all the organs are withdrawn into manus and the prana absorbs him with brahman. In moorcha avastha jivatma loses his individuality in a state of unconsciousness and he does not have the experience of the world. In moorcha avastha also jivatma resolves into brahman. That is also sat sambattih only. Both are different states of sat sambattih only. In moorcha avastha there are certain features common to sushupti and there are certain features close to maranam. The

vital signs continue and comes back to the same body etc. And also morocha avastha is closer to maranam and that is when one goes to come, people are frightened. This is the gateway to maranam for many people it is through moorcha, one gets into the claws of death. In that respect it is closer to death and that is treatment is required. Coma means people are afraid that he will die. Moorcha is partially similar to sushupti and partially similar to maranam and therefore it is part of sushupti sat sambatti and it a part of maranam sat sambatti. This is the hybrid of sushupti sat sambatti and marana sat sambatti and therefore vyasacharya names it artha sambatti. It has got features of sushupti as also maranam's sat sambatti. This is the analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Mukdhe in the state of unconsciousness artha sambattih a condition of partial absorption [is experienced by the jiva] parishesat this is known by the law of exclusion. This is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Murkam means extreme state of moha or tamo guna. This is intense tamo guna; atdhasampattih means partial absorption but you should not take it in literal sense; absorption is total only but it is one part of sushupti sampattihi and marana sampattih. Parishesat means a nyaya the law of exclusion means after excluding all others whatever remains you take as a new one; a law of the remainder also. We have excluded jagrat, swapna.sushupti, maranam and the fifth one is moorcha. If there is hypnotic state caused by someone and it is moorcha. All other states will find in the above five category only. The samadhi is not included in any of the five states. Samadhi is a state talked about in yoga sastra and vedanta does not accept. In yoga samadhi is accepted as avastha and it is given a prominence and it is a state of absolute thoughtlessness. They talk of various steps to reach the samadhi state. The thoughtless state is considered as the highest state of samadhi. It is adopted in vedanta also by many people and gradually the yoga samadhi has become extremely important in vedanta also but vyasacharya does not give a separate status. Vedanta itself talk about separate state and utility of the state of samadhi. Some claim in vedantins themselves only in the absolute thoughtless state one can develop and extraordinary power of intuition with which one can realize the turth or brahman. This is the theory of vedantins theselves. They also feel jnanam can give knowledge and samadhi state is compulsory for direct apprehension. This is one theory of samadhi.

Then there are some other vedantins claim that in the state of samdadhi alone one can enjoy jivan mukti avastha. Constant experience of brahmananda requires a mind abiding in brahman. Mind will abide in brahman according to them only when mind is thoughtless. Thoughtless state is possible only when you end all the transaction. They believe that jivan mukta avastha is possible only when you end all transactions and bide in brahman and enjoy amrita ananda and visualize the highest state which is called brahma vid avastha. You are absolutely dead in this world and they talk about of birds building nests in the beards of the sage. The hunger is not known, thirst is not known etc. This alone is jivan mukti according to these people.

Then there is a third theory and it says moksa is possible only when the mind is destroyed. According to them the mind will continue to exist as long as fuel and nourishment is there and vasanas are the oil for the mind to be alive and therefore all the vasanas have to be eliminated. As the vasanas are eliminated, the mind is emaciated. And the mind becomes thinner and thinner by exhausting vasanas and not feeding the mind with fresh vasanas. According to them remaining in samadhi will assist in the shrinking of the mind. Samadhi sessions are to be practiced. In each samadhi session the mind will shrink. The rate of shrinking will depend upon the frequency, intensity of the samadhi state; and also depends

upon the length of samadhi state and that mindless person enjoys the jivan mukta avastha and the lord takes over his life. Lord will guide his activity. Samadhi as stateless state is talked about by some people. Vyasacharya does not talk about samadhi as a state at all. Do we talk about samadhi at all in va. We say we do talk about a samadhi and even adhi sankaracharya talks about it. It comes in the sixth chapter of gita and mandukya karika. We don't mean the thoughtless state, plying the three roles giving a new intuitive power, directly apprehending brahman we don't agree; there is special intuition to realize brahman. Intuition is not included to realize brahman as pramana. The second one that samadhi is required to abide in atma also is not accepted. We say that a thoughtless state is not required for the mind to abide in atma because everything in creation all the time is abiding in atma only. Atma is not a chari which you have to sit at a particular time and atma is all pervading in chaitanyam. Everything abides by atma and nothing can come and abide in atma whether the mind is thoughtful or thoughtless. Mind is abiding in atma. It is like wave does something to abide in ocean. Wave does not do anything. Third role is shrinking the mind to realize the brahman state. Shrinking of the mind through samadhi we don't accept and we say a mithya vastu need not be shrunk gradually. The rope snake you need not gradually reduce in rope meditation. I know there is no snake and i do sessions of rope meditation to shrink the thought of the mithya snake. Adhi sankaracharya says it is possible in yoga because yoga believes in the reality of the mind. Whoever does not accept mithya, they require samadhi sessions of meditation or mind control. For them mind is not mithya and for vedantins mind is mithya and we concentrate in gaining knowledge alone. We do not accept the concept of samadhi. Vedantins accept and says samadhi is a thoughtful state and it entertains vritti or thought but we insist upon vedantic thought of dwelling upon the teaching and in this if we exclude all distraction and if you are absorbed in that and that absorption in vedantic thought is called samadhi. Even absorbed sranvanam is called samadhi. Therefore, you are in samadhi if you are absorbed through writing notes or meditating upon the vedantic studies. Since thoughts are involved, the thoughts based on pramanam are involved and in that state, also one is pramata in jagrat avastha. We also have other types of absorption worry, health, money etc. There also someone has to shake you up and that is one type of samadhi in jagrat avastha. Samadhi is not a separate state but include in jagrat avastha and get absorbed in the thought of aham brahma asmi. This is also talked about in panca dasi first chapter. Yogic samadhi is not acceptable and vedantic samadhi is not a separate state but included in jagrat avastha and it is acceptable to us.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.11 [329]**

#### ***Na sthanato'pi parasyaobhayalingam sarvatra hj***

Not on account of [difference of] place also tow-fold characteristics can belong to the highest, for everywhere [scripture teachers it to be without any difference.

The sutrakara now proceeds to deal with the nature of brahman.

With the previous sutra and adhikaranam the avastha discussion is over and with that jivatma vichara is over. Jivatma is established as avasthathriya saksi and jivatma is unhooked jiva and is one with paramatma. This analysis is called tvam pada vichara. This is not complete

because mahavakya requires tvam and tat pada vichara. Tat pada vichara means paramatma pada vichara. Only then, we are ready for aikya jnanam. This tvam pada vichara is called sadhana, tat pada vichara is also called sadhana, and aikya jnanam is called sadhyam. That is why both are discussed in sadhana adhyaya.

Now in the following four adhikaranam we will discuss the tat pada vichara or paramatma vichara. I will introduce the fifth adhikaranam. This is called ubhaya linga adhikaranam with 11 sutras. Here brahman is defining as sagunam, nirgunam, or both. These are the adhikaranam the differences of opinion between dvada and vishistadvaida are highlighted or made prominent. Also we will establish that brahman is nirgunam. Sagunam nature of brahman is of lower order of reality and therefore mithya. Nirgunam brahman is sathyam, which is not accepted by vishistadvaidam. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 256

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.11 [329]**

#### ***Na sthanato'pi parasyaobhayalingam sarvatra hj***

Not on account of [difference of] place also tow-fold characteristics can belong to the highest, for everywhere [scripture teachers it to be without any difference.

The sutrakara now proceeds to deal with the nature of brahman.

Here tat pada vichara or paramatma swarupam is being analysed here. Here it is critically analysed whether brahman is sagunam or nirgunam brahman. There are some upanisadic vakyams describing sagunam with attributes and there is some other upanisadic description that brahman is nirgunam. Vishistadvaiddam says that they have dissolved the problem that there is no problems at all because there is no such thing called nirgunam brahman. They do not accept the very existence of nirgunam brahman. They do not have vyavaharika dristi or paramarthika dristi etc. In moksa avastha slo both jiva and brahman are sagunam only. Suppose an advaidins ask a question what about nirgunam appearing in the upanishad, they would say that nirgunam does not mean attributeless brahman. There is no such thing called attributeless brahman. Nirgunam means dusta guna rahitam. Brahman is free from negative or evil attributes. Brahman has all the kalyana gunam and brahman has not akalyana gunam as attributes. Nirgunam brahman means suddha gunam brahman and suddha gunam brahman is sagunam brahman. There is contradiction or there is no need of reconciliation. They do not have to bring in vyavaharika paramarthika beda and they do not have to say knowledge is the means of liberation. Because there is no nirgunam brahman; mithya is not required, in vishistadvaiddam it does not mean brahma jnanena moksa but brahma upasanena moksa. By practicing the upasanas, a person will travel by shukla gathi, go to vaikunta, and gain moksa. All this is based on the foundation that there is no nirgunam brahman. But advaidins accepts nirgunam brahman. It is suddha brahman; for advaidins nirgunam is accepted and sagunam is also there. The reconciliation of the two is done in this adhikaranam.

Now i will give you the development of the analysis. First vyasacharya points out that both sagunam and nirgunam cannot coexist and therefore we have to take necessarily only swarupam as the intrinsic nature. Then vyasacharya develops further. He divides vedantic teachings into two levels. The differences in the eligibility of the students one set are unprepared students and the other one is prepared students. Keeping the level, vyasacharya points out that upanishad reveals nirgunam brahman alone. That is the ultimate teaching and that is the destination; central theme of the entire study. It even directly negates the sagunam brahman. This is the first level of development.

Then he says however accepts sagunam brahman also for the lower unprepared students even though in the face of upanishad sagunam brahman is mithya to be negated later. Temporarily

avidya avasthayam anadhikari avasthayam sagunam brahman is accepted at that level because sagunam brahman alone is useful for getting the eligibility. Nirgunam brahman cannot help me in getting the eligibility for nirgunam brahman is not an object of prayer. You cannot meditate and you cannot do anything. Those who are in sagunam brahma permanently, then they are the unfortunate people. This is the development.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the first sutra. Here it is said that both nirguna and saguna swarupam cannot belong to brahman. Brahman cannot be combination of both. These two swarupams cannot belong to brahman in alternating manner. This means first brahman was nirgunam and then came maya, brahman became sagunam brahman, and we scrubbed maya and again became nirgunam brahman. It is like water becoming hot and then becoming cold etc. Brahman cannot have both swarupam in alternating matter.

Whether they both can coexist, the answer is that both cannot coexist at all. Because opposite attributes cannot coexist. A person can be short and fat and a person can be tall and fat. It is because tallness and fatness is not opposite attributes. A person cannot be log and short being both opposite attributes. Brahman cannot be nirgunam brahman and sagunam simultaneously because of the opposite attributes. The conclusion is that brahman should have only one intrinsic nature and that should be permanent. That permanent nature is nirgunam only. Nirgunam cannot be displaced and sagunam cannot come sagunam cannot be replaced by nirgunam.

Vyasacharya says nirgunam is the intrinsic nature of brahman as described in all the upanisads. 1.16 of mundaka upanishad gives a clean description of attribute-less of brahman. Mantra 1.3 of the kenopanisad says that brahman is not accessible to any attribute. The next one 1.3.5 of kathopanisad says it is without sound, without touch without form and without decay. Kaivalya upanishad says when the five elements is not there where is the question of gunas because gunas are borrowed from panca bhutas only. Taittiriya upanishad says nirgunam brahman is real and mandukya upanishad describes nirgunam brahman. Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 3.8.8 says that it is neither coarse, nor fine, neither short nor long neither redness nor moisture. Chandogya upanisad mantra 3.14.2 says from whose all activities all desires all odours and all tastes proceed.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Parasya na brahman does not possess ubhaya lingam two types of nature [by itself] apisthanah even due to location; sarvatra hi it is revealed uniformly everywhere [as nirgunam brahman] this is the running meaning.

Now we will see significance of the words. Na sthanato'pi even because of particular location brahman does not get the attributes of the location; this is based on madhu brahmanam and in this brahmanam upanishad says brahman is located in every objects in prithivi, vayu, jalam not only in macro objects but also in micro objects brahman is located. [brihadharaynaka upanisad ii chapter 5<sup>th</sup> section]. Here brahman defined as tejomaya amrita maya purusah. The description is uniform whether it is located anywhere. If brahman is borrowing the attributes the description should be defined with attributes. It is not tainted by the attributes of location. It is not affected by the punya papam because of the association with the mind; location does not influence the nirguna swarupam of brahman. Neither originally attributed nor is it attributed by contact. Parasya means parambrahma; ubhaya lingam means the combination of two nature saguna nirguna ubhaya swarupam na means it is not. Therefore, it can have only one nirguna swarupam. Everywhere nirgunam is talked about in sruti.



## **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

### **Sutra 3.2.12 [330]**

#### ***Na bhedaditi chenna pratyekamatadvachanat***

If it be said that is is not so on account of difference [being taught in the scriptures] we reply that it is not so; because with reference to each [such form], the sruti declares the opposite of that.

An objection to the preceding stura is raised and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of this sutra. It has two parts and first is purva paksa part and the second is siddhanta part. The objection portion is 'bhedat iti chet and the siddhanta portion is na pratyekamatadvachanat'

Bedat here means attributes. Purva paksa claims that the upanishad talks about attributes also and how dare you say upanishad talks about nirgunam brahman only. He quotes the convenient portion. We do have the upanisadic statement like sarva kama, sarva gandha, sarva rasah etc. Refer to chandogya upanisad 3.14.2 attributes mentioned. Hence, purva paksa says your conclusions are not correct. When brahman is associated with bhumi it will have gandha; associated with agni all rupam etc. This is how brahman is sagunam. Vyasacharya says we cannot accept this argument. In madhu brahmanam it has been very clearly said that brahman does not take any attributes to it. Other than chaitanyam it has no attributes at all. This is the essence of this sutra. Now we will go to the word meaning.

Bedad means since attributes are also mentioned na you conclusion is incorrect or wrong. Up to this is purva paksa. Iti chet if this is your contention na it is not so. Atadvachanat because the attributeless brahman is revealed pratyekam in each location; this is the meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Bedad means because the attributes are also mentioned in the sruti vakyam [3.14.2 of chandogya upanisad] now advaidins say if this is your argument you are wrong. Atadvachanat in chandogya upanisad it is clearly said even though brahman is located in prithivi it does not have the attributes of prithivi. Atad means nirgunam brahman; vachanat means mentioned or revealed even when brahman is located in the prithivi or jalam. Pratyekam means in each location.

## **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

### **Sutra 3.2.13 [331]**

#### ***Api chaivameke***

Moreover some [teach] thus.

A further argument is given in support of sutra 11

First we will do a general analysis of this sutra. Purva pakshi has quoted a mantra which states that brahman has the taste, touch etc. We hold on to madhu brahmana mantra that brahman is attributesless. Purva pakshi holds on chandogya upanisad mantra. The question is which one we should hold on to. Advaidins say nirguna alone should be held on to. There is no plurality at all and there are no differences at all. If brahman is taken as saguna differences will be there. Where properties are there difference would be prominent. In nirgunam alone nanatvam can be negated. There are so many other places where the upanishad even threatens that if you continue to see the differences you will go to greater hell. Therefore, upanishad dissolves the contradiction that nirgunam brahman alone persists.

Now we will do word for word analysis of the sutra. Api cha moreover; eke means some upanisads [directly teach] evam in this [nirgunam brahman by negating the attributes] manner. This is the word meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Apicha even though upanishad seemingly contradicts sagunam and nirgunam, upanishad itself resolve the doubt and say sagunam is mithya and whatever is negated is mithya and it is of lower order of reality. This mithya you must reject ultimately. Eke means some upanishad negate saguna and in some the negation is not explicitly done but done implicitly. Evam means in this manner and says that nirgunam alone exists and there is no saguna. Kathopanisad 1.4.11 and also brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra 4.4.19 are kept in mind while negating purva paksha. In the case of unprepared student the negation of saguna may prove to be dangerous. From the next sutra we will take sagunam as stepping stone to reach nirguna and drop sagunam. Saguna is sadhanam and nirgunam is sadhyam more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 257

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.13 [331]**

#### ***Api chaivameke***

Moreover some [teach] thus.

A further argument is given in support of sutra 11

In this fifth adhikaranam vyasacharya deals with the nature of brahman whether it is sagunam brahman or nirgunam brahman or brahman is with attributes or brahman is without attributes. There is confusion because we find there are saguna and nirguna vakyams are there in the upanisads. At the same time all agree that it can neither be sagunam or nirgunam and it cannot be either or both. Both features are not possible in brahman simultaneously. Vishistadvaidam uses one method that there is no contradiction since there is no such thing as nirgunam brahman. But advaidins resolve in the opposite way and say that there is only one brahman that is nirgunam brahman. One rejects nirgunam brahman and the other rejects sagunam brahman. The first three sutras we established that upanishad reveals nirgunam brahman alone. This is our first development in the first three sutras. While establishing nirgunam brahman, we ignored the sagunam brahman with attributes. Initially we ignore the existence of saguna vakyams and point out that nirgunam brahman is uniformly revealed in the upanisads. Then we also pointed out that even the brahman obtaining in various locations of the world as antaryami, essence of elements also revealed as nirgunam brahman while pointing out the vakyams in madhu brahmanam. In the third sutra, we corroborated it by saying that the sruti positively negates the attributes by the expression nena nanati kincana. Wherever attributes are there, plurality will be there. This we have negated. Jivatma with inferior attributes will be necessarily different from paramatma with superior attributes and will reveal plurality. By negating the plurality 2.4.11 of kathopanisad, we negated the sagunam brahman. Up to this we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.13 [331]**

#### ***Arupavadeva hi tatpradhanatvat***

Verily brahman is only formless on account of that being the main purport of all texts about brahman.

A further argument is given in support of sutra 11

This is the reinforcement of the conclusion that has been arrived at the previous sutra. Here vyasacharya says that brahman has to be understood as colourless and attributeless. This means brahman is nirgunam brahman. That is the central theme of the upanisads. The upanishad does not teach bedah and upanishad teaches abedah alone. We have already established this fact in samanya adhikaranam. The most important argument given there was to teach a saguna vastu upanishads are not required. To teach divisions and attributes upanishads are not required. Saguna brahman can be arrived at through perception being pouruseya vishaya. Also refer to 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of mandukya upanishad. Nirgunam brahman is the centra teaching that should be accepted as true. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis.

Apurvavat hi brahman is indeed attributeless; tat pradanatvat since it is the central these of the upanishad. Rupam primarily means colour and here it should be taken as any attribute in general. Rupavat means endowed with attributes. Na rupaat means brahman without attributes. Eva and hi gives emphasis that is doubtlessly. Tat pradhanatvat means the arupa brahman nirgunam brahman is the tatparyam of the upanishad; the bottomline of the upanisadic teaching. Therefore brahman is nirgunam brahman only and there is no sagunam brahman at all.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.15 [333]**

#### ***Prakasavacchavaiyarthyat***

And as light [assumes forms as it were by its contact with things possessing form, so does brahman takes form in connection with upadhis or limiting adjuncts], because [texts which ascribe form to brahman] are not meaningless.

A further argument is given in support of sutra 11

Vyasacharya concludes the first part of our discussion that nirgunam brahman alone is there. He gives the final agreement that nirgunam brahman alone is there by comparing brahman to the light. Chaitanya tattvam is compared to the prakasah. We do not talk about the source of light but use the word prakasa, which is formless and spreads over the object and reveals the objects. Sunlight spreads all over the objects but it does not take the attributes of any of the objects on which sun's light spreads. When it spreadsover dirty water it does not become wet or dirty. Dirty is asangah and it is incapable of taking attributes. It means chaitanyam will be nirgunam. It was, it is and it ever will be nirgunam brahman. Since chaitanyam is brahman, brahman was, is and will be nirgunam brahman. Nirguna advoidam was, is and will be for ever. Even if brahman wants to be sagunam it cannot become sagunam brahman. Up to this is the first part of the development.

If you say sruti consistently reveals nirgunam brahman and if the central teaching is nirgunam how can you reconcile the saguna vakyams in the upanisads. In chandogya upanishad mantra we have pointed out that brahman has got gandha, touch etc. First of all we say that there is

sagunam brahman. There is no change in our position. Sagunam brahman is impossible and it is only a misconception in the minds of the ignorant people. This is the first point to be noted.

Then comes the question tell me whether sruti is ignorant or wise. We can appreciate ignorant people talking about sagunam brahman. Then why should upanishad talks about sagunam brahman. Can you say upanishad is also ignorant because it talks about sagunam. Upanishad temporarily accepts the misconception of the ignorant people. Because the upanishad feels that, the misconception also has certain utility. It is useful up to a particular level to become an adhikari. It is needed to become wise; he has to go through karma and upasana kanda deliberately accepting the human misconception. The upanishad says that everybody is not mentally prepared to take nirgunam brahman as it is being ignorant; they are to be prepared. Sruti does not get angry with them when they talk of sagunam brahman. Sruti is compassionate to them. Sruti allows to go to karma kanda. Then we have upasana kanda where you can replace the rituals with meditation. Then you are taught of the jnanam that what you believed so far is of no value and they are taught nirgunam brahman concept to make them wise. This realization alone is liberation. Nirgunam cannot be objectified. You are the subject nirgunam brahman and it is a matter to be claimed and not to be objectified. If the mind does not accept, allow the mind to continue to stick to sagunam brahman and do rituals and wait for the mind to become matured to realize nirgunam brahman. Veda deliberately puts into use the misconception of ajnani and therefore saguna vakyams are called anuvadha vakyam, deliberately accepting the misconception. Nirguna vakyams are said to be pramana vakyams. Start with anuvadha saguna vakyam and end with nirguna pramana bhuta vakyam. This is the approach of the vedas. Brahman is ubhaya lingam having both features of sagunam and nirgunam one on the basis of karma kanda and the other on the basis of vedanta. Adhi sankaracharya says we do not mind accepting both but on one condition that nirgunam brahman is sathyam and sagunams are mithya because it is accepted during avidya avastha. In fact upanishad says yatra dvaidam bhavati idara idara bhasyati. Brahman is sathya guna, mithya guna, sathya nirguna swarupam. You cannot say both are mithya or both are sathyam. Both are sathya mithya combination.

Now i will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha moreover; prakasavat is comparable to the light; avaiyarthyat means being purposeful [sagunam brahman is also talked about] this is the running meaning. Now i will give you the significance of the words. Cha means further or additional argument. The argument given here is brahma chaitanyam to the light. Just as surya prakasa does not take good or bad attributes, brahman cannot take the good or bad attributes of the world or the maya that permanently stays with brahman. It is so because it is the nature of brahman. Cha means conjunction addition of the third argument. This is the reconciling part of the vyasacharya's argument. In fact even science wise if you see the sagunam portion is more. Avaiyathyatvat means the uselessness; that is why i positively translated as usefulness. The sun is the center, which was not accepted earlier the sun sets in the morning and sets in the evening is a misconception. It is used for some practical usage. Sunrise has got vyavaharika sathaym.misconception with practical utility is vyavaharika sathyam. Sagunam brahman of karma kanda and upasana kanda is required for us to realize brahman. But advaidin will never get angry with believers of sagunam brahman but sympathise with them and allow them to continue their sadhana to ultimately reach the nirgunam brahman level for advaidins feel that sagunam brahman level is the stepping stone to reach the top position of the nirgunam brahman level and gain moksa where the liberation lies.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

**Sutra 3.2.16 [334]**

***Aha cha tanmatram***

And [the sruti] declares [tth brahman is] that [i.e, intelligence] only.

The force of the word 'matra' in tanmatra is to denote exclusiveness.

The following sutra is the reinforcement of the conclusion that nirgunam brahman is sathyam and sagunam brahman is mithya and sagunam brahman is useful ultimately to realize brahman. Being useful mithya is talked about but the truth sagunam brahman is useful and nirgunam brahman is truth. Nirgunam brahma jnanam is vyavaharika but nirgunam brahman is paramarthika. Nirgunam brahma jnanam is very useful to gain the knowledge of nirgunam brahman. Here it is said that brahman is chinmatram. There are no three sarirams and three prapancham and brahman is only chin matram. Chit eva sat. Tat chit eva ananda matram. There is no attributes at all to nirgunam brahman. The sruti kept in mind is 4.5.13 of brihadharaynaka upanisad that says the self is neither inside nor outside but is altogether a mass of knowledge. It is as a lump of salt has neither inside nor outside but is altogether a mass of saltiest taste. It is pure consciousness neither nothing inside nor outside. There is no matter. There is no substance other than consciousness and therefore there is no attribute. If the consciousness is a substance, you have to apply some attributes to it. If it is an attribute, it has to be attached to a substance. Consciousness is neither substance nor attribute. That is why sat is neither a substance nor attribute. We say the naiyayika concept of dravyam, guna etc., have no meaning.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha means moreover; aha the sruti declares; tanmatram brahman to be pure consciousness. This is the running meaning. Significance of the word is simple. Sruti itself declares tan matram tat means chaitanyam matram means chin matram and there is no other substance nor there is any attribute. It is beyond science. It is nonmaterial. It is spirit and it is spiritual. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 258

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.16 [334]**

#### ***Aha cha tanmatram***

And [the sruti] declares [ttht brahman is] that [i.e, intelligence] only.

The force of the word 'matra' in tanmatra is to denote exclusiveness.

In this fifth adhikaranam, vyasacharya has taken up an important for analysis regarding he sagunam brahman and nirgunam brahman because sruti talks about both sagunam brahman and nirgunam brahman. We cannot accept both because these two have opposite features. If it is nirgunam brahman it cannot be sagunam brahman. Vyasacharya explain this confusion in a very slow manner. Nirgunam brahman is the central these of the teachings. This is the first statement.

Then vyasacharya comes down a bit and we should remember that the tatpryam is only nirgunam brahman and sagunam brahman there is no tatparyam. He accepts the existence of sagunam brahman as unimportant entity. In that sutra arupaveda, tat pradanatvat that sagunam brahman is there but less important. Third state is sagunam brahman is acceptable but it is mithya but it is of inferior variety. Vyasacharya conveys that it is mithya through prakasa dristandha. Nirgunam brahman cannot take any attributes. It is that which cannot take attributes. If i simply translate attributeless then you will mistake that it will gather attributes during course of time. The light cannot take the attributes of the objects even though the light spreads over all the objects. Then the next stage is that even though sagunam brahman is less important and mithya it is still useful in the beginning stage of sadhana. It is mithya. Even though it is apradhanam and mithya, it is not useless. It is useful at the time of ignorance when one wants to gain knowledge he has to prepare the mind for which sagunam brahman is useful as upasyam brahman. Once he prepares the mind, upanishad tells sagunam brahman is mithya. Nedan enidham upasade [kenopanisad] sagunam brahman can be meditated upon but it is not the ultimate truth. It is there; it is less important and mithya and it is useful. One nirgunam brahman and there is another mithya sahitam brahman and then there will be no contradiction. There can be contradiction only when both belong to the same order of reality. One is of higher order of reality and the other is lesser order of reality; one is vyavaharika sathyam and the other is paramarthika sathyam; one is attributeless and the other is with the attributes. Thus, there is no contradiction between sagunam brahman and nirgunam brahman for the reason that sagunam brahman is the stepping-stone to reach the ultimate nirgunam brahman and gain liberation. Light in the jagrat avastha and darkness in swapna avastha can coexist in the same room. I can have lights on and take to sleep and yet i can have dream. I may sleep in a dark room and i can have a dream with bright sunlight. Up to this we saw in the last class.

## **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

### **Sutra 3.2.17 [335]**

#### ***Dasayati chatho api smaryate***

[the scripture] also shows [this end] it is likewise stated in the smriti.

The argument in support of sutra 11 is continued.

Here vyasacharya says that because brahman is nirgunam only sruti has to make use of indirect method of revealing brahman. Sruti is unable to make direct description because attributes are not there. The indirect method used by sruti is called nisheda mukha pramanam. It is negating every attribute. The definition using the method of negation is neti neti 2.3.6 of brihadharaynaka upanisad. Whatever you can convince of is an attribute. 'even the idea that it is', is opposed to nonexistence. Even the very word sat you should not really use. Brahman cannot be even called sat. Asat is another concept as opposed to sat. Any empirical concept is seen to be an attribute alone. The immature people have all types attributes attached to brahman. The knownness and unknownness is attributes attached to brahman, and then comes the ultimate question that no guna can be attributed to brahman. Is nirgunam is a guna. He says even we are not happy to use the word nirgunam. But we will keep on using the word nirgunam when you use the word sagunam and to negate the word sagunam we use the word nirgunam. The word nirgunam will not be used the moment you stop using the word sagunam. If nirgunam should not be used, it is said that amatra the silent is the word used to nirgunam brahman in the mandukya upanishad. Adhi sankaracharya quotes a smriti vakyam maha bharata shanty parva a verse occurs. It says that you see me with attributes but all the attributes are mithya attributes created by me and do not be carried away with the saguna form and never understand me in the saguna form. Do not see me in saguna form but know me nirguna form. This is the maha bharata word. It occurs in the gita also.

Now i will give you the running meaning of the sutra. Darsayati the sruti reveals it, the nirgunam brahman. The sruti restates also. Atho api in the same way; now we will see the significance of the word. Darsayati the vedic statements reveal the nirgunatvam. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 2.3.6; kenopanisad 1.4; and taittiriya upanishad 2.9; gita 13.12; and also 2.25;

## **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

### **Sutra 3.2.18 [336]**

#### ***Ata eva cgioana syrtajaduvat***

For this very reason [we have with respect to brahman] comparisons like the images of the sun and the like



The argument in support of sutra 11 is continued.

Here vyasacharya says that the sruti supports the same teaching by other methods also. Nirgunam brahman is sathyam and sagunam brahman is mithjya; nirgunam brahman is absolute reality and sagunam brahman is empirical reality. Here vyasacharya gives an example. Nirgunam brahman is compared to the sun and sagunam brahman is compared to the reflected sun that is surya pratibimba. Bimba is original and pratibimba is reflection. Original sun he calls as surya and the reflected sun as suryaka. Like surya and suryaka it is said. We know from the analogy the reflected sun is not real and it has certain attributes, which do not belong to the original. Reflected sun has attributes borrowed from the sun. Sun has chalanam but it does not belong to the original. Reflected sun has plurality if the reflected medias are many. Reflected sun moves from one place to another if the reflected medium moves. But it does not belong to the original. Thus sagunam brahman is unreal; it has attributes which do not belong to the original sun; sagunam brahman attributes belong to the upadhi due to sarira triyam and prapancha triyam. This does not belong to the sun the original. That saguna chaitanyam is mithya. There is no such thing called saguna chaitanyam.

The sruti gives the pratibimba dristanda in brahma or amrita bindu upanishad. Drishyate jala chandravat is the quotation. Surya dristanda is also there in other upanisads. Eka avahi bhutatma there is only one nirgunam brahman obtaining that is in every sariram and it is attributeless originally; when reflected it is many like the moon reflected in the water. If there are hundred lakes there will be plurality of the moon and the brightness also depending upon the purity of the water.

Now we will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Atha eva hence; upama the following analogy [found in the upanisads] surya kadivat sagunam brahman is like the sun reflected in the water; now we will see the significance of the words. Ata eva means therefore only since nirgunam brahman is sathyam and sagunam brahman is mithya. Upama means comparison or example' suryakadivat means pratibimba suryah; the ka indicates the inferiority of the reflection showing that it is inferior to the original sun. It is the inferiority in terms of the reality. Vedantins never disrespects sagunam brahman. Vedantins respects and devoted to sagunam brahman. The additional information we gather that the sagunam brahman enjoys the lower order of reality. Or nirgunam brahman enjoys the higher order of reality. We are never against sagunam brahman. That is why adhi sankaracharya wrote many stotras in the name of several gods.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.19 [337]**

#### ***Ambuvadagrahanattu na tathaatvam***

But there is no similarity [of the two things compared since ] [in the case of brahman ay second thing] is not apprehended or experienced like water.

An objection to the preceding sutra is raised by the purva paksin.

This is a purva paksha sutra where vyasacharya raises a possible doubt. The doubt is bound to arise whenever an example is given. Sometimes example creates doubt if the principle of example is not properly understood. Example is called upamanam and the original is called upameyam. Example is called dristanta and original is called drastanta. If face is compared to moon, moon is dristanta and face is upameyam. Between upamana and upameya there will be common features and more importantly between upamana and upameya there will be uncommon features. That is why it is called analogy. Between moon and face, there are common features. Moon and face are beautiful, bright, attractive, give joy; but there are so many uncommon features; face is not inert, not satellite, does not have mountains or craters; the job of the listener or the student is to cooperate with the teacher. The cooperation is the looking for the sadarmiyam and see the similarity of the example and not probe into the dissimilarity. Teacher knows the dissimilarity and students should not focus on the dissimilarity. Rope and snake example you should see the similarity and not dissimilarity. Here in the sun example, the student sees the dissimilarity. The sun has form and how can the nirgunam brahman which has not form. Mirror and sun has distance in between them. Sun is far away. There is no distance between nirgunam brahman and sagunam brahman. Formless consciousness form reflection in the formless mind. Sun can form a reflection or a reflecting medium other than the sun. Therefore there can be reflection. You say brahman is ekam eva etc. There is no original and the medium and how can you talk of the reflection. Such explanation is not acceptable. This is the purva pakshi's argument. The answer comes in the next sutra.]

Now i will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Na tathatvam there is no similarity agrahanat since reflectin medum is not seen; ambuvat like the water; this is the purva pakshi's argument. Now we will see the significance of the words. Ambuvat in the case of sun and the water, we can see the reflection and the medium is real and tangible medium. Here we don't have a second thing other than brahman. Even if you accept second thing you don't see the tangible medium for mind is not an effective medium. Mind is formless. There is dissimilarity in the original also. Sun has a form; face has a form and they can form a reflection. But brahman does not have form nor there is any medium like water. Tu means rejection of the example. Na tathatvam there is no similarity between chandra bimba and rejecting medium. This is the significance of the words.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.20 [338]**

#### ***Vriddhihrasabhaktvamantarbhavadubhyayasamanjasyadevam***

As [the highest brahman] is inside [its limiting adjuncts] it participates in their increase and decrease; owing to the appropriateness [thus resulting] of the two [things compared it is thus, [i.e., the comparison holds good.

The objection raised in the preceding sutra is refuted,

In this sutra vyasacharya tells all your problem is that you look for dissimilarity between sagunam brahman and nirgunam brahman. You should know that there is no reflection of consciousness. Consciousness cannot get reflection. There is second consciousness which is

less real than primary consciousness. The conditions required for reflection is not there. The reflection is experienced. Similarly, localized consciousness is experienced. The example is given for the conditions. If you like another example you take one. There is one paramarthika chaitanyam and vyavaharika chaitanyam. The details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 259

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.20 [338]**

#### ***Vridhhihrasabhaktvamantarbhavadubhyayasamanjasyadevam***

As [the highest brahman] is inside [its limiting adjuncts] it participates in their increase and decrease; owing to the appropriateness [thus resulting] of the two [things compared it is thus, [i.e., the comparison holds good.

The objection raised in the preceding sutra is refuted,

We do the 20<sup>th</sup> sutra's general analysis. It is the answer to the purva paksi raised in the last sutra. The question asked is how can there be pratibimba chaitanyam and or reflected chaitanyam. The whole thing came up when we talked about sagunam brahman and nirgunam brahman and when we said that nirgunam brahman is original consciousness and sagunam brahman is reflected consciousness and the former is sathyam and the latter is mithya. In this context, purva paksi has raised the question. Reflection requires one original and a medium for formation of the reflection. Reflection means dvaidam. I talk about the reflection means that there is a mirror capable of raising a reflection of the original. Brahman is claimed as advaidam. If brahman is advaidam where is the question of receive the reflection of brahman. This is the first objection raised by the purva paksi for which advaidins answer. He says we have maya which is other than brahman. Maya is there to form the reflection or the avidya is there to form the reflection or adhikaranam is there to form the reflection. Then the purva paksi again retorts that if you accept maya or andhakaranm means you accept dvaidam. For that adhi sankaracharya says we only say paramarthika vastu is advaidam and we do not mind any number of thing which is of lesser order or reality, or vyavaharika sathyam or prathibasika sathyam. Maya being mithya does not disturb the nondual status of brahman. Mithya maya can serve as reflecting medium or andhakaranam can serve as a reflecting medium. There is maya or there is andhakaranam and i can never accept that the reflection of brahman forming in maya or andhakaranam in the macro medium or micro medium because generally we see refection is formed under two condition. The original one is concrete substance or my face is murtha vastu. We have a reflecting medium a tangible substance like mirror or water surface. One murtham forms the reflection form another murtham. In your case original brahman is amurtham without form or colour and the reflecting medium maya andhakaranam which are also amurtham and they are formless and invisible. If may had been concrete i would clearly perceive. So also the mind is not tangible. How can arupam brahman be reflected in arupa maya or arupa andhakaranam. Therefore brahma pratibimba is impossible. Therefore to claim that sagunam brahman is pratibimba chaitanyam is not acceptable. This is the purva paksi objection.

Advaidins say that it is wonderful and your arguments are all right. They argue that it is why we say that it is like reflection. It is something comparable to reflection the nearest example

but i do not say it is reflection. The word upama means comparison. I say face is like moon and i do not say face is like moon. Chidhabasa or chit pratibimba is like chaitanyam. He is tiger means he has the qualities of tiger and he is not a tiger himself. If chit's pratibimba can be comparable to chaitanyam what are the common features to use the upamana. Five common features are there between sun and its pratibimba. First thing is that the reflection is always obtained and situated in a particular locus. Surya pratibimba is situated in either a mirror or surface of water or polished granite. A reflection obtains within in some asraya. Second common feature is that the reflection has got the similarity to the original. In the example the reflection is similar to the original sun; both are bright; both can illumine; third thing is the reflection borrows some of the attributes of its locus or asraya. The reflected sun has got several properties borrowed from the mirror. If the mirror is dull, the reflection is dull; if the mirror changes, the reflection also changes; if the water moves, the reflected sun also has got wavy motion. It is called savikaratvam. The medium moves, the reflection also moves. It is there in the original. If there is plurality in the asraya the reflection also has plurality. Further alongwith the origination and destruction of the medium, the reflection also originates and gets destroyed. Again, this is not in the original sun. Fourth is the reflection is mithya and it is not real as the original sun. Either it is unreal or it is real. If the word disturbs you, change it as less real that is called mithya. Fifth reason is even though it is mithya it has got its own utility. The reflected sun serves some purpose as if the reflected sun can illumine the dark room. Dark room cannot illumine by the original sun but the duplicate sun can illumine the dark room. It is called saprayojanatvam. Mithya can be useful and mithya alone is useful. These are the features of the pratibimba. Advaitins say that we have chaitanyam in the jada sariram that is very similar to the reflection. Reflected consciousness means reflection like consciousness. If there is no chaitanyam in the body means that matter will decay. Now vedanta says sariram chaitanyam is like a pratibimba. It is comparable to pratibimba because it has all the five features in this consciousness also. Sun obtains in the mirror. Similarly chaitanyam obtains in the body as an integral part of the body to such an extent scientists mistake that the consciousness is part of the body. The consciousness or chetanatvam has got similarity with original consciousness and that is both are self evident. Sadhrishyam is there. Third common feature is the reflection has got several properties borrowed from the mirror. The bodily consciousness has several properties borrowed from the body like the size of consciousness seems to be the size of the body; outside i don't see the consciousness; the plurality the bodies are many and consciousnesses are many. Expansion of contraction when the body is small consciousness is small and when the body expands the consciousness also expands. It does not expand some part of the body will have chetanatvam and some jadam. Consciousness seems to be born in the body and consciousness seems to die with the body. Consciousness seems to have origination and the end similar to the reflection which also has birth and death with the mirror. Both are mithya. Reflection is mithya and localized consciousness is mithya. All pervading consciousness alone is sathyam. Localized consciousness obtaining in the body is mithya. Though mithya, reflected consciousness has all the utility. Pratibimba chaitanyam in the body is jiva and total chaitanyam with the world is called prapancha. All vyavaharikams are because of the reflection like consciousness only. In the academic circle of vedanta, they do not use the word reflection but call it prototype consciousness which is called pratibimba chaitanyam. This consciousness is sagunam brahman and at macro level is called isvara and at micro level is called jiva and jiva has borrowed attributes and isvara also has got borrowed attributes and both are mithya. Sathyam is the original consciousness which is not obtaining in any medium and it is called nirgunam brahman. Therefore there is no problem. This is the analysis of this sutra.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Antarbhavat since paramatma obtains in the reflecting media like the body; vriddhibrasabhaktvam it is subject to increase and decrease; ubhaya samaanjasyat because of similarity between the two; evam as mentioned above [there is no flaw in the analogy] there is no flaw in the mistake in the example. Now we will see the significance of the words. Vriddhibrasabhaktvam. I gave you several similarities but vvasacharya mentions two similarities only viz.reflection, expansion and contraction. The reflection of the sun in a small drop of water will be small. Similar is the case with the body. Hrasa decrease vriddhi increase; reflection is endowed with increase and decrease. Antar bhavat the bodily consciousness obtains only in the body and do not experience it outside. Scientists do not accept consciousness outside the body. Reflection also obtains in the mirror. It is antarbhavat. Ubhaya samanjasat means similarity or identity with saguna chaitanyam in the body and surya pratibimba in the mirror. They are comparable the reflection is not reflection but comparable to reflection. Evam means as i mentioned before. Vriddhibrasabhaktvam reflection expands and contracts even when the original does not expand and contract. Similarly bodily consciousness expands and contracts even when the original consciousness does not expand and contract. This prototype consciousness is called sagunam brahman. This requires a container or medium and that medium is called upadhi. In several upadhis several prototype consciousnesses are there and this consciousness is sagunam only and this sagunam is called jiva at micro level and is called isvara in macro level but the original consciousness is neither isvara nor jiva. Now we will go to the next sutra.

#### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranm [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.21 [339]**

#### ***Darsanaccha***

And on account of the declaration of scripture.

A further reason is given to refuse the objection raised in sutra 19

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. You say a prototype consciousness is available in the upadhi. It is saguna chaitanyam and it is available in the upadhi and in vyasti upadhi it is jiva and in samasti upadhi it is isvara. How do you know that a prototype consciousness is available in the upadhi is the question. One answer is that i am a sentient living body is a proof that there is sentient consciousness in you. This consciousness moves as even the body moves. Our experience is a pramana and if you are not satisfied with the experience pramana i will give you the sruti pramanam. Every anupravesa sruti is a pramanam 2.5.18 of the brihadharaynaka upanisad talks of the anupravesa of brahman it is also repeated in 6.3.2 of chandogya upanisad. It talks about the entry of consciousness in the body. This entering consciousness cannot be the original all pervading consciousness because all pervading consciousness cannot enter anywhere and there is no question of entry into anything. Prototype is another word for reflection. Sruti talks about a consciousness, which has entered the body, which makes the body sentient, and which will be there as long s the medium is there. In the brihadharaynaka upanisad the word purah means several bodies and the brahman enters several bodies. This prototype consciousness has the birth and death and

the localized consciousness dissolves in sleep. In this regard, there is very elaborate analysis in upadesa sahasri 18<sup>th</sup> chapter.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Darsanat cha means since it is revealed in sruti this analogy is flawless; now we will see the significance of the word. Darsanat means pratyaksa darsanat we can take. Adhi sankaracharya takes the sruti pramana darsanat. If logic does not satisfy you give your own logic based on str. Cha means because of this reason also. With this, this sutra is over and this adhikaranam is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 260

### **Topic 4.mugdhe'rdhasampattyadhikaranam [sutras 11-21]**

The nature of brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.2.21 [339]**

#### ***Darsanaccha***

And on account of the declaration of scripture.

A further reason is given to refuse the objection raised in sutra 19

With the 21<sup>st</sup> sutra we have completed the 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the second pada of the third chapter. It is a significance adhikaranam through the teaching of the creation Upanishad establishes that Brahman is the jagat karanam and the whole world is the karyam. The whole world being a product it is but nama rupa. We have come to know that Brahman is the only substance and everything is but name and form. Name and form cannot exist independently, name and forms are but adjectives of Brahman and they do not have the substantiality of their own. Brahman is the substance and the whole world is but the attributes of that Brahman. Brahman is viseshyam and world is viseshanam. The colours, form etc., belong to Brahman. Then come the crucial substance and the whole world is an attributes and do the latter enjoy the same order of reality. Do the substance and attributes enjoy the same order or enjoy different order. If you say they enjoy the same order it is vishistadvoidam and if you say it does not enjoy the same order it is nir-vishistadvoidam. The world objects enjoy the same gunas of Brahman but they are of inferior order of reality while Brahman enjoys the superior order of reality. The Upanishad do not treat both of them equally the Brahman the substance and the attributes that is the nama rupa Prapancha. Between the two there is discrimination between Brahman and the creation. Upanishad does not negate the Brahman the substance while attributes are negated. Therefore you cannot give the same order. How can the unnegatable and negatables be treated equally. That is why we say attributes are vyavaharika sathyam and Brahman is Paramarthika sathyam. All gunas are mithya and Brahman the substance is sathyam. Hence, we say Nirgunam Brahman is sathyam and Sagunam Brahman is mithya. Sagunam Brahman is mithya because gunas are mithya but Nirgunam Brahman is sathyam and hence we conclude that Brahman the nirguna sathayam aspect and Sagunam the mithya aspect. Even though Brahman has nirguna sathya and saguna mithya aspects we do not say Brahman has two aspects. We do not want mithya aspect be counted with sathya aspect. Normally we say that there is only one Nirgunam aspect and we do not consider Sagunam mithya aspect. This point is revealed in this adhikaranam. Really Brahman is Nirgunam and gunas are negated and substance Brahman is not negated. All the sruti vakysams reveal that Brahman does not have any property. We have the word Nirgunam in svetasvara Upanishad. Now we will enter into the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**



The neti-neti text explained.

**Sutra 3.2.22 [340]**

**Prakrtatiavattvam hi pratishedhati tato braviti cha bhuyah**

What has been mentioned up to this is denied by the words ‘not this not this and the sruti says something more than that [afterwards].

In this group of sutras also the sutrakara expounds nirvisesha [formless Brahman]

First, I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with nine sutras. . The previous adhikaranam related to the statement that Brahman is the substance and world is its attributes, we said that attributes world is of lower order and the world is negated and therefore it is of lesser order and Brahman is not negated and therefore it is of higher order. Dream is of lesser order because it is negated on getting up and the world is to not negated. A Purva Paksi comes and tells if you read the Upanishad carefully you will find that Brahman is also negated. Substance Brahman is also like the attributes world and Upanishad negates Brahman also. Viseshanam as also viseshyam are mithya. One extreme is substance as also attributes are sathyam. If you say both are sathyam it is vishistadvaidam. We cannot say both are mithya or both are sathyam. We say one is sathyam and the other is mithya. Brahman with attributes is mithya and Brahman without attributes is sathyam. 2.3.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad says that Brahman as ‘neti-neti’. In this Upanishad begins with Brahman having two types of attributes. Once set of attributes is visible attributes like prithivi, water and Agni [visible attributes] and Akasa and Vayu [invisible attributes] are amurtha viseshanam. Sthoola Prapancha and sthoola sariram is murtha viseshanam and sookshma karana sariram is amurtha viseshanam and Brahman has got tangible and subtle attributes. Thus Brahman has got two rupams and so we can call Brahman as two roopi. It is roopi the substance, rupam, and rupi are introduced. These are arguments of Purva Paksi. Later by neti neti Brahman is revealed. Neti neti means Upanishad wants to negate two things and question is which are the two things negated and Purva Paksi argues the two things negated are Brahman the substance and murtha and amurtha viseshanam attributes. Substance and attributes are murtha and therefore you cannot say one is sathyam. This is the purva paksa of adhikaranam. The object of neti neti is seen to be the subject matter and what is negated is by neti neti is the doubt. Purva Paksi says that what is negated is visible and invisible attributes. The siddhanta says neti neti do not negate the Brahman and the two attributes and neti neti negates the attributes part and not the Brahman part. Naturally he will ask if the Upanishad negates attributes, why there are two neti’s and one neti is sufficient. The reason is Upanishad talks of two attributes and one is visible and another is invisible attributes. Thus Brahman has to be retained is one substance un-negatable the subject I. It is un-objectifiable substance the un-negatable Consciousness which is sathyam Brahman. This is the substance of the adhikaranam.

Now we will see the general analysis of the first sutra. In this sutra Vyasacharya says that the two attributes of Brahman the murtha and amurtha and never negates the substance, the Consciousness or Brahman. We have sruti support as also logical support also. Sruti support is that after negation Upanishad redefines Brahman as sathyasya sathyam. The firsts sathyam being the vyavaharika sathyam murtha amurtha viseshanam and the second sathyam is Paramarthika sathyam the absolute reality. The negatable viseshanam is supported by un-negatable substance Brahman and therefore you cannot Brahman is also negated. If

everything is negated as mithya the question will come what is adhistanam the support. Anything mithya cannot exist without a real support. You cannot talk of mirage water as urneal unless there is dry sand, which is sathyam, if rajju sarpa is mithya the rupe is sathyam; if the dream is mithya the waker is sathyam. Mithya cannot exits without sathya adhistanam. If Brahman is mithya what is adhistanam of Brahman. Niradhistana vadha is called sunya vadha which is buddistic philosophy. If everything has to be negated there must be some saksi to talk about the negation of everything. Logically also we cannot accept the Purva Paksi argument. In 2.6.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad you cannot negate Brahman also. You negate everything and not Brahman. There are other statements also in support of our argument Brahman cannot be negated.

Now we will see the word for word analysis analysis of the sutra. Pratishedhati through the statement of neti neti in the negate word is there and all others we have to supply. Prakritaitavattvam only those two specific attributes mentioned in the section; cha means moreover; braviti bhuyah sruti clarifies this again; tathah thereafter.

Now we will go to significance of the words. Pratiseshati means negation; who egates is sruti and here sruti is understood. Neti neti is the vakyam 2.3.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The word hi is the emphasis to negate the Purva Paksi. Prakritataattvam only this specific two attributes and do not extend the Brahman the substance; this much refers to two specific attributes which are prakrita which occurs in the very section. That means murtha amurtha Brahmanam; murtha nama rupa Prapancha amurtha nama rupa Prapancha it negates and not the viseshyam Brahman. Sruti itself knows that there people who will misinterpret and therefore sruti itself clarifies the point. That attributes are to be negated as the lower reality and Brahman is to be retained as higher reality. World is to be negated as lower reality and Brahman has to be retained as higher reality and it is conveyed through sathyasya sathyam. Brahman is higher reality sustaining the lower reality mithya. A technical point you should remember is that whenever we talk of negation means it is not nonexistence of the world. The word negation means of a lower order of reality. It means the higher order exists in lower form. World is negated means world is mithya, the lower order of reality. You do not take the body as absolute reality. Negation means mithya and not nonexistence must be very clear. This is said in the same mantra 2.3.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad once again for clarity. It is mentioned as 'sathyasya sathyam'. There is one more point. When the sruti says that world is sathyam and Brahman is sathyasya sathyam, the sruti has used the word sathyam alone for both lower and higher order of reality and one may argue that word mithya has not been used in the sruti. Why do you convert sathyasya sathyam as mithya Prapancha sathyam. The world is called sathyam because of another reason. It is not used in the sense of reality. Sathyasya word is used for the world and here the word does not means the reality. Upanishad says murtham is called sat and amurtham is called thyam. The first sathyam is not the regular word reality and it is called murtha amurtha viseshanam. It is said Brahman is sathyam. The second sathyam is reality. First sathyasya does not mean the reality. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 5.pakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

*The neti-neti text explained.*

**Sutra 3.2.23 [341]**

***Tadavyaktamaha hi***

That [Brahman] is not manifest, for [so the scripture] says.

The character of Brahman is discussed.

A question can arise in the mind of a seeker after the first sutra. By neti neti vakyam sruti defines Brahman. Brahman is the only substance after the negation of murtha amurtha Prapancha. I am supposed to understand Brahman as the substance, which remains after the negation of all the attributes. What is left is attributesless Brahman that is reality. The problem is after negating everything there is no Nirgunam Brahman as a remainder. That is why some people said that there is such thing called Nirgunam Brahman at all. Therefore, how can you say unnegatable Brahman remains? For that Vyasacharya gives the answer. The unnegatable Brahman remains, as Nirgunam Brahman but you cannot objectify that. Because what is objectifiable is attribute. Yad drishyam tad gunah. Attributeless Brahman is there and if you do not see it is the nature of Brahman and it is avyaktam. Brahman remains nirguna and it is not objectifiable. Then one may ask if Brahman remains as remainder how do you say, it is there. Then Upanishad enjoys calling us ignorant and you cannot objectify Nirgunam Brahman and unfortunately or fortunately that Nirgunam Brahman is you, the yourself alone. It is unobjectifiable \. This is the essence of the sutra.

Tad means that Brahman; avyaktam means is not objectifiable; aha hi means sruti reveals this; now we will see the significance of the words. Tad means that Nirgunam Brahman unnegatable Brahman which remains as remainder after the negation of murtha amurtha Prapancha; avyaktam means in this context it is aprameyam, not available for any pramanam. It is pramana agocharam. Aha hi means because it is revealed in the sruti statement. The sruti vakyam is 3.1.8 of Mundaka; 3.9.26 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad and 1.1.6 of Mundaka Upanishad. You cannot grasp Brahman through any instrument of knowledge. Brahman can never be grasped. Nirgunam Brahman can be understood only in one way and that is claim without objectification that ' I am Nirgunam Brahman' in me alone the Nirgunam Brahman murtha amurtha mithya Prapancha exist. I am the only substance of the creation and the murtha amurtha Prapancha exist in me. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 261

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.23 [341]**

#### ***Tadavyaktamaha hi***

That [Brahman] is not manifest, for [so the scripture] says.

The character of Brahman is discussed.

We are in the sixth adhikaranam of the second pada of the third adhyaya named sadhadhyaya a chapter dealing with the sadhanas to gain Self-Knowledge. The second pada deals with Jivatma swarupam tvam padartha and Paramatma swarupam tat padhartha. They come under sadhana because only after analyzing the nature we can talk about the aikyam of these two. Therefore the word asi will be meaningful only if the word tat and tvam are properly understood. Otherwise, you will say Brahman keeping something in the mind and the student will think Brahman as something else. How can I be Brahman while I am only an embodiment of brama. Tat pada and tvam pada are sahdanam and asi pada vichara is sadhyam. In the first four adhikaranam Jivatma vichara was done by analyzing the various avasthas of Jivatma and establish that Jivatma is avasthatriya saksi. Now we have come to Paramatma vichara form 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam onwards. Is it endowed with any attribute? This question is being analysed here. In the scripture the glories and gunas of Paramatma are talked about. Whether we should take both or negate both or we should retain only one is the point that needs analysis. We say Paramatma substance part should be retained and attributes part should not be taken to account. Paramatma is therefore nirgunah. This is what we established in the fifth adhikaranam and in the sixt we deal with the question raised by Purva Paksi that guna and guni both should be negated. According to them sunyam is the ultimate substance neither Consciousness is there nor the attributes are there. In support of the neti neti vakyam and they interpret as one to the attributes and the other ;this is not there' first neti is guna nishedah and the next one dravya nishedah. Two netis refer to two forms of attributes. It is negation of two forms of attribute. One is a perceptible attribute and another is a subtle attribute. Tf it is not sunyavadha. If all attributes are negated and Brahman alone is attribteless Brahman for that Vyasacharya says tad avyaktam. The attributesless Brahman is not objectifiable. All our organs can identify the objectifiable objects and the ultimate Brahman is not available for objectifiable and not identifiable by the sense organs. Attributeless Brahman is not objectifiable and it does not means it is 'non-existent' but it is the subject, the absolute reality. Therefore, you are the Nirgunam Brahman and whatever you objectify happens to be the attribute. Substance is the subject, attributes are the objects, and the objective attributes can never belong to the subject. Therefore, Brahman is the nirguna subject. This he says in the sutra 2.

**Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]** [check once again with the original speech because there are some omissions. Not it at the time of editing.

The neti-neti text explained.

**Sutra 3.2.24 [342]**

***Api cha samradhane pratyakshanumanabhyam***

And moreover [Brahman is experienced] in devout meditation [as we know] from the sruti and the smriti.

Here Vyasacharya gives another support to establish that Brahman is not sunyam, the absence obtaining after negating everything. It is a possible substance. For this he talks about the wise person who tries to recognize Brahman by applying neti neti pramanam. Whatever he sees as murtha viseshanani and then in the mind there are varieties of thoughts and emotions and he negates all of them at the time of meditation. He then arrives at not the sunyam at all. Vedantic meditation is not suyam meditation; it is not a state of thoughtlessness. He arrives at Brahman as Consciousness which is the witness of all the negation, witness the absence of all the objects. When others say mind is blank but Vedantins says that mind is something other than Consciousness. the blankness is because of chaitanya jyoti and therefore Brahman is not sunyam but bhava rupa Chaitanyam. This is not my assumption and it is said in the Upanisads. They do not recognize sunyam but recognize jyoti. Jyoti means Chaitanyam or chaitanya jyoti. This has both sruti and smriti pramanam. One is from 2.1.1 of Kathopanisad. when he negates all the objects and turns inwards he recognizes the Chaitanyam that is the witness. The conclusion is that Atma is nirguna Chaitanyam and not sunyam. Adhi Sankaracharya gives another quotation Mundaka Upanishad not 3.1.8 that says when a man's mind has become purified by the serene light of knowledge then he sees Him, meditating on Him as without parts. Such a person with pure mind recognizes Chaitanyam. This does not mean objectifies but he subjectifies Paramatma and he claims Paramatma as I the Chaitanyam which does not require a thought to illumine it. It is because of that thoughts get illuminated.

He also gives Maha Bharata quotation. This says that he who is seen as light by the yogins meditating on Him sleeplessly with suspended breath with contented minds and subdued senses etc., reverence be to Him and 'the yogins see Him, the august eternal one. Here it is emphasized that attributes alone can be negated and never the substance, the subject or the Consciousness.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. The wise people recognize Brahman in meditation pratyakshanumaanabhyam as revealed by sruti and smriti. The significance of the words is api cha means moreover further support of Vedantic meditation; vidvad anubhavapramanam samradhane means in this context dhyanam; or the Vedantic meditation; this recognition is possible only if you recognize aham Brahma asmi at the time of sravanam. Otherwise meditation is of no use. Meditation cannot give new knowledge but re-live the knowledge gained at the time of sravanam. Pratyaksa anumanaabhyam it means sruti pramanam pratyaksa pramana does not require any proof and what is known by pratyaksam we don't ask for any other proof. Pratyaksa proof is final. Pratyaksa is considered primary proof, which does not require any other proof. Veda pramana is considered as primary proof. Veda pramana is considered as pratyaksa pramana and it does not require any other proof. What sruti tells I take it as fact and I do not hunt for any other proof? Anumanam refers to smriti pramanam. Sruti and smriti are dependent on any other pramanam. Smriti depends upon sruti pramanam. Anumanam inference always depends upon sruti. Logic is always

weaker than sruti and pratyaksa pramanam. Even the science has no reight to question Veda pramanam.

## **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

### **Sutra 3.2.25 [343]**

#### ***Prakasdivacchavaishyam prakasascha karmanyabhyasat***

And as in the case of [physical] light and the like, there is no difference, so also between Brahman and its manifestation in activity, on account of the repeated instruction [of the sruti to that effect].

The discussion on the character of Brahman is continued.

I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya quoted example of meditation to point out that Brahman is a positive entity and as the very Chaitanyam after the negation of everything else. This is Vyasacharya's approach. When he tries to handle the sunyavadhi some other Purva Paksi takes advantage of the argument. Now dvaidya philosopher takes advantage of this statement and attacks Vyasacharya from another angle. He says that you accept of mediators recognize Paramatma; Jivatma recognizes Paramatma. Jivatma knows Paramatma. It is clear that Paramatma is an object of recognition and Jivatma is subject of recognition and subject and object cannot be identical that proves Jivatma and Paramatma are different. One is the subject of knowledge and the other is object of knowledge. This is beda vadi's purva paksa. Here Vyasacharya that no doubt I made the statement. I use the very word Jivatma and Paramatma. I do say Jivatma and Paramatma are the same also. It appears as though I contradicting. I do accept the difference from vyavaharika or sarira dristi. Jivatma is murtha amurtha sarira avacchinna Chaitanyam. Jivatma is Consciousness enclosed in murtha amurtha sariram or Sthoola Sariram and Sookshma Sariram and karana sariram. Murtha amurtha Prapancha avacchinna sariram it is the Consciousness enclosed in murtha amurtha Prapancha avacchinna is the macro container. Seeing this in view I used the word Jivatma and Paramatma/ when I say the difference, I say Consciousness in micro container and Consciousness in macro container. Keeping that difference in mind I use two distinct words Jivatma and Paramatma. When I say that you the Jivatma the knower and Paramatma both are one and the same, at the time of equation I shift the vision. When I say aikyam I shift the vision to the content Chaitanyam, space contained within a pot micro container and space contained in huge macro container. I acknowledge the difference between the pot container and the space container. I remove the difference in another context. Vyavaharika dristya difference I focus and Paramarthika dristya identity I focus Vyasacharya says. When I ask you to bring a banana you bring a banana with the skin and when I say I ate one banana you take it that I have eaten only the banana and not the skin. Your discriminative intellect takes the right meaning taking the context. You do not take the vachyarth and you do not take the skin part but the banana part as the context requires. The word can refer to the totality and a word can refer to the part. When I ask you the cost of the hall, you take the whole hall. When I say I am seated in the hall, you never take the total hall, but a part of the hall. When I say this is the desk, desk refers to the whole desk. When I say the book is on the desk, I refer to the part of the desk. Jivatma can refer to the sarira or sariri the Chaitanyam and you have take the meaning in the context. The content Chaitanyam does not have the attribute of the

container. Content Chaitanyam does take the attribute of Chaitanyam. Chaitanyam within the micro and Chaitanyam within the macro both are attributeless. The light does not take the attribute the object with which it comes into contact. Light encounters the body but the body does not pollute light. The Consciousness within the micro container is small and Consciousness in macro container is big and how can you say small nirguna Chaitanyam and big Chaitanyam be identical. It is not micro Consciousness, Consciousness is small or big, the container alone can be small or big, and Consciousness is one entity in which small and big Consciousness exists. The attributes of the containers do not pollute or get associated with content Consciousness.

Prakasa is used twice in the sutra, the first one refers to regular light, and the second prakasa refers to the aboudhika prakasa the Chaitanyam. Cha means however; avaiseshyam Jivatma and Paramatma are identical prakasidivat like the light etc; prakasah cha and the Paramatma [is apparently different] karmani during the act of meditation. Abhyasat means this is known [through the repeated assertion] [of the oneness of the Jivatma and Paramatma. This is the running maning.

Now we will see the significance of the word. Parakasidvat when light appears in the small object, light seems to be of the diemension of the body. When light is associated with smaller object the light seems to be a dot. Therefore, prakasadhivat is light seemingly pluralistic and they are not different. Light coming out through a small hole and light coming out of the window are not different but apparently look different. Adhi means etc., etc., means Akasa dristanta. The difference is seen because of the size of the containers, the body to body in the case of Jivatma. Avaiseshyam means abedah, it means aiqyam between Jivatma and Paramatma. Between there is real aiqyam with seeming difference. Karmani refers to the meditative action, or the action of meditation. There is seeming difference bedah eva at the time of meditation we keep the difference in mind meditator is called from the standpoint of body the meditator status is not refers to the Consciousness. When I say meditator I keep the mind of Jivatma in view and when I say Paramatma the I keep Paramatma in macro entity Murtha Amurtha Prapancha. When I say the difference I kept the container in the mind and when I say aiqyam I keep in mind the content. When you cooperate with me you are the disciple and when you fight with me you are the Purva Paksi. Atma beda sahitah dhyana karmani. Abhyasat means you know the aiqyam from tat tvam asi maha vakyam. From this you find difference is superficial and identity between Jivatma and Paramatma is real.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 262

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.25 [343]**

#### ***Prakasdivacchavaishyam prakasascha karmanyabhyasat***

And as in the case of [physical] light and the like, there is no difference, so also between Brahman and its manifestation in activity, on account of the repeated instruction [of the sruti to that effect].

The discussion on the character of Brahman is continued.

We see the sixth adhikaranam of the second pada of the third adhyaya in which tat padha vichara or the Paramatma vichara is going on. We have completed neti neti vakyam of Brihadharayana upanishad. The two netis negate the attributes of Brahman. Sunyavadhis say that one neti negates attributes and the other the Brahman and they say sunyam is the ultimate reality. This view is objected to by the siddhanta in these sutras. We say two viseshanams are negated and Nirgunam, nirviseshanam Brahman is not negated. Having said this Vyasacharya confirms it by pointing out the experience of the wise people in meditation. He says the wise negate all attributes, Murtha Amurtha Prapancha and they do not arrive at sunyama but recognize nirvisesha Chaitanyam Brahman. They recognize it as saksi Chaitanyam. Up to this is the first topic. The last topic triggers another topic. Since Vyasacharya says jnanis recognize Paramatma as saksi Chaitanyam it is very clear that Paramatma is the recognized one and jnanis are recognisers, jnanis are knowers and Paramatma is known. The beda vada is the second topic. This topic commenced from sutra 25. Vyasacharya said that the jivatma and Paramatma beda is vyavaharika sathyam and not the absolute reality. One and the same Consciousness from micro angle is Jivatma the knower and the very same Consciousness from macro angle is the Paramatma the known. Remove the micro upadhi Jivatma is not the knower and remove the macro upadhi Paramatma is not known. Therefore knower known difference is vyavaharikam and not Paramarthikam. These two upadhis the micro and macro container will not pollute the Consciousness, the Consciousness being asangah. The Consciousness in the micro container is not polluted by the negative attribute of the individual and the Consciousness in the macro container is not tainted by the positive attributes of Paramatma. Neither good virtues nor the negative attributes go to pollute the Consciousness. Therefore bedah vyavaharika and abedah paramarthika. Duality is the relative truth and the nonduality is the absolute truth. Up to this we saw in the last class. This is further reinforced in the following sutra.

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**



The neti-neti text explained.

**Sutra 3.2.26 [344]**

***Ato'nantena tatha hi lingam.***

Therefore [the individual soul becomes one] with the Infinite for thus the scripture indicates.

The result of realization of Brahman is stated here.

It is confirmation of abedavada or aikyavada. Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam is reinforced. Since beda is incidental and vyavaharikam and abeda is real and Paramarthikam, jivatma and Paramatma aikyam alone should be taken as the teaching. This is supported by the sruti vakyam also. Tat tvam asi vakyam is repeated nine times in the Upanishad. There are indirect clues also that support the above statement. 3.2.9 of Mundaka Upanishad states the knower of Brahman is Brahman, this is possible only if jivatma and Paramatma are identical. They are identical and with ignorance I see the difference and with wisdom the difference goes away. Real difference will not go away by knowledge. This is the law like the watch and me. I am different and watch is difference. Wherever there is misconception, knowledge can remove the difference. Difference is erroneous perception and jivatma and Paramatma beda is vasthavam and abeda is vasthavam. There is another sruti vakyam 4.4.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad that Jivatma through knowledge becomes one with Brahman. Naturally the question comes if Jivatma becomes knowledge after knowledge before knowledge he was Brahman or not. Before knowledge also Jivatma was Brahman only. Being Brahman gains knowledge and becomes Brahman. He is Brahman all the time and becomes Brahman. If he is already Brahman why should he become Brahman. Being Brahman the thought he is not and knowing Brahman he claimed his Brahmanhood and the claiming is figuratively called becoming. Upanishad clearly says that we are all the time Brahman and the difference only the misconception and knowledge removes the misconception and we realize that we are Brahman. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Jivatma is identical with the limitless Paramatma. Lingam there is sruti statement tatha hi in support of this. This is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Athah means the reason given in the previous sutra. Jivatma is Consciousness, Paramatma is Consciousness, and from Consciousness point of view there is no difference. The difference is there from the point of view of attributes only. Attributewise difference also we cannot talk about. We cannot say god is pure nirguna Chaitanyam. There cannot be impurity on Nirgunam Brahman. If you say omniscience and attribute belong to the content Consciousness but they relate to Consciousness the container. Therefore prakasa tulyatena anantah means Paramatma; supply two words Paramatma Jivatmana aikyam; the identity of Jivatma and Paramatma should be accepted as truth. Tathahi means in support of that; to reinforce the aikyam there are indirect sruti pramanam. With this Vyasaacharya has reinforced the views of abedavada.

**Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

**Sutra 3.2.27 [345]**

***Ubhayavyapadesattvahikundalavat***

But on account of both [i.e., difference and non-difference being taught [by the sruti], the relation of the highest Brahman to the individual soul has to be viewed] like that of the snake to its coils.

These two sutras 27 and 28 relates to purva paksha sutras. A new philosopher is introduced who is not happy with advaيدا, abeda and aikya vadhas. He says that abedavadins commit a big mistake. He says advaidins do interpret Vedas in a balanced manner. He only takes some selected portions, which are very conducive to him and go goes on repeating them only. If you study Vedas comprehensively, you will find beda vakyams, dvaيدا vakyams also. You study Karma Kanda and you will find it to be full of Veda. The entire Karma Kanda is beda vada and if you come to jnana kandas, you find there are many many beda vakyams. 3.1.1 of mundakopanisad is one instance. Everywhere sruti talks of jiva knowing Paramatma and it is only because of knower, known difference. If you talk of Brahma jnani there is Brahman and jnani and tow are there. Aikyam merger into Brahman again presupposes duality. How can we ignore them? These beda vakyams should be given due importance. The problem with Advaidins is that they take Advaida vakyam and ignore dvaيدا vakyams. Dvaيدins take dvaيدا vakyams and turn a blind eye to the Advaida vakyams. None has impartial comprehensive look at the Vedas. If you have a balanced view, you should accept the sathya beda and accept sathya abeda since both are talked about by the Vedas. A balanced philosophy an objective philosophy matured philosophy should be beda abeda vadah. In fact vishistadvaidam is refined version of beda abeda alone. First accept both as sathyam is their view. Claiming one is unreal is wrong approach they say. Both should be sathyam. Once you agree to this fundamental premise, your next problem is how will you accept both as reality as there is logical contradiction. Both are opposite in nature. Accepting one is rejecting the other and they are like light and darkness and how can you accept both. Beda is revealed by sruti abeda is revealed by sruti. Now you try to handle the contradiction. He says that beda and abeda can be accommodated by having guna guni dristi or amsa amsi dristih. Seein one as attribute and the other as noun and oen as part and the other as whole is sensible view. Take Jivatma as the viseshanan of Paramatma or see the Jivatma as the part of Paramatma. One you have this vision, it will accommodate beda as also abeda. Attribute is neither totally different from substance nor is it totally identical with the subject. Attribute cannot exist separate from the substance. At the same time attribute is identical with the subject also. Both cannot be totally identical and at the same timer they are not totally different also. Jivatma is an attribute of Paramatma they are neither very different nor totally identical. Substance and attribute are both equally real. The relationship between the real substance and real attribute is beda abeda, dvaيدا advaidam. It is like the hand and individual. Is the hand identical with me or is the hand very different. Hand is not identical with me and if it be so, the weight of me will be the weight of the hand. Hand the amsa and individual amsi cannot be identical. At the same time, they are different also because a part cannot exist separate from the whole like Tamil Nadu and India. When we are born in Tamil Nadue we say we are Indian. Tamil nadu is not India because area of Tamil Nadu and India are different. There for beda abeda vada should be accepted. This is the beda abeda vada which was prevalent at Adhi Sankaracharya's time.

We will go to the general analysis of the 27<sup>th</sup> sutra. Vyasacharya gives two examples for guna guni or viseshana viseshya sambanda. You can take the example of dress and the colour and also man and the hand. Vyasacharya gives two different examples. The example he gives is the snake and the coil. The relationship between snake and coil is that coil is a part of the snake and it is part of the total snake. Both are related in amsa amsi sambanda. The second example he gives is the light and its luminosity or radiance. He uses the word prakasa and prakasa asrayah. The sun is nine crores miles away. The relationship between the sun and the sunlight? They are neither different nor are they identical. This is guna guni sambandah. With this we will see the sutra. I will give you the running meaning of the sutra.

Ubhayam vyapadesat means since the sruti tells ahikundalavat they are Jivatma and Paramatma are like or indeed like a snake and its coil. Snake is the amsi and coil is the amsa. Now we will see the significance of the word. Ubhayavyapadesat means there is sruti vakyam in support of both dvaiddam and Advaidam. One is 3.1.1 of Mundaka Upanishad and the other is tat tvam asi is 6.8.7 of Chandogya upanisad. Tu is the emphasis on Advaida. Ahikundalavat means the snake and the coil. Therefore Jivatma is an amsa of aparoksam. Paramatma is the ocean and Jivatma is the wave; Paramatma is the body and Jivatma is the cell. This is the example one. Now purva paksha continues with the second example in the next sutra.

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.28 [346]**

#### ***Prakasasrayavadva tejastvat***

Or like [the relation of] light and its substratum, on account of both being luminous. The relation between Brahman and the individual soul also is discussed.

Now we will do the general analysis of this sutra. We can take the example of prakasa and asraya that is the light and its source. Light can be taken as an attribute and the source the substance. If the sun is the substance and sunlight is attribute and their sambanda is beda abeda sambanda. Both are abeda and there is abeda identity between them because both are brilliant. Both of them are inseparable and identical and one is attribute and the other is the substance. Now we will do the word for word analysis. Va ir orajasasrataat thy are like the light and its source that is the Jivatma and Paramatma are like light and source both being luminous. We will see the significance of the words. Light and the lamps; praba and deepah. Source refers to the lamp. Tejastvat both being luminous, they are identical and different also. Jivatma is the beams and the source is Paramatma. As the beams are many Jivatmas are many in number. Instantaneous relation comes as the fire as also the sparks are sathyam. Beda abedah eva varthavyah. The answer we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 263

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.28 [346]**

#### ***Prakasasrayavadva tejastvat***

Or like [the relation of] light and its substratum, on account of both being luminous. The relation between Brahman and the individual soul also is discussed.

In this second pada the first four adhikaranam deals with tvam pada or Jivatma vichara and the last four adhikaranam deals with tat pada vichara or Paramatma vichara. Now we see whether tat pada refers to Sagunam or Nirgunam Brahman. We have seen that Sagunam is vyavaharika sathyam and it is Paramatma sathya Nirgunam Brahman. In this adhikaranam we established that Brahman is not suyam. Brahman is neither nigunam, nor Sagunam nor sunyam. It is combination of all the three. As an incidental topic in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya raises a question as whether Jivatma is different or non-different from Brahman. Jivatma Paramatma sambanda vichara is being discussed incidentally in this adhikaranam from 25<sup>th</sup> sutra onwards.

Purva Pakshi wants to say that we have to accept difference between jivatma and Paramatma because you talk about Jivatma knowing the Paramatma, which was said in sutra 24. The very idea of knowledge will presuppose the knowing Jivatma and the known Paramatma and therefore you accept the beda you, yourself and naturally the question comes as to why do you explain all abeda vakyams. From the standpoint of knowledge, there seems to be difference and from the standpoint of mahavakyam there is oneness and which one we should take it as correct. In this context beda abeda philosopher comes and suggests beda abeda vada combining both difference and oneness and this purva paksa is given in sutra 27 and 28 and he claims we should accept beda and dvaidam and also advaidam and only if we accept both only we accept the Veda fully. Therefore, he asks that we should accept beda abeda and accept the relationship between Jivatma and Paramatma and accept the fact that they are different beda abeda is contradictory relationship and this can be accepted by taking amsa and amsi relationship and part whole relationship should be taken. The part is neither totally identical with the whole nor it is very different from the whole. Alternatively, the light being the property and lamp being the substance and taken the relations between the property and substance is beda and abeda. The property is neither totally different from the substance nor the property is totally identical with the substance as is in the case of light and the brightness which is the property of the light. Why cannot you accept beda abeda sambanda. Accepting abeda by the Advaidins is totally not acceptable. If the Jivatma is different from the creator Paramatma and if the creature Jivatma is pratyaksam and also supported by pramana siddham as per sastram. Therefore it is improper and unfair approach to negate dvaidam as false, it cannot be false, and it is sathyam.

Vyasacharya answers this question in a small sutra.

## Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]

The neti-neti text explained.

### Sutra 3.2.29 [347]

#### *Purvavadvā*

Or [the relation between the two, i.e., jīva and Brahman is] as [given] before.

The two previous sutras express the view of bedabedavadins who maintain the doctrine of difference and non-difference. This sutra refutes the view of bedabedavadins and establishes the final truth, which has been declared in sutra 25 viz. That the difference is merely illusory and identity or non-difference is the reality.

The answer is simple. He says that you should accept abeda and not bedabeda and this abeda is talked about in sutra 25 and 26. Vyasacharya says as stated in the above two sutra abeda alone should be accepted and not bedabeda although bedabeda vadins establishes his point of view with strong supports. Adhi Sankaracharya gives his answer in more elaborate manner.

We give the answer in a roundabout way. Bedabeda vadi says beda is also sathyam. Abeda also sathyam because it is sastra pramana siddham. Therefore bedabedavadi's argument is whatever is pramana siddham is sathyam and therefore Jivatma is sathyam because pramana siddham; Paramatma is sathyam because pramana siddham; Jivatma beda is pramana siddham; Jivatma Paramatma aikyam is sathyam because of pramana siddham jivatma and Paramatma abeda is sathyam because pramana siddham. Pramana siddham means it is revealed by the sastra. Therefore it is sathyam. If you look at the same sastra Jivatma Paramatma beda is talked about in Mundaka 3.1.1 two birds mantra. Then we ask the question what does the sastra says in the next mantra. It says this Jivatma which is different from Paramatma [3.1.2 od Mundaka] suffers sorrows. It has pains and dukham. Sastra pramana talks about sorrow of the Jivatma. Is dukham pramana siddham or not is our question. We find that dukham is also pramana siddham. Two pramanas are one sastra pramana says jivah socchadi; it is not only sastra pramana siddham and it is also pratyaksa pramana siddham. I have sorrow need not be proved by sastram. It is our own pratyaksa anubhava siddham. Sorrow is also pramana siddham. This even nasthikas will agree. Five items are pramana siddham. Now I ask the beda abedavadi that according to you pramana siddham is sathyam and dukham or sorrow is a sathyam and all of them equally pramana siddham and all should be therefore equally sathyam. Dukham sathyam pramana siddhatvad Jivatma Paramatma beda abedavad. If all the five are sathyam because pramana sathyam, tell me whether all of them or sathyam and that sathyam is nithyam or not. If beda abedavadi says all are sathyam, if whatever is sathyam as nithyam and then you should accept all the five are nithyam which includes dukham. If all the five are nithyam at the time of moksa also Jivatma Paramatma beda abeda will continue including the dukham. According to your own argument that dukham will continue at the time of moksa also. If dukham continues in moksa it is not moksa. To avoid this problem then you should say yad sathyam tad anithyam. That dukham will go away in moksa. If you say that whatever sathyam is anithyam, all the five jivatma and Paramatma beda, jivatma and Paramatma abeda and dukha goes. Dukham alone is perishable in moksa says beda abeda vadis. It means if you want to keep dukham as anithyam and the other four as nithyam you will be forced to talk about two types of sathyams namely the first four are sathyam but they are nithya sathyam which will continue in moksa but dukham alone is sathyam a peculiar

type, the peculiarity will be different one. One is pramana siddhi sathyam negatable in moksa and the other is pramana siddha sathyam which is not negatable in moksa. That alone we say that one is of lower order of reality anithya sathyam and dukham comes under the lower order of reality even though it is sathyam because dukham goes away in moksa. However, Paramatma will to go away in moksa. You accept lower reality and higher reality the vyavaharika sathyam and Paramarthika sathyam even they are talked about in the sastra. You have to be partial. How can you compare dukham and god equally and then dukham will be as permanent as god. Dukham has to be vyavaharika sathyam and the other four have to be Paramarthika sathya. Now beda abeda vadi says that I can accept the lower order of reality. Dukham is inferior reality or vyavaharika sathyam because it goes away in moksa. Once I accept vyavaharika sathyam and you quietly change it into mithya. It is the word mithya that disturbs me. Once the rope snake comes into picture, I am frightened. Why are you adamant and particular about the word mithya? This is the argument of beda abeda vadi. Advaidins say I am not interested in the word mithya. I want to convey the concept and you find out the appropriate word. We say dukham is lower order of reality but negatable at the time of moksa. How is the dukham is negated. Sorrow is negatable and it is of a lower order of reality and how is sorrow negated is our question. We also use karma or action to eliminate something. Action is required to eliminate anything. Karma badhyam is the normal thing to eliminate a thing. I approach dukham also in the same way and what action is required to remove sorrow. What should I do to remove sorrow? Sastra gives a unique solution and it says sorrow is not eliminated by karma and it is eliminated by jnanam. It is a unique thing. Normally anything is eliminated by an action but here dukham is eliminated by jnanam. Thus we get a second important information that dukham is of lower order of reality and it is negatable by knowledge. Negatable by knowledge is vyavaharika sathyam. Mithya only means that which is of lower order of reality and that which can be eliminated by knowledge and therefore dukham is vyavaharika sathyam and it is mithya. Mithya means I want to convey that it goes away by knowledge. Dukham must come under that category which is removable by the knowledge. Jnanam alone eliminates sorrow which is lower order of reality or vyavaharika sathyam. I find the rope snake example is right because rope snake is eliminable by knowledge. So also dukha is removable by the knowledge. During moksa it never exists so we call it lower order of reality. Now bedabedavadins argue that I am willing to accept dukham as mithya. Brahman should not come under the knowledge eliminable lower order of reality. He says that he can accept dukham as mithya but why do you say beda is mithya is the argument of bedabedavadins. Once you say Dvaidam as mithya it is disturbing proposition. Only now we have to extend it to bedah also. Our argument is yatra yatra bedah tatra tatra dukham. Beda and dukham are synonymous and they are inseparable pair. Both coexist and it is sruti yukti pramanam. Wherever beda the second thing there is fear and fear causes dukham. Beda means dukham sruti reveals. Logic also reveals that wherever there is division there is mortality and wherever there is mortality there is sorrow. Anubhava also proves that beda and sorrow are synonymous. In jagrat avastha there is beda and pains and the same thing is there in swapna also. Even the happiness experienced in beda is refined form of potential sorrow only. In duality there are only two types of sorrow one is present sorrow and the other is potential sorrow. Sushupti avasthayam in deep sleep abedah anandah. Sushupti avasthayama abedah suganca. If dukham is knowledge eliminable lower order of reality alone. If beda survives dukham cannot go away. One set of pramana siddham is sathyam and another is mithya. Jivatma, Paramatma and abedah will come under pramana siddha sathya vasthu. Knowledge eliminable lower order of reality is bedah and dukham. If it is not mithya, we will cry and have dukham even if get liberated and go to vaikunta. Mithya beda sathya abeda sambandhah or vyavaharika beda Paramarthika abeda sambandhah. Suppose bedabeda vadi says that alone I also say, then you bless them with all goodness. You

cannot call both Jivatma and Paramatma are sathyam. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Va means in fact; they are to be taken as non-different as mentioned before. This is the running meaning.

The significance of the word is purvavat means as before or as mentioned in sutra 25 and 26 abeda alone should be accepted. Jivatma Paramatma abeda alone should be accepted. Va means in fact or really. This is the approach. With this bedabeda vadha kandanam is over. This is reinforced in the next sutra.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 264

### **Topic 5.Prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.29 [347]**

##### ***Purvavadva***

Or [the relation between the two, i.e., jia and Brahman is] as [given] before.

After dealing with the Jivatma swarupam from 5 adhikaranam onwards Paramatma swarupam is established as Nirgunam Brahman only. It is neither Sagunam nor is it sunyam as contended. Further it is also discussed the relationship between jivatma and Paramatma. Vyasacharya points out here that relationship is jivatma and Paramatma aikyam alone. Thereafter a purva paksa was considered who being bedabeda vadhi. Purva paksa was presented in sutra 27, 28, 29, and 30 Vyasacharya refutes the purva paksa and establishes abedavadha. We completed sutra 29 in the last class. No doubt sastra talks about beda and abeda and samsara dukham has to be taken and dukham is also will become sathyam and will become eternal and in moksa also dukham will continue alongwith others. One will be liberated and the other un-liberated. This is not possible. In moksa dukham should not be there if moksa has any meaning to gain. Chaitanyam should be given such a reality that is not negatable. Such a stand alone is called Advaidam. This is the conclusion we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 5.prakritaitavattvadhikaranam [sutras 22-30]**

The neti-neti text explained.

#### **Sutra 3.2.30 [348]**

##### ***Prtishedhaccha***

And on account of the denial.

Sutra 29 is confirmed. The sruti in fact expressly denies separateness.

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Bedabedavadi said that we should give equal status to both beda and abeda. Purva paksa's contention was that both should be given equal status because both are talked about in the sastram. You should be impartial and not have discrimination of any kind. For that Advaidins say that I have to discriminate because Veda makes discrimination between beda and abeda. It does not treat them equally. No doubt, Vedas talk about beda and later abeda. In the beginning, both are given equal importance. However, in the condition Veda negates beda but never negates abeda. When Vedas introduced abeda but never negates abeda. The difference we make is that since beda



introduced and negated it is of lower order of reality. But abeda is not subject to introduction and negation. The example is given in Antaryami Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad [nanyo dosti mata 3.7.,23 where it is said that there is no experiencer Jivatma separate from Paramatma. In fact Paramatma alone is in Jivatma vesham just as the waker enters the dream and becomes a dream experiencer thus very clearly Upanishad says that there is Jivatma separate from Paramatma. Therefore beda and abeda should not be treated equally. We do not say beda is non-existent but we say beda is there but it relates to vyavaharika sathyam or mithya which is negated ultimately.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Pratishethat ca; because of the negation of the difference also [they are to be taken as before] now we will see the significance of the words. Pratishethat because of the negation of that between beda and abeda, beda part alone is negated and not abeda. Beda is like scaffolding, which is carefully placed but because of the scaffolding is carefully introduced; we cannot hold it on when the ceiling is set. Similarly, Dvaidam introduces that for establishing Advaidam and on realization of Advaidam Dvaidam will be removed like scaffolding of the building under construction. This is in addition to the reasoning given in the previous sutra. With this, this adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.31 [349]**

#### ***Paramatah setunmanasambandha bhedavyapadeschhyah***

There is something superior to the Brahman on account of terms denoting a bank, measure, connection and difference used with respect to it.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with seven sutras. The topic of this adhikaranam is about bedavadhah which is the seed for Dvaida darsanam. The difference between bedabeda vada and beda vadi is this. First one accepts both equally. But bedavadi does not accept abeda at all. He does not accept jivatma and Paramatma aikyam at all. He does not agree that Jivatma is a part of Paramatma. He says Jivatma is a different entity. He also takes the support of the same Veda alone. Vyasacharya will refute and establish abeda in this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the first sutra. This is purva paksha sutram. He says Jivatma and the world should be very different from Paramatma. Everything is different and nothing can be identical with another. Jivatma is Atma and Paramatma is Atma and still they are different. Similarly Jivatma and jagat are different. Isvara jagat bedah. Everything is different. In moksha also Jivatma will be jiva in vaikunta and Isvara will be Isvara in kailasa or in the heaven. Everywhere difference is there. But ananda is the same everywhere.

In this sutra Vyasacharya shows four places where distinctions are accepted. Setu unmana sambandha and beda because of these four portions the beda is established. Setu means a bund which is constructed out of mud between two pieces of cultivated land so that water from one area will not cross over to the other portion of the land. This comes in mantra 8.4.1 of Chandogya upanisad. This controls the dharma of the people. Here water is dharma or the

cause of the universe is water that is maintained by the Lord. The moment there is violation Bhagavan has his own method of adjusting the population. That is called dharma sethu, the protector of dharma. Wherever there is bund or wall there should be something to be protected. It is meant to protect the water from flowing out. There is protector and protected water. Isvara is the protector and dharma etc., is the one that is protected. Jivatma comes under protected. It is very clear tha jivatma and Paramatma are different one is the sethu the protector and other things are protected.

Next the sastra talks about the size of both Paramatma and Jivatma. This occurs in mantra 4<sup>th</sup> chapter section 5 to 8 and Brahman or Paramatma is talked about having four padams. This means Paramatma has the size. The reaching Paramatma also implies the location of Paramatma. Chatuspad etc., is the measurement of Paramatma. Similarly, Jivatma also has been given the measurement in 5.8 of Svetasvara Upanishad. Both Paramatma as also jiva have got the measurement. The fact that Jivatma has to reach Paramatma shows that both jivatma and Paramatma have got the measurement and also the location and the size.

The third one is sambandah or the relationship. Thre relationship is talked about the Jivatma and Paramatma and Paramatma and the world. Where the relationship is talked about there is difference between Jivatma and Paramatma. Refer to mantra 6.8.1 of Chandogya upanisad in this regard. Jivatma resolves into Paramatma during sleep. This means laya adharam and adhara adhaya sambandha. The locus of merging and the merging refers to relationship between Jivatma and Paramatma. Similarly, the relationship between Paramatma and the universe is talked about in mantra 2.3.1 Kathopanisad. All the lokas rest on Bhagavan. Bhagavan is supporter and the world is supported.

The fourth occasion is at very places beda is mentioned. The Paramatma is said to be the illuminator of the whole world. How can the illuminator and illumined be identical. How can Consciousness and matter be ever identical. Therefore beda vyapatesepyah and therefore Dvaidam alone is ultimate truth. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Param means there are categories [which are different] atah means from that Brahman or Paramatma. Sethumanasambadhah bhedavyapadesah this is implied truth; the word that reveals the banks [river banks] measure relationship and difference. This is known by these words that Paramatma and Jivatma are different. Vyapadesat means words. Unmana means measure.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Param means difference' atah means Paramatma or Brahman; other than Paramatma other categories are there. Brahman alone is there is Advaidam; beda says that there are other things are there which are Jivatma and universe.

## **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

**Sutra 3.2.32 [350]**

***Samanyattuy***

But [Brahman is called a bank etc.] On account of similarity.

The objection raised in the preceding sutra is refuted here.

Purva paksa gave a long sutra. Vyasacharya gives the reply in a small sutra. He says whenever beda gives an example you should find out as to how much the example should be extended. Here Veda has compared Paramatma to a bund or a bank. If you are going to extend it to too much bund is limited and Paramatma also will be limited. The limitation part should not be extended. Here bund is inert in nature and if you extend like this you will find Paramatma is also inert or jadam. The example does not refer to finite measurement. The finitude of bund should not extend to Paramatma. This is the idea and samanya means take to the general nature and not to the uncommon features.

Now we will see the word for word analysis analysis of the sutra. Because of the similarity Brahman is referred to as a bank or a bund. Now we will see the significance of the words. Samanya means similar features and all features will never be same between the example and the original and then the example will be the original. All Vedantic examples are extended too much. If I give you the example of screen and movie you should take only the screen and the movie. You should not extend the example to the presence of the projector etc. The example is given only to show that the adhistanam of the movie characters is the screen on which the characters appear and the characters will not be there in the absence of the screen. You should not be fault finder but take the example in the spirit in which the example is given.

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.33 [351]**

#### ***Buddhyarthah padavat***

[the statement as to Brahman having size] is for the sake of easy comprehension [i.e., Upasana or devout meditation just like [four] feet.

Here Vyasacharya negates the second example given by the purva paksa. The measurement given to Jivatma as anu and the measurement given to Paramatma the chaturspad. Vyasacharya says again you have to see the context. The context here is Upasana. In Upasana context we find such things. In Chandogya upanisad the whole thing is there in the Upasana portion. From first to fifth chapter of Chandogya upanisad talks about the Upasana. If you study the vedic portion, the Veda says that four padas are the parts of various creation and it is a figurative expression that everything is included in Paramatma and nothing is away from Paramatma. Do not take the padas of Paramatma literally. The word anu also should not be taken literally. Anu means it is not available for objectification. It does not refer to size but it refers to un-objectification.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 265

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.33 [351]**

#### ***Buddyarthah padavat***

[The statement as to Brahman having size] is for the sake of easy comprehension [i.e., Upasana or devout meditation just like [four] feet.

Here Vyasacharya discusses the relationship between jivatma and Paramatma. Jivatma swarupam and Paramatma swarupam happens to be the same. Vyasacharya takes to some other philosopher who talks differently on the subject. Bedabeda vadi was refuted first and later in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya refutes bedavadi. Previous philosopher says that relationship is identity in difference is the view of bedabedavada. The present philosopher does not accept identity at all and he says that there is eternal difference between jivatma and Paramatma, Jivatma and jagat and jagat and aparoksam. All mahavakyams should be interpreted in such a way that the identity is figurative. This is the argument of the beda vadis. They says tat tvam asi is only part of the full sentence. They argue Atma tat tvam asi svetaketu and in sanskriti you should interpret it is Atma atat tvam asi. Never split it as tat tvam asi but split it as atat tvam aso. Thus wherever aikyam is mentioned, it should be taken figuratively and beda alone is sathyam. This bedavada existed during and before Adhi Sankaracharya time. Madhvacharya crystallized this view. It is this beda vada is criticized. Brahman is as if a bund protects the world. Unmanah sastra talks about the size of Jivatma and Paramatma. Paramatma is described as chaturpad Paramatma with four padas. This is a limited factor of Paramatma. Jivatma is of the size of anu. Then the relationship is talked about between Jivatma and Paramatma, the world and Paramatma, jagat and Jivatma, protector protected sambanda is talked about. Then the clean difference is talked about. Because of these four, you have to accept beda. Vyasacharya has refuted the bank or bund expression quoted by beda vadins. Supported and supporter relationship does not prove the ultimate truth of reality. This is possible between sathyam and mithya also. Waker is supporter and dream is the supported. If beda vadi says that I talk about apparent duality, we will say it is all right. The word sethu is there, two birds are there and they represent vyavaharikam and not the absolute reality. Vyasacharya answers the unmana sabda as to what about Paramatma having four padas. Vyasacharya says that all forms, shapes etc., are given only for the sake of meditation because the beginners to the Veda classes cannot understand Nirgunam Brahman. Even the scholars are not able to accept the nature of Nirgunam Brahman what to talk of the beginners. For the sake of beginners, sruti comes down and talk of Sagunam Brahman for the sake of teaching the Nirgunam Brahman concept. Chatuspat Brahman is for the purpose of Upasanam only. This methodology of teaching is not new to Veda. Vada uses the pada expression in other places also. 3.18.1 of Chandogya upanisad and 3.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad it is said you meditate upon the mind or the space as Brahman. After introducing the two meditation, the Upanishad talks about chatuspad manah. Mind has got four feet, vak. Prana cakshu and strotram, organs of speech, prana,eyes, ears; similarly

Akasa has got four feet Agni, Vayu, adhithya sun and dik the quarters. These four are supposed to be akasasya chatuspasyam. Vyasacharya asks do you feel that Akasa has got four feet. These expressions are figurative only and the four expressions should not be taken in the primary meaning but the figurative meaning. It is as though the mind functions with the help of the four organs. In the Akasa all the four exists as though four parts. Do not be carried away by the expression of padas. The world cannot exist away from Brahman just as the dream world cannot exist away from the dreamer. Pada amsa etc., means 'as though'. The Upanishad considers these and do not hold on to them after gaining jnanam and realize the meditator is Brahman. This is the significance of the sutra.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Buddhyarthah means four padas are mentioned for Brahman for the sake of Upasana' padavat means of like that of the mind and the space. Buddhi means Upasana in this context. Arthah means for the sake of Upasana. Padavat means like the four padas mentioned elsewhere. Here the example is chatuspad mana and Akasa. Chatuspad mana and Akasa are example and chatuspad Brahman is the topic here.

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.34 [352]**

#### ***Sthanavisheshat prakasadivat***

[the statements concerning connection and difference with respect to Brahman] are due to special places; as in the case of light and the like

Sutra 33 is further confirmed.

In this sutra Vyasacharya refutes the other two expression given by the bedavadis. Now the sambandha and beda expressions are refuted in this sutra. Here purva paksa says scripture talks about relationship between Jivatma and Paramatma. Creator created; meditated and meditator; protector and protected relationship are mentioned but here we see the knower and known relationship. Any relationship proves duality and therefore we must accept duality. Not only it indirectly proves duality but sastra directly talks about duality. Sambanda indirectly talks about beda and beda directly talks about beda. For this Vyasacharya says that sastra does talks about duality and relationship as intermediary step of teaching. Even Advaidins starts the class with puja but we say it is vyavaharika bedah or mithya bedah and it is accepted temporarily as a stepping stone. It is lower order of reality like the differences in the light. Undivided light seems to be divided because some media of manifestation. Once you keep a mirror in front of sun you see reflected and the other direct sunlight. Now, the question is what is the relationship between the two. Now I say the original sun is cause and the other one is the effect. The reflected sunlight cannot exist independent of itself without the adhistanam which being the original sunlight. Hence, reflected sunlight is called mithya and the original the sathyam. Bimba Surya is different from pratibimba Surya. There is 'seeming difference' and not actual difference. It is mithya bedah. Seeming difference caused by the medium of manifestation. Gatakasa pot space matakasa the room space are seemingly different. One can accommodate one litre of milk and the other can accommodate any amount of milk. The difference between them is caused by the manifestation. Similarly, Jivatma is Consciousness and Paramatma is also Consciousness but there is no difference

between them essentially but there is 'seeming difference' caused by the medium of manifestation, which in the case is various upadhis like Body Mind Complex. The differences are only the medium of manifestations. If the medium is of superior type, we call it Paramatma and when it is inferior, we call it Jivatma. If you do not understand this, you go on practising and you will know this ultimately.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Sthanavisheshat means the difference in relationship between jivatma and Paramatma are mentioned because of the medium of manifestation; prakasativat as in the case of light etc.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Sthanavisheshat means upadhi [the medium of manifestation and the manifestation here means Consciousness] viseshat means medium; Jivatma has got inferior micro cosmic medium called sariratriyam; whereas Paramatma has got superior macrocosmic medium of Prapanchatriam. Through the medium you will have distorted version. One is visva, taijasa prajna jiva and this jiva has inferior attributes. Whereas the second distorted version is called virad, Hiranyagarbha and Antaryami rupa Paramatma. The group is called Isvara. Jivatma as also Paramatma have inferior attribute and superior attributes re there because original attributes do not have any attribute inferior or superior. Isvara is useful up to the moksa paryantam. After moksa when jnani goes to God, it is not for getting and it is not even getting moksa but to convey one's gratitude to God for blessing him. Jnani does puja to god only to thank the God for giving the opportunity to be one with God. I do archana seeking the non-forgetfulness, which is vyavaharika requirement. Worship god a vyavaharika puja for vyavaharika requirement of non-forgetfulness of Paramarthika fact that I and god are one. Sthana visesha means the particular medium which distorts and because of the distortion there is seeming beda and seeming sambanda also. From Paramarthika dristya Jivatma is neither karyam nor Isvara is karanam. The Advaita prakaranam of Mandukya establishes this only. In the mirror example there is seeming division. Prakasa adhvivat means akasah etc. Like space pot space is produced out of total space; pot space is karyam and total space karanam and they are only expression pot alone is product and pot space is never a product.

## **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

### **Sutra 3.2.35 [353]**

#### ***Upapattescha***

And it is reasonable

All the four expressions quoted by purva paksa have been reconciled. Veda is source of knowledge and we have to reconcile every word. The reconciliation is beda is seeming and abeda is a fact. Bedavadi says abeda is seeming and beda is a fact. Advaitam is fact Dvaidam is figurative we say. Which one we should take is our problem. Both of them are not better off because both take one as a fact and another a fiction. Vyasacharya asks us to use our own intellect to judge which is right and which is wrong. Do not accept everything because it is old or it is new. Anything is possible old may be good new may be wrong or otherwise. Intelligent people use their intelligence before coming to the conclusion. If everyone says he is logical, you should use your intellect to come to your own conclusion. If Jivatma is

eternally different from Paramatma, you will always be away from Paramatma. Sastra talks about beda and pratyaksa pramanam reveals beda. They must be taken as sathyam and sathyam must be eternal and therefore difference must be eternal. We have already given the argument in bedabeda kandanam. If beda has to be sathyam and eternal because of experience and sastra vakyam, sorrow also must be true and eternal because sastra talks about dukham of Jivatma. Sastra clearly says Jivatma is different from Paramatma and Jivatma grieves. If Jivatma is different from Paramatma in vaikunta or kailasa, Jivatma will continue to suffer there also. If one argues grief goes or it is not ultimate reality in moksa grief will go away. If it is a fact, it will not go in moksa. In the same way beda also goes away or has to go away. A bound person cannot be happy however noble the chain of bondage may be. As long as you are dasa whether you are dasa of an MLA or president or Bhagavan Narayana, dasatvam is smallness and you cannot talk about freedom as a dasa. It is proved and experienced. If you say I will be dasa of the Bhagavan, I have nothing to tell you. My intelligence does not accept freedom and emotional problems. How can I have happiness when several people share the blessings of God. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 266

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.35 [353]**

#### ***Upapatteschā***

And it is reasonable

If we have to understand the central teachings of Vedanta we have to enjoy a prepared mind to grasp the teaching. This mindset we can get only if we remember certain fundamental teaching or fundamental principle. Vedanta presents moksa as the goal. Moksa is defined as dukha nivrutti purvah sukha praptri, the attainment of purnatvam preceded by the removal of apurnatvam. The next important text we have to gather which is toughest nut to crack is the dukham is treated as synonymous with Dvaidam. Dukham and beda are to taken as synonymous and if this truth is not understood, Vedanta will not make any sense. If not done there will be lot of emotional problems also. We should know that dvaidam is dukham. We should convince our intellect that dvaidam is dukham. First sruti says in Chandogya upanisad that Bhuma alone is sukham and abhuma is dukham. [7.24 if Chandogya upanisad]. If Bhuma is sukham and alpam is dukham, what is definition of Bhuma and then Sanatkumara gives the definition. Bhuma means absence of duality. Bhuma means Advaidam. Bhuma means abedah. Nondulaity, advaidam is sukham. Where there is duality is alpam; where there is finitude there is mortality; where there is mortality there is discomfort and where there is discomfort there is sorrow. Yukti also reveals the fact. Where there is mortality there is fear and dukham. The fear is the end of favourable conditions we enjoy and the happiness affects us and creates fear in us. This is the fear of losing the condition we are supposed to enjoy. The intelligence will pose a question that the whole world is dukham and how can you sweep aside the dvaidam as dukham when world is a mixture of sukham and dukham. If all Dvaidam is dukham, how do you account for the dvaida sukham. Dan intelligent one will see the exception as why the exception prove otherwise. Therefore the exception is how do you say all dvaidam is dukham. For this the answer is dvaida sukham is sukha abasah. It is a seeming sukham and it is a sukham of a non-thinking or immature person. Every sukham is sukha abasa because every dvaida sukham has got superficial coating of sukham and behind sukha abasa is dukham caused by the loss of dvaidam. Sukham in Dvaidam is defined as dukham hidden in sukham coating. Vedanta to accept and assimilate that Dvaidam is dukham. One is direct dukham and the other is sukha abasa dukham. Unless this is done the seekers of Vedanta cannot understand Vedanta. Even if there is sukham, the end of the object is the source of pleasure. When the contact of sukham ends it is dukham. If one says that I don't mind dvaida dukahm and I am satisfied with sukha abasah, Vedanta says that you are not a candidate for jnana kanda. For them our advice is that you go to Karma Kanda. One cyou assimilate the fact, then I can talk about sukham. Therefore moksa must be defined as dvaida nivrutti. Any dvaida results in problem, fear etc. Remember dvaida quarrel whether it is sacred or divine also is problem. If you visualize moksa with Lord sitting as person, and people residing there also will have probnlem who should be near the Lord, who does service



to Lord, who should serve to lord and who is senior liberated person and who is the junior etc. All the problems will be there. You will find the divine Dvaidam or nondivine Dvaidam and all should end in moksa. It should be understood as dvaida nivrutti and dvaida is not an absolute nivrutti. That Dvaidam should not be absolute reality, if Dvaidam is sathyam it will continue in moksa then dukham also will continue. Advaidins say dvaidam is mithya and mithya ends in moksa. Therefore Dvaidam is mithya and beda is mithya and Advaidam is sathyam and abeda is sathyam. Vedanta talks about both and we should take one is sathyam and the other is mithya. Do not take both beda and abeda equally. All the vakyams in Veda that talk about beda is anuvada vakyam and all that talk about abeda is sathyam. Sethu, unmana, sambanda and beda all talk about Dvaidam and do not argue that therefore it is sathyam. It is mithya. It is vyavaharika sathyam. It is relative reality. Swapna is relative reality; jagrat is relative reality; vaikunta is relative reality. You can have any number of relative reality. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. Upapatteschha means from the reasoning also [this is the conclusion]. The significance of the word upapattihi means reasoning; you should not blindly take all the vakyams in the Veda equally; it talks about beda sambanda, abeda sambanda bedabeda sambanda and you should not talk all of them equally but use your intelligence before taking the right view. . From the reasoning also we come to beda is aupathikam. Differences are non factual. Cha means also. Because another support Vyasacharya gives in the next sutra.

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.36 [354]**

#### ***Tathanyapratishedhat***

Similarly on account of the express denial of all other things [there is nothing but Brahman]

Further sruti denies expressly that there is any other entity besides Brahman. [Brahmavedam sarvam; atmaivedam sarvam] Brahman is described as the innermost of all.

Suppose you are not confident about reasoning, beda vakyam and bedabeda vakyam, abeda vakyams whether all the statements should be taken equally or not is our question. Can we give all the three equal status? If one should be given better status each is the best one. Veda itself helps us to select the best. It introduces all the three and negates all other than Advaidam. Dvaidam is negated specifically and Advaidam is never followed by the negation of Advaidam. How can you treat negated Dvaidam and unnegated Advaidam on equal footing. Nega nanaci kincana [kathopanisad] neti neti in Brihadharaynaka upanisad; there is no Akasa there is bhumi etc., in kaivalya Upanishad. There are endless statements that negate Dvaidam. This is the essence of this sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of this sutra. Taha means moreover; anyapratishedhat since a second thing is negated by the sruti, difference is not acceptable. This is the running meaning. The significance of the meaning is tatha means moreover; previously logic is given and here sruti pramana is given in support of Advaidam. Anyapratishedhad means a second thing; bedah in general; pratishedhat means negation.

Negation is done in different ways directly and indirectly. Whichever deity you meditate upon that is not final truth. In Upasana you dwell upon the Lord. Vedanta gives a violent jolt yad Upasana is not the ultimate truth. Vedanta does not say Upasana is useless. Vedanta says Upasana has to take you up to a level. A time should come for you to come to that knowledge yad drishyam tad mithya including the objectified Bhagavan. Objectified Bhagavan is vyavaharika sathyam only. Bhagavan must be aham Brahma asmi. Until you understand this, you do not reach your goal. Dvaidam is meant for enjoyment up to the level of moksa and for gaining moksa you have to realize Advaidam through knowledge. Dvaidam is delusion before knowledge; once knowledge is attained through enquiry, you revive Dvaidam and with the knowledge you realize that Dvaidam is relative reality and the taste of Advaida bhakti has got a different taste that you will realize only if you feel it. Advaida increases love. Therefore one need not be afraid of Advaidam and you will be better person in the field of reality. Another indirect method of seeing is that whoever sees duality is an ignorant one. Duality is seen ignorant person means duality is not a fact and Advaidam is sathyam and duality is mithya. Now comes the last sutra.

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

#### **Sutra 3.2.37 [355]**

#### ***Anena sarvagatatvamayamasabhadibhyah***

By this the omnipresence [of Brahman is established] in accordance with the scriptural statements regarding [Brahman's] extent.

First I will give you general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that whoever takes duality as reality in localized Brahman or Lord, their concept of god will be something located somewhere. Other than Advaidins all will localize Lord. He will verbally say anantaya nama and Advaidins alone will see the full meaning of ananta. The thought of Lord being located will not go from the bedavadhis. Once Bhagavan is localized moksa will require a journey requiring a special path. There in vaikunta will be a great crowd with path being small number of people to enter will be more. Once Bhagavan is localized journey is involved and moksa will be a product in time. It will never be a fact obtaining now. Advaidin alone can avoid this and all other people can never avoid this trap. Bhagavan is everywhere and then why should you go anywhere to pray him. Therefore Vyasacharya says in sutra in Dvaidam mithyatvam alone is sathyam and only in Advaidam alone Brahman is all pervading and there is no second thing. You cannot say if this cannot be avoided then Brahman is not all pervading. You cannot do so also because sruti clearly say that Brahman is all pervading. All pervading Brahman can be accommodated only if Dvaidam is not a fact.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Anena means by this sarvagatatvam; the all pervasiveness of Brahman; is also explained. Ayama sabdadibhyah means [all pervasiveness is known] from the words which reveal the extent of Brahman. This is the running meaning. Now will see the significance of the words. Anena means only by this Adhideivam sathyam and Dvaidam mithya; only by seeing the reality of Advaidam and mithyatvam of Dvaidam; all pervasiveness of Brahman will be established. If Bhagavan is one of the things, Bhagavan can never be all pervading. Ayama sabha means the size the extent measurement, the pervasion; there are many words in sutra. Sarva gatham is there

Mundakopanisad; sarvagathasthanu is there in the Gita [2.24]. Sarvagatha sabdah etc. With this the seventh adhikaranam is over; beda vadha kandanam is also over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 267

### **Topic 7.paradhikaranam [sutras 31-37]**

Brahman is one without a second

**Sutra 3.2.37 [355]**

***Anena sarvagatatvamayamasabhadibhyah***

By this the omnipresence [of Brahman is established] in accordance weith the scriptural statements regarding [Brahman's] extent.

With this 37<sup>th</sup> sutra we have completed the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. We have seen that the second pada is devoted to tat pada and tvam pada artha of maha vakyam Tat Tvam asi. Of this in the first ten sutras tvam padhartha was analysed and it was pointed out that the primary meaning of tvam is saguna Chaitanyam the Consciousness with varieties of attributes especially inferior attributes which are caused by sarira thriyam. Tvam padha lakshyartha is Nirgunam Brahman and this arrived at by understanding the fact that the Consciousness is asangah, relationless and it cannot take any attribute just as space cannot take any attributes. Chaitanyam cannot be Sagunam and it is caused by misconception and it for the ignorant people who have not understood the nirguna Chaitanyam. From the standpoint of those people who have understood the nature of creationm know that tvam refers to Nirgunam Brahman which is intimately associated with body but not understood by the person. It does not have any of the three karmas. Even the idea of exhausting prarapta is a misconception. When Chaitanyam has not kartrutvam there is no question of any karma and when there is no karma there is no question of exhausting the praraptam. There is no question of jnani exhausting prarapta because jnani knows that he is nirguna Chaitanyam. From the 11<sup>th</sup> sutra up to 24<sup>th</sup> sutra, tat pada lakshyartha was pointed out and it is the Consciousness without any attribute. The definition of Brahman Chaitanyam is incapable of any attribute and therefore Sagunam Brahman is a misconception. Sruti itself negates all attributes from Paramatma, therefore Paramatma is not ubhaya lingam, and Paramatma is only nirgunatmagam. Saganatvam is a brama. Tat padhartha reveals nirguna Chaitanyam and therefore there are no attributes between tvam padha and tat padha. Differentiating attributes are seen during ajnanam. That which is seen by an ajnani is vachyartham and that which is seen by the jnani is lakshyartham. Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam was pointed out in sutra 25 and 26. From 27<sup>th</sup> sutra to 37<sup>th</sup> sutra, Vyasacharya negated all other interpretations of the mahavakyam. One interpretation is bedabeda vada and another is beda vadha. Maha vakya vichara has been successfully completed in the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. Now Vyasacharya wants to say that the aikyam is the absolute truth and we should know that in vyavaharika we should accept jivatma and Paramatma beda. Jivatma and Paramatma beda is vyavaharika sathyam. In vyavaharika I am all the time functioning either as pramata, karta or bogta except during sleep. Normally sleep is not problem. In jagrat and swapna I am either bogta, karta or pramata. Jnani itself a status of pramata. Tvam pada lakshyartha is not a jnanam; tat pada lakshyartha is not a jnani. Jnani is a pramata. Alpajna jiva is also a pramata. Apramtru Brahman is neither sarvajnah nor alpajnah. Therefore when I do Vyavahara I am a vyavaharika karta or bogta or pramata. When I exhaust prarapta as a vyavaharika jiva, as

vyavaharika pramata as a vyavaharika jnani I don't want to forget Vedanta because Pramata has got the problem of forgetfulness. Vyavaharika pramana this jnani who is exhausting prarapta also requires the grace of the Lord. As long as I continue as pramata during the praraptam days I need the blessings of Lord. Jnanam requires Isvara anugraha, karmas for siddha suddhi etc., requires the blessings of Isvara; swargathi phalams also require Isvara anugrah. This blessing Isvara omniscient Isvara the four types of baktas and that Isvara is saguna Isvara or tvam pada vachyarth. In the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam Vyasacharya comes down to vyavaharika plane. We should not get confused at this state. In vyavaharika level vyavaharika pramata jnani vyavaharika karta jnani and he starts the pada and he requires Lord's blessings. Then there is no need for teaching. Better you pray the Lord and seek is blessings and the Advaidins have no problem in this regard. If you are god why do you worship god. I am god vyavaharika dristya and I am god from Paramarthika level. If there is beda, the relationship is that jiva is karma karta, karma phala bogta and Isvara is neither karma karta nor karma phala bogta but Isvara is karma phala dada. After doing karma you will receive the karma phalam. This is the essence of this adhikaranam.

### **Topic 8. Phaladhikaranam [sutras 38-41]**

The Lord is the giver of the fruits of actions.

#### **Sutra 3.2.38 [356]**

#### ***Phalamata apapatteh***

From Him [the Lord] are the fruits of actions, for that is reasonable.

Another characteristics of Brahman is established.

In this sutra Vyasacharya establishes Isvara as a separate intelligence principle which Isvara is different from Jivatma and is different from jagat and this jiva jagat vilaksana Isvara alone can give result of action. Neither jiva nor jagat can give karma phalam. Jiva cannot be karma phala dada because jiva's knowledge is too limited. Jiva does not even know how many factors are involved which is proved everyday. When there is a crime that criminal is to be prosecuted, and for one crime argument in the court goes on for years. Ultimately the result sometimes the wrong one is punished. Millions are jivarasis are there trillions of crimes are committed and how can jiva give the punishment or give karma phala. If jiva is allowed to decide the karma phala, the judgment will not be perfect. The selection of person to decide may not be perfect. No jiva will judge against himself because raga and dvesha problem and because of his alpajnatva, jiva cannot be karma phala dada. We cannot hand this job to jagat which is achetanam and which cannot think and give appropriate karma phalam. We cannot argue karma will give result on its own karma being jadadvad. Therefore Isvara alone can be karma phala dada being sarvagathah. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Phalam the result of action comes from atah from Lord alone upapatteh means that is reasonable. We will see the significance of the words. Phalam means we have drista and adrista karma phalams. How can the human beings know adrista phalam when they are not able to know even the drista phalam. Knife is used by doctor and during operation a person dies and another person a decoit kills a phalam. Here one goes free and another gets punishment. Atah means it is a pronoun means from this one. This refers to Paramatma or Isvara. Tat padha vachyarth Paramatma is different from

vachyartha Jivatma. Vachyartha Paramatma, which was seen identical with Jivatma, is now seen as different from Jivatma in this sutra. Upatteh means logic or reason or propriety. This is a reasonable conclusion. Karma phala dada require two important qualifications that is one should have chetanatvam and sarvagatatvam. These two qualifications are not there with jiva and jagat. Jiva has got chetanatvam but does not have sarvagatatvam. Jagat does not have both chetanatvam as also sarvagatatvam.

### **Topic 8. Phaladhikaranam [sutras 38-41]**

The Lord is the giver of the fruits of actions.

#### **Sutra 3.2.39 [357]**

#### ***Srutatvaccha***

From Him [the Lord] are the fruits of actions, for that is reasonable.

Another characteristic of Brahman is established.

In the previous sutra Vyasacharya said that it is logical that there should be one Isvara as karma phala dada. Like that why cannot we have automatic karma phala dada. This is not possible that even automatic machines require a man behind to operate the machine. It appears as though computers do every job but there should be a man behind a computer to feed the input. If there is a cosmic computer that gives karma phala based on the fed laws, again there should be a person to feed the data which is again Isvara. We can only arrive at the logical possibility and necessity and logic does not prove the existence of Isvara for Isvara is beyond human instruments of knowledge. Our supporting reasoning is not the proof for the existence of Isvara. Now we need a pramanam for existence of Isvara. That is given in this sutra that sastra is the pramana for the existence of Isvara. Logic supports and the sruti reveals the existence of Isvara. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra. Srutatvaccha means [this is so] because sruti also reveals this. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. Srutatvad means sruti pramanad; karma phalam comes from Isvara who is different from jiva and jada jagat. Cha means also. Because in the previous sutra yukti pramana is given. Here sruti pramana is given in this sutra. Sruti pramana is primary and yukti pramanam is secondary. Supporting logic for existence of Isvara is elaborately discussed in Kenopanisad one is pada bashyam and another is vakya bashyam [3<sup>rd</sup> chapter devas and asuras fighting here in the introduction Adhi Sankaracharya gives elaborate commentary to establish logically establish the existence of Isvara]

### **Topic 8. Phaladhikaranam [sutras 38-41]**

*The Lord is the giver of the fruits of actions.*

#### **Sutra 3.2.40 [358]**

#### ***Dharmam jaiminirata eva***

An objection is raised to Sutras 38 and 39.

Here Jaimini who happens to be the disciple of Vyasacharya raises a purva paksha. Purva Mimamsa do not accept Isvara. They say that every karma produces an invisible force called adrishtam or apurvam. Karma is completed and produces an invisible force called adhristam which is called dharma. It is called Avyakta punya papam that will remain and at the appropriate time it will fructify and will produce drista sukha and dukham. Even after millions of creations, karma phala can produce results. This we call sanchita karma. Karma phala can give results even after many sristis. Punya papam gives the karma phalam of sukha and dukham. We do not therefore require an Isvara to do the job. The laws of karma will take care of the phalam. Good karmas will give punya, punyam will give sukha phalam, and papa karma will give dukha phalam. This is proved from sruti pramana itself. One who wants to go to swarga let him do good karma it is said in the sruti. If you do yaga, you go to swarga. Here adhristam is proved by sruti. If karma produces result where is the need of karma? I have to introduce punya papa because karma does not produce result immediately. Since sukha and dukha is not produce immediately, you have to introduce punyam and papam that is kept in the account. Good karma is stored, bad karma fructifies, and then one goes to temple crying or suffering some problem. Between karma and phala, an account is maintained for the fructification of karma and karma phalam. For this you do not require a Bhagavan is said by Jaimini.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Jaimini means Jaimini holds dharma that is punya papa [as the giver of the results]. Atah eva means due to the same reason. The significance of the words is dharmam means adhrista punya papa; atah eva means due to the same pair of pramanams sruti and yukti pramanams. Sruti pramanam is swarga kamo yadeva. Yukti pramana is between action and result there is a big gap, for bridging the gap you need an intermediary force in the form of punyam and papam and punyam produces sukham, and papam produces dukham.

### **Topic 8. Phaladhikaranam [sutras 38-41]**

The Lord is the giver of the fruits of actions.

**Sutra 3.2.41 [359]**

#### ***Purvam baadarayano hetuvyapadesat***

But Baadarayana thinks the former [i.e., the Lord to be the cause of the fruits of action] on account of His being declared to be the cause [of the actions themselves]

Vyasacharya answers and says that former view alone is correct. Isvara alone is karma phala dada. No doubt, karma produces punya papam and even punya papas cannot give sukha and dukha by themselves because the fructification of punya papa requires appropriate time, place and condition. It should be managed in such a way that the fructification of someone's punyam tally with someone's papam also. Punya papa produces the result backed by Isvara. Isvara alone makes the punya papa fructify. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class: 268

### **Topic 8. Phaladhikaranam [sutras 38-41]**

The Lord is the giver of the fruits of actions.

#### **Sutra 3.2.41 [359]**

#### ***Purvam baadarayano hetuvyapadesat***

But Baadarayana thinks the former [i.e., the Lord to be the cause of the fruits of action] on account of His being declared to be the cause [of the actions themselves]

We see the 41<sup>st</sup> sutra the last one of the second pada and the last adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam Isvara's pada vachyarthā is analysed. Isvara is established as karma phala dada. The enquiry here is who gives the phalam to the krayam that is karmas here in the form of sukha and dukha anubhava. Karma is action and phalam is sukha and dukha boghah. Here karma means vaidhika karma even though all other loukika karmas can be included. Karma intended here are sastra or vaidhika karmas alone. This enquiry is necessitated because of the unique law of cause and effect given by the tarka sastram. It says karya niyata purvaksana vritti karanam. Karanam should invariably exist before the karyam. Also invariably not now and then, every time even if there is one exception the karanam loses the karanam status. If a particular disease is caused as, particular thing and that can be accepted as karanam only if it is there whenever the disease comes. If in one instance the karanam is absent, that karanam cannot be called karanam. This is called niyata purva vrutti. The second rule is that not only it should precede the karyam and it should precede the karyam immediately before not remotely precedent but proximately precedent. If the proximateness is absent, karanam cannot be called karanam. All accepts this view of tarka sastram. We find a peculiar problem in the case of vedic rituals. The phalams in the case of rituals comes after a long time. Swarga does not result immediately. It comes after death and death comes after the prapramas are exhausted. Karma and swarga sugham there is a very big gap and therefore a doubt comes as to how can the karma can be said to be the cause of the swarga sugham. Karma and swarga sugham are distanced and it does not comply with the second condition mentioned above. Both Purva Mimamsa and uttara mimamsakas face this question. Vedantins solve in different way. Purva Mimamsa says karma and swarga sugham are not directly connected because of the ritual and the heavenly pleasure. Therefore, to connect them we require an intermediary link and because of this, Purva Mimamsa introduces a factor, which is not said in the Veda, and that factor is called adhrisam or apurvam. This means ritual does not directly produce the result. The ritual produces only adhrisam or apurvam and this is an invisible force. Therefore, it is called athristam, this is maintained in the account of the ritualist, it is in the name of the jiva, and this adhrisam is called dharmam. The word dharmam is called vaidhika janya adhrisam or apurvam and it is this that produces the heavenly pleasure. The unexpected favourable even which you have not worked for and that favour is not given by the Lord or the world but it is the invisible dharmam that favours you and that dharmam is produced by karma and that karma is done by you and you might have done this in the immediate past or remote past. Whenever you see the incidence you should connect it to your own karma and if it is favourable you thank yourself or if it is unfavourable you curse



yourself. According to Purva Mimamsa this apurvam also is jadam in nature and it is chetana tattvam being invisible force. The very word force indicates it is achetanam or jadam. Apurvam the force is also achetanam. Purva Mimamsa derives this adhristam with the help of sruti pramana and yukti pramana. Let the desirer of heaven perform the ritual. This sruti vakyam is pramana, which tells that karma produces phalam and it does not say the god produces swarga. Yaga produces swarga and swarga is produced by yaga and not by Bhagavan. For yaga, we require Veda, Veda, and yaga are required for swarga and not the Lord. We also use logic to arrive at and the nyaya of tarka sastra and by using the logic; we explain the phenomenon by introducing the apurva or dharma principle. Yaga produces dharma and dharma produces sukha and dukha without the intervention of a god. This is the philosophy of Purva Mimamsa of Jaimini. Vedantins say that I do not accept your approach. The problem with your approach that karanam is jadam and karna janya apurva is jadam and jada vastu can never produce any result. A result depends upon Infinite laws of the creation. This includes moral laws of creation also. Science does not take into account the moral principle. Not only the immediate laws or immediate factors, you should take into account the remote factors. Achetana karma cannot produce the result. An inert thing cannot intelligently function without the backing of a sentient principle. That is our nyaya. Therefore chetana tattvam is required. Now the question is if chetana tattvam is required why should we introduce a Isvara. Why not chetana jiva gives the phalam? This is the law of simplicity. If without Bhagavan you can explain the events of creation why introduce Isvara? Let is manage with jiva is Purva Mimamsa's argument. We say chetana jiva is incapable of determining the result because jiva's knowledge is too limited to do the job. Alpajna jivah is incapable and therefore we require sarvajna chetana and that sarvajna chetanah is called Isvara. By logic we establish that sarvajna Isvara alone produce the phalam. We add a condition that Isvara does not give his choise and he give the result according to the karma. Thus, karma becomes the visesha karanam and Bhagavan becomes the samanya karanam for every experience of ours. In addition to the logic we have the sruti pramana also. Mantra 4.4.24 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is the sruti support. Here it is said mahan Atma which means Paramatma Isvarah alone is the annadah vasudanah means giver of food and giver of wealth. Here food and wealth represents all the karma phalams, sukha and dukha anubhavah. We generally talk of happiness creating world and we do not know the problem creating wealth. Wealth is of two fold one is happiness creating wealth and the other is problem creating wealth and both are created by the Isvara alone. Also refer to 7.21 of Bhagavad Gita also supports the view. If Isvara is the karma phala dada where is the need for intermediary adhristam, which is introduced by Purva Mimamsa because of the absence of Isvara? Since we accept god do we require adhristam as a factor. Either way it is ok. If you accept apurvam Vedantins will say Bhagavan gives phalam according to apurvam. Or else Bhagavan gives phalam according to karma. Apurvam is not a very important necessary concept in Vedanta. It can be avoided also. Generally we accept it because to please the Purva Mimamsa in this regard. Thus in the first sutras Vyasacharya introduced our siddhanta, in 40th sutra Vyasacharya introduced Jaimini madham, and now he says Vedanta madham is superior to Jaimini madham. Here Vyasacharya says that the sruti pramana clearly says that Bhagavan gives sukha and dukham. Bhagavan is mentioned in the sastra refer to 3.8 of Kaushitaki Upanishad. Also refer to 2.1.34 of Brahma sutra where the above Kaushitaki Upanishad quotation. This will create confusion and if he gives Sukha and dukha then Bhagavan will be said to be partial. There the sukha and dukha based on the past karma whether it is good or bad clarified Bhagavan gives. Criminal law book will not punish the criminal and to punish a criminal a judge is required. God cannot independently give the punishment. Judge and the criminal law give the punishment. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Tu means however; Badarayana means Vyasacharya [holds]; purvam means the former view hetuvyapadesat means since the Lord is revealed as the cause of the karma phalam.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Purvam means the first view given in 38<sup>th</sup> sutra. Isvara gives sukha and dukha not the apurvam; tu is added to differentiate this from the Jaimini madham; Badanarayana is the name of Vyasacharya; Vyasacharya is supposed to have lived in Badrinath. Vyasacharya holds the purva madham because hetuvyapadesat means Bhagavan is the cause of the phalam even if dharma or punya papa and even to operate the adhrisam we need Bhagavan because adhrisam cannot operate itself. Punyam cannot think and operate. You cannot say it accidentally happen and then that will be disaster. Isvara is hetu for karma phalam; vyapadesat means sruti vakyam. Our traditional interpretation is Vyasacharya is the author of Brahma sutra with this 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over and tat pada vachyartha is over and also the second pada is over.

The central theme of the second chapter is tat pada vachyartha tat pada lakshyartha tvam pada vachyartha and tvam pada lakshyartha. Tvam pada vachyartha is saguna Jivatma tat pada vachyartha is saguna Paramatma; this saguna Jivatma and saguna Paramatma are never identical. They can never be equal and therefore as long as we look from the vyavaharika angle Jivatma will be saguna Jivatma and Paramatma will be saguna Paramatma and their relationship is Jivatma is karta and Isvara will be karma phala dada; Isvara will be swami and jiva will be dasa. Jiva will be giver of puja. In addition, Isvara will be the receiver of puja etc. The beda should be accepted.

Tvam pada lakshyartha is Nirgunam Brahman and tat pada lakshyartha is nirguna Chaitanyam. This is the truth from Paramarthika dristi and from this Paramarthika dristi Jivatma and Paramatma are seen to be identical because the differentiating attributes are not there. Karyatvam karanatvam etc., are not there from Paramarthika angle. This is the aikyam. Jnana kanda functions from Paramarthika dristi and karma kanda function from vyavaharika dristi. Therefore, do not mix up Karma Kanda and jnana kandam. Do not mix up beda vakyam and abeda vakyam and have clarity of understanding. This comes under sadhana adhyaya. This is the sadhana for aikya jnanam. With this second pada is over.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 3			
Classes: 268 to 306 = Sutras: 3-3-1 to 3-3-66			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
268	126	3 . 3 . 1	360
269	127	3 . 3 . 1 and 3 . 3 . 2	360 and 361
270	131	3 . 3 . 2 and 3 . 3 . 3	361 and 362
271	135	3 . 3 . 3 to 3 . 3 . 6	362 to 365
272	140	3 . 3 . 6 and 3 . 3 . 7	365 and 366
273	144	3 . 3 . 8 and 3 . 3 . 9	367 and 368
274	148	3 . 3 . 9 to 3 . 3 . 11	368 to 370
275	152	3 . 3 . 12 to 3 . 3 . 14	371 to 373
276	157	3 . 3 . 14 and 3 . 3 . 15	373 and 374
277	161	3 . 3 . 16 and 3 . 3 . 17	375 and 376
278	165	2nd interpretation	376
279	168	3 . 3 . 17 and 3 . 3 . 18	376 and 377
280	172	3 . 3 . 18 and 3 . 3 . 19	377 and 378
281	176	3 . 3 . 19 to 3 . 3 . 22	378 to 381
282	180	3 . 3 . 22 and 3 . 3 . 23	381 and 382
283	183	3 . 3 . 24 and 3 . 3 . 25	383 and 384
284	186	3 . 3 . 25 and 3 . 3 . 26	384 and 385
285	189	3 . 3 . 26 and 3 . 3 . 27	385 and 386
286	192	3 . 3 . 28 and 3 . 3 . 29	387 and 388
287	196	3 . 3 . 29 to 3 . 3 . 31	388 to 390
288	200	3 . 3 . 31 and 3 . 3 . 32	390 and 391
289	203	3 . 3 . 32 and 3 . 3 . 33	391 and 392
290	206	3 . 3 . 33 and 3 . 3 . 34	392 and 393
291	209	3 . 3 . 34 to 3 . 3 . 36	393 to 395
292	213	3 . 3 . 37 and 3 . 3 . 38	396 and 397
293	218	3 . 3 . 38 and 3 . 3 . 39	397 and 398
294	222	3 . 3 . 39 to 3 . 3 . 42	398 to 401
295	227	3 . 3 . 43 and 3 . 3 . 44	402 and 403
296	231	3 . 3 . 44 to 3 . 3 . 47	403 to 406
297	235	3 . 3 . 47 to 3 . 3 . 49	406 to 408
298	239	3 . 3 . 50 and 3 . 3 . 51	409 and 410
299	243	3 . 3 . 52 to 3 . 3 . 54	411 to 413
300	247	3 . 3 . 54	413
301	251	3 . 3 . 54 to 3 . 3 . 56	413 to 415
302	255	3 . 3 . 57 and 3 . 3 . 58	416 and 417
303	258	3 . 3 . 58 and 3 . 3 . 59	417 and 418
304	261	3 . 3 . 60 and 3 . 3 . 61	419 and 420
305	264	3 . 3 . 61 to 3 . 3 . 66	420 to 425
306	269	3 . 3 . 66	425
	270		

## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 3

### Class 268 contd.

#### Introduction to the third pada

Now I will introduce the third pada. This is the biggest pada of Brahma Sutra with 36 adhikaranam and 66 sutras. In this big pada Vyasacharya predominantly analyses saguna Upasanas occurring in the Vedanta. Nirguna jnanam is also discussed here and there. Adhi Sankaracharya uses the word para vidya. Saguna Upasanas are discussed because Vedanta is aimed at moksa. While nirguna jnanam is the aim of moksa why Vyasacharya discusses saguna Upasana is our question. Adhi Sankaracharya says saguna Upasanas also contribute to moksa in two fold ways. They are extremely important. One-way is saguna Upasana gives Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi in this janma itself; it brings in a guru who is accessible. If a person worship me I will provide him a guru at appropriate guru says Krishna in Bhagavad Gita. Isvara's blessings are required to gain moksa. It gives you moksa. Saguna Upasana is indirect means for liberation. There is another indirect method also. Saguna Upasana may not provide conditions in this janma and if a person holds on to saguna Upasana and remembers Isvara at the time of death [8<sup>th</sup> chapter] will go to Brahma loka and it is another name for ideal conditions for nirguna jnanam. Porthumous ideal condition is Brahma loka. It means you will get a wonderful guru in the form of Brahmaji. In Brahman, loka there is nothing to do other than gaining knowledge from Brahmaji. Saguna Upasana helps one to gain krama mukti. This is analysed in the third pada. Saguna Upasana means Isvara Upasana. Gods with various virtues will be meditated upon. This is the topic of the third pada the details which we will discuss in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 269

Having completed the second pada of the third chapter, we will enter the third pada. First I will give general analysis to the third pada. This is a part of sadhana adhyaya. It deals with the sadhans for moksa. The previous chapter dealt with tvam and tat pada vichara. Padhartha vichara is sadhanam for vachyārtha jñanam and vachyārtha jñanam is the path for moksa. Here we will analyse the Sagunam Brahman Upasani. Upasana means meditation. Saguna Isvara dhyānam means Sagunam Brahma Upasana. There are referenes to nirguna Brahman jñanam also. Why should we deal with saguna Upasana when we are interested in nirguna jñanam which alone will give us moksa. We say saguna Brahman is mithya we have said in Mandukya Upanishad. Saguna Upasana we have said is a miserable person. Then why should we discuss that topic. When we criticize saguna Upasana we should know the intention behind the criticism. When one says that saguna Upasana will give liberation we criticize but suppose if one practices saguna Upasana for the purpose siddha suddhi and not expect liberation, then we encourage them to do the saguna Upasana to integrate and organize the mind. With the integrated mind, one can get nirguna jñanam later. Saguna Upasana is a path to nirguna jñanam. Such Upasana we encourage one to do saguna Upasana. Saguna Upasana is indirect help to jñanam. I practise and come to nirguna jñanam in this janma itself and attain jivan mukti. Saguna Upasana can give me jivan mukti in this life itself. There is another method also. I continue saguna Upasana throughout my life without coming to nirguna jñanam. Vairagyam is a must for liberation. With strong vairagyam and strong mumuksutvam, such Upasana will go to Brahman loka and he will get nirguna vichara with the reachings of brahmaji. Saguna Upasana can be jivan mukti sadhanam or krama mukti sadhanam not directly but via nirguna jñanam. Saguna Upasana thus is important for Vedantic jñanam. Thus a study of saguna Upasana is relevant in Brahma Sutra. Anything to do in life is relevant you spiritually either go or get kicks and practise vairagyam. It is not going to be how the Upasana is practiced but certain type of Upasanas occur in different Upanisads and these Upasanas have got great resemblance and they appear to be one and the same Upasanas looking identical but they do have dissimilarities. They have common as also uncommon features also. Because of the differences, a doubt may come to the students as to whether they are the same or different Upasanas with certain similarities. We can see them as same or different. In this pada, several such Upasanas are going to be analysed. Vyasacharya will point out which are the same and which are different Upasanas. Once Vyasacharya establishes the two Upasanas are established to be identical, another rule is applied. If two Upasanas are one and the same with minor differences, we see certain attributes are applied in one Upanishad and certain attributes are not common in the Upasana mentioned in another Upanishad. Then Vyasacharya says that missing attributes in one Upanishad can be transferred to the Upasanas mentioned in another Upanishad. Brihadharaynaka upanishad Hiranyagarbha can borrow the attribute of Chandogya upanishad Hiranyagarbha attributes. This transference is allowed only after establishing that both are one and the same Upanishad mentioned in two Upanisads. The guna transference is called guna upasamharah. This is the technical word used in the Upanishad. In determining the beda and abeda between the Upanisads mentioned in different Upanisads several laws will be applied in this context. All the laws are borrowed from Purva Mimamsa darsanam to decide the beda and abeda between the Upanisads mentioned in different Upanisads. In Purva Mimamsa they face similar problems. It is analysis of Veda purva bagha. There we have sutrams written by Jaimini Maharishi. In Purva Mimamsa sutra they have to do karma beda

abeda vichara. In ritualistic portion, several rituals resemble with certain similarities and dissimilarities also. Therefore Purva Mimamsa has well developed set of laws to do karma beda abeda vichara. Once they establish oneness of rituals, they apply guna upasamhara. The guna upasamhara is applied in Purva Mimamsa sutram and we are going to apply the same principle in the case of Upasanas also. Because of these reasons, the whole pada follows Purva Mimamsa principle. It is mimamsa pradhan pada. It is considered to be a tougher pada. I will not bore you with Purva Mimamsa discussion but deal with the gist of the sutra relating to our subject. Since we are interested in jivan mukti we need not much bother about the Upasana subject which is not practiced nowadays. Kriahna Upasana replaces Vedic Upasanas, Rama Upasana etc. This has got 36 adhikaranam with 66 sutras.

Now we will enter into the first adhikaranam of the third pada.

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.1[360]**

#### ***Sarvavedantapratyayam chodanadyavisheshat***

[the vidyas or the Upasanas] described in the various Vedanta texts [are not different, are identical] on account of the non-difference of injunction, etc. [i.e., connection, form and name]

This is the first adhikaranam with four sutras. It is an important adhikaranam based on which the latter adhikaranams are developed. Here we get the general rules to point out the two Upasanas are identical. Two sample Upasanas are taken for enquiry. Here the differences between two Upasanas are pointed out and the oneness between them are established. This is the general introduction to the first adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. Here Vyasacharya says two Upasanas can be considered identical if four common factors are available based on the Purva Mimamsa rules. They are injunctions [the type of commandment], the result, rupam the nature of the deity of meditation; and fourthly the name of the ritual or the name of the Upasana like pancagni vidya. Based on the four factors identity or difference are established. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Sarvavedanta pratyayam means a particular karma or Upasana taught in different branches of Veda [is treated as the same] chodanadyavisheshat on the basis of the sameness of the factors like injunction.

Now we will see the significance of the words occurring here. Here the word pratyayam means karma or Upasana. That which is learnt from Veda is either karma or Upasana. For us what is relevant is Upasana. Sarva vedanta means all the Upanisads or different Upanisads. Panchagni vidya occurring in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad will be treated as identical as per this sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the example 6.1.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad the prana Upasana and the same is given in 5.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad and the Upasana is prana Upasana. Prana is the eldest one born in the beginning

itself; even in the individual, when individual is born life manifests first and when the baby is born the sense organs develop. Prana is called jesta tattvam. Prana is also called sreshta tattvam and for that a story is given. One suffers from the loss of any of the sense organs and the moment prana plans to go all sense organs become weak. This prana Upasana mentioned in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad are one and the same or not is our enquiry. We say both are the same. The commandments are same in both the Upasana; the phalam are the same; the phalam being the prana Upasana will become most powerful one among the family members; in the society as well; the upasya devata are also the same for the Upasana in both the Upanisads. The name is called prana vidya in both the Upanisads. Therefore, they should be taken as one Upasana. Chodanavyavisheshat means the other three factors, which we have to borrow from Purva Mimamsa sutram. Aviseshat means samanyat which means similarity or sameness. All the four factors are the same and therefore treat the Upasana as one. Now we will go to the second sutra.

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.2 [361]**

#### ***Bhedanneti chennikasyamapi***

If it be said that the vidyas are separate on account of difference [in minor points], we deny that, since even in the same vidyas [there may be such minor differences]

An objection to the preceding sutra is raised and refuted.

This sutra answers a possible doubt occurring in the above statement. Even if the four factors are same, we do see certain differences also and how can you take them as one and the same Upasana. For this Vyasacharya gives his answer. When the similarities are dominant and few factors are different, you can ignore the minor differences because major identity overpower the minor differences. Therefore, you can treat such Upasanas as identical. Even minor difference you can remove appropriately by adding here and there. If there are major differences, you have to introduce a fresh Upasana. This is the essence of the second sutra.

Two Upasana are taken as examples here. First is the example of pancagni vidya. This occurs in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad where the travel of Jivatma is talked about. The Jivatma goes through after death five stages before taking up to the new body. The five stages are heaven, clouds, earth, father and mother. When the jiva passes through each stage, jiva manifests more and more and when the jiva comes out of the mother the manifestation is complete. Since the five stages are important for rebirth, you meditate upon these stages as Agni and this pancagni vidya is famous Upasana. Here these four factors happen to be identical. Therefore it looks both are one and the same Upasana but there are differences creating confusion. In Chandogya upanisad 5.10.10, the Upanishad says *etan evam panca agnim beda* let a person meditate upon pancagni the life process. But we find another mantra in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 6.2.14 where it is said *athainam agnaye haranti, tasyagnir evagnir bhavati*; in this mantra Upanishad says jiva has come through five stages and the jiva enters the sixth fire at the time of cremation jiva is burnt in fire. The sixth Agni is also talked about, in Brihadharaynaka upanisad six agnis are enumerated, and in Chandogya

upanisad only five agnis are stated to be there for the rebirth of the jiva after death. For this answer is given. Adhi Sankaracharya gives three answers to this question.

The first answer is that the sixth Agni is not part of the Upasana at all even though sixth Agni is mentioned in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. It is so because in the previous five agnis, five agnis were not real fire at all and they are imaginary fires. One condition of Upasana is that you should see something else upon something else. You invoke Lord Shiva on the stone. Stone is jadam and Shiva is Chaitanya tattvam. Can you say rope snake as Upasana? But there you say bramah. If you ask this question we say for error and Upasana one thing is common that of seeing something on something else. In error something is seen as something else because of ignorance. But when Shivalinga is seen as Shiva the Upasaka knows the fact. He has taken the stone and deliberately seen as Shiva. In pancagni vidya the various things are seen as Agni deliberately for the purpose of meditation or Upasana. These five are Upasana and the sixth one is real Agni and there is no Upasana and it is the Agni on which the jiva is offered after death. This is answer number one.

The second answer is that in Chandogya upanisad also sixth fire is mentioned. Refer to 5.9.2 *tam pretam distam itah agnaye eva haranti*. When that person dies, the body is put on fire. It is not imaginary fire but it is actual fire. Chandogya upanisad indicates indirectly that the sixth fire should not be included although sixth Agni is mentioned in Chandogya upanisad. Therefore there is no difference.

The third argument is that even if one Agni is missing in one Upanishad, that is only a mirror difference. When five agnis are mentioned there is no need to take seriously the minor disagreement of one Agni not being mentioned in one Upanishad. Therefore, the Upasana should be taken as one. We have to apply this for prana Upasana also which we will do in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 270

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.2 [361]**

#### ***Bhedanneti chennikasyamapi***

If it be said that the vidyas are separate on account of difference [in minor points], we deny that, since even in the same vidyas [there may be such minor differences]

An objection to the preceding sutra is raised and refuted.

This pada enumerates Upasana beda abeda vichara when similar Upasana occurs in more than one Upanisads. Once abeda of Upasana is established that is the sameness of Upasana is established then guna samhara law can be establish. If the upasya devata which is common in both Upanishad with certain features missing in one Upanishad and available features in the other Upanishad, then the combined features have to be taken. For this purpose four clues are to be taken as already mentioned in the last class. The natures of commandment, result, devata etc., are to be taken into account while determining the beda and abeda between the Upasanas mentioned in two Upanisads. Two Upanisads need not be fully identical and there may be minor differences can be there and it can be taken as identical. We see the general analysis of this sutra where we have taken two Upasanas for our study. Between two pancagni vidyas mentioned in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad, there are 'seeming differences' but they are found to be identical which we established in the last class.

Now we will take another Upasana for analysis. We will now take up prana Upasana. We will take up 5.9.2 of Chandogya upanisad and 6.1.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad where the prana Upasana is mentioned with identical features. In both these sections it is said that prana should be meditated upon as the eldest in creation. Shresta means greatest in the creation. Prana is seen to be superior according to time and quality. Prana is active right from conception itself whereas buddhi etc., is active much later. Prana life is the beginning. It is qualitatively superior. Both Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad tells a story to establish the superiority of prana. Each organ leaves the body for sometime and after sometimes each organs come back and they see that nothing happens to the individual and the individual survives. When the prana is about to go all the sense organs struggle. The sense organs do namaskaras to prana and the titles they have, and each sense organ surrenders the title to the prana without which any of the sense organ can survive. Hence one should meditate upon prana. Adhi Sankaracharya says even though they are similar in both the sections, the dissimilarity is minor and we can ignore and accept the two as one Upasana. The minor dissimilarity is that in the story the organs go out and come back. Organ of eyes, ears, mana etc., are mentioned in both the sections. But in Brihadharaynaka upanisad retah the organ of reproduction also goes out for one year and during that year he did not have the creative power. Then afterwards the prajanana indriyam came and this is not mentioned in

Chandogya upanisad. That does not mean that the Upasanas are different. Prana's glory is same whether the organ is mentioned or not. Some sample organs are mentioned and we should not take whether five are mentioned or six are mentioned as samples. The minor difference in shrestatva description, the prana Upasanas mentioned in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad are one and the same as we establish in the case of pancagni vidya.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Bhedad na is purva paksa part and iti chenna is Vedanta part. Na means [this principle] is not correct bedad because of the presence of certain differences; up to this is purva paksa. Itichet if this is the contention; na it is not so. Ekasyam api means [minor differences are possible] even in the same Upasana. This is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Na is the purva paksa negation. Purva Paksi negates the principle mentioned in the previous sutra. This principle is not correct. The Upasana mentioned in different Upanishads should be treated as one is our principle and Purva Paksi says it is not so and they quote Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad prana and pancagni vidyas. Treating them, as one is not correct is their contention. For him the logic is that even though there are similarities there are differences. Therefore, each one should be treated differently.

Iti chet is Vedantins answer. If you raise such an objection I cannot object. The answer is that I do note the dissimilarities also. I do see the similarities as also the dissimilarities. My contention is that whether the dissimilarities are superficial and minor or major dissimilarities. When the basic similarities are there we should treat them as one and when the dissimilarities are major we should treat both as two. We should see which is major and which is minor objection. Dissimilarities can be admitted if the same are minor. This is the significance of the words. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.3 [362]**

***Svadhyayasya tathatvena hi samachare'dhikaraccha savavaccha tanniyamah***

[The rite of carrying fire on the head is connected] with the study of the Veda [of the atharvanikas], in the samachara [it is mentioned] as being such. And [this also follows] from its being a qualification [for the students of the atharva Veda] as in the case with the [seven] oblations [viz., saurya etc.]

An objection based on a statement of the Mundaka Upanishad is explained and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will see the Brahma Vidya itself occurring in two different places. Previous one is saguna vidya and here we take for analysis nirguna Brahma Vidya. This is discussed in all the Upanisads. This occurs in Mundaka Upanishad also. The doubt is whether Brahma Vidya occurring in Mundaka Upanishad is different from the Brahma Vidya occurring in other Upanisads. In Mundaka Upanishad

Brahma Vidya is called Aksara vidya or para vidya. Whether Aksara vidya is identical with other Brahma Vidya is the topic for discussion here. He says because of the unique qualification mentioned at the end of the Mundaka Upanishad for the student which qualification is not mentioned in the other Upanishad. The mantras are 3.2.11 and 3.2.10 mention about the qualification for the Brahma Vidya students. A special ritual is mentioned here. One should not learn Brahma Vidya without going through the ritual mentioned in the mantra 3.2.11. That person who has not performed the ritual is not eligible for the Brahma Vidya it is said here. The vrutam is called sirovritam. This is not mentioned in the other Upanisads. Since the qualification is different the subject matter must be different it is argued. Therefore Aksara vidya is different from Brahma Vidya. This is the argument of the Purva Pakshi.

Incidentally, we will like to know what is called sirovrutam. We have to chant certain mantra and kindle a particular fire. And that ritualistically kindled fire must be placed on a pot. And the pot should be carried on the head. They have to do some Agni pradakshina etc. It is described in Veda vruta books. The question is that whether it is true or not. Our conclusion is Brahma Vidya of other Upanisads and Aksara vidya of Mundaka Upanishad are one and the same and they are not different. We will see our argument for our conclusion.

He says that this ritual is a preparatory ritual accepted. But this is a preparatory not for learning Brahma Vidya itself. Brahma Vidya is the same and this is a preparatory ritual for learning the chanting. It is an adhyayana vrutam and not a vichara vrutam. We make a subtle difference between Veda adhyayanam and Veda vichara. Formal leaning to chant is Veda adhyayanam. Veda adhyayanam is chanting the mantra alone. Many of the priest even do not know the meaning of the mantra. Without learning the meaning there can be problem also. This will happen because Veda adhyayi need not be Veda vichara. Veda vichara means artha grahanam. Vyasacharya says look at the mantra 3.2.11. The verb used here is adhite for adhyayanam or sabda grahanam and not for artha vichara. That is one reason for our conclusion.

The second reason is that there are books that gives the preparatory ritual for Veda adhyayanam. There is a book called samachara grandhah. Samachara is the anem of the text which deals with atharvana Veda adhyayanam. For Mundaka Upanishad adjuauamam the samachara book mentions the sirovrutam ritual and from that it is clear it is meant for adhyayanam and no additional qualification is needed for vichara. Hence Brahma Vidya mentioned here and in other Upanisads are the same.

The Purva Pakshi says that you make this conclusion based on the 11<sup>th</sup> mantra of the Mundaka Upanishad. Therefore it looks it is meant for adhyayanam and not vichara. The tenth mantra says that Brahma Vidya should be given to only those people who have done sirovrutam. This means artha grahanam only. Therefore Brahma Vidya must be unique here. For that, Vyasacharya says etam Brahma Vidyam adjective is there in the mantra. Etam Brahma Vidyam means that Brahma Vidya revealed through this Upanishadic words alone is the meaning. Brahma Vidya is one and the same and the words are different from one Upanishad to the other Upanishad. Words are not wisdom. The different between words and wisdom is that words are sabda pramana and wisdom is prama. Word is outside and wisdom is inside. Words can be different and wisdom can be identical. Therefore, if a person wants to gain Brahma Vidya through atharvana words he requires sirovrutam but the vidya is not different from the other vidya. Difference belongs to the means and difference is not there for the ends Brahma Vidya.

Now comes the next problem. Then are we to study the Mundaka Upanishad first to study Brahma Vidya. For that Vyasacharya says that even that is compulsory for the atharvana Veda people. It is not meant for the people belonging to the other Vedas. According to sastra, yajurvedi has to study yajur Veda which is compulsory. He need not study other Vedas. If he is to study other Vedas, he should follow the rules prescribed for the study of that Veda. The sirovrutam is compulsory for atharvana vedis when they want to study Brahma Vidya through Mundaka Upanishad. Fortunately atharvana vedis are not there. This rule is applicable for others. For this Vyasacharya gives an example. Sava vat cha means a series of oblations to be offered. The scripture talks about a set of oblations to Surya devata. When these oblations are mentioned, in which Agni these oblations are to be offered. The Veda talks about several types of fires. The type of fire is determined by the mantra used in kindling the fire. Ritualistic fires are many. Among them there is one Agni called eka rishih, which referred to in Mundaka Upanishad [3.2.10]. These oblations are supposed to be offered to in the eka Agni alone. We find in the sastra ekagni is associated with atharvana Veda alone. Therefore, oblations are connected to ekagni, ekagni is connected to atharvana Veda, and oblations are to be offered by atharvana vedi only. In the same way the Mundaka Upanishad adhyayanam is connected with atharvan Veda only. Therefore, other people need not do sirovrutam.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samachare means the book of procedures sirovrutam is indeed prescribed; tatadvena means as a preliminary ritual swandyayasya means of the vedic chanting only. Cha means moreover; adhikarat means since the eligibility is specified [in the Upanishad] sirovrutam ritual does not differentiate the Brahma Vidya. Tan niyamaha cha means and this condition [applies to the followers of Atharvana Veda only. Savavat means like the oblations. Sava is the name. The significance of the words we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 271

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.3 [362]**

#### ***Svadyayasya tathatvena hi samachare'dhikaraccha savavaccha tanniyamah***

[The rite of carrying fire on the head is connected] with the study of the Veda [of the atharvanikas], in the samachara [it is mentioned] as being such. And [this also follows] from its being a qualification [for the students of the atharva Veda] as in the case with the [seven] oblations [viz., saurya etc.]

An objection based on a statement of the Mundaka Upanishad is explained and refuted.

Here Vyasacharya elaborates the teaching of what is stated in Mundaka Upanishad is not different from other Upanisads with regard to Brahma Vidya. The role of surovrutam is to be understood in two stages. First we have to differentiate Veda vichara from Veda adhyayanam. One comes under jnanam and the other comes under karma. Veda vichara is jnana rupa and Veda adhyayanam is karma rupam. Whether surovrutam is jnana angam or Veda adhyayana rupa karma angam. Vyasacharya concludes that surovrutam is not jnana angam and it relates to karma angam. It is a part of chanting ritual. Veda adhyayanam is of two types. One relates to vihita vedadhyayanam and avihita vedadhyayanam [formal compulsory learning and the other is informal and optional learning] this difference is based on a vedic injunction swadhyayah adye tavyah. It is not in Vedanta baga but it is in Veda purva baga. Swadhyaya means one's own Veda. It means depends upon one's parampara. If one comes under rig Veda parampara, he is a rig Veda. For yajur vedit yajur Veda is swadhyayah. And adhe tavyah means should study. A rig vedi must compulsorily study rig Veda. So the yajurvedi yujurveda. Once Veda compels to do a job, it is an injunction and rig Veda has to study rig Veda chanting. It is Veda vidhi. Not studying that Veda becomes a papam. If he does not do that, he gets pratyavaya papam. For rig vedi yajur Veda adhyayanam is not a vihitam. Not studying is not rig Veda is not a papam. He must study yajur Veda. For yajurvedi studying rig Veda is optional and not studying will not bring any papam. Mundaka Upanishad adhyayanam comes under atharvana Veda adhyayanam and this atharvana Veda adhyayanam is twofold vihita atharvana Veda adhyayanam and avihita Veda adhyayanam. Surovrutam is compulsory for atharvana Veda adhyayanam and Vyasacharya says surovrutam is compulsory for vihita atharvana Veda adhyayanam and not for formal atharvada Veda study. This is connected to atharvana vedi alone. Srutovrutam is associated with vihita atharvatha Veda adhyayanam and it is connected with atharvana vedi and therefore surovrutam is connected with atharvana vedi and that too when they do adhyayanam. This connection between surovrutam and atharvana vedi is indirectly shown and for this an example is given by Vyasacharya. Sava oblation is connected with ekagni fire and ekagni fire is connected with atharvana vedi and therefore sava oblation is connected with ekagni fire and ekagni fire is connected with atharvana vedi and therefore sava oblation

is connected with atharvana vedi. Therefore surovrutam also is indirectly connected atharvana vedi only and that too when they want to do adhyayanam. Surovrutam is therefore karma angam and not connected with jnana angam. Do not bring surovrutam in the topic of jnanam. Surovrutam is compulsory for that vedi alone and not for other people belonging to other vedis. Surovrutam and Atma jnanam have no connection and Atma Jnanam is same in all the Upanishad. Surovrutam is connected with karma angam and not enquiry angam. For this Vyasacharya gives two pramanams. One is atharvana Veda chanting rules book. It is not given in the Brahma Vidya. Chanting rulebook is one pramana and the second pramana is Mundaka Upanishad itself for it says 3.2.11 that it should be chanted for particular time and particular people belonging to that Veda alone.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Tatatvam means angatvam. Surovrutam is an angam, it is a compulsory condition and there is no dispute in angatvam status. The dispute is angam of what. You think it is a part of Atma Jnanam but it is an angam of formal study of Vedic chanting started on the first upa karma day. Samachare means as prescribed in the Vedic chanting book of rules especially for atharvana Vedis. Ahikaracha means this is mentioned in the Mundaka Upanishad itself while specifying the eligibility. Adhyayanam requires this vrutam as per the Mundaka Upanishad. Tan niyamah means this conditions also are not for all the vedis. This is applicable to the atharvana vedis alone. Other vedis doing atharvana Veda adhyayanam this is not applicable. But the other vedis should do the adhyayanam of their own Veda first before taking up the other Veda adhyayanam. With this the third sutra is over.

### **Topic 1 Sarvavedantapratyayadhikaranam [Sutras 1 – 4]**

The vidyas having identical or the same form found in scriptures constitutes one vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.4 [363]**

#### ***Darsayati cha***

[the scripture] also instructs [thus]

An argument in support of sutra 1 is given.

In this sutra Vyasacharya reconfirms the conclusion of what is stated in the previous sutra. Vidya abedah eva vidya bedah. Surovrutam will differentiate the chanting rules and not the Brahma Vidya. A mantra in Kathopanisad 1.2.15 proves this fact. The mantra reads as *Sarve Veda yat padam amananti, tapamsi sarvani va yah vadanti yad icchanto brahmacaryam caranti, tat te padam samgrahena bravimi; aum iti etat* the meaning of the mantra is that word which all the Vedas declare and which all the austerities proclaim, desiring which [people] live the life of a religious student, that word, to thee I shall tell in brief. That is Aum.

In this mantra the first line is relevant to us. Here the Kathopanisad says all the four Vedas talks about the same Brahma Vidya only. Here Mundaka Upanishad also included here. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Darsayati cha means the struti itself reveals [the sameness of Brahma Vidya in all the Upanisads. Veda itself tells that the Brahma

Vidya is same in all the Upanisads. The special qualification is for the chanting only and not for the Brahma Vidya. With this fourth sutra, the first adhikaranam is over. We have established three vidyas, pancagni vidya is same in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad; and we established prana Upasana is the same in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad and then thirdly Brahma Vidya is same in Mundaka Upanishad and atharvana Upanishad. Now in the second andhakaranam the corollary of this is revealed which we will see now.

## **Topic 2 upasamharadhikaranam [Sutras 5]**

Particulars of identical vidyas mentioned in different sakhas or places are to be combined into one meditation.

### **Sutra 3.3.5 [364]**

#### ***Upasamharo'rthabhedavidhiseshavatsamane cha***

And in the Upasanas of the same class [mentioned in different sakhas] a combination [of all the particulars mentioned in all sakhas is to be made] as there is no difference in the object of meditation, just as [a combination of] all subsidiary rites of a main sacrifice [mentioned in different sakhas is made].

A deduction is made from the four preceding sutras. This sutra states the practical outcome of the discussion carried on in the first sutra.

First I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here Vyasacharya gives the corollary to the first adhikaranam. If two Upasanas are identical the missing portion of one Veda can be filled up from the borrowed portion of the other portion. Missing Chandogya upanisad portion can be borrowed from Brihadharaynaka upanisad and the missing portion in Brihadharaynaka upanisad can be borrowed from Chandogya upanisad. When you add this portion, this combination of features is called upasamharah. If the same pancagni Upasana is given in another Upanishad, you have to collect all the features from all Upanishad and meditate upon the devata on the combination all the features of all the Upanishad. The important condition is that the combination of features are allowed only if the Upasanas are identical and if it is not proved as identical such combination cannot be taken into account. This is the general analysis of this adhikaranam.

Now we will go to the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that you can combine the features because in both the Upasana the meditating deity is the same. [prana Upasana and panchagni vidya] upasya devata aikyad you combine the features. Here he gives an example from Karma Kanda. In the Karma Kanda portion the Agni hotra ritual is mentioned in several places. Some features are mentioned in some place and some are mentioned in another place. But when you do Agni hotra, you must have all secondary rituals should be collected from all Vedas and you will have combined Agni hotra ritual. It is compilation and not directly gathered from one portion of the Veda. Just as this, the Upasana is also a compilation from several Upasana. This is the ritual example.

Now will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samaneca and in the case of the same Upasana; upasamharah means the combination [of the features mentioned elsewhere should be

understood. Arhtabedat since the subject matter is the same vidhisheshavat means like the combination of the secondary rites or rituals with regard to one primary ritual;

Now we will see the significance of the words. Upsamharah means combination of different features collection of different features mentioned in different places in the Vedas; arthabedat the subject matter in the case of the Upasana portion, the subject matter is upasana devata and in the case of Karma Kanda it is the ritual. Artha abeda means aikyam; because of the oneness of the subject matter; upasya devata abedat. Vidhisheshavat means Karma Kanda example and here vidhi means the primary ritual. Sesha means the secondary ritual; it does not independent existence and all connected to the primary ritual. These are combined and connected to one primary ritual. Samane cha means this is applicable only when the Upasanas are identical. Then alone this rule will be applicable. The four factors like the nature, deity, phalam and featies should be identical as already mentioned in the earilier adhikaranam. With this the upasamhara adhikaranam is over. The most important part of the third chapter is over. Several issues will be henceforth be taken in the following adhikaranams.

### **Topic 3 Anyathatvadhikaranam [Sutras 6 - 9]**

Those values with different subject matter are separate even if there may be some similarities.

#### **Sutra 3.3.6 [365]**

#### ***Anyathatvam sabdaditi chennaviseshat***

If it be said [that the Udgitha vidya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad and that of the Chandogya upanisad are different on account of [difference in] texts, we deny this on the ground of their non-difference [as regards essentials]

This sutra represents the view of the Purva Paksin or the opponent. The Purva Paksi tries to establish that the two vidyas are one.

Now we enter the third adhikaranam. I will give you the general introduction. This has three sutras. In this adhikaranam a case is taken to show how there can be exception to the rule. The first case study is an exception. It is prana Upasana occurring in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad again. In Chandogya upanisad first chapter second section [1.2] prana Upasana is talked about and in Brihadharaynaka upanisad in 1.3 prana Upasana is talked about. Here prana is glorified through a story. The glory of prana is that prana is one organ which cannot corrupted or polluted or sullied by anyone. It is uncorruptable or unpollutable. Nithya suddhatvam is the glory of the prana. In this regard a story is given where the several asuras the evil forces rajasic and tamasic forces all the time attack our organs. A spiritual seeker wants to keep his organs in sattvic mood. When he does so, the eyes, ears etc., are attacked by the evil forces, which we call in this place as asuras. Asuras are but symbolization of the evil forces that corrupt the sense organs and its functions. Seeing what should not be seen corrupts eyes. Ears hear good thing but secretly hear the rumours etc. Every jnanendriyams are polluted and they do punya and papa karmas. All papa karmas are done by jnanendriyas and karmendriyas and not by the prana. The prana alone is not corrupted by the asuras and an example is given. A clog of earth and you through the clay upon the rock to destroy the rock and instead of destroying the rock the clog itself is



destroyed. This story is told to enumerate that the prana stands unaffected by any of the evil forces that try to destroy prana. There are some common features in both the Upasana. Prana is upasya devata; story is same; example si the same; this prana is to be meditated upon in association with Omkara; Omkara sambandha is talked about; the conclusion is similar; and when Omkara is musically chanted in samaveda and when it is chanted so it is called Udgita. Prana is connected with Udgita. Because of Udgita sambandha this Upasana is called Udgita vidya. The Udgita vidya is seen 1.2 and Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.3 with several common features. However, there is one uncommon feature also between the Udgita vidya mentioned in the above two Upanisads. The dissimilar feature we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

### Class 272

Topic 3 Anyathatvadhikaranam [Sutras 6 - 9]

Those values with different subject matter are separate even if there may be some similarities.

Sutra 3.3.6 [365]

*Anyathatvam sabdaditi chennaviseshat*

If it be said [that the Udgitha vidya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad and that of the Chandogya upanisad are different on account of [difference in] texts, we deny this on the ground of their non-difference [as regards essentials]

This sutra represents the view of the Purva Paksin or the opponent. The Purva Paksi tries to establish that the two vidyas are one.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. The purpose of this adhikaranam is to show that even though the five principle are given as criteria, do not blindly use them because there are exceptions to the rule. Sometimes the criteria is ignored and you should discriminately arrive at the conclusion, the first two adhikaranam represents the general rule and the present one represents the exception. We see the example in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad regarding the Udgita Upasana. Here we find in both these portions the Upasanas are very similar and similarities are numerically more. In both the portions prana tattvam is meditated. In both section prana is glorified as suddha prana incapable of pollution. In both the portions prana is associated with Omkara. Incidentally, Omkara mentioned here is Samaveda Omkara which is called Udgita. The fourth similarity is the suddhi of the prana is revealed by the same story. The story given to reveal the prana suddhi also is the same. In both it is said the asuras attack the prana with impurity. Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary says asuras in this context symbolically represents rajasa and tamasic gunas and sattva guna is devas. This attacking story is also the same in Chandogya upanisad 1.2 and Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.3. The details of the story also the same and asuras are successful in attacking the sense organs. When the asuras attack the prana the asuras are not able to succeed. In life there is no goodness or badness. Prana is sacred in every animal including the jivas. This story details are also the same. The next similarity is the same. The example given is also the same. Asura attacking the prana is clod of earth is also the same. When it attacks the rock, instead of rock being disintegrated, the clod suffers and gets disintegrated. Thus there are several similarities. There is one dissimilarity. The sambandha between prana and Omkara, the relationship is dissimilar between Chandogya upanisad version and Brihadharaynaka upanisad version. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad version all the organs try to chant the mantra Omkara. The purpose of Omkara ganam or udgita gnanam is to win over the asuras or the evil forces. Therefore to strenthen themselves all organs are asked to chant Omkara. Asuras do not allow the sense organs to chant the mantra. Even before getting the immunity, they are attacked and evil forces succeed in getting over them. The crux of the message the prana is Omkara chanter. Any chanter of Omkara or Udgita is called Udgata. Prana is udgata priest that is the symbolism in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Whereas in Chandogya upanisad version prana

is not the chanter of Omkara, prana itself presented as Omkara. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad prana is the priest and in Chandogya upanisad prana is the 'chanting'. This is the dissimilarity as against several similarities. When there are many similarities what we should do. If you apply the principle of the first adhikaranam, since similarities are more and dissimilarities, the two Upasanas must be identical. This will be natural conclusion. But Vyasacharya reverses the conclusion and establishes that these two Upasanas are different. The reason he gives is very important. The reason is that even though the similarities are high if the similarities are at the nonessential level, if at the essential level the dissimilarity is there and even that dissimilarity is one, it becomes powerful. Here one becomes more powerful than many similarities. It is like one lion and thousand goats. In addition, I can give another example. A chartered bus has been arranged to take a number of people to another place. All the people have come at the time of the departure of the bus except one person. Even after lapse of long time the bus has not started. Here the majority people have come and according to our rule, the bus must start. However, it has not started and the missing person happens to be the driver of the bus. So also, in our case, the dissimilarity is of an important nature and hence the general rule cannot be applied and the two Upasana in our case is treated as different and not one. Blind quantity is not enough. Both are prana Upasana and the nature of prana in one and nature of prana in the other is different. This is the essence of the adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. The first portion anyathatvam subdaditi and channaviseshat is the second portion. The first portion is siddhanta and the second portion is Purva Pakshi. The first sutra ends with purva paksha refuting the siddhanta and the next sutra the siddhanta comes again and refutes the Purva Pakshi. The first part of the sutra that is siddhanta says because of the dissimilarity the Upasanas are different. When he talks about the dissimilarity in one prana is chanter of Omkara and in another prana is Omkara. This contention is refuted in the second part of the sutra by the purva paksha. Even though the dissimilarity is there and it is one as against the similarities are more. Hence we should treat the Upasanas identical. Even though numerically large, the essential dissimilarity is more important. I am singular but I am Advaidin.

Now I will give you the running meaning. Of the sutra and the significance of the words. Anyathatvam means the difference [between the prana Upasana of Chandogya upanisad 1.2. And prana Upasana of Brihadharaynaka upanisad 1.3. Sabdad is known from the difference in the description. This is said by the siddhanta. Now Purva Pakshi refutes this by applying the general rule applied in the first adhikaranam. If this is your view na means not so. Aviseshat means because they are identical [due to many similarities] this is the refutation by the Purva Pakshi.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Anayatatvam means bedah; the difference between Chandogya upanisad prana Upasana and Brihadharaynaka upanisad prana Upasana as mentioned above. This is said by the siddhanta; sabdad this is proved by the sabda pramana. All the sense organs sang Omkara the very expression indicates that the prana is the chanter of Omkara as per the context of the story. In Chandogya upanisad the statement is pranam udgitam upasansaksute here prana is Omkara and caksuh is Omkara and not the chanter. In one prana is Omkara and in the other prana is the chanter. Itichena means the refutation by the Purva Pakshi. Aviseshat means non-distinction, which means similarities. You focus one similarity and you ignore many similarities. Therefore our conclusions are identical and this is the Purva Pakshi's conclusion.

Topic 3 Anyathatvadhikaranam [Sutras 6 - 9]

Those values with different subject matter are separate even if there may be some similarities.

Sutra 3.3.7 [366]

*Nava prakaranabhedat parovariyastadivat*

Or rather there is no [unity of the vidyas] owing to the difference of subject matter even as [the meditation on the Udgita] as the highest and greatest [i.e., Brahman] [is different from the meditation on the Udgita as abiding in the eye etc,

The objection raised in the preceding sutra is refuted.

This sutra is siddhanta sutra. First I will do the general analysis of the sutra. Siddhanti says I am aware of the similarities and still he says that the dissimilarity is in the very nature of upasya devata. There also the description of the devata is significance and not the story. If you study the very development as I said all the devatas approached the organs and asked them to chant sama ganam and ultimately came to the conclusion that prana could not be attacked and it was proved that prana is the fittest priest to chant udgita mantra. Not only Omkara is priest who can chant Omkara and he is the udgata priest who can chant all other mantras also. That is the type of meditation prescribed in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. If you see the mantra in Chandogya upanisad, in the first section and in the first mantra, says that sama Veda Omkara is the ideal symbol to invoke any devata. Udgita is the best symbol and the uniqueness of the symbol for it lends itself for the invocation of any deity. Normally in the Upanishad portion particular symbol is associated with particular devata. But Omkara is alampanam for several deities. In all the Upasanas Omkara is common symbol. This Chandogya upanisad development. In the list of various deities invoked one of the deities invoked in prana devata. That means Omkara is to be visualized as suddha prana as per Chandogya upanisad. If you do not see the development you will be carried by the development. Here prana is the priest and in Brihadharaynaka upanisad prana is the very chanting itself. How can you equate both? If you equate these Upasanas naturally the attribute will have to be combined to make it one Upasana. You will not be able to combine because the attributes in both are mutually exclusive. If one is the chanter, it cannot be the chanted. If it is the chanted it cannot be the chanter. Therefore our argument because descriptions are different and because the descriptions are mutually exclusive you have to see the essential non-difference and come to the conclusion. He gives an example in this regard. This paropariya Isvara Upasana occurs in the mantra 1.9.2 of Chandogya upanisad. The analysis of this we will do in the next sutra. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the running meaning of the sutra. Nava means the two prana Upasana are not at all the same. Prakaranabhedat means since the introductions of the two topics are different. Paropariyatvavadd means like parovariya Isvara Upasana. This is the translation.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Nava means these two Upasana cannot be identical in spite of numerous similarities quoted by the Purva Paksi. The reason for this is prakaranabhedat. The very introduction of the two Upasanas. This determines the very nature of prana to be meditated. That very nature of prana is different. In the introduction we find the devas approached organs and requested them to chant Omkara to keep themselves from the evil forces of asuras.. It is seen that devas were weaker and asuras were stronger within

the body. Thus, each organ is the chanter and not the chanted. Then the next word is parovariyatvat means one of the glories of the Lord. Both itnersm of dimension and size and also quality greatest is Bhagavan. Parah refers to the greatness in terms of size sarvagatatvam and gunah means regarding the quality or glory-wise Bhagavan is the greatest, that Isvara Upasana is talked about in Chandogya upanisad 1.9.2 and if you study that the meaning of this sutra will be clear. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 273

### **Topic 3 Anyathatvadhikaranam [Sutras 6 - 9]**

Those values with different subject matter are separate even if there may be some similarities.

#### **Sutra 3.3.7 [366]**

#### ***Nava prakaranabhedat parovariyastadivat***

Or rather there is no [unity of the vidyas] owing to the difference of subject matter even as [the meditation on the Udgita] as the highest and greatest [i.e., Brahman] [is different from the meditation on the Udgita as abiding in the eye etc,

The objection raised in the preceding sutra is refuted.

We have completed the 7<sup>th</sup> sutra in this third adhikaranam of the third pada. Here two prana Upasanas discussed in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad was analysed as to whether they should be taken as one Upasana or two Upasanas. Siddhanta held that they should be different Upasana because the dissimilarity is of essential nature while the similarities pointed out by the Purva Paksins were of nonessential level. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad the prana is chanter whereas in Chandogya upanisad prana is presented as the very chanted the udgita mantra itself. Chanted and the chanter cannot be identical as they are mutually exclusive. Chanting cannot be chanter and chanter cannot be the chanted. Thus it was established the similarities in the story should not be taken seriously. Up to this we saw in the last class. Now we will go to the third and final sutra of this adhikaranam.

### **Topic 3 Anyathatvadhikaranam [Sutras 6 - 8]**

Those values with different subject matter are separate even if there may be some similarities.

#### **Sutra 3.3.8 [367]**

#### ***Samjnataschet taduktamasti tu tadapi***

If it be said [that the vidyas are one] on account of [the identity of] name; [we reply that] that is explained [already]; moreover that [identity of name] is [found in the case of admittedly separate vidyas]

An argument against the preceding sutra is refuted.

In this sutra the first portion is the objection from the purva paksa. Then siddhanta answers. Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. Before the purva paksa raised the objection that the two Upasanas are one because of the various similarities. Our answer was that many similarities are nonessential and the one dissimilarity is essential one and hence the two Upasanas are different. There are four factors to [RIND] result of the two Upasanas,

injunction or commandment, name of the two Upasanas and deity of the two Upasanas and if the four factors are identical, then the two Upasanas can be taken as identical. Purva paksha now says that nama aikyam is there that both are prana Upasanas. Prana is associated with Omkara. Samaveda Omkara is called Udgita, in both Upasanas prana is associated with Udgita, and both are called utgita vidya. Therefore nama aikyam is there. Not only nama aikyam is there. The fourth factor devata aikyam is also there. Prana devata is there in both the Upasanas. The Purva Pakshi says this. Siddhanta says even though name and deity are identical, the description of prana in one and description of prana in the other is different. They are different in such a way that they cannot be combined. The combination is not possible in this case for the reasons given above. This Vyasacharya says has not been explained earlier. Vyasacharya gives two other Upasana in support of his statement. The two Upasanas have the same name and the deities are identical. Yet we have said that they are different. The two Upasanas are one is 1.6. And 1.7 sections; in this the topic is Isvara Upasana in or upon Udgita Omkara the one occurring in samaveda. Because it is Isvara Upasana upon Omkara symbol this Upasana is called Udgita Upasana and the deity is Isvara the Lord. There is another Upasana in Chandogya upanisad 1.9 where Isvara Upasana is prescribed upon Udgita Omkara. Since the alambanam used is the same and it is also named Udgita Upasana. In these two Upasanas name is common deity is also common. In spite of this, we treat both as different Upasanas. The reason for this treatment is \the description of Isvara is different in both the cases. The descriptions are such that they cannot be combined and made into one Upasana. In Chandogya upanisad Isvara is described as aksi adhithya gatha hiranmaya purusah. Hiranmaya purusah means the shining god. Not only the Lord is shining and is shining in the brilliance of the sun and the eye. Both sun and eye are called light and both light are requires for seeing an object. Not only the brilliance is pointed out but also the Upanishad describes that the Lord has the body, which is of golden colour. This is to be imagined as the rays are taken as the golden hair of the Lord. Also it is the description of the personal god. This Chandogya upanisad Upasana is a art of sandhyavandanam. In Chandogya upanisad 1.9 also Isvara Upasana is given where Isvara is imagined to be the all pervading Akasa. It is described as parovariayan. Parah means parimanah utthamanah. Qualitywise it is the greatest. Therefore, god is parovariyan. It is not personal god. The formless all pervading god is described 1.9 and description is given in the 1.6 of Chandogya upanisad. Therefore we take these two Upasanas as separate Upasanas. In the same way prana Upasana is different even though the names are identical.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samjnatah means due to the identity of the names the two Upasanas are the same; siddhanta answers chet means if this be your contention tat it has been answered in the previous sutra. Identical name is there api even [for different Upasanas] now we will come to the significance of thw words. Samjnatah because of the common name for both the prana Upasanas; tah means because of the common name [the Upasana must be identical based on the view taken in the first adhikaranam] chet that has been answered in the previous sutra. Incidentally the two Upasanas are analysed in the Brahma Sutra itself [1.1.20 antaradhikaranam and parovariya Akasa rupena Isvara Upasanam it is discussed in 1.1.22 akasadhikaranam. From this our condition is that the identity of name is not the main factor to determine the identity of the Upasanas. Name of the Upasana cannot be taken as primary factors to decide the Upasana's relationship with one another. Name is not the compelling factor to come to the conclusion. With this third adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 3 sarvabhedadhikaranam [Sutras 9]**

It is appropriate to specialize OM by the term Udgita.

**Sutra 3.3.9 [368]**

***Vyapttescha samanjasam***

And because [OM] extends [over the whole of the Vedas] [to specialize it by the term [Udgita] is appropriate.

Sutra 7 is elaborated here.

This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. Here a technical or grammatical aspect of sastra is analysed. This discussion is based 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad. May one meditate upon syllable Om the udgita. The confusion here is that the word udgita and om are put in apposition. Udgita is Omkara that occurs in apposition carrying the same meaning. Rama the son of Dasarata went to forest. The son of Dasarata is apposition. In Sanskrit when two words are in apposition it should agree in the case, number and gender. This appositional usage is called samanadhikaranyam. This topic is extremely important for Advaidins. Lots have been written on samanadhikaranyam. All mahavakyams are samanadhikarana vakyams. Naturally the sastra analyses and says that there are four types of samanadhikaranyam. Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary in this adhikaranam talks about four types of appositional usage. They are adhyasa samanadhikaranyam wherein two words are used in samanadhikaranyam even though they are different the samanadhikaranyam coms. This is the snake and here this refers to the object in front which is a rope and snake refers to another object which is not there and the two rope and snake are take as though one and the same and we use the expression ayam sarpah. Here are there are two types. One is deliberate one and the other is erroneous one. It is a wrong perception born out of ignorance but when one looks at stone and say that this is god and you pray and offer naivedyam. You look upon achetana vigraha as chetana devata. This is Ganapathi Haridrabimbah ganesah. Here one is taken for another and here deliberate mistake is committed for the sake of puja or Upasana. In the same manner if disrespect the flag of the nation, you disrespect the nation. This is adhyasa samanadhikaranyam. The second one is apavada samanadhikaranyam. Here you refer to erroneous object wrongly seen as a snake the rope. You correct the mistake the snake you saw is the rope. The snake is the rope. From the context you should know that the snake is rope. In corrective samanadhikaranyam, the first one is replaced by the second one. I displace the snake and replace it with rope. When the sastra says brahmarpanam, etc. The world is god, the Upanishad conveys what you see as world is mistaken vision and there is no world at all but there is god. Whatever is god and what is what is god it is often said. The very same god the otherwise a person sees as the world. This is apavada samanadhikaranyam. This is displacement samanadhikaranyam. The third one is aikya samanadhikaranyam. This is most common. When two things which are different or superficially different are revealed as one, it is called aikya samanadhikaranyam. There are one thousand namas are there but all indicate one Vishnu. This is aikya samanadhikaranyam. All astottra and sahasranamas are aikya samanadhikaranyam with words many but revealing one deity. Tat tvam asi is also indicate that tat as also tvam indicate Bhagavan only. The fourth one is where one is adjective and the other is noun. The mango tree is apposition and it is a samanadhikaranyam. The viseshana word is specifying the object among the group of objects. When I say mango tree, tree refers to general group of trees and mango refers to the specific tree. Without mango it is general and with the mention of mango it is specific. Both specific and general are shown here and it



is called vishesha samanadhikaranyam. May one meditate Udgita Omkara. Here udgita and Omkara are in samanadhikaranyam. Now the doubt is which samanadhikaranyam we see in udgita and Omkara. The answer given in this adhikaranam here it is the fourth type of viseshana viseshya bhava samanadhikaranyam. I will explain further in the next class. The significance is when you say Om, the word Omkara refers to Omkara occurring in all the Vedas. Thus the word om iti aksaram refers to general Omkara. And by adding udgitam omkaram the Upanishad wants to specify the musical Omkara occurring in the Samaveda. Call that tall man means the person is specified. Tall localizes the man. Similarly Omkara is general and udgita Omkara is specific. In Chandogya upanisad specific Omkara is mentioned. The chanting prana Upasana is also udgita. Parovariya Akasa urpena Isvara Upasana is Udgita Upasana. Upon that symbol many Upasanas are prescribed. Udgita Upasana is versatile symbol. Normally one Upasana is used for one deity but udgita Omkara is used for several Upasana. This is the topic of the adhikaranam. The exact meaning we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 274

### **Topic 3 sarvabhedadhikaranam [Sutras 9]**

It is appropriate to specialize OM by the term Udgita.

#### **Sutra 3.3.9 [368]**

#### ***Vyaptescha samanjasam***

And because [OM] extends [over the whole of the Vedas] [to specialize it by the term [Udgita] is appropriate.

Sutra 7 is elaborated here.

We see the fourth adhikaranam and the seventh mantra. Here the relationship between aksaram and Udgita is being analysed, samanam means the same; adhikaranam means the objects. When two names have got the two names like Dasarata putra and Rama they have got samanam and adhikaranam and in this context it is the meaning or the object. The object of Sita husband and Dasarata putra is the same. When two objects have the same meaning, that nature of the two words is called samanadhikaranyam. In English it is called apposition. Samanadhikaranyam is indicated by the words occurring in the same case and in the same number. Sathyam jnanam anantam Brahmann is samanadhikaranyam. Udgitam occurring in the Chandogya upanisad is samanadhikaranyam. Visheshana viseshya samanadhikaranyam one qualifying the other. Udgitam and Omkara has got viseshana viseshya samanadhikaranyam. The Omkara belongs to all the four Vedas. General om belongs to all four Vedas and once we use the word Udgita Omkara restricts it to vyavarthana viseshanam or restrictive adjective. The word Udgita can refer to samaveda or musical Omkara. Other Omkara is excluded in Udgita Omkara. The other three samanadhikaranyam does not fit in here because of the other three apavada samanadhikaranyam and aikya samanadhikaranyam is not possible because they are used in the context of teaching or giving knowledge. Apavada samanadhikaranyam is used when one thing is mistaken I have the job of correcting you and for that purpose I have displace the wrong perception. In the case of rope snake example I have to see the rope and not snake and I have to replace the snake by the knowledge of rope the sathyam. Apavada samanadhikaranyam is used for education or teaching purpose. The world is Brahman the Upanishad says and it is not an Upasana but it is a correction. Displace the idea that there is a world and replace that with the Brahman. Therefore apavada samanadhikaranyam is used in jnana prakaranam. Similarly aikya samanadhikaranyam is used for teaching. When things are taken differently because of superficial differences I have to tell you that the differences are superficial and do not take it seriously and convince that both are equal. Every equation is aikya samanadhikaranyam. I am forced to write the equation that the left side figures and right side figures are different but really both are same and this is jnana prakaranam. What is stated here in Chandogya upanisad is Upasana prakaranam and in this context apavada and aikya samanadhikaranyam is not prakaranam. There is one more samanadhikaranyam and that adhyasa samanadhikaranyam. This is only a but technically difficult`. You take the sentence as prescription of Upasana.

Meditate upon Omkara as Udgita. If you take Omkara as Udgita then you can call it adhyasa samanadhikaranyam, Omkara is a symbol on which I superimpose utgitatvam, and if such a proposition is made then there should be separate phalam for such Upasana. But there is no Upasana phalam is mentioned and if am to do Udgita upon Omkara then it should have separate phalam and adhyasa samanyadhikaranyam is not applicable and it will be Udgita Omkara should be taken as visesha viseshya and upon Omkara you meditate Isvara etc. Udgita is not an object of meditation and it is an adjective for symbol of meditation. If we superimpose Udgita on Omkara and Udgita will become object of meditation. Here Udgita Omkara put together is a symbol and upon this Omkara we meditate prana Isvara etc., and Udgita is not object of meditation but it is an attribute of the symbol over which we meditate later. The logic is if Udgita is object of meditation a separate phalam should be mentioned and therefore adhyasa samanyadhikaranyam is not applicable here. Here Udgita Omkara is a symbol on which varieties of deities are invoked.

Vyaptehe because of the wider meaning [of Omkara] cha samanjasam it is indeed appropriate [to specify it with the adjective Udgita] this is the running meaning. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Vyapteh means pervasion and pervasion is wider meaning of the word Omkara. The wider meaning is om occurring in other four Veda has wider meaning because it spreads in all conditions. If I am to specify I have to give an adjective. The next word is cha is made in the negation of the other three meaning. Samanjasam means appropriate that is using the word as an adjective is appropriate. By serving as adjective the wider meaning is restricted and samaveda Omkara alone is the symbol and this restriction is achieved by the udgitam.

## **Topic 5 Sarvabhedadhikaranam [Sutra 10]**

Unity of the prana vidya

### **Sutra 3.3.10 [369]**

#### ***Sarvabhedadanyatre***

On account of the non-difference [of the vidya] everywhere [i.e., in all the texts of the different sakhas where the prana vidya occurs] these qualities [mentioned in two of them are to be inserted] in the other places [e.g., the Kaushitaki Upanishad]

A concrete instance on the general principle of sutra 5 is cited.

First I will give you the general introduction of this adhikaranam with one sutra. In this adhikaranam the subject matter is prana Upasana and prana Upasana that occurs in three Upanishad in almost similar manner. Chandogya upanisad 5.1. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 6.1 and Kaushitaki Upanishad second chapter; in all these three portions prana Upasana is there where we see the common story. There is prana samvadha. There is a big debate between all the sense organs and the prana as to who is the greatest. One by one each sense organs and the mind quit and when other organs quit nothing serious happens to the individual but when prana is about to quit all the other organs are not able to quit. Then all sense organs and andhakaranam accept prana as the greatest and the eldest. There is a slight difference in the Kaushitaki Upanishad approach and Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In the other two Upanishad while giving the story the Upanishad talks about the glory of each

sense organs also. Eye has got the glory and vak has got the glory; vak indriyam is given the vashistatvam. Vak indriyam is given the glory of richness. Organ of speech is wealthy because it has got the wealth of knowledge and through the knowledge you can get money also. Since the eyes are given the glory of pradhista. It means the support. Eyes are said to be support while walking etc. It is the eye that supports when you walk on the road. For the mind also glory is given. I use the expression vashistatvadi guna, which means virtues like richness. These are the glories of the sense organs. After the experiment is over, all the organs understand that prana alone is the greatest one and every organ says whatever glory they have it is because of prana and not because of them. If prana is not there eyes cannot have glory and vak etc. All the glories the sense organs hand over to the prana. At the end of the story, vashistatvam is transferred from vak to prana; so all the organs surrender their virtue individually. Therefore, the prana Upasana includes the meditation of prana with transferred virtues also. Prana had no virtue at the beginning but at the end of the story, prana has all the glories of the sense organs. This transference of virtues from sense organs to prana is mentioned in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. But in Kaushitaki Upanishad the additional virtues are not mentioned while the story part is the same. Hence, Purva Pakshi says that the prana Upasana of Kaushitaki Upanishad is different from Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad prana Upasana. Our conclusion is that it is not different from the other two. This is the essence of the adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. The prana in all the three Upanisads is the same because of jyestatvam and shrestatvam. The story reveals the intention of the Upanishad. The purpose of the story is any virtue of any organ belongs to prana. Every organ is known as secondary prana because the very virtue of every sense organ belongs to prana. Because prana is the same, the attributes also are the same.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Ime these attributes; anyatra should be included in the prana Upasana mentioned elsewhere. Sarvabedat means since the Upasana is the prana Upasana is the same everywhere. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Sarvabedat means one and the same; upasya prana abedat; sarva refers to all the three Upanishads. Anyatra ime means anyatra refers to Kaushitaki Upanishad; imey means the attributes [vashistatvadi attributes which are said in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad and which are not said in the Kaushitaki Upanishad] samyojyah should be added.

Adhi Sankaracharya raises minor Purva Pakshi and answers that. 2.14 of Kaushitaki Upanishad says that yaha evam vidvan one who meditates in this manner he will get the phalam. Once prana is used other attributes are added. You cannot separate the virtues of the prana. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 6 Anandadyadhikaranam [sutras 11 – 12]**

Attributes like Bliss, etc., of Brahman have to be combined into one meditation.

**Sutra 3.3.11[370]**

***Anandadyah pradhanasya***

Bliss and other attributes [which the true nature] of the principle or the Supreme Self, i.e., Brahman [have to be combined from all places in the meditation on Brahman]

Brahman is described as bliss, knowledge, all pervading, the Self of all, etc., in different texts of different sakhas. All the attributes are not mentioned in all places.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with three sutra. In this adhikaranam the topic is Brahman. Upanishad talks about Brahman and Upanishad does not differentiate Sagunam Brahman and Nirgunam Brahman. We only to avoid confusion we use the word Isvara to indicate Sagunam Brahman and Brahman to indicate Nirgunam Brahman. The Upanishad uses the word Brahman for nirguna as also saguna version. Brahman is used in jnanam context also as also Upasana context. Both the topics are called Brahma Vidya. In fact in vishistadvaidam Brahma Vidya means saguna Brahma vidya only. Therefore you ask a vishistadvaidam Brahma vidya apnoti Param means saguna Brahma upasana through out the life after death as also up to the travel of vaikunta. When the word Brahman is used what all attributes to be taken universally on all contexts and what should be taken contextually. This is the discussion in this adhikaranam. The answer is that sathyam jnanam ananda etc., are the intrinsic nature which should be taken all the time along with Brahman which comes in the context of jnanam. There are certain essential features occurring in jnana prakaranam should be taken even if some features are not mentioned. There are some incidental features, which are not taken always but taken only in the context of a particular Upasana. Similarly, sathya kamah sathya sankalpah etc., will vary from Upanishad to Upanishad. Even isvaratvam will vary from Upanishad to Upanishad. He can be the controller because we are there controlled jivas this differentiation of incidental and intrinsic features is the essence of this adhikaranam.

First I will give general analysis of this sutra. Vyasacharya here gives the intrinsic feature of Brahman to be taken always wherever there is jnana prakaranam. In the next sutra Vyasacharya takes up the incidental features that varies from Upasana to Upasana. Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Anandayah means features like ananda or intrinsic attributes like ananda pradhanasya or the nature of Brahman [in all contexts or in all the contexts of jnanam]. Now we will see the significance of the words. Anandayah means ananda etc. Pradhanasya means Brahman; the word pradhanam is used any substance is called pradhanam and attribute is called apradhanam. All apradhanam attribute is called Brahmam. When it is dependent it is called apradhanam. In all the jnanam contexts occurring in all the Upanishad is taken here. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 275

### **Topic 6 Anandadyadhikaranam [sutras 11 – 12]**

Attributes like Bliss, etc., of Brahman have to be combined into one meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.11[370]**

#### ***Anandadyah pradhanasya***

Bliss and other attributes [which the true nature] of the principle or the Supreme Self, i.e., Brahman [have to be combined from all places in the meditation on Brahman]

Brahman is described as bliss, knowledge, all pervading, the Self of all, etc., in different texts of different sakhas. Not all the attributes are mentioned in all places.

We now see the sixth adhikaranam consisting of three sutras. We have completed the first sutra. Here Vyasacharya differentiates or classifies Brahman into two types one is Sagunam Brahman and another is Nirgunam Brahman. Jneyam Brahman is Nirgunam Brahman and it is described with a few important intrinsic features like sathyam, jnanam and anandam. These are the four important features of Nirgunam Brahman and it is for understanding only. No Upasana is required for jnanam Brahman or anantam Brahman. It is to know that the sathyam Brahman is I am. The ignorant based problems of samsara will go away on knowing that I am Brahman. There is no Nirgunam Brahman Upasana. It is meant for understanding. Upasyam Brahman is described in the sastra with variety of features. It is not meant for knowing only but after knowing we have to use that Brahman in the practise of Upasana. The knowledge does not produce in the case of Sagunam Brahman. Knowledge has to be followed by meditation and all the phalam depends upon the quality of the meditation. With duration of meditation, the benefit will increase. Here Vyasacharya says all the important attributes etc., must be included in the entire context. Wherever jneyam Brahman is mentioned, all the essential features should be added. Therefore jneyam Brahman is only one and all the features must be brought in all the Upanishads wherever jneyam Brahman is talked about., in the case of Upasyam Brahman we cannot take all the features but take only the special features mentioned in the particular place. Eka rupam and aneka rupam cannot be brought in. The nonessential features should not be brought in. Essential features do not require maya sambandha. Brahman is sathyam without maya; Brahman is jnanam without maya; Brahman is ananda means what is the ananda we talk about should be taken into account. If ananda is experiential coming going arriving departing bliss means it requires maya and if ananda means non-experiential purnatvam or freedom from lack, freedom from apurnatvam or limitation and that ananda is the essential nature of Brahman does not require maya. They must be brought in wherever jneyam Brahman is talked about. Pradhanasya belongs to tatparyam Brahman, or viseshyam Brahman or jneyam Brahman. The next question is what are nonessential features, which need not be brought in when we talk about jneyam Brahman. This we will discuss in the next sutra.

### **Topic 6 Anandadyadhikaranam [sutras 11 – 12]**

Attributes like Bliss, etc., of Brahman have to be combined into one meditation.

**Sutra 3.3.12[371]**

***Priyasirastavadyapraptirupachayapachayan hi bhede***

[Qualities like] joy being His head, etc., are not to be taken everywhere, [being subject to] increase and decrease [are possible only] if there is difference [and not in Brahman in which there is non-difference]

The discussion commenced in sutra 11 is continued stating here as to which of the attributes are not to be culled and combined together in every form of meditation. ‘More’ and ‘less’ will apply only if there is differentiation

In this sutra the nonessential features of Brahman [Upasyam Brahman] is discussed here. Sristi karanam is Upasyam Brahman and similarly laya and sthithi karanam are nonessential features. Vyasacharya says even the experiential ananda is nonessential feature. Existential ananda is prayasirastvadi. Here he reminds the Taittiriya Upanishad where Brahman is discussed as experiential ananda. Atma, which is non-different from Brahman, has so many grades of ananda. Priyam eva sirah means ananda, more happiness and superlative ananda is discussed in the Taittiriya Upanishad. They are superficially said to be Brahman in the ananda maya kosa prakaranam. Later we establish that the existential ananda is kosa ananda and these are said to be ananda initially. Our conclusion is that they are the nonessential features and it should not be brought in jneya Brahma prakaranam. We should also not bring sristi, sthithi, laya etc. Karta in the jnana prakaranam. This comes only when Brahman is loosely used in Sagunam Brahman and Nirgunam Brahman. Now we see Brahman means Nirgunam Brahman Sagunam Brahman means it is Upasyam Brahman. In the context Brahman is loosely used we should what are the essential and nonessential features. Experiential pleasures are subject to increase and decrease and this cannot be the essential features of Brahman.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of this sutra. Priyasirastvadyapraptih means attributes like happiness [experiential pleasures] are not to be included in all the contexts. Heupachayapachayau since they are subject to increase and decrease; bhede in the field of duality; this is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the word. Priyasirastvad is a compound word of tvam adhi and apraptih the happiness of the head as mentioned in Taittiriya Upanishad; it is followed by modha dakshina paksa etc. Apraptih means non-inclusion; non-inclusion of experiential happiness in Brahman. Brahman is not the embodiment of experiential happiness. We should not take experiential happiness to be the features of Brahman. In Brahman’s presence mind experiences, the world, emotions, and it should not be connected with Brahman. Upachaya means increase and apachayah means decrease priya will increase and become modha and modha increases to become pramodha and promoda increases to become apriaya and apriaya becomes krodha. Such ananda cannot be called brahmananda. Brahmananda has nothing to do with experiential pleasure. Brahmananda means freedom from the sense of limitation. Notion from freedom from the notion that I am finite is Brahmananda and it has nothing to do with happiness but the understanding. The Ananda is freedom of the notion of limitation is also all the time there; knowledge based ananda is un-

displaceable. Experience based ananda is displaceable by counter experience. Brahmananda is knowledge based and it is the removal of the notion that I am finite. Bhede means in the context of difference or duality which means vyavaharika dristi. We see Upasyam Brahman in vyavaharika dristi or beda dristi. In jneyam Brahman context the aim of sastra is to remove the difference and jneyam Brahman is from Paramarthika dristi and Upasyam Brahman is vyavaharika dristi. The level of dristi is different. Through vishistadvaidam alone we have to go to Advaidam and even after Advaida jnanam I have to continue to vyavaharika world. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 6 Anandadhyadhikaranam [sutras 11 – 12]**

Attributes like Bliss, etc., of Brahman have to be combined into one meditation.

### **Sutra 3.3.13 [372]**

#### ***Itare tu tvarthasamanayat***

But other attribute [like Bliss, etc., are to be combined] on account of identity of purport.

The previous discussion is continued.

It is only a reinforcement of the first sutra. Itare means the other features. In the previous sutra we talked about nonessential features. After talking about this, Vyasacharya says others means the essential features. The essential features mentioned in the 11<sup>th</sup> sutra sathya jnana ananta ananda should be brought in whenever jneya Brahma prakaranam. It is so because jneyam Brahman is ekam and Upasyam Brahman is anekam. In Shiva purana Shiva is Upasyam Brahman. In Vishnu purana Vishnu is Upasyam Brahman. But that is totally different and do not bring Shiva purana upasya Brahman to Vishnu purana Brahman. We want to retain beda. Ajnana nivritti is not the aim of Shiva puja. Only when you come to jneya Brahma prakaranam ajnanam will go away. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Tu means however; itare the other attributes [are included everywhere] artha samanyat because of the oneness of Brahman.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Tu is to differentiate the essential features from nonessential features. Itare means essential features that is sathyam, jnanam, anantam and anandam. This should be included in all the context. In this context the subject matter is jneyam Brahman. Samanya means is one and the same. Jneyam Brahman is the same in all the Upanishad whereas the Upasyam Brahman differs from Upanishad to Upanishad. In this context Upasyam Brahman refers to Nirgunam Brahman and Upasyam Brahman refers to Sagunam Brahman. Each Upasana is different from the other. With this sixth adhikaranam is over. Now we will go to the seventh adhikaranam.

## **Topic 7 Adhyanadhikaranam [14 – 15]**

Katha up. 1.3.10 –11 merely that the Self is higher than everything else.

### **Sutra 3.3.14[373]**



### *Adhyanaya prayojanabhavat*

[The passage in Kathopanisad 1.3.10 tells about the Self only as the highest] for the sake of pious meditation as there is no use [of the knowledge of the objects being higher than the senses and so on]

The previous discussion is continued.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses a kathopanisad pair of mantras. Mantra 1..3.10 and 11 are taken up for discussion. The essence of the mantra is that Atma is revealed as panca kosa vilaksanah. The mantra says the mind is superior to sense organs and intellect is superior to mind and mind refers to manomaya kosa and ananda maya and then Atma. The Upanishad mentions each kosa is superior to the previous one and the superiority is indicated by the word parah. Parah means it is superior, subtler and closer to the Atma which being subtlest. That is why prana can be controlled by mind and mind by intellect etc. Ananda maya paratvam is talked about. Superiority of several things are talked about in this mantra. The discussion is whether the Upanishad wants to teach four things or one thing. Four things are prana maya superiority, mano maya superiority, vijnana maya superiority, ananda maya superiority and our discussion is that whether the Upanishad talks about the superiority of these four or it talks about only Atma paratvam. Upanishad comes to the conclusion that Atma paratvam is being taught and the other paratvams are stepping stone and they are not meant for teaching. After teaching you should forget them. That is why there is a problem here. Sense organs are superior to sense object or sense objects are superior to sense organs. Normally we say sense organs are superior because they give status to the sense objects. Sense organs are closer to Atma. Sense organs are subtler and sense objects are made of sthoola bhutani. In the normal course it should have been said that mind is superior to sense organs. Sense objects are superior to sense organs. I make use of this to conclude that Upanishad itself is very loose in this regard and it is very clear that Upanishad does not want to focus on that. You may take sense organs are superior or sense objects are superior; whether mind is superior or intellect is superior you may take any decision; mind alone control the intellect. It is because our aim is not which one of the two is superior and you have to cross with the help of them and arrive at the Atma. Here Atma is taught and not about the other things.

Now we come to general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that Atma alone is talked about. Superiority of Atma alone is talked about and superiority of mind and intellect is not the object of intellect. By knowing mind is superior or intellect is superior, you do not get any purusartha. That is why while we talk about six clues to arrive at the teaching one of the condition is prayojanam. If there is no benefit Upanishad will not intend to teach that. Therefore that is not the aim. On the other hand knowing the Atma is beneficial to us. This Upanishad itself tells clearly in several places. If you know Atma is superior you get immortality. This is given in the mantra 1.3.15 of Kathopanisad. Then the next question is if manomaya paratvam etc., is nishprayojanam why should Upanishad introduce that. For that we say they do not have swatantra prayojanam but they have got indirect benefit of serving as the stepping stone. That knowledge by itself has no utility but it has the indirect utility of serving as the stepping stone for meditation or the knowledge of Atma. It is useful for Atma Jnanam. A person's mind cannot directly turn from the grossest to the subtlest. Annamaya Atma is grossest Atma and ananda Atma is subtlest Atma and the mind cannot turn from

grossest to subtlest. That is why even the Vedantic student commits the mistake. They say they have the knowledge but their viparita vasana is not gone. If you analyse that you have understood Vedanta. Your complain is that I have lot of vasanas. That means Brahman has got vasanas. That means even after thorough study of Vedanta we complain that I have knowledge but I have not got moksa and I have emotional problem due to viparida bhavana. Tell me are you Brahman is the question asked by them. The emotional problem is of the mind. All the time I think of the mind even after ascertaining that I have understood. All the time I have the feeling that I am the mind. The nididyanam should be I should not have viparida bhavana and that viparida bhavana is viparida bhavana. We have shifted the eye from the body and we have not shifted the eye from the mind. We do see the moksa not from the point of Atma but see from the standpoint of the mind. Therefore Upanishad says never judge your moksa based on the emotional condition and moksa does not depend of emotional condition but it is despite of the emotional condition. It is beyond the mind. One swami has got the name Beyondananda. I think parananda name has been changed to beyondananda. For this dhyanam manomaya paratvam vijnanamaya paratvam etc., are taken for our study. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 276

### **Topic 7 Adhyanadhikaranam [14 – 15]**

Katha up. 1.3.10 –11 merely that the Self is higher than everything else.

#### **Sutra 3.3.14[373]**

#### ***Adhyanaya prayojanabhavat***

[The passage in Kathopanisad 1.3.10 tells about the Self only as the highest] for the sake of pious meditation as there is no use [of the knowledge of the objects being higher than the senses and so on]

The previous discussion is continued.

We analyse the 14<sup>th</sup> sutra of the seventh adhikaranam of the third pada of the third chapter. We analyse both saguna vidya as also nirguna vidya. Saguna vidya means saguna Upasana and nirguna vidya means nididyanam or nirguna jnanam. This saguna vidya and nirguna vidya occur in all the Upanisads. Some of them look similar and a doubt may come whether two similar vidyas are identical or different. Vyasacharya establishes that when two vidyas are seen whether they are different or identical. When two are proved identical and when some of the features are not mentioned in another place the question is whether we can carry forward for comparison. The vedic saguna Upasanas are not practiced nowadays and it may not have practical Advantage. We should know for the purpose of analysis. Here we do the seventh adhikaranam, which deals with nirguna vidya, and the subject matter taken for analysis is two-mantra occurring in Kathopanisad. We have done the general analysis of the sutra. Here the word to be noted is the word parah which means supremacy or superiority. Adhi Sankaracharya calls it as mahatvam, sookshmatvam and pratyatvam, which means subtlety, vastness or pervasiveness, and being more inerior. The Upanishad ultimately talks about the paratvam of Atma. Atma is refered to as Purusa and the subtle pervading the innermost. Before revealing the paratvam of Atma, Upanishad talks about the paratvam of other kosas also. Manomaya, vijnanamaya, ananda maya are said to be Param and the word kosa is not used here although it refers to kosas only. Avyaktam here refers to anandamaya kosa and each kosa is said to be Param. Now the doubt is whether the Upanishad wants to give one knowledge through the section or does the Upanishad want to teach many vidyas which means paratvam of the kosas. Vyasacharya wants to conlude that the two mantras wants to convey only one lesson and the other paratvams are aid to teach the Atma paratvam. The various paratvam are the stepping stone to reach Atma paratvam. The various paratvam vijnana maya, ananda maya etc., are only angam and the main lesion is Atma vidya. Atma vidya is angi and others are but angams. To prove this one mimamsa rule applies. The rule is eventhough Upanishad talks about manomayasya paratvam, ananda maya paratvam the Upanishad does not talk about any phalam or benefit for that knowledge. By knowing the manomayasya paratvam you get this or that has not been said and it is nishphalam. No prayojanam is mentioned in the case of other paratvam. These vakyams are secondary and they are not tatparya vakyams. It is like the thread, which is used for mala. The thread does

not have independent value. But it goes to the head under one condition when it is used to tie the flowers and as flowers anga rupena. Flower is angi and thread is angam. In the absence of angi flower the thread will not be used at all. Similarly, manomayasya paratvam is like a thread, it does not have independent existence, and in the absence of Atma jnanam manomaya has no relevance. Vijnana maya, ananda maya etc., do not have any relevance in the absence of Atma jnanam, which is the goal of our study. When we say prayojana abhavad, we say it does not have independent utility. But the same thing will get value in association with other thing. Atamanah paratvam alone is independently useful but manomaya paratvam is not useful independently. They do not have independent status of vidya and they are meant for knowing and meditating. When you want to do Atma Jnanam your mind cannot directly contact Atma and you have to use annamaya as stepping stone and it is useful to enter prana maya and prana maya meditation is useful to enter mano maya. Similarly, you enter vijnana maya and your mind should concentrate on silence, which is ananda maya kosa, and from silence, you come to saksi of the silence, which is my 'Self'. This is mentioned in Kathopanisad itself. Withdraw the mind and focus on the body; and from mind focus on silence and then focus on the witness of the paratvam. When you say the other paratvam is of no use, Atma paratvam is beneficial, and for that Adhi Sankaracharya says that if you study Kathopanisad portion it will be useful and it will be very clear it is said. In this context, we get the Ratha kalpana and how the Atma travels by the chariot. The various parts of the body are taken as the horses etc. Intelligent Jivatma will discriminately make the spiritual journey and gain moksa or reach the Paramatma. Jivatma journey in the case of spirituality is not an external journey but an internal journey. These two mantras mention the spiritual journey, each kosa is an intermediary station, and the intermediary station is not the destination. The Upanishad talks about the destination, which is called Chaitanyam. All other lesions are like intermediary stations and Atma Jnanam is only the destination of our study. Chaitanyam alone is the end of the journey. That final destination is hidden and that is called Atma and that Atma everyone has to reach ultimately. Finally, the Upanishad says in 1.3.15 that reaching vijnana maya, reaching ananda maya etc., do not give any benefit but reaching Atma alone gives the benefit in the form of gaining moksa. There is only one vidya and there is no many vidyas.

Now I will give you the running meaning. Adhyanaya superiority of other things are mentioned for the sake of meditation of Atma and not independently. Prayojana bhavad because there is no benefit out of their knowledge of mind intellect etc. This is the word meaning. Now we will do the significance of the words. Adhyanaya means deep meditation or nididyanam or Atma dhyanam; for the sake of Atma dhyanam alone is the meaning and you have to complete the sentence that other kosas are mentioned only for Atma Jnanam and they do not have value of their own. Therefore, they are considered as angam and not angi. Watching the breath or silence of the mind is only the means and not the end. You should know what is the angam and what is angi. Remember watching the mind is not an end in itself; watching the chakra or kundalini is not the end in itself and even silence is anatma as you are aware of the silence. They are angam and the real dhyanam is from the observed silence you have to come to observer silence. Meditation on the meditator is nididyanam. If you do not understand you will do lot of meditation without knowing what you do. They are not end in itself because it is prayojana abhavad. Prayojana abhavad means because they have no validity of their own. They are like arthavadha vakyams and they are pramana vakyams.

## **Topic 7 Adhyanadhikaranam [14 – 15]**

Katha up. 1.3.10 –11 merely that the Self is higher than everything else.

**Sutra 3.3.15 [374]**

***Atma sabdaccha***

And on account of the word Atman.

An argument in support of sutra 14 is given.

The central teaching of the Upanishad is seen to be Atma Jnanam and not the kosa jnanam as we have seen in the last sutra. Phala lingam is mentioned in the 14<sup>th</sup> sutra by the word prayojanad. The bottom line of Bhagavad Gita is one message or many message is a big discussion. Adhi Sankaracharya in his introduction says that Gita has only one message. One group says that there are many messages. The other one says that Atma Jnanam is only message. Once you accept that there is one message the question is what is that message whether it is karma, bhakti, dhyanam. Jnanam is only message as stated by Adhi Sankaracharya. Knowledge with sannyasa gives moksa is the message as per Adhi Sankaracharya. Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi sahitat jnana moksa. Karma is not the message of Gita. Bhakti is not the message of the Gita. Dhyanam is also an angam. Discipline is an angam. Gita is eka Atma vidya. Bhisma says in Bhagavatam that the message of Gita is Atma jnanam. In this sutra another clue or indicator or mark to find as to what is the central message of the Upanishad. It is apurvata lingam apurvata means a subject matter not available for other instruments of knowledge. The idea is Veda's message is something which cannot be known through pratyaksa pramana etc. What we can know through pratyaksa pramana Veda need not teach/ even if Veda says pratyaksa pramana we do not take them seriously. Not all-living being survive with food need be known from Veda. The message of Veda must be that which is not knowable through other means of knowledge. When you apply that manomaya, vijnana maya etc., can be known by 'ourselves'. Veda need not tell me that I have the mind, mind has emotion etc. They are not apurva vishaya but Atma is apurva vishaya because the nature of Consciousness the size of Consciousness etc., I cannot study without the help of Vedas. Atma the Chaitanyam is not objectifiable. We can never study it. Whether it is anithyam or nithyam no scientist can find out whether the Consciousness is there or not after death. Existence of Consciousness is evident but the nature of Consciousness we are never able to study and therefore it is apurva vishaya. Therefore, it is the subject matter of Veda.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Atma sabhdad cha from the usage of the word Atma also [this is proper]. This is proper means the above conclusion is proper that eka vidya eva. There is only 'one Atma vidya' that is established. The usage of word Atma is found in 1.3.12 of Kathopanisad. The Purusa that we talk about is you yourself. Therefore, in the above mantra, the destination Purusa is seen as the subject and the nature of the subject can be known only through sastra. Am I finite or infinite I have no way of knowing. I am very evident. I am finite or infinite I cannot know. I know my eyes are with me but I cannot know my eyes are red or yellowish. For this we require a mirror. So also to know about Atma we need Veda the mirror.

Now we will see the significance of the words of the sutra. Sabhdhad means because of the usage of the word Atma 1.3.12 of Kathopanisad. The significance we derive from the word

Atma is that the word Atma is the subject and it is not objectifiable. Therefore it is not available for all the pramanas. Therefore it must be the subject matter of the above two mantras. Veda need not teach that are objectifiable. Cha is the conjunction to connect what is said in the previous sutra with the present one. With this the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 277

### **Topic 7 Adhyanadhikaranam [14 – 15]**

Katha up. 1.3.10 –11 merely that the Self is higher than everything else.

#### **Sutra 3.3.15 [374]**

#### ***Atma sabdaccha***

And on account of the word Atman.

An argument in support of sutra 14 is given.

We have completed the two sutras of 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam which is called adhyanayadhikaranam. Here Kathopanisad mantras were taken and established that panca kosas are taught to sensitise the mind to take to Atma vidya. Therefore it is Atma eka vidya only and there are no many vidyas. Kosa vidya is not independent vidya and kosa vidya is an angam of Atma vidya. Panca kosa vidya has no independent validity because it has no prayojanam. In the garland the thread has no value without the flowers. It gets validity only with the associationship of flowers. A useless vakyam becomes an anga vakyam in the presence of anga vakyam. Kosa vidya is angam and Atma vidya is angi. Now we will enter into 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

### **Topic 7 Atmagrithityadhikaranam [16 – 17]**

The Self mentioned in Aitareya Upanishad 1,1 is the Supreme Self and the attributes of the Self given elsewhere should be combined with this meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.16 [375]**

#### ***Atmagrihitiritaravaduttarat***

[In the Aitareya Upanishad 1.1 the Supreme Self is meant, as in other texts [dealing with creation] because of the subsequent qualification.

First I will give you the general introduction. This adhikaranam has got two itnterpretation. For the first interpretation, Aitareya Upanishad has been taken and for the second interpretation, Chandogya upanishad has been taken. Aitareya Upanishad has been treated as principal Upanishad because of the fact that this has been taken for interpretation in Brahma Sutra.

The interpretation is called pradhama varnakam. In Brahma Sutra commentary the word varnakam indicates interpretational classification. This adhikaranam has got two sutras. Here the analysis is the Aitareya Upanishad which begins with the word Atma. The whole debate is what is the meaning of the word Atma because in certain context Atma has the meaning of

chaturmuga Brahma as in the case of 1.4.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad the word Atma means Hiranyagarbha or brahmaji. In some context Atma means Hiranyagarbha and in Taittiriya Upanishad the word atma means Brahman the Paramatma. Brahman also has two meanings Sagunam Brahman or Nirgunam Brahman. Atma means Brahman or Paramatma is being analysed here. We establish here that Atma means Paramatma only. Therefore, Aitareya Upanishad comes under Brahma vidya. In Aitareya Upanishad the first word, Atma refers to Brahman. For this purpose Vyasacharya takes the entire Aitareya Upanishad. First we will see the development of Aitareya Upanishad. It has got three chapters and the first chapter has got three sections and the second and third sections have one chapter each. In the first chapter first section Atma is introduced and is presented as the creator. Mantra 1.1 of Aitareya Upanishad reads as *Atma va idam eka evagra asit, nanyat kin cana misat sa aiksa lokan nu srja it* the meaning of the mantra is the Self, verily was all this, one only, in the beginning. Nothing else whatsoever winked. He thought 'let me now create the worlds. Not only the lokas he creates and four lokas are mentioned. Atma created Swarga loka, anthariksaka, buloka and pathala loka. What is Atma is the debate here. Devata rupa jivas were created. Loka jiva sristi is mentioned in the first chapter and sarira sristi is mentioned in the second chapter. Then the body was created. Atma brings different bodies and shows which body is wanted by the first creation. In the end Atma brings manushya sariram which was accepted by the creation. Human being is the best creation by the Lord. This is the truth. In the third section, anna sristi is talked about. Then it is said at the end of the third section Atma itself entered the sariram as the jiva. Then jiva later discovered that I am the Atma. This is the essence of the first chapter. Atma entering the body is anupavesa. Then the jiva suffers, comes to a guru and gains liberation etc.

The second chapter of 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter deals with the garbha vasa and samsara. Then the third chapter has one section which talks about rishis discussing about Atma. The rishis conclude that Atma is saksi Chaitanyam which is all pervading Brahman or prajnanam Brahman. This is the essence of Aitareya Upanishad. The third chapter talks about aikyam. First talks about creation, second about samsara and the third about the aikyam of jivatma and Paramatma. Our conclusion is Atma is Paramatma and not Hiranyagarbha.

Now we will come to the general analysis of the first sutra. Here Vyasacharya says that the word should be taken as Paramatma only and not as Hiranyagarbha as found in 1.4.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. It is Atma occurring in Taittiriya Upanishad. Do not take Brihadharaynaka upanisad meaning and employ Taittiriya Upanishad meaning of Atma.

Atma is Paramatma because the latter portion clarifies this idea. What do you mean by the following portion. There was only one Atma with sajadiya, vijadiya beda. At the time of creation there was nothing before creation. If we are talking about absolute non-duality it has to be Paramatma only. Here absolute ekatvam is talked about in Aitareya Upanishad. The second reason is that aikya eeksata Atma visualized the whole creation and it is parallel to the Paramatma creation. In the sixth anuvaka it is clearly said that Paramatma visualizes and creates the lokas. Therefore ekatvam is one basis and eeksanam is another basis. Because of these reasons, we conclude that Atma is Paramatma and not Hiranyagarbha.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Atma means paramatma is to be understood [by the word Atma occurring in Aitareya Upanishad] itaravad means as in the other cases; uttarat means this is known from the following portions. This is the running meaning.



Now we will see the significance of the words. Gritihi means grahanam or understanding. Atma means Paramatma. Understanding of Paramatma is to be done in the case of the word Atma occurring in the Aitareya Upanishad. Itaravat means as the Atma occurring elsewhere. Like the word occurring in the other Upanisads. Now Vyasacharya has in mind is 2.1 of Taittiriya Upanishad. Uttarat means the latter portion supports. The latter text intended is that nondual Atma is Paramatma alone. Hiranyagarbha has the swagata beda and Paramatma alone is free from sajadiya, vijadiya and swagata beda. Therefore nondual means Paramatma. Iksata means visualization. Sankalpa matrene sristi is seen here.

## **Topic 7 Atmagrithityadhikaranam [16 – 17]**

The Self mentioned in Aitareya Upanishad 1,1 is the Supreme Self and the attributes of the Self given elsewhere should be combined with this meditation.

### **Sutra 3.3.17 [376]**

#### ***Anvayaditi chet syadavaharanat***

If it be said that because of the context [the Supreme Self is not meant] [we reply that] it is so [i.e., the Supreme Self is meant] on account of the definite statement [that the Atman alone existed in the beginning.

An objection to sutra 16 is raised and refuted.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Purva paksa says that Atma should be taken as brahmaji or Hiranyagarbha only and not Brahman. We should not take the Taittiriya Upanishad example but take Brihadharaynaka upanisad Hiranyagarbha. When Veda talks about Paramatma as creator, first he talks about panca bhuta sristi. Paramatma does not create the lokas but panca bhutas. In Chandogya upanisad also the creation of elements alone is mentioned. Purva paksa says that Paramatma starts with bhuta sristi and not loka sristi. After the creation of pancha sristi Hiranyagarbha is created and Hiranyagarbha alone creates the various lokas. Paramatma delegates the powers to create the world to the Hiranyagarbha. Therefore, Purva Paksi argument is bhuta sristi is done by Paramatma and loka sristi is done by Hiranyagarbha. In Aitareya Upanishad bhuta sristi is not mentioned. Therefore since loka sristi is mentioned consistency requires Atma should be taken as Hiranyagarbha. Wherever bhuta sristi is there it should be Brahman and wherever loka sristi is there it should be Hiranyagarbha and not Brahman. Samanvaya or consistency is very powerful argument.

In the first chapter second sristi of Aitareya Upanishad jiva wanted sariram, approached Atma, and asked for the body. When they asked Atma, Atma took one one body and showed. If the creator Atma brings the body and showed to devata it should be embodied one and Paramatma cannot show the body at all. This activity is possible only by Hiranyagarbha alone. The specific activity of showing the various body is possible only by Hiranyagarbha and not by Paramatma. Therefore Atma means Hiranyagarbha only. In the latter part siddhanta answers. Siddhanta says no and argues that your argument is not correct because Upanishad clarifies later and confirms that it is Paramatma only. For that purpose Aitareya Upanishad is further analysed. There anupravesa sruti comes and it is a powerful topic which reveals Paramatma. You should not ask the fundamental question what is the anupravesa. Paramatma as though enters every body through a special door called Brahma yandram. First

argument is anupravesa proves that Atma means Paramatma. After anupravesa Paramatma is called Jivatma. Before entry into the body it is called Paramatma and after the entry into the body is called the present Jivatma. Former Paramatma is called later Jivatma. This is confirmed by the Mahavakya aikya jnanam. Saha etam eva purusam brahmam tatama avasyat Jivatma recognizes the original Paramatma who has entered the body. If you take Atma as Hiranyagarbha, the knowledge would have been that I am the Hiranyagarbha and not that I am Brahman. This will work only if you take that Paramatma entered, Paramatma created and this flow of thought will come only if you take that the Paramatma created Paramatma entered. Then Paramatma is available in the form of Jivatma and now I realize or recognize its original nature that I am the all-pervading Paramatma and this fact alone mahavakyam reveals that Atma means Paramatma.

The third argument is there in the third chapter of the Aitareya Upanishad. It begins with *koyam atmeti vayam upasmate, katarah sa Atma, yena va pasyati yena va srnoti yena va gandhan ajighrati, yena va vacam vyakaroti, yena va svadu cvasvadu ca vijannati* the meaning of the mantra is 'in a person, indeed this one first becomes an embryo, that which is semen is the vigour come together from all the limbs. In the Self, indeed one hears a Self. When he sheds this in a woman, he gives it birth. That is the first birth. Rishis themselves ask the question what is the Atma. That controversy already was there with the rishis. They clearly concluded that Atma is the Chaitanyam. That Atma is none other than Chaitanyam and if you take Atma as Hiranyagarbha, it will not tally with what is said in the third chapter. This is called prajnanam. At the end of discussion, the Upanishad says prajnanam Brahman. That Consciousness is none other than Brahman. Originally we started with Atma and in the third chapter we called Brahman and in the end we concluded with Chaitanyam and therefore it is Brahma vidya and finally it is said that one who gains the knowledge gains liberation. As the phalam is liberation, it can be only Paramatma jnanam and not Hiranyagarbha jnanam. Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam and moksa phalam are possible only if you take Atma as Paramatma. If you say Atma is Paramatma how do you answer this question. I have said Paramatma is only created the elements and loka sristi is done by Hiranyagarbha. Therefore if Atma is to be taken as Paramatma then Aitareya Upanishad should have talked about pancha bhuta sristi and how do you explain the pancha bhuta sristi. For that we supply pancha bhuta sristi anantaram. After pancha bhuta sristi he created the lokas. The majority portions reveal Atma is Paramatma and with the minor loksa sristi you cannot say Atma is Hiranyagarbha. This doubt should be cleared by taking what is stated in the other Upanishad should be supplied before concluding that Atma refers to Paramatma alone. Therefore the absence of pancha bhuta sristi should not be magnified. Paramatma created pancha bhuta and later created the later lokas. Paramatma created Hiranyagarbha and Hiranyagarbha created the lokas. For this we say Paramatma directly creates pancha bhutas and Paramatma indirectly creates everything through Hiranyagarbha. One is direct creation and all others are indirect creation. That is why we take all creations are the products of Paramatma. Paramatma is the moola karanam and is the creator of all and therefore these two arguments are not powerful enough in front of more supportive arguments. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Anvayad means from the standpoint of consistency or harmony [this is not proper] it is said by Purva Paksi. Iti chet if this is your contention; syat we say that this is proper only. Avadharanat means because this is substantiated or confirmed by the sruti itself. This is the running meaning. The significance of the words we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 278

### **Topic 7 Atmagrithityadhikaranam [16 – 17]**

The Self mentioned in Aitareya Upanishad 1,1 is the Supreme Self and the attributes of the Self given elsewhere should be combined with this meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.17 [376]**

#### ***Anvyaditi chet syadavaharanat***

If it be said that because of the context [the Supreme Self is not meant] [we reply that] it is so [i.e., the Supreme Self is meant] on account of the definite statement [that the Atman alone existed in the beginning.

An objection to sutra 16 is raised and refuted.

We are in the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with sutras. Adhi Sankaracharya has interpreted this adhikaranam in two different ways. We have seen the first one. In the first interpretation, the adhikaranam has taken the interpretation of the Aitareya Upanishad. This we have seen in detail in the last class. The Purva Paksi said that the word Atma has the meaning of Hiranyagarbha also. In support of such an interpretation, he quoted 1.4.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad. In that mantra Atma is taken as Hiranyagarbha. Why cannot we take that meaning here? Adhi Sankaracharya answers that in that particular Brahmanam we have enough supporting evidences to show that Atma is Hiranyagarbha only and this is a rare case. The supporting evidences are the first it is said that there was Atma of the forms of a manushya; a particular form is highlighted whereas the original Atma is niraharah. Therefore, the word Atma must refer to Hiranyagarbha and not mukya nirahara Atma. Later it is said in that Brahmanam that Atma the Hiranyagarbha attained that position because of the punya Upasanas. Thata tma got the name Purusa because Atma got the position by following the sadhana and Upasana. If the Atma has got that position through sadhana and Upasana, that cannot be Paramatma. Paramatma does not get Paramatma position by doing punya karma. But Hiranyagarbha gets his Hiranyagarbha position by doing punya karma. Therefore, Brihadharaynaka upanishad mantra must mean Hiranyagarbha. That Atma got frightened it is said there. If it is referring to Paramatma the Paramatma will have fear. Can the one who has fear be called Paramatma? The fear indicates Hiranyagarbha. Hiranyagarbha gets fear and Brahman teaches Brahma jnanam and he is freed. The Hiranyagarbha is lonely and he needed companion. Hence he created the whole world etc. Is said in the Brihadharaynaka upanishad. He divided himself as manu and satarupa. What is relevant is that there lonely is hinted. Paramatma never creates out of loneliness. There it refers to Hiranyagarbha alone but in Aitareya Upanishad it refers to Paramatma.

Now let us go to the second interpretation. In Brahma Sutra different interpretations are given and it is called varnakam. We have to give new meaning to the first sutra as also to the second sutra. In this second interpretation we do not take Aitareya Upanishad but we take the sixth chapter of Chandogya upanishad and also Brihadharaynaka upanishad [4<sup>th</sup> chapter] the

doubt is whether same Brahma Vidya is taught in both the Upanisads or something else. This is also a textual analysis. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad the third and fourth sections are important. The fourth Brahmanam is called sariraka Brahmanam considered to be very important Brahmanam. Many important mantras are there. Here the teacher talks about Atma as avastatriya saksi Self effulgent Consciousness. Based on this alone Adhi Sankaracharya writes Vedanta in one word. I am the swayam jyoti Atma. This is revealed as avastatriya saksi in the third Brahmanam. Later the very same topic is continued in the fourth Brahmanam. Here the aikyam of Atma with Paramatma is finally revealed. Avastatriya saksi Jivatma is none other than Paramatma is proved here. The teaching starts from 4.3.7 and it is completed at the end of the fourth chapter. This avastatriya saksi Chaitanyam is none other than Brahman. This Atma vidya is found in these two Brahmanam.

Now we will come to Chandogya upanisad sixth chapter. This is a confusing portion for the Purva Paksi. The teaching begins with 6.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Whether Chandogya upanisad deals with Atma vidya or not is the question here because the word Atma is not used but the word sat is used. The word sat means existence and Purva Paksi's doubt is that existence cannot be equated with Atma because the word existence refers to an abstract noun satta. The abstract noun refers to common property. Seeing the abstract noun the generality it cannot exist as an independent entity. Man can be a substance but manness cannot be a substance. When we say Brahman is existence you should not get confused. Existence is associated with some thing there. This adjective existence is associated with so many nouns and if you make it an abstract noun the humanhood, tablehood etc., cannot exist independently. This is applied to the Consciousness also. The word Consciousness we knew as property like tallness fatness etc. When you take the abstract noun of a property and that cannot be taken as the substance. So also, Consciousness is the abstract noun of an adjective and it cannot be a substance. Therefore, the word sat refers to satta samanyam and it is not a dravyam. Therefore Chandogya upanisad is not talking about Atma entity but talks about general property of existence which is associated with every substance. In these two adhikaranam we will establish that the existence in Vedanta is not an abstract noun derived from an adjective or a property but totally different.

The existence in Vedanta is this. Existence in Vedanta is not a part; product or property of any substance. The existence in Vedanta is an independent entity which pervades and lends existence to every substance. The existence in Vedanta is not limited by the boundaries of the substance. The existence in Vedanta continues to survive even after the substance gets destroyed that is when pot is destroyed pot alone goes and the 'isness' which was in the pot survives. It is the truth or reality. The existence in Vedanta the surviving existence is not recognizable not because it is absent but because it is not manifest the medium being absent. The medium here is pot namarupa which manifests existence. In Vedanta sat is an entity and it is not a property or adjective. Similarly Consciousness is an ultimate thing and it is not adjective derived is samanyam. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. The word sat refers to Atma only is established here. It is not a property or adjective. Seeing the existence, as adjective to the noun is ajnanam. The proof for is supplied in Chandogya upanisad sixth chapter. In the seventh section, the Upanishad says that existence, which is introduced, is none other than Atma and therefore it is nothing but Atma vidya. Therefore what is said in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad are 'one and the same'.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Atmagrihitith Paramatma should be understood by the word 'sat' in Chandogya upanisad 6.2.1. Itaravat as in the case of the other [Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.3.7] . Uttarat this is know from the following portion [Chandogya upanisad 6.8.7]

Now we will do the significance of the words. Atmagribiti means there should be understanding of Atma alone from the word 'sat' 6.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Itaravt means just as we understand in 4.3.7 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad; uttarat means the latter portion which refers to 8<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad. The vagueness of second section is clarified in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad. The existence as the ultimate substance is the unique teaching of the Vedanta. Consciousness is the ultimate substance which is the mind boggling teaching of the Vedanta. Chair etc., are adjective namarupa. Existence is the substance chair, table etc., are the nama rupa property. If our buddhi can visualize this, we have sookshma buddhi. I have to see all of you as changing adjective and the 'isness' is the substance. Now we will turn to the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra.

Purva Paksi argues further because the latter portion talks of Atma, I will not accept 'satt' as Atma because in mimamsa sastra there is a rule that always the latter portion is weaker then the former portion in the sastra. There are exceptions to this rule. This I am not going to discuss. Why we say the former is stronger? When you read the former portion the idea has already taken in the mind. The latter portion is weaker because it has to enter the buddi it has to displace the former one. Therefore the latter portion is durbhalam and this rule is called upakraman nyayah. Therefore, Purva Paksi says by upakraman nyaya we have understood the word satt as abstract not as a substance but as an existence the abstract noun. The Atma statement occurs latter and therefore it is weaker. Therefore I would say that is Atma should be understood as Upasana and therefore Chandogya upanisad statement does talk about Atma vidya but it talks about some abstract existence. Saha Atma is some Upasana on abstract existence to glorify that. This is purva paksa.

Siddhanta says that we cannot argue like that and we should understand 'satt' as Atma only because the Upanishad clarifies that in the latter portion. Satt is Atma it is not an imagination you do is a fact. How does the latter portion support that we will see latter.

We will see the word analysis now. First portion is purva paksa and second portion is siddhanta. Anvaya from the context it is not proper. Itichet if this is your contention syat we say it is proper; avadharanat because this is substantiated by sruti itself. This is the running meaning.

Now I will tell you the significance of the words. Anvaya means because of the context and it is according to upakraman nyaya. Satt means existence and existence is an abstract noun and it refers to a property or generality and therefore you should not interpret it as substance. Itichet means if this is your contention; syat means our interpretation is proper in spite of upakraman nyaya even though the nyaya is acceptable to us we can overrule upaksraman nyaya and say that satt is substance Atma and not generality. Avadjaranat means my interpretation is confirmed by the Upanishad itself. Therefore satt is Atma and satt vidya is Atma vidya and both Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad talks about Atma vidya alone.

What are the substantial features? Based on the bashyam I will give you six clues of supporting features in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 279

### **Topic 7 Atmagrithityadhikaranam [16 – 17]**

The Self mentioned in Aitareya Upanishad 1,1 is the Supreme Self and the attributes of the ‘Self’ given elsewhere should be combined with this meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.17 [376]**

#### ***Anvayaditi chet syadavaharanat***

If it be said that because of the context [the Supreme Self is not meant] [we reply that] it is so [i.e., the Supreme Self is meant] on account of the definite statement [that the Atman alone existed in the beginning.

An objection to sutra 16 is raised and refuted.

We discuss the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the third pada of third adhyaya of Brahma Sutra. This adhikaranam has got two interpretation and of them we see the second interpretation. Here the debate is that whether the satt occurring in Chandogya upanisad refers to Atma or something else. Remember the word ekamedat dvidiyam and there is ekamedat dvidiyam Brahman. If Brahman has occurred there would not be any controversy. Therefore this ‘satt’ is Atma is the question. If the satt is Atma then the whole prakaranam would be Atma vidya. Whether the Chandogya upanisad six chapters is Atma vidya or not depends upon this word alone. One vidya ekatvam established based on the gunopa samhara nyaya. The entire third pada of sixth chapter is gunopa samhara pada. Whether the Atma vidya of swayamjyoti Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is the same mentioned in Chandogya upanisad is our question. The Upanishad latter says satt satyam Atma. Therefore there should not be any confusion, in spite of that Purva Paksi is not satisfied, and he says satt does not refer to Atma. Satt means existence and existence is a property and it is not a substance at all whereas Atma is a substance and satt is a nonsubstance and it is samanyam. How can non-susbtantial satt and substantial Atma one and the same. . Satt satyam tada Atma do not take seriously and you imagine it as Upasana or glorification and therefore satt and Atma are not identical and therefore satt vidya is not Atma vidya and therefore satt vidya of Chandogya upanisad and Atma vidya of Brihadharaynaka upanisad cannot be taken as one. This is the purva paksa argument. For that Vyasacharya gave the answer in the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra and he said that satt is Atma and it is not glorification but it is a fact. That it is a fact we can know from the analysis of the sixth chapter of Chandogya upanisad properly. Naturally since Vyasacharya only indicates the answer, Adhi Sankaracharya has come to our risqué. He does the analysis for us and establishes that. If you look into sankara bhasyam I said I would highlight six clues to show satt is Atma.

The first point he mentions is the very word satt means it is not a property at all. You take satt as satt jathih and the it will mean existence in generality the abstract noun of the property. If you grammatically study the word, it only means the fundamental susbtacne which ever is. Because the word satt is derived from the root ‘is’. From that root the word satt is formed and

is present active participle usage and in English and it refers to person who is going or one coming and here satt refers to 'is' and it is a substance and therefore it can refer to Atma.

The second point is that after talking about satt, Upanishad refers 'satt' as the creator. Who visualizes the whole thing and thereafter creates the elements, which comes immediate next mantra of Chandogya upanishad. The Upanishad says that satt visualized the whole creation and said that let me become many. Satt is presented as creator or visualiser and from this we come to know that it is Paramatma alone. How can the property visualize and create something. Visualization and creation by satt indicates satt is Atma as presented in Taittiriya Upanishad and Aitareya Upanishad.

The third clue is the Upanishad latter says tad satyam. Chandogya upanishad 6.9.7 says tat satyam which means that is the absolute reality and here the pronoun that refers to the creator from which the whole creation is talked about and at the end Upanishad says that is reality and from this we come to know that satt said in the beginning is satyam alone because Atma alone is satyam. If satt is anatma tad satyam means anatma is satyam. This cannot be possible. Therefore, satt has to be understood as Atma alone.

The fourth argument is the equation satt as Atma and it comes latter. Tat tvam asi comes latter. 6.8.7 of Chandogya upanishad. The Upanishad itself equates satt with Atma. When we pointed out this equation purva paksha said you do not take the equation serious. It may be a glorification. Purva Pakshi refused to accept the equation by saying that it is a glorification. Adhi Sankaracharya says that you cannot ignore the equation because the Upanishad does not want us to ignore the equation tat satyam yaha Atma. In mimasa sastra it is said whenever you are serious about something you repeat the same thing. This is to show the seriousness. We go on repeating and repetition is one of the tatparya lingam and Upanishad knows that there are people will take tat tvam asi lightly and therefore nine times tat tvam asi is repeated. Therefore, Adhi Sankaracharya states that you cannot take it as glorification but the equation is a fact. The equation means satt the creator is the Atma and therefore 'Satt vidya' is Atma vidya and therefore swayam jyoti of Brihadharaynaka upanishad is Atma vidya and the satt vidya of Chandogya upanishad are 'one and the same'.

The fifth argument is given in the latter portion in the Upanishad. The teacher analyses the sushupti avastha. In the mantra 6.8.1 sushupti vichara is there. The Upanishad says that the jiva resolves into its swarupa, the real nature of Atma. Then the very same Upanishad says that means jiva resolves into the satt. Is the second statement. Jiva resolves into swarupam Atma. Next statement is jiva resolves into satt and equating the two, we get the truth that satt and Atma are identical.

The sixth and final argument is this. In the introduction to the sixth chapter of Chandogya upanishad the teacher says satt is the original cause of the creation. The Upanishad teacher says since satt is karanam of everything and since everything is karyam, karana satt vijnanena karya vijnanam bhavati. This is well known eka vijnanena sarva vijnana pratijna. By knowing satt everything is known. Adhi Sankaracharya argument is suppose Atma is not satt, then the question is can you know by knowing satt. Then eka vijnanena sarva vijnana pratijna will not happen. Satt is there and world is there. If you gain the knowledge of satt everything is known because by gaining the knowledge of satt world is also known because world is product of satt. If Atma is product of satt, satt vijnanena sarva vijnana is possible. But the Atma cannot be the product of satt because Atma is nityah and therefore Atma is not a product of satt. If Atma is different from and Atma is product of satt the eka vijnanena

sarva vijñanam na bhavati\). Because of the six clues Adhi Sankaracharya concludes satt is Atma and therefore satt vidya is Atma vidya and therefore what is said in Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad are one and the same. With this 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. Now we will go to the ninth adhikaranam.

## **Topic 9 Karyakhyanadhikaranam. [18]**

Only thinking water to be the dress of prana is enjoined in the prana vidya.

**Sutra 3.3.18 [377]**

### ***Karyakhyanadapuryam***

On account of [the rising of the mouth with water referred to in the prana vidya] being a reiteration of an act [already ordained by the smriti] what has not been so ordained elsewhere [is here enjoined by the sruti]

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with only one sutra. This adhikaranam is of academic interest only. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is prana or Hiranyagarbha Upasana occurring in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In Chandogya upanisad it is 5.2. And in Brihadharaynaka upanisad it is 6.1 where prana Upasana is there. The prana is seen to be endowed with various features. In this Upasana itself there is no problem. Upasana is followed by a portion where there is a controversy. After talking about the prana Upasana, Upanishad tells a story of the debate among the various organs of the individual. They go to brahmaji and asks who is the greatest among us. Brahmaji suggests an experiment that each one should leave the body and see what happens to the individual. The absence of which, ends the life individual is the greatest he said to the organs. The organs did not understand and each one left the body and nothing happened to the individual. Once the prana decided to leave, all the organs became weak and were plucked along with prana. None of the organs functioned as the prana wished to leave. Thus the prana was established as the greatest and prana is the hero. Then the organs offered their glories to the prana. Each organs offered their glories handed over to the prana. Then prana asked what they were ready to offer me. Hereafter alone the debate portion will start. Then all the sense organs point out that whatever food consumed by any human being is offered to prana only. Whatever human being eat whatever food animals or germs eat are \the offering to the prana which is inhering all the body. The water that is drunk along with or after food that water is the vastram or the clothing of the prana. This is given 6.1.13 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad and the parallel idea is given in Chandogya upanisad. That is even now all vaidhikas do achamanam after eating. This is given in 6.1.14 of the Upanishad. They do achamanam before and after taking food by all the jivas. That is followed by another statement that they do achamanam because the water is seen as dress of prana. Without water, prana will be naked and water will not be protected properly. That water is visualized as the vastram of prana and therefore they think after achamanam prana becomes anagnam not naked or dressed up. Here the question is because Upanishad talks about achamanam and also visualization of water as the vastram of prana, meditation of water as the vastra of prana. Jalam is not regular vastram and jalam is visualized as vastram. These two things occur in the last portion of the Upanisads. The debate here is through this story what type of vidhi or injunction the upanishad wants to give. One is achamanam and the other is Upasanam. One is water as prana vastama and the other is the meditation on water as vastram. Are there two



vidhi or is there one vidhi and which one is the vidhi or commandment or instruction. Is achamanam vidhi or Upasanam is the vidhi. Both Purva Paksi and siddhanta agree that two vidhis cannot be there in one prakaranam. If there are two vidhis then attention will not be there. When a person is not clear what he wants to focus he should state both prakaranam. Therefore, there is problem if one is not clear about the focused subject matter. In any discussion, speaker should be clear about the focused subject matter. Two vidhis cannot be there and should not be there. If one is focused another will not be focused. The clarity is possible only in one. It is not only in the scriptures but it is seen in our day-to-day communication also. Our subject is achamana vidhi, Upasana vidhi cannot exist in one prakaranam, and therefore there is only one vidhi. When we agree there should be only one vidhi, which one is correct. Purva Paksi says achamana vidhi is main one and the siddhanta will say jala vastra Upasana vidhi. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you general analysis of the sutra. Purva Paksi argues it has to be achamana vidhi because in the previous mantra or in the various same mantra the Upanishad has said jalam is the vastram. It is cleared said apo vastrah. If achamanam is not done, there is the question of vastra. Therefore achamana is only vidhi and it is understood arthavadha and there is no injunction there. This is one argument.

The second argument he gives that in Brihadharaynaka upanisad there are two versions available. They are kanva and madyantina saka. In the madyantina saka achamanam is said in imperative mood. Because of these two reasons achamana is the vidhi but Vyasacharya says there is no vidhi in achamanam and vidhi is there in jale vastra dristih. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 280

### **Topic 9 Karyakhyanadhikaranam. [18]**

Only thinking water to be the dress of prana is enjoined in the prana vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.18 [377]**

#### ***Karyakhyanadapuryam***

On account of [the rising of the mouth with water referred to in the prana vidya] being a reiteration of an act [already ordained by the smriti] what has not been so ordained elsewhere [is here enjoined by the sruti]

We do the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam named karyakyanadhikarnam with one sutra. Here Vyasacharya analyses Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad mantra. The meditation upon total prana endowed with various attributes is mentioned. At the end of the story, we have a portion where there is confusion. Prana asks all the other organs for offerings. Sense organs say that whatever Annam consumed by the living being is your Annam and whatever water is sipped at the time of food is vastram for the prana. Then Upanishad makes a statement, which occurs, in 6.1.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad and in 5.2.2 of Chandogya upanisad. Here two ideas are conveyed one is doing achamanam before eating food and one after eating food. In the vedic context achamanam is a formal ritual. Therefore, another idea is conveyed that this water is looked upon by the prana upasakas that the sipped water is vastram of the prana. This visualization of water as vastram is an Upasana. Vastram means dress. Since non-dress is visualized as dress jale vastra dristi is karma or meditation. Two karmas are there which are the achamana karma and jale vastra dristi karma. One is physical work and the other mental thought. Our question is how many karmas or this enjoins action. I said that two injunctions could not be there in one context. Human mind is capable of focusing only one thing at a time. If you focus two things one will be forgotten or both will be forgotten. All other information given is arthavadha to support the vidhi. There can be only one vidhi but you can have any number of arthavadha. Therefore, in this mantra there can be either achamana vidhi or vastra drsit vidhi. The debate is what? Purva Paksi says achamana is the vidhi and siddhanta says it is not so. Purva Paksi gives two reasons for their point of view. The first argument is in the same mantra in the first part it is said apo vasah water is the dress of prana and from that it is clear that prana is dressed only after you do the achamana. The dress is said to be water and naturally, there should be commandment for sipping the water. Then he gives a second reason and that is based on the knowledge that the Brihadharaynaka upanisad has two versions one is kanva saka and the other is madhyantina saka. Both are almost the same. But there are very few places where the mantra slightly vary. Adhi Sankaracharya has written commentary on kanva sakha and vidyaranya has written on madyantina saka. Brihadharaynaka upanisad 6.1.14 has got two karmas achamana and jale vastra karma. The corresponding version of madyantina saka of Brihadharaynaka upanisad talks of imperative mood that conveys commandment and says achamana. Present tense is used in kanva saka and in madyantina saka there is commandment with regard to

achamanam. There is vidhi in achamanam and vastra dristi vidhi nasti. Siddhanta has given his view in the sutra. Up to this general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya says achamane vidhih nasti. Vastra vidhih eva varthate. Jale vastra dristi varthate. Vyasacharya negatres and he gives three reasons for his conclusion.

First two are the negation of the purva paksa contention and the third one is the clinching reason for us. He says that the previous portion of the same mantra it is said that all sense organs point out water is the dress of prana and therefore there should be sipping of the water. Therefore it goes without saying that we should sip water to dress up prana. Adhi Sankaracharya says that there is another statement and that is all the food consumed by the sense organs is food of prana. Sense organs whatever food the germs are eating and dogs are eating are pranas for annam. Purva Paksi says since apah is vastram going by the same rule all the food all the living being is food of prana. It is said prana food is food of all the being. Then you have to take dogs food also and therefore you should not take that rule for your conclusion. The second argument Purva Paksi said was that there is a vidhi vakyam and that cannot be supportive argument because in kanva saka vidhi is not there. We cannot ignore kanva saka. In Chandogya upanisad the whole portion is omitted. Therefore vidhi in madyantina saka cannot support your argument.

The third and main and the clinching argument is that the achamanam before and after eating cannot be special vidhi for a prana upasaka. It is so because this achamana vidhi is there as a general rule for all vaidhikas. That general vidhi says that this achamanam should be done by all those who follow the vedic tradition. The vaidhika before every ritual should do achamana including eating which is considered as agnihotra karma. The sacred fire in the case of eating is stomach. Since eating is considered as a religious rite a special vidhi is not required. The water sipping is for all and if he becomes a prana Upasana there is additional injunction and upon that water that is sipped because of prior injunction you should have vastra dristi and it is not done by a common dvijah. Prana upasaka does this achamanam and he has a special vidhi. Prana upasaka takes the water the water taken for achamanam is vastra for the prana.

Now I will give the running meaning. Meditation upon water as prana's dress is the new injunction. Apurvam means is the new injunction. Karyakhyanat means since sipping of water [achamanam] is a restatement of a previously enjoying rite. This is the running meaning. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Karyakhyanat means an injunction having been given already. The achamana injunction is given before. Akyanam means a restatement or anuvadhah. Achamanam is only a reminder of already given injunction. Anuvadha is not a fresh statement. The status of anuvadha cannot take the status of an injunction because it does not have apurvavtam. Therefore it cannot be a vidhi. Apurvam means jale vastra darsanam eva apurvam. Seeing the water as vastram is a new information and that has apurvata lingam. vastra darsanam eva vidhih is the conclusion of the siddhanta.

## **Topic 10 Samanadhikaranam [19]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

### **Sutra 3.3.19 [378]**

### ***Samana evam chabhedat***

In the same [sakha also] it is thus [i.e., there is unity of vidya] owing to non-difference [of the object of meditation]

A corollary to sutra 5 is proved

First I will give you the general introduction to this andhakaranam with one sutra. Here the topic of discussion is that one Isvara Upasana is taken up for analysis given by Sandilya rishi. It is called Sandilya vidya or Sandilya Upasana meditated upon Isvara. The uniqueness of this Upasana is that Isvara Upasana is given with special virtue. Here this Upasana occurs in two places of shukla yajur Veda. One is in a particular portion of purva bagha Agni rahasya bagha. The mantra runs like this. Saha atmanam upasita mano mayam prana sariram bhah rupam a may one meditate upon Paramatma who is associated with all the mind and therefore full of knowledge who associated with prana and with full of effulgence. Another similar Isvara Upasana is given in 5.6.1 Brihadharaynaka upanisad. The mantra says mamayoyam Purusa saaha sathyah. Here also Isvara Upasana is mentioned that is manomayah. Prana sarira missing here. The word sathya occurs here but it does not occur there. There are some mutually exclusive attributes and there are some common attributes also. The controversy is whether the two Upasana should be taken as eka vidya or binna Veda. Vidya means Upasana or meditation. If it is eka vidya the advantage is you can mix up the attributes and pool together and make it one Isvara Upasana. Purva Paksi says that these are two different Upasanas. Siddhanta says that it is one Upasana. Now the question why does the Purva Paksi say these two Upasanas are different. His reason is that he says both the Upasanas occur in the same branch of the Veda. Therefore if Upanishad wants to combine or treat them as one Upasana the Upanishad itself could have given them together as one Upasana combining all the attributes because every shukla yajur vedi is supposed to study the Veda and therefore it is enough to give both in one place. The combination of the two Upasanas is needed only when two Upasanas are given in two Vedas. Every person is supposed to study his own Veda. One studying Isvara Upasana in yajur Veda he will not know Isvara Upasana mentioned in the other Vedas and therefore there is a possibility that he may not know the Isvara Upasana given in the other Vedas. Therefore you have to do mimamsa and join them and make it one Upasana. Combination of vidyas and combination of attributes are required only when they occur in two Vedas. But we will not require that if it is in one Veda itself because one will study the whole Veda. Veda would have combined them together. Therefore the two vidyas are to be taken as different.

Siddhanta gives the answer. Vidya aikyam is possible even within one branch of Veda itself. Samane Veda eva. Until now, all topics occurred in two different Veda. But here two Upasanas occur in one shukla yajur Veda.

Now we will come to the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that both the Upasanas occurring in Veda purva bagha and Brihadharaynaka upanisad have same upasya devata and both relates to manomaya alone. Since manomaya bhah rupa vishista Isvara has the same Upasyam because of the rule that they have the four factors given in the first two padas. Among those four factors, one of the main factors is upasya devatga aikyam. Here it is manomaya bhah rupa Isvara. If the Upanishad talks about the same Upasana why should it give it in two places. Adhi Sankaracharya backed by Vyasacharya is because Upanishad wants to add some more attributes to already given attributes. It is for giving additional

attributes it can give the Upasana again. Then purva paksa asks the question if the attributes are to be added it should give new attribute and why it should add manomaya and bhah rupa. That Adhi Sankaracharya says that only mano maya bhah rupa attributes are added you will be able to remember that Upasana with which it is to be combined. The attributes are to be added to Sandilya vidya for the recognition of this vidya. Once you hear the word mano maya and bhah rupam, you are supposed to remember the Sandilya vidya. For this purpose, the vidya is repeated here. Sandliya vidya vidya attributes are given only for you to recollect the vidya mentioned before. Therefore, Upasanas are one and the same is our conclusion. Vidya aikyam and guna upasamhara is possible within one Veda is possible is our conclusion. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 281

### **Topic 10 Samanadhikaranam [19]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.19 [378]**

#### ***Samana evam chabhedat***

In the same [sakha also] it is thus [i.e., there is unity of vidya] owing to non-difference [of the object of meditation]

A corollary to sutra 5 is proved

We have completed the general analysis of this sutra in which we saw that the two Upasanas occurring in the same Veda also can be combine together and it need not be two Upasanas belonging to two different Vedas. We have discussed this in detail in the last class.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Evam means the same rule is applicable; samanae cha in the sutra samana is there and samane is not there. It is not a printing mistake. When you split it becomes samane. Even when two meditations occur [in the same branch of the Veda], abhedat means because of the oneness of the object of meditation. Now we will see the significance of the words. Samane means in the same branch of the Veda [shukla yajur Veda]. Evam means the same rule is applicable. The same rule means that these two Upasanas can be treated as one. The consequences also is applicable that is guno upasamhara. Abhedat means even though it occurs in the same branch of the same Upanishad. Abhedat means oneness of the object of meditation upasya abhedat. In both the places the object is Isvara which is common upasya devata. With this smanadhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 11 Smbandhadhikaranam [20 – 22]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.20 [379]**

#### ***Sambandhaddevamanyatrapi***

In the same [sakha also] it is thus [i.e., there is unity of vidya] owing to non-difference [of the object of meditation]

A corollary to sutra 5 is proved.

First I will give you general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. The topic of this adhikaranam is to reveal certain exception to the previous adhikaranam. The topic of the

previous adhikaranam is that when the upasya devata is one and the same and two Upasanas are prescribed in two places, we will take them to be one and the same because the upasya devata is one and the same. Now we say that even though the upasya devatas are one and the same and the Upasanas are prescribed in two different places, according to previous adhikaranam we would have joined but in certain cases Upasana are treated separately even though the upasya devatas are one and the same. Once the upasana beda comes guna upasamhara cannot be applied. Vyasacharya says we are forced to do this because sometime Veda wants to associate the upasya devata to a particular location like adhitya Purusa Upasana, hridaya Purusa Upasana aksi Purusa Upasana. It is because of the association with a specific location, the upasya devata is treated separately because Veda wants us to meditate in that particular location. It is like temples for Ayyappa are there in many places but the Ayyappa temple at Sabarimala has special affinity and it has special powers if one worships that deity in that particular temple. So also, the upasya devatas meant for meditation. Bhagavan is associated with certain specific locus and when Lord is associated with certain locus when associated with another place it is although a different deity. Similarly, here ayathana vishesha vishista Isvara is talked about. Because of association with specific location, some special namas are given to the Lord to the Lord associated with a particular sthanam. These special names are called Upanishad. Vishesha namadeyam to the Lord when the Lord is associated with a paroksam location. We find such a case occurs in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 5.5.3 and 4. In both these mantras Hiranyagarbha Upasana is described and Hiranyagarbha there is called sathya Brahma. Sat means murtha Prapancha and tyam means amurtha Prapancha. Sathya Prapancha means murtha amurtha Prapancha the visible and the invisible worlds are the bodies of the Hiranyagarbha and Hiranyagarbha is called Brahma and Hiranyagarbha Upasanam is prescribed. This Hiranyagarbha is associated with two different locus, one is adhitya the sun, and Hiranyagarbha located in the sun is called adhitya purusah. The Upasana is prescribed adhitya garpha rupena sathya Brahman Upasana and the other is as located in the eye second ayadhanam is our own eye. 5.5.3 adhitya Hiranyagarbha rupena Upasana and the second upesana prescribed in 5,5.4 should be taken as combined Upasana or should be taken as separate Upasana is our question. The devata in both cases are one and the same and the devata is Hiranyagarbha. Vyasacharya wants to establish in this adhikaranam eventhough devata is one and dthe same the Upanishad wants to treat it as two different locuses and locuses cannot be combined and they should be treated as two different Upasanas. Since they are different, guna upasamhara cannot take place and the descriptions cannot be combined. Adhitya Purusa is called aham and aksi Purusa is given special title aham. Adhitya Purusa is adhdeiva Purusa and aksi Purusa is adhyatma purusah. This unique titles cannot be exchanged. It is so because the word ahar means day time. And adhitya Purusa deserves the titles because adhitya and day are connected. Aham is first person singular and it should be associated with aksi the individual. Aksi is connected with me the subject. Hence it deserves the title aham. Hence you cannot combine the both. This is the general analysis of the adhikaranam.

Now we will do the general analysis of the first sutra. This relates to the Purva Pakshi sutra. He expresses his doubt. He says both Upasanas are combined Upasanas. The reason he gives is that both are one and the same Hiranyagarbha one and the same sathya Brahman only. The answer will come in the next two sutras.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Evam means the rule of guna upasamhara should be the same anyatra aphi elsewhere also. Sambandhad because of their connection [to the same object of meditation] the same upasya devata.

Now we will go to the significance of the words. Sambandhad means connection and here connection refers to the oneness of upasya devata. Adhitya Purusa and aksi Purusa and Purusa refers to Hiranyagarbha. Evam means the same rule should be applied the rule being that you should treat both Upasanas as one; wherever the upasya devatas are same you have combined and why not apply the same rule here is the Purva Paksi contention. Now siddhanta will come in the next sutra.

### **Topic 11 Smbandhadhikaranam [20 – 22]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.21 [380]**

##### ***Na va viseshat***

Rather not [so] on account of the difference [of place]

The conclusion arrived at in the preceding sutra is set aside. This is the siddhanta sutra.

We will see the general analysis of this sutra. Even though the upasya devata is ‘one and the same’, the upasya devata gets associated with some place and because of the association of the particular place some names are given and that is locus specific title or locus centric title. Even though Hiranyagarbha, there is a difference between the two because of the locus of the deities mentioned in the two mantras of the Upanishad. Hence we should treat it separately and not take them as one. Even though substantive is the same, attribute or the loci are different and hence they should be treated as different.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Na va means it is never so; viseshat means because of their distinction. Sutra normally contains pronouns and we have to deal with the words also.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Na means not; va is emphasis never as the Purva Paksi said. Purva Paksi vyakyanam is if the devatas are same in two Upasanas they should be one and the same but siddhanta contends that it is not so because of the difference in the locus. Viseshat means because of their distinction. Distinction of the Upasana and upasya devata and the sthana viseshah. Distinction is in the locus of the upasya devata. When the crocodile is in water because of its location, it can drag even an elephant. The same crocodile when it comes to the shore it becomes very weak. Crocodile remaining the same, it is strong when it is in water and it is weak when it comes to the shore. Aham and ahar title should be given to separate Hiranyagarbha.

### **Topic 11 Smbandhadhikaranam [20 – 22]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.22 [381]**

##### ***Darsayati cha***



[the scripture] also declares [that]

An additional argument is given to refute sutra 20

Vyasacharya gives another supporting argument in this sutra. We have got an Isvara Upasana in Brihadharaynaka upanisad upanisad first chapter 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> section and that Isvara is Hiranmaya Purusa rupena Isvara, the God with golden complexion etc. Here also we get adhithya sthanam and aksi sthanam are mentioned. There when the aksi sthana Purusa is described in mantra 1.7.5 the Brihadharaynaka upanisad makes a statement. The mantra while talking about aksi Purusa the nama of aksi Purusa is the same as nama of adhitya Purusa. This is the meaning of the mantra. Vyasacharya uses ingenious reasoning here. In 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> section upasya devata is same. Only sthana is different. Purusa is one and the same. Now since the devata is one and the same the nama also must be one and the same. Why should Upanishad specifically say that the nama is one and the same. Vyasacharya argues that when the sthanam are different, devatas are treated as though different. That is the rule. But in this Upasana the Upanishad does not want us to treat nama differently. Therefore nama aikyam is specifically mentioned and the specific mention of nama aikyam indicates that they are different. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 282

### **Topic 11 Smbandhadhikaranam [20 – 22]**

Vidyas of the same sakha which are identical should be combined in meditation.

#### **Sutra 3.3.22 [381]**

#### ***Darsayati cha***

[the scripture] also declares [that]

An additional argument is given to refute sutra 20

Here the topic is hiranmaya Upanishad occurring in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Here Hiranyagarbha is said to be located in two sthanams Hiranyagarbha located in the sun and Hiranyagarbha in the eye. [5.5.3 and 5.5.4 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad] this Hiranyagarbha originally called sathya Brahma and there a title given to the Hiranyagarbha located in sun as ahah and the Hiranyagarbha located in the eye is given the title aham. This special title ahah is the specific title is the rahasya namadeyam. The special title given in both cases can be combined as one. In the first sutra Purva Pakshi said that it can be combined and the ahah and aham should be given to Hiranyagarbha. Siddhanta said that they should be treated as separate Upasana and the reason given is even though Hiranyagarbha is common, Hiranyagarbha in the first Upasana is associated with adhitya and the locus here is intrinsic and it is located in adhitya is one whereas the Hiranyagarbha located in the eye is vishishta Hiranyagarbha. The locus should be taken as integral part of the devata. When locus is changed, the powers of the devata will also change. Hiranyagarbha based on the location has different powers and therefore they should be treated as two.

When one and the same devata is placed in different places or loci their power differs and in such cases, the Upasana mentioned in both the cases should be treated differently instead of combining them as one. In support of this another quotation is given. The present one is from Chandogya upanisad 1.7 and 1.6]. Here upasya devata is hiranmaya Purusa whose complexion is golden, nail is golden, body is golden, the example here given is Isvara Upasana. Here also Isvara is presented in two different loci`. The Upasanas mentioned are aksi gatha hiranmaya Purusa and adhitya gatha hiranmaya Purusa. One who transcendent all the papam here is stated to be “Ut”. Now Upanishad while talking about Hiranmaya Purusa, says whatever the secret name of the Lord located in the sun, the same secret name applies to the aksi Purusa also. The secret name of the Lord here it Ut. Based on this Vyasacharya says because of the upasya devata aikyam all the attributes are going to be same and because of the sameness of the devata then the ut the secret name belonging to the adithya Purusa will be transferred to aksi Purusa also. If it is going automatically transferred the Upanishad need not specially say that the secret name of adithya Isvara is the secret name of aksi gatha Isvara. But Upanishad specifically mentioned that the aksi gatha Purusa also has the specific namadeyam, it means the transfer is not automatically transferable. Therefore, our condition is even though upasya devata is one and the same, attributes may be different, the loci\ may

be different and therefore you cannot argue aksi gatha Hiranyagarbha and adkthya rupa Hiranyagarbha and both are separate only. The Brihadharaynaka upanisad does not say the secret name is the same in both the cases. Therefore secret name is not transferable and its secret name is different and therefore the upasya bedah rahasya nama bedah also. Ahar is the secret name of adhithya rupa Hiranyagarbha and aham is the secret name of aksi gatha Hiranyagarbha whereas in Chandogya upanisad the mixing up is allowed because the Upanishad allows mixing up specifically. Therefore our conclusion vidya bedah. Guna upa samhara is not allowed and therefore secret name is not mutually changeable.

Now we will do the word for word analysis analysis of the sutra. Cha means sruti also darsayati reveals this; this is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the word. Darsayati means sruti supports our conclusion. Chandogya upanisad hiranmaya Purusa sruti [1.6 and 7] unless specifically located in two different places must be treated differently if the locations are different. In Chandogya upanisad specific mention is there and where the specific mention is not there you should treat it separately. Ca indicates the additional reason. With this 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

## Topic 12 sambhrityadhikaranam [23]

Attributes of Brahman occurring in the ranayaniya khila constitute an independent vidya. .

### Sutra 3.3.23 [382]

#### *Sambhritidyuvyapyapi chatah*

For the same reason [as in the previous sutra] the supporting [of the world] and the pervading the sky [attributed to Brahman in the Ranayaniya Khila] also [are not to be included in other vidyas or Upanisads of Brahman]

A restriction to sutra 5 is made.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here one Isvara description occurring in the Sama Veda [Ranayaniya sakha] is taken for analysis. Ranayaniya saka is one of the branches of Sama Veda. It is in Khila bagha which means miscellaneous portion. In Khila bagha vidhi nisheda will not be there. In this sakha there is khila bagha and there is a mantra that glorifies the Lord. Here Lord is described as omnipotent and omnipresent. The mantra is *Brahma jesta virya sambradhyani Brahma agre jetsam divam athadhanai* the essence of the mantra is Brahman is omnipotent and omnipresent. Brahman is stated to be having sristi sthithi laya sakti powers. In the sutra the word samhriti is given and it is based on this mantra. In the next part it is said that he same Isvara pervades the whole space. Karanam Brahman pervaded the whole sky even before the origination of other elements. Fourteen lokas etc. This Vyasacharya refers as tumvyapti. Samhirti means possession of great powers tim vyapti means pervasion of the space which means omnipresent. The problem here is because of such a glory is mentioned in khila bagha a Upasana is indicated here that the Lord should be meditated upon. Whether this Isvara Upasana should be preached as an independent Upasana or can we club this Upasana with several Isvara Upasana mentioned elsewhere. Other where Isvara Upasanas are mentioned are Sandilya [name of the Guru] vidya occurring in Chandogya upanisad 3.14; Upakosala [name of the student] vidya mentioned in 4.15 of Chandogya upanisad; then there is another Isvara

Upasana named as Dahara [the Akasa] vidya occurring in 8.1 of Chandogya upanisad; they are all Isvara Upasanas only. Whether omnipotent and omnipresent Upasana can be clubbed with other Upasanas. The answer is that you have to treat this Upasana separately. Guna upasamhara will not apply here even though the upasya devata is Isvara only. This is the general introduction to the adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that the reason for treating as above is the same as given in the previous adhikaranam. The reason given is ayadhana beda. Because Isvara Upasana mentioned elsewhere are associated with specific location and here the location is not mentioned here and therefore you cannot mix them up. For sandilya vidya the location given is hridaya ayadhanam. The very word hridaya is used here. For Upakosala vidya it is aksi ayadhanam that is eye. Eyes are considered to be very important. It is also used as locus of the Lord. Dahara vidya is also hridaya Akasa ayadhanam. There Isvara has specific locations are there. But in khila bagha specific location is not mentioned. Now comes a purva paksa with a question. If these Upasana have got specific ayadhanam why cannot you find out some other Upasana where the location is not given like sodasa kala Isvara occurring in Chandogya upanisad. Here again Isvara Upasana is mentioned. Purva Paksi asks there is no location. Ranayaniya khila bagha Isvara also there is no location. For that siddhanta gives the answer. Which one you will take is our problem. You will not be able to find out which one you will take for combining and the question will which ayadhana rahita Isvara will be taken for combination. Normally when you take two Upasana the general clue is we will find certain common virtues mentioned in the two Upasanas. That clue is called pratya vijnanam and if that is there, we can combine two ayadhana Isvara and such clues are not there in our case. Hence, you should treat it as separate Upasana.

Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Athah cha means due to the same reason; sambhritidyapti api the attributes of omnipotence and omnipresence [pervasion of the sky] also should not be included in the other Isvara Upasanas. Now we will go to the significance of the words. Sambhrithyapti means possession of the creative and sustaining and resolving power sristi sthithi laya sakti possession; which we call in simple language as omnipotent and omnipresence. Divyapti means Akasa pervasion. It means omnipresence sarvagatatvam. Api means also. These two attributes also which means ahar and aham rahasya namadeyam. Athah means because of the same reason given above. With this 12<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 283

### **Topic 13 Purushavidyadhikaranam**

The Purusa vidya in the Chandogya upanishad and the Taittiriya Upanishad are not to be combined.

#### **Sutra 3.3.24 [383]**

#### ***Puruhavidyayamiva chetareshamanamnanat***

And [as the qualities ] as [mentioned] in the Purusa vidya [of the Chandogya upanishad] are not mentioned [in that] of the others [i.e., in the Taittiriya Upanishad] [the two Purusa vidyas are not one., are not to be combined.

The Purusa vdy a of the Chandogya upanishad and that of the Taittiriya Upanishad are now examined.

Now I will give you the general introduction of this adhikaranam with only one sutra. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses Purusa vidya a form of Upasana given in the Vedas where the very human life is compared to a yagna or a yaga. The various stages of life are compared to the various stages of yagna. Similarly, the various organs of the individual are compared to the various factors involved in a yaga. The various faculties of the individual are compared to various vows involved in the yaga. The various activities of human life is compared to various rites involved in the yaga. This is called Purusa yagyatva kalpana. Here Purusa and yagna are equated. The most popular non-vedic example we have in Shiva manasa puja. Atma is the Lord, body is the emple, various organs are bhuta ganas, what I eat is the offering, at the end we have a small dhyanam, and sleep is compared to samadhi. Dhyanam at the time of sleep is the end of the present day and beginning dhyanam of the next day. We have similar dhyanam is Soundarya lahari [sloka 26] also. In this adhikaranam two such Upasanas are taken occurring in two branches of Veda. The analysis is the two Upasanas can be taken as one or the two Upasanas should be taken as different.

One Purusa yajnasva kalpana occurs 3.16 and 17<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanishad and the section beings with Purusa vava yajnah. The very human life is a form of worship. That is why when they talk of about various samskara, the various activities offered are sacred action. Every word is supposed to be an archana to the Lord and therefore you should be deliberate before using the word. Similar visualization is found in Maha Narayana Upanishad. In this Upanishad the last section talks about a similar visualization. It begins with the portion tatsa evam vidhusah yajnasya Atma yejamanah.

The controversy here is whether we can treat the two Upasanas or Purusa yajnasya Upasanas be taken as one or differently. If these two Upasanas are taken as one, then the attributes missing in can be borrowed from the other. Purva Pakshi points out that both the Upasanas are 'one and the same'. But siddhanta says that they are different.

Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that even though the two Upasanas are superficially the same but on scrutiny we find that they are two Upasanas. Therefore guna upa samhara cannot be employed. The reasons are indicated in the sutra. Adhi Sankaracharya elaborates it.

The first difference Vyasacharya says that in the visualization or comparison we find that there are certain differences. In Chandogya upanisad three portion the human life are taken. First 24 years are taken as the morning part of the ritual as is seen in Prata savanam. It is called morning extraction. Similarly there is noon extraction and evening extraction. The next 44 years refers to madyantina savanna and the last 48 years relates to sayam savanam. But in the Maha Narayana Upanishad all the three are compared to our morning, noon and evening part of life. The very comparison there is difference.

Another difference in comparison in one branch is the sense control while in the second Upanishad the sathya vachanam or speaking the truth .the most important difference is that in Chandogya upanisad the Purusa himself is taken as yajnah. But in Maha Narayana Upanishad the Purusa is not taken as yajna but one is taken as yejamana of the yajna the very performer. Atma yejamanah is the yajnah. This is one argument.

The second argument is swarupa bedah. The very nature of Upasana there is a difference. In Chandogya upanisad it is called swatantra Upasana which is one done by an ajnani. It is a sadhana done by an ignorant person. You look upon the life, organs and words are sacred. In Maha Narayana Upanishad the Purusa yajnyasya kalpana is not an independent Upasana of ajnani but it is a natural consequence, which happens for a jnani. It is not a deliberate sadhana but a natural consequence. It is a spontaneous consequence. It is a siddhi. It is so because in the previous section of Maha Narayana Upanishad sanyasi is talked about. Jnani and sannyasa is glorified. Even in the last section, also the beginning is sathya evam vidhusah. Vidhusah means a jnani. Chandogya upanisad deals with a ajnani and Maha Narayana Upanishad talks about jnani. Therefore, they are separate. What a jnani does is not an Upasana. It is neither Upasana nor karma but it is called jnana siddhi. Therefore, it cannot be called Purusa vidya. It is a 'seeming Purusa vidya'.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Itaresham means the other branches [like the Taittiriya Upanishad branch] anamnanad cha means do not present an imagery Purusa vidyayam iva means as given in the Purusa vidya of Sama Veda. Now I will give you the significance of the word. Purusa vidyayam iva refers to 3.14, 16 and 17 of Sama vidya itaresam anamnanad the there is no description or no presentation. Itaresham means in the other branches other than the sama Veda. Here Maha Narayana Upanishad is kept in mind which relates to yajur Veda presentation. Since the presentations are different, the Upasanas are different. One is Upasana and the other one is jnana phalam. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 14 Vedhadyadhikaranam**

Unconnected mantras and sacrifices mentioned in certain Upanisads do not belong to Brahma vidya.

### **Sutra 3.3.25 [384]**

### ***Vedhadyarthabhedat***

Because the mater [of certain mantras] such as piercing and so on is different [from the matter of the approximate vidyas], [the former are not to be combined with the latter.

Certain expressions occurring at the beginning of an Upanishad of the Atharvana Veda are taken up for discussion.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. In this adhikaranam the analysis is that in the Upanisadic portion of the Veda or in the proximity of the Upanisadic portion [in the entire Veda including the end of the purva kanda], the scriptures give many karmas. Vachika karmas for japa and kayika karmas for rituals and manasa karmas of Upasanas. In Taittiriya Upanishad we see the siksa valli enumerates many karmas like avahanti yajna, japa for memory etc. Japas are called vachika karma. Certain Upasanas are also prescribed here in the Upanisadic portion.

Should we take the karmas as the integral part of the Upanishad or not is our question now. Brahma Vidya in Isa Upanishad has certain karmas and Brahma Vidya in Kenopanisad [last chapter] has certain karmas. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad there are many karmas. Whether all the karmas are the integral part of Upanishad is our problem now. Since Brahma Vidya in all the Upanishad is the same, you will have to add all the karmas to Brahma Vidya by applying gunopasamhara nyaya. You have to do all the karmas and Upasanas if you have to gain Brahma Vidya as per the norm.

One example is a Vedha mantra. Vedha mantra is one occurring in the Atharvana Veda closer to Upanisadic portion. In this mantra there is a prayer which is a peculiar one. Here a devotee asks for the destruction of his enemies. Such prayers used for destruction of enemies are called abhicharika karmas. It is comparable to black magic. But the Veda warns that the above karmas should not be used at all and if at used it is should be used very carefully. Still it is considered to be tamasic karmas to be avoided. The content of the mantra is destroy the enemy and destroy every part of the enemy. Then there is another mantra occurring in proximity of Brihadharaynaka upanisad wherein a yaga is prescribed pravartya karma. Previous one is vachika karma and the one in Brihadharaynaka upanisad is kayika karma. Should we include such karma as an integral part of Brahma Vidya or not is the controversy. The answer is given in the sutra

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that karma should not be a part of Brahma Vidya. Siddhanta says that karma should not be taken as an integral part of Brahma Vidya. It only helps to gain siddha suddhi. Adhi Sankaracharya says that if karma and Brahma Vidya is taken together, then sannyasa dharma is not possible. Sannyasi while following Brahma Vidya cannot practice any vaidhika karma. Sannyasa means renunciation of all karmas. He removes his sacred thread and in the absence of which one cannot do any karma. Therefore Vyasacharya concludes that the karmas are not part of Brahma Vidya. This is the conclusion. Artha beda is the argument which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 284

### **Topic 14 Vedhadyadhikaranam**

Unconnected mantras and sacrifices mentioned in certain Upanisads do not belong to Brahma vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.25 [384]**

#### ***Vedhadyarthabhedat***

Because the mater [of certain mantras] such as piercing and so on is different [from the matter of the approximate vidyas], [the former are not to be combined with the latter.

Certain expressions occurring at the beginning of an Upanishad of the Atharvana Veda are taken up for discussion.

We discuss the 14<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with one sutra 25. Here the discussion is regarding the combination of certain karmas with Brahma even in the Upanishad in the proximity of Brahma Vidya certain karmas are mentioned as detailed in the discussion in the last class.

Purva Pakshi contends that the karmas are the part of Brahma Vidya while siddhanta says it is not correct. While the Purva Pakshi says due to proximity of karmas, the latter should be taken as a part of Brahma Vidya. But siddhanta gives the fitness argument. He says that Brahma Vidya and karma do not go together. Brahma Vidya talks about mithyatvam of the karma phalam and after getting vairagyam towards karma phalam one has gain Brahma Vidya and how can karma or japa in which destruction of enemies is talked about. In Brahma Vidya there is no second thing and there is no question of second thing in the form of friend or foe. Purva Pakshi argument is position based and siddhanta argument is fitness based. One is based on sthanam and the other is based on samarthiyam. No karma can be connected to Brahma Vidya and in you want to connect any karma to Brahma Vidya there is only one karma which is sannyasa ritual. Only karma that ideally fits with Brahma Vidya is sannyasa karma. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the running meaning. Vedhadyarthabhedat means since the meaning of the vedha mantra and others are not connected to Brahma Vidya [they should not be included in Brahma Vidya] now I will give you the significance of the word. Vedha adhi artha bheda are the four words in this common word vedhadyarthabhedat. The Veda mantra occurring in the proximity of the Brahma Vidya is indicated by the word vedha. Adhi means similar karma vachika or kayika karmas. The word artha means samarthiyam or fitness or the gist or essence. Artha means tatparyam or samarthiyam because of incongruity of tatparyam of the karmas you cannot combine them. Therefore karma cannot be combine to the Brahma Vidya. This is the launching pad to encourage people to take to sannyasa as commented by Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyams in several places.



Before going to next sutra I would like to briefly refer to Purva Mimamsa sutram which is considered very important sutra. The purpose of the sutra [*samavaye para dour bhalyam artha viprakarsat* it is Jaimini sutram. Here in the third chapter third section 13<sup>th</sup> mantra relates to the above sutra. In Veda purva bhaga there are many rituals. There are many primary rituals occurring and there are many secondary rituals all right. Among the small rituals, some are not independent but they are part rituals or subordinate rituals forming part of some other big rituals. Often Veda itself tells clearly, which secondary ritual should join which primary ritual to avoid confusion? However, there are certain secondary rituals where Veda does not explicitly say to which primary karma they should be joined. If it is secondary ritual separate, result is not give. The phalam is gain for the primary ritual alone. Such karms are called anga karmani. In some places angi karmas are not mentioned explicitly. Here we need mimamsa logic to know the correct position. Such study is called viniyochaka pramanam by which you know to which main ritual a particular subsidiary ritual should be connected. In Purva Mimamsa there are six such pramanam. The six pramanams are given here. Sruti, lingam, vakyam, prakaranam, sthanam and samakya, which has specific meaning as per Purva Mimamsa books. While doing this there are some problem. Sometimes there will be some conflict between the two pramanam. Of the six pramanas two of them may contradict each other. If there is a conflict which one will one is a problem. You should decide on the basis of prabalam and durbalam. Prabalam will set aside the durbalam. Here there are six pramana and each of the earlier pramana is stronger than the latter pramana. The commentators of the sutra have written big commentaries. Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam refers to the stura but he does not elaborate this Purva Mimamsa sutra. This sutra is quoted here because Purva Paksi argument is that karma should join Brahma Vidya like a subsidiary ritual. Purva Paksi argument is based on the fifth of the six pramanas. It is sthana pramanam. Our argument is that basing on the fitness argument [second pramana of the sutra] we say that the karma do not form part of Brahma Vidya. Thus it is concluded that karma cannot join Brahma Vidya. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## Topic 15 Hanyadhikaranam

The statement that the good and evil deeds of person go respectively to his friends and enemies is true for texts that mention discarding of such actions by him.

### Sutra 3.3.26 [385]

#### ***Hanau tapayanasabdaseshatvat kusacchandastutyupaganavattaduktam***

But where only the getting rid [of the good and evil] is mentioned [the obtaining of this good and evil by other has to be added] because the statement about acceptance is supplementary [to the statement about the getting rid of] as in the case of the Kusas, metres, praise and hymns or recitations. This [i.e., the reason for this] has been stated [by jaimini in Purva Mimamsa].

Here is a discussion on the shaking off, of virtues and vices by the released soul at death and their acceptance by his friends and enemies.

We enter the next adhikaranam with one sutra. It is highly textual adhikaranam with Purva Mimamsa arguments. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is this. While talking about mukta Purusa, Vedas talk about how the karmas go away from him and therefore he does not

have punar janma. Much karma is destroyed by the power of knowledge. Some karmas are exhausted by sukha and dukha experiences. It is said that some karmas are transferred to other people especially some agami karmas. Whoever harms the jnani, in such cases the papams of jnanam will get passed on to the other people so also the punya too to other people who serve the jnanis. Adhi Sankaracharya says that we should not take the statement literally. Literal transference is not intended here. The meaning is that jnani's karmas are destroyed. Jnani is free from karmas and the second intention is that the glory of jnani and by worshipping the jnani, one may get all the phalams as if worshipping the Lord. Jnani puja gives the same benefit as if the puja done to the Lord. Jnani is an exalted human being and he should not equate with normal human being. The idea of transference is twofold; one is jnani is free from karma and he is an exalted individual. We should not probe into actual transference of karmas from jnani to another. This is talked about in several places in the Vedas. Veda talks about similar transference in the case of upasakas also. They are krama mukta Purusa. First reference is Chandogya upanisad 8.13.1 wherein an upasaka is talked about and for the upasaka the upasaka janma is the last janma. Before or during the death all the karmas are to be distributed. An example is given just as the horse shakes off the old hair just as the moon frees itself from Rahu at the end of the grahanam; the upasaka shakes off all the karmas during the final death. The uniqueness of this mantra is that Upanishad talks about the dropping off the karma and transference is not mentioned here. There is another Veda mantra occurring in Yajur Veda purva bagha. That mantra says shrudah sadhu kirtyam vishantah papa kirtyam. These mukta Purusa gives all the punyams to their wellwishers. The enemies of jnanis and upasakas and papams will be transferred to them when they troubles the jnani. Also 1.4 of Kaushitaki Upanishad also reiterates what is said above. The good people who worship him take punya and apriya the papas takes the papams of the jivan mukta or krama mukta. The second and third talk about the transference of the karma to priya apriya. The first one does not talk about the transference of papams and punyams. The transference should be included in the first mantra or not is our question. This is the controversy. Purva Pakshi will say that the transference should not be applied in the first mantra as Veda has omitted it. Therefore, you should not transfer the transference. Siddhanta says Sama Veda also says that the transference must be included. Punya papa will get transferred is the purva paksa argument.

Here Vyasacharya<sup>1</sup> says whenever there is no clarity with regard to a particular mantra, we refer to corresponding portion occurring elsewhere. In Chandogya upanisad the clarity is not there. What happens to discarded karma is not explained here. . The Purva Pakshi asks what is the advantage you get from the transference. Adhi Sankaracharya argues here that the discussion here is of some benefit as it reveals the exalted status of the jnani. Jnani sthuthi you get only through the transference of punya papa karmas. The transference says that whoever worships a jnani will get punyams and therefore the worship of jnani is highly beneficial to the worshippers. Mundaka says that knowing shaking off good and evil, he reaches the highest oneness free from passion. All the punyams he will transfer to the worshippers of the jnani. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 285

### **Topic 15 Hanyadhikaranam**

**Sutra 3.3.26 [385]**

#### ***Hanau tapayanasabdaseshatvat kusacchandastutyupaganavattaduktam***

But where only the getting rid [of the good and evil] is mentioned [the obtaining of this good and evil by other has to be added] because the statement about acceptance is supplementary [to the statement about the getting rid of] as in the case of the Kusas, metres, praise and hymns or recitations. This [i.e., the reason for this] has been stated [by jaimini in Purva Mimamsa].

Here is a discussion on the shaking off, of virtues and vices by the released soul at death and their acceptance by his friends and enemies.

We do the general analysis of the 15<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and here three mantras are taken for analysis one from Sama Veda Chandogya upanisad and another from yajur Veda and one from rig Veda Kaushitaki Upanishad. Two mantras talk about mukta Purusa and what will happen to his karma. We talk both the krama and jivan mukta purusah. The upasaka is also referred to here and for jivan mukta also talked about here. What will happen do such person's karma is the question here. Some of the dropped karmas are transferred to priya Purusa and apriya Purusa those who do good and harms to the jnani. Transference of karma should not be taken in literal sense because transfer of karma cannot be done from one person to another. It has only figurative significance. Whoever does well to the jnani etc., will get punya and those who does bad will get papams. This is said to be transfer of the punya papam in the mantra. Even though the transference does not have literal significance, we get an indirect benefit from this mantra. The mantra serves as arthavadha mantra that glorifies the mukta purusah. It is implied that the worship of a mukta Purusa is a great thing. Worship of jnani is great and it glorifies the jnani and indirectly glorifies the jnanam. The harming a mukta Purusa is a greater papam. This significance we are able to derive from the transference of punya papam. Therefore, we are particular in the statement that the transference of punya papa is all right. Such transfer is not mentioned in the Chandogya upanisad mantra while it is indicated in the other mantras. Vyasacharya says that the transfer of papams etc., of jnani should be included in the Sama Veda mantra although it is not specifically mentioned in the Veda. The idea is vaguely mentioned in another mantra. The vagueness is clarified from the clear mantra. Jnani drops the punya papa and other people take them. The vagueness is clarified here. In the Veda purva bagha it is very common. Four such examples are given in the sutram. Kusha is example one; chanda is example two; sthuthi example three and upaganam is the example four and all these four are drawn from Veda purva bagha. In each case we have to see two mantras. One vague mantra and another clarifying mantra. Adhi Sankaracharya does this in his bashyam.

In the example one, kusha means twig that is a small piece of wood taken from a big branch of a tree; kuasha also relates to the grass. The twigs are supposed to be used to count the

number of recitation of the mantras. Veda does not say the twig of which tree. Are we allowed to use the twig of any tree. The word kusha is used in a particular mantra. When there is doubt one should look for similar mantra somewhere else. Oudhumpara tree is specified in some other place.

The second example is chanda. Veda mantras are to be changed during vedic rituals. In certain rituals Veda asks a person to chant the mantra that glorifies the celestials. When there is a confusion which devata is to be glorified and the order when not specified, this confusion is clarified here.

Sthuthi means stotram especially stotrams of sama Veda. The devatas are glorified by singing the sama Veda. The Sama vedi alone glorifies the devatas at a particular time during the rituals. The Veda does not say the sodasi stotram. This is a particular vessel used in the rituals. Veda does not say when this should be sung by the udgata. In some other place the time is given.

The fourth example is upa ganam which means chorus thinking or singing alongwith udgata. In certain place other priests like hota, adhvaryu should chant along with the udgata. This is given in one mantra. Chorus singing by other priests is called upaganam. When you scan the Veda it is said elsewhere, that the yajur Veda priest should not sing and join with Udgata.

Chanda means vedic mantra confusion and the next is sthuthi sama Veda confusion. All these four confusions are solved in the Karma Kanda. In the same in Chandogya upanisad, the transference of punya papa are transferred to others is the argument here.

Tatuktam means Vyasacharya says this method of clarification is mentioned by Jaiminii in Purva Mimamsa sutra 10.8.15 [Jaimini sutra].

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Hanau tu when dropping of the punya papa alone is mentioned [their transference to others has to be understood] upayanasabdaseshatvat means is associated with transference in the other Vedas kushachandastutyupaganavat this is understood from the examples of kusha sticks, chanda, sthuthi and upaganam. Tad uktam means this has been mentioned by Jaimini in Purva Mimamsa sutra.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Hanau means dropping of punya papa mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 8.13.1. Tu means the transference is not mentioned in Chandogya upanisad. When it is not mentioned, the transference of the dropped punya papas. This is called upayanam. Upayana sabda seshatvat means the word upayanam or grasping by other people, that expression upayanam is found elsewhere. Tad uktam means this has been said by Jaimini. With this the adhikaranam is over. Here guna upasana can be used in artha vadha part is stated here. The glorification can be transferred from one place to the other.

## **Topic 16 Samparayadhikaranam [Sutras 27 – 28]**

The shaking off of good and evil by the man of knowledge occurs only at the time of his death.

**Sutra 3.3.27 [386]**

***Samparaye tatrityavyabhavattathahyanye***

[He who attains knowledge gets rid of his good and evil deeds] at the time of death, there being nothing to be attained [by him on the way to Brahmaloaka through those works] for thus others [declare in their sacred texts]

This sutra decides when the individual soul shakes off his good and evil deeds.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. This is also highly technical and textual adhikaranam. In some of the vedic mantras, it is said that mukta Purusa drops all punya papas just before death. The total from karmas takes place at the time of death because prarapta karma continues until death. Some mantras talk about dropping of the punya papams after gaining knowledge or becoming wise. Kaushitaki Upanishad says that mukta Purusa travels through and crosses a river called viraja. Sankalpa matrena the dead soul crosses the river. He crosses all the punya papam in the river. Now there is a controversy. In Chandogya upanisad it is said that a jnani drops all punya papams at the time of death. Now the question is whether one drops the entire punya papa at the time of death or during the time of travel through shukla Gathi. The conclusion is that at the time of death itself all punya papa karmas are dropped not after niraja nathi sthanam. This is general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that all punya papas are dropped at the time of death. Punya papa have to be retained if during the journey experiences are to be encountered. The role of punya papa is giving sukha and dukha anubhava. For mukta there is no sukha and dukha anubhava. Experiences to be encountered are no more there, for him he will not have sukha and dukha anubhava, and therefore there is no punya papa on his account.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samparaye [the upasaka drops punya papa at the time of death itself. Tatrityavyabhavat means because he has no more experiences to be faced on the way [shukla Gathi highway] after death. Anye means the other branches of the Veda tathahi declares so;

Now we will see the significance of the words. Samparaya means death; sampareyate means final travel. Tatrityavyabhavat means the pleasures and pains in the form of sukha and dukha are encountered. They are not there. He will have to attend brahmaji's class and gain jivan mukti. Tathahi anye means other branches of Veda. At the time of dropping the body he drops punya papa also. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 286

### **Topic 16 Samparayadhikaranam [Sutras 27 – 28]**

The shaking off of good and evil by the man of knowledge occurs only at the time of his death.

**Sutra 111.3.27 [386]**

#### ***Samparaye tatritavyabhavattathahyanye***

[He who attains knowledge gets rid of his good and evil deeds] at the time of death, there being nothing to be attained [by him on the way to Brahmaloaka through those works] for thus others [declare in their sacred texts]

This sutra decides when the individual soul shakes off his good and evil deeds.

We have completed the 27<sup>th</sup> sutra that belongs to 16<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. Before proceeding further I would like to make some general remarks. The vedic statements taken in the present and previous adhikaranam are one and the same [for details last class]. The rg, yajur and sama mantra are some taken for the previous and present mantra. Only with regard to rg mantra there is slight difference. The mantra taken from Kaushitaki Upanishad in this sutra is 1.4 between the previous and present mantra the rg mantra slightly differs while yajur Veda mantra is the same. Similarly sama mantra is exactly same in the previous and present mantra 8.13.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Coming to the present adhikaranam we have three Veda mantras. The topic is that all the three mantras talk about the upasaka dropping all punya papas before attaining krama mukti. Saguna upasaka drops all punya papa at the time of final jnanma. He will attain krama mukti and therefore there is no punar janma for such person. The time of dropping is the subject matter of analysis. Rg mantra says one thing and yajur and sama Veda mantras tell differently. Yajur and sama mantra says when the upasaka is about to die he drops all punya papas. Yajur mantra says that after maranam when he travels and he goes through shukla Gathi and he crosses the viraja nathi. The controversy is whether the krama mukta drops his sukha and dukha at the time of dropping the body or after death while travelling in higher lokas. Both these views have got sruti and smriti support. The sruti statement always reign Supreme. Again the sruti support with logical support will sway over the sruti support without logical support. The rg Veda mantra has no logical support. For yajur Veda and sama Veda vakyam have logical support and therefore we discard the Kaushitaki Upanishad vakyam. Punya papa thyaga should be brought to marana kalam. After marana kala if the upasaka does not drop the punya papa means after death before reaching the destination, there is an intermediary state. There must be some punya papa which must be dropped at viraja nathi. Punya papas are required only for giving sukha and dukha anubhava and punya papa cannot give sukha and dukha anubhava during intermediary state as the upasaka does not have body after death. The sariram he will take only in Brahma loka and therefore in the intermediary state he will not have a body and he cannot have any sukha and dukha anubhava. This is argument number one.

The second argument will be given in the next sutra.

## **Topic 16 Samparayadhikaranam [Sutras 27 – 28]**

The shaking off of good and evil by the man of knowledge occurs only at the time of his death.

### **Sutra 3.3.28 [387]**

#### ***Chandata ubhayavirodhat***

[Interpretation that the individual soul practicing yama-niyama] according to his liking [discards good and evil works while living is [reasonable] on account of there belong harmony in that case between the two [viz., cause and effect as well as between the Chandogya upanisad and another sruti]

The second argument is this. Not only there is no logical support but also there is positive logical problem. The upasaka will enjoy a freewill only as long as manusya sariram is there. Therefore whatever punya papa neutralization has to be done, is to be done in manusya sariram. Once the shukla Gathi travel starts the upasaka does not have manusya sariram. For Vedanta sravanam he will take a sariram only in Brahma loka. If freewill is absent the upasaka during prayanam cannot do any sadhana. He cannot also do any karma. One requires sariram and will to do any sadhana or karma. If upasaka does not drop punya papa then he will have problem during the travel. That will make him to be born again. Even viraja nathi crossing is mentioned and one crosses during the journey alone. He cannot take any will-based decision. Kaushitaki Upanishad does not mention any sadhana also. Whatever happens during shukla Gathi prayana is not will-based event and there can never be any sadhana. If a tiger kills a deer, tiger will not get any papam because the killing is instinct based and not will-based. Tiger will not kill a deer for pleasure. Then Vyasacharya says that this is in agreement with the other two. The other two relates to the Veda vakyams [yajur Veda and sama Veda vakyams]. All Upanisads says that the krama mukti is as a result of Upasana. Between Upasana and punya papa thyaga cause effect relationship is given in all the Upanisads. Suppose we go by the Kaushitaki Upanishad, the problem is that at the time of maranam he will not drop punya papa. Then upasaka retains some punya papa and if he drops the punya papam in viraja nathi then what is the cause of mukti. Then the credit will go to the crossing of viraja nathi and having a snanam in the river. Nowhere in sastra is it said that viraja nathi snanam will give mukti.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Chandadah means this is true because of the presence of freewill [before death] ubhayaabirodhah and because it is in agreement with the other two. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Chandah means because of the presence of freewill [my interpretation is correct. Before maranam alone, freewill is available but during shukla Gathi freewill is not available to neutralize the punya papam. Avirodah means agreement with ubhaya the other two. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives two interpretations. The other two means the other two sruti statement Chandogya upanisad and yajur Veda statement given in the previous statement. The second meaning Adhi Sankaracharya gives for this is the agreement with cause and effect; Upasana being the cause and krama mukti is result. This will fit only if the upasaka drops the punya papa at the time of death. If not viraja nathi sthanam will take the credit. One more Purva

Mimamsa nyaya is applied in this context although Adhi Sankaracharya does not explicitly mention it. But subcommentators offer this point. Kaushitaki Upanishad gives a order in a different manner by saying that upasaka dies; takes the route of shukla Gathi; comes to the shore of viraja nadhi; crosses the nadhi; then drops all the punya papams. The punya papa is chronologically presented after crossing viraja nadhi and we conclude that dropping the punya papa after crossing the viraja nadhi; here while interpretation we should change the order by saying dropping of punya papa first in favour of logical order. Changing the sruti for the logical order is an allowed thing. This particular mimamsa principle is very big topic in Purva Mimamsa sastra. Any karma requires an order and we cannot change the order, as we like. They are to be done as per the system enumerated in the sastra. When the krama is vague, a proper krama is taken by looking for the logical support. Sruti, artha, pata, sthanam, mukhyam and pravrutti are the six pramanas are taken into consideration while changing the order in the sastra. When two give contradictory report, sruti must be given the prime importance. Here the rule is when there is textual order and logical order, the latter will win by changing the former order, which in our case is the textual order. I will give you an example from Vedanta. In Mundaka there is a mantra. 2.1.3 where in the first line indriya sristi is mentioned. Panca bhuta sristi is mentioned in the second line. The textual order is indriya sristi first and panca bhuta sristi is given in the second order. All creations are should come first because from panca bhutas only emerges the indriyams etc. Therefore between indriya sristi and bhuta sristi we have one logical order and textual order. When there is a conflict the logical support is stronger and then we change the order. Logical order is superior to textual order. With this the sutra and the adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 17 Gaterarthavatvadhikaranam [Sutras 29 – 30]**

The knower of Sagunam Brahman alone goes along devayana, and not the knower of Nirgunam Brahman.

### **Sutra 3.3.29 [388]**

#### ***Gaterarthavattvamubhayathanyatha hi virodhah***

[thje soul's] journey [alon the path of the gods, devayana] is applicable in a twofold manner, otherwise there would be contradiction [of scripture]

Here is a side issue of sutra 27

First I will give you a general introduction to the adhikaranam with two sutras. In this adhikaranam the topic is about mukti only. In the sastra they use two words in a loose sense and they are vidya and mukti. This has created lot of problems. These two words have two meanings according to the context. One is vidya is equal to Sagunam Brahma Upasana and the next is Nirgunam Brahma jnanam. Similarly mukti has got two meaning one is krama mukti and the other is jivan mukti. When you say vidya produces mukti, we have to read the sentence twice. You have to give the meaning property is that Sagunam Brahman gives krama mukti; the next meaning is Nirgunam Brahma gives jivan mukti. Upanishad in several says vidya phalam moksah. Moksah is defined as sakala punya papa phalam. In the context of mukti in several places Upanishad talks of shukla Gathi. Our controversy is whether shukla Gathi is applicable in both the cases of Sagunam Brahman Upasana krama mukti and



Nirgunam Brahman sadyo mukti our conclusion is that it is should be discreetly applied. The details we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 287

### **Topic 17 Gaterarthavatvadhikaranam [Sutras 29 – 30]**

The knower of Sagunam Brahman alone goes along devayana, and not the knower of Nirgunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.29 [388]**

#### ***Gaterarthavattvamubhayathanyatha hi virodhah***

[thje soul's] journey [alon the path of the gods, devayana] is applicable in a twofold manner, otherwise there would be contradiction [of scripture]

Here is a side issue of sutra 27

I have given a general introduction to the 17<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with two sutras. Here the topic of discussion is shukla Gathi. This discussion is required because vidya and mukti are used in sastra loosely with two meanings, which I have explained in my last class. The two meanings unique to advaidam. Similar mukti also has got two meanings krma and jivan mukti followed by vidheha mukti. First time when you say vidya gives mukti means it means saguna Brahma Upasana gives krama mukti. Nirgunam Brahma jnanam gives jivan mukti. In the context of mukti in several places in the sastra. Shukla Gathi is talked about. Now the debate is whether shukla Gathi should be included in the both the types of vidya and mukti. This is our debate. Purva Paksi says that shukla Gathi should be included for all the people both upasaka and jnani. However, siddhanta establishes that shukla Gathi applies only to krama mukti and not to jnani enjoying jivan mukit. Jnani cannot and will not travel with the dissolution of the three bodies on gaining jnanam. The Gathi should be partially applied. .in the case of upasaka Gathi should be applied and in the case of jnani Gathi should not be applied.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that shukla Gathi should be partially applied to only some mukta Purusa and not to all the mukta purusas. Vyasacharya gives the logic also and the pramana is sruti pramanam wherein Upanishad says jnanis merge with Brahman here and now without traveling at all refer to 3.1.3 of Mundaka Upanishad. One who has gained jivan mukti is free from all punya papams and he gains absolute identity with Brahman. Some say that identity means Jivatma is one with Paramatma. We say that paramam samyam means that it refers to absolute identity, Jivatma is Paramatma, and Paramatma is Jivatma. The absolute oneness is gained through knowledge. There is no question travel possible and there is no question of shukla or Krishna Gathi. If you apply the Gathi travel for all, it will tantamount to sruti virodha.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Arthavattvam gadhe the validity of travel ubhayatha is partial; anyathahi otherwise; virodhah means there will be scriptural contradiction. Now we will go to the significance of the words. Gateh means shukla Gathi as part of mukti; arthavattbvam means validity or applicability or meaningfulness; ubhayata means only partial; do not apply this for all the people associated with liberation. There are

two types of people get vivaha mukti at the time of death or krama mukti at the time of death. Both will not get punarjanma after death. Viveha mukta does not travel but the krama mukta will travel after death. Sthoola sariram alone goes in the case of ajnani while all the three sarirams go for jnanis at the time of death. Upasana will have karya and sookshma sariram but for jnanam, only sthoola sariram will go. Anyatadi otherwise if you apply shukla Gathi for all the people both jnani and ajnani the travel is not determined by you and even patyaksam is not pramanam none can determine who is krama mukah and who is jivan muktah. Only pramana we have is sastra. Mundaka says that jnani merger here and now and his sooksma sariram does not leave at all. Through which nadi the life comes out is relevant only when you know, the soul goes out. In Kathopanisad it is confirmed jnani merges here and now and there is no question of his soul going anywhere/. Virodhah means sruti virodhah. Refer to 3.1.3 and Artha Bagha Brahmanam of Brihadharaynaka upanisadm

### **Topic 17 Gaterarthavatvadhikaranam [Sutras 29 – 30]**

The knower of Sagunam Brahman alone goes along devayana, and not the knower of Nirgunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.30 [389]**

#### ***Upapannastallakshanarthopalabdherlokavat***

[the twofold view taken above] is justified because we observe a purpose characterized thereby [i.e., a purpose of the going] as in ordinary life.

The previous discussion is continued.

This is the reinforcement of the idea that you have to apply the Gathi partially one set of people take to Shukla Gathi and no Gathi for jnani. Now purva paksa says that why not upasaka also not travel and gain mukti here and now. Vyasacharya that it is not based on your likes and dislikes as the sastra makes the distinction that upasaka travels after death while jnanis do not travel. Sastra reveals that jnanis do not travel and upasakas travel is supported by the sastram. You cannot physically perceive the Sookshma Sariram and therefore you have to rely on the sastra pramana. Refer to Kaushitaki Upanishad and Taittiriya Upanishad, and Kathopanisad. Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya take to 1.5 of Kaushitaki Upanishad. Here is given a vivid description of Brahma loka and there the glory of Brahma loka. This specific upasana is called paryanka vidya that takes him near the Bhagavan. If going to another loka and going near Lord means certainly travel has to be accepted. Here the destination of upasaka indicates the travel after death. Not only travel, the upasaka has a different body to travel in the higher loka and sit near Bhagavan etc. Therefore it presupposes shukla Gathi but jnani does not have any body and jnani's Brahmann is avyavahara Brahman. There is no question of sitting together and having conversation with Lord etc.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Upapannah this is proper; tallakshanarthopalabdheh because a result which indicates travel is found in the sruti. Lokavat means as in the world or as in the experience. Now we will go to the significance of the words. Upapannah means this is logical that the upasaka must have travel and he cannot be clubbed with jnani as he does not travel after death. The upasaka's travel by shukla Gathi is proper and logical; tallakshanaarthopalabdheh means gathih or travel a result that indicates

the travel is found in the sruti; in otherwards Brahma loka prapti. Reaching near the Bhagavan is the result. Conversation with the Lord is the result. This phalam is the indicator of the travel to such a loka which is here the Brahma loka. Such a statement is found 1.5 of the Kaushitaki Upanishad. Lokavat means that this can be understood from our common experience also. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two examples one is arogya prapti [gaining health] and grama prapti. Even though prapti is common to both, one prapti indicates travel, another does not indicate the travel, and you have to use the discretion. In Grama prapti physical travel is involved and in the case of arogyam there is no travel involved in this case. Brahma loka prapti there is travel involved because Brahma loka is away from our present world Buloka. Krama mukti involves travel and jivan mukti does not involve travel is the essence of this sutra.

### **Topic 18 Aniyamadhikaranam [31]**

The passage of the soul by Devayana applies equally to all vidyas of Sagunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.31 [390]**

#### **Aniyamah sarvasamavirodhah sabdanumanabhyam**

There is no restriction [as to the going on the path of the gods for any vidya]. There is no contradiction as is seen from the sruti and smriti.

The journey of the soul who knows Brahman is continued.

I will give you the general introduction to the adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is upasakas. The debate is whether all upasakas have travel or not. Purva Pakshi says the doubt comes because we go by the sruti only and after death what happens we do not know and sruti lone is the pramanam. In certain cases the upasana is based on the travel or shukla Gathi after death. But in some other cases Upasana is mentioned and shukla Gathi is not mentioned. I will give you two examples. One is pancagni vidya 5.10 of Chandogya upanisad consisting of several mantras. And another Upasana is sandilya vidya 3.14 of Chandogya upanisad. Both of them talk about saguna vidya alone. Here the problem is that in pancagni vidya shukla Gathi is mentioned in detail. In sandilya vidya shukla Gathi is not mentioned. Hence the doubt is suppose a person does sandilya vidya that teaches Brahman is srusti sthithi laya karanam and that Brahman is named tajjjalan. Meditaiting upon Brahman is jagat karanam is prescribed in Sandilya vidya. Pancagni vidya is various stages a dead soul undergoes before taking rebirth. Suppose a person practicing sandilya vidya will he undergo shukla Gathi for sandilya vidya upasaka. Siddhanta says no. And says they will go through shukla whether it is mentioned in the Upanishad or not.

Now will do the general analysis of the sutra. Veda expects some people who manage to get confused. For such people Veda gives clarification. In the sutra the word sabda means sruti pramana and anumanam means smriti pramanam. What is the sruti smriti pramana? Mantra 6.2.15 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad is sruti pramanam this mantra pancagni vidya is repeated as in Chandogya upanisad. At the end of pncagni vidya shukta Gathi is mentioned in the end of the portion and it adds that not only this upasaka as also other upasakas [any other saguna Brahma Upasana] will undergo shukla Gathi. Smriti pramana is 8.24 of Bhagavad Gita says

that all the saguna Brahma upasakas will undergo shukla Gathi. Therefore the condition is that all saguna upasakas will have shukla Gathi. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 288

### **Topic 18 Aniyamadhikaranam [31]**

The passage of the soul by Devayana applies equally to all vidyas of Sagunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.31 [390]**

#### ***Aniyamah sarvasamavirodhah sabdanumanabhyam***

There is no restriction [as to the going on the path of the gods for any vidya]. There is no contradiction seen in the sruti and smriti.

The journey of the soul who knows Brahman is continued.

We have completed the general analysis of this sutra in the last class. All shukla Gathi people will go to Brahma loka but not all of them gain liberation but some may even return and have rebirth. All upasaks go by shukla Gathi or not is the issue here. Karmis are not discussed here because they get Krishna Gathi. Those who are ajnanis will get athogathi. Those who are upasakas gain shukla Gathi. I had already given that the sruti and smriti pramanams in support of Siddhanti's view. Whoever practises saguna Brahman upasana generally that all upasakas go through shukla Gathi.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Aniyamah means shukla Gathi is common sarvasam means for all Upasanas avirodhah this is in agreement sabdanumanabhyam means with the statements of sruti and smriti. Now we will see the significance of the words. Aniyamah means nonrestrictions free for all. It is common to all upaksakas. Sarvasam means upasananam or vidyanam. Avirodhah means is in agreement or non-disagreement; universal shukla Gathi is in agreement with what is said in sruti and smriti. In the tradition when sabda [words] are said to be a source of knowledge, it is called sruti alone. Before the newspaper was written, the newspaper knowledge was there already. Already authors of the book gains knowledge by other means. Since already, the knowledge is generated in the scientist and the book is only career of knowledge of the scientist. I am the career of the clip and not a producer. No book is a producer of the knowledge. Career of knowledge is not called pramanam but it is anuvadhaka vakyani. However, Veda is the only book that produces knowledge but knowledge derived from Veda cannot be gained through any other pramanam. For Bhagavan we cannot say Veda produces knowledge because Bhagavan is the producer of Veda. No one produces knowledge for Bhagavan and he does not require the production of knowledge. The knowledge gained through Veda is called sabda pamk`. It is sruti pramanam. The next is anumanam or smriti pramana. It is so because anumanam is not independent pramana but is derived from pratyaksa. Through pratyaksam we get anumanam. Anumanam is not swatantram and it depends upon prathyaksam. So also smriti is also paratantram or dependent. Dependence is common to both. With this this adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 19 Yavadadhikaradhikarnam [32]**

Perfected souls may take a corporeal existence for divine mission

**Sutra 3.3.32 [391]**

***Yavadadhikaranmavasthitiradhikarkanam***

Of those who have a mission to fulfill [there is corporeal] existence so long as the mission is not fulfilled.

A plausible objection to sutra 31 is refuted.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here a special topic is dealt with. Normally it is said that karmis will have Krishna Gathi and upasaka shukla Gathi and jnani has no Gathi. For a gnani prana merges into samasti and it does not go anywhere after death. Sookshma Sariram of jnani does not travel and it does not take another Sookshma Sariram as there is no rebirth of jnani. Jnani does not acquire agamim karma. He does not have an ego problem. He does not aham abhimana and therefore agami is avoided. Prarapta karma is exhausted. Samchita is burnt by the knowledge. In the case of ajnani samchita very much remains and from that alone next prarapta is collected. Prarapta is present samchita. In the case of jnani the whole samchita is burnt down. As there is no prarapta no sariram can be taken up. Based on this general observation, I talked about Ramana Maharishi. Sastra agree certain celestial phenomena either arrival of mahatma or departure of mahatma. The light going out at the time of death we do not say it is not possible. We should not connect that light to the three sariram of the Atma. That light is not Sookshma Sariram. It is neither Sthoola Sariram, nor Sookshma Sariram or karana sariram not it is Atma which is all pervading. We do not negate the light but we object to anything association with three forms of sariram.

We have said jnanis do not travel. Here the Purva Pakshi says that we have sastric reference jnanis taking rebirth. How is that possible if what is said above is taken to be true. Either it should be that jnanis will have Gathi or you will have to say that the sastra vakyam is wrong. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a few examples. 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanishad where it is said that Sanatkumara rishi alone appeared in the form of Skandah. Tam skandah agacchade. This should not have happened according to the sastra. Sanatkumara is a jnanin according to sastra which also we cannot deny. Sanatkumara is Brahmaji's manasa putra. The second case is 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter first line of Taittiriya Upanishad. Here it is said that Brigu Maharishi is varuna putrah. We know that Brigu was one of the sapta rishis born out of Brahmani's mind. That Brigu manasa putra alone dropped his body during Daksha yaga. First one is Brahmaji putra and then he was born as Varuna Putra. How did jnani guru manasa putra of Brahmaji be born again as varuna putra. Vyasacharya himself is a reappearance of another rishi according to the sastra. The name of the rishi is Apantara tama. That rishi for whom inner darkness is apagatham. How that rishi again became vyasa rishi. In all cases jnani takes the new body. Hence jnani will travel or jnanam does not give moksha. In the case of certain special jnanis, especially in the rishi category there are some speciality and they can take new body which is similar to Bhagavan taking avatara. We do not call it avatara. They are Jivatma jnanis in assuming special sariram which is similar to god taking to new avatara. They are called adhikarika Purusa endowed with special powers to take to new body. In their case even after being a jnani can take to a new sariram which is of totally new dimension.

Now I will give you general analysis of this adhikaranam. Adhikaritanam the new sarira grahanam is possible. But it will not come under punar janma at all. This is the idea conveyed in this sutra. On the case of the special jnani jnanam would have destroyed the samchita karmas and certainly agami karmas will not be there for such people. Their prarapta karma is of some peculiar character, which is different from ordinary jnani. What are the difference of prarapta karma of ordinary jnani and the special jnani of the above variety? Adhi Sankaracharya says that the adhikarika purusas [the special jnanis]. They have certain extra duties for loka sangraha. In the case of ordinary jnanis, they do not come to society and they remain in forest and experience sukha and dukha anubhava and get liberation. The special jnanis get involved with improvement of society and some of them they can do with a particular body and some they can fulfill by taking another body. Because of their special duties, they take with special prarapta give up one body and take another body. The next question is what is difference between vishesha jnani taking a new body and ajnani taking a new body? Difference is an ajnani takes a new body from the samchita karma and jnanam is not there. One part of samchita becomes prarapta and it is samchita based new body. But in the case of vishesha jnani there is no samchita at all and it is the vishesha prarapta enables to drop one prarapta and take new prarapta to take new body. The special jnani's rebirth is previous prarapta based body and the ajnani's body is previous samchita based. There is another difference also. When an ajnani takes to new body, ajnani continues to be ajnani in the new body also. It is previous samchita based. But the vishesha jnani's new body is the extension of the previous prarapta and in the new body the jnanam continues and he continues to be a jnani. Being a jnanis they do not bother about taking any number of bodies. They may even take several bodies at the same time simultaneously. Incidentally, make a note that not all those who can take different body may be jnani. Not all the people taking various bodies need be jnanis. Can we take the above jnani taking new birth be taken as an avatar. If you ask, we can say it is similar to avatara but it is not the same as avatara. It is similar because the body is taken purely for loka samhara and jnanam will be there right from the birth. The dissimilarity is that they come under Jivatma category and they cannot be called Isvara or Paramatma. The body in the case of vishesha jnani is made of vishesha praraptam whereas in the case of bhgavan there is no samchita prarapta etc., but it is of sankalpa matram the body is taken. Many of the rishis vashista, brigu etc., come under the category. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 289

### **Topic 19 Yavadadhikaradhikarnam [32]**

Perfected souls may take a corporeal existence for divine mission

#### **Sutra 3.3.32 [391]**

#### ***Yavadadhikaranmavasthitiradhikarnam***

Of those who have a mission to fulfill [there is corporeal] existence so long as the mission is not fulfilled.

A plausible objection to sutra 31 is refuted.

We are now in sutra 32. I have given general introduction to this adhikaranam where Vyasacharya deals with a special type of jnanis. Even though their jnanam is the same Aham Brahma asmi, still they belong to a special category and such people are called adhikarah purusah. such people have jnanam; they have destroyed samchita karma; avoid agami arma and they survive because of the prarapta. There is some uniqueness between vishesha jivan mukta and samanya jivan mukta. Because of the vishesha praraptam and vishesha duty they live long and sometimes stretching to century, during their long lifetime they change the body, and sometimes they take different bodies. This is due to special cosmic duty. The assumption of new body will not come under punar janma category. The new body is but the extnension of the previous prarapta and they are born new jnani even with the new body. They are like avatara but not avatara proper. They resemble avatara because they are born jnanis and they know the previous janma also. The vishesha jivan muktas for fulfilling special duties are also born jnani in the new body. First time they gain jnanam through guru sastrams etc. And in the second or the next birth they remember the jnanam and they need not go through sastra etc. It is determined by the vishesha prarapta. Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.

The adhikarika Purusas will continue to take new bodies for loka sangrah. the ups and downs in life will not bind the special jnanis. Vishesha jivan mukta has go sustain several sariram while the samanya jivan mukta will sustain only one sariram. I will discuss some general points with regard to jivan mukti. How can we identify the vishesha jivan mukta. This is question is irrelevant because you cannot identity even samanya jivan mukta. Sastras alone is the pramanam for vishesha jivan mukta. Vyasacharya, Sanatkumara etc., are vishesha jivan muktas as per sastram. They are in the form of rishis and devatas. Such rishis have duties of revealing Veda in the new sristi. We have also devatas doing the loka sangrah. Adhikarika Purusas are in the form of rishis and devatas. For this sastra alone is the pramanam. Adhikarika purusas are possible in modern times also. Who is an avatara and who is an adhikarika Purusa but how to identify them. Many claim them to be an avatara. Even if they don't claim the sishya do not leave them. All spiritual sect claim their guru to be an adhikarika Purusa. Only thing we have to prople the biography of such avatara purusas. We have no regular pramanam but it is only a belief. For a believer no proof is required and for

nonbeliever no proof is sufficient. Therefore adhikarika Purusa is possible but we have no proof. The tradition accept the sastra alone as pramanam. Any samanya guru can give us the knowledge. This is the second corollary.

Who determine or who should become vishesha jivan mukta and samanya jivan kukta. Bhagavan alone decideds adhikarika Purusa accordintg to the prarapta of the jiva.

The next corollary I would like to discuss a point. If somebody asks that I want to become a jivan mukta. For jivan mukta there is no punar janma. If someone wants to continue to be a special jivan mukta so that I will be jivan mukta and I will come again and again and impart the knowledge or serve the universe. Now the question is how to become a jivan mukta. Struggling to become a vishesha jivan mukta itself a contradiction. If you say I want to become a jivan mukta, I will ask you which part attracts you to ask that question. Whether the vishesha adjective part or the mukti part? Vishesha jivan mukta means superiority or the greatness and it belong to Atma or anatma. Can we say the Atma of vishesha jivan mukta is superior and samanya jivan mukta is inferior. For this there is no difference, it is stated. If you are interested in mukti part, mukti is dependent on the glory of Atma. Mukti requires Atma abhimana and vishesha requires anatma abhimana. One presupposes the negation of the other. Moksam means you should turn towards Atma and when you think of any superiority it is anatma abhimana. No samanya jiva can never have the desire for vishesha jivan mukti. Then comes the next question. How can jivan mukta becomes vishesha jivan muktas? How did they become vishesha jivan mukta? The samanya jiva never works for vishesha jivan mukta. Samanya jiva even before getting the desire for mukti he may get a desire to become a vishesha jivan mukta. This desire is possible. The desire of all the samsari is from samanya jiva I want to become a vishesha jiva. This has an advantage. All our struggles are only to become a vishesha and in sastra vishesha jiva extends upto rishi, devata etc., status. It is not jivan mukti variety. Yama himself discloses this information to nachiketetus. Yama says that he wanted to become liberated but desired to become a vishesha jiva and became yama deva. After becoming vishesha jiva and it got vairagyam to this status itself. I discover vishesha jiva means vishesha samsara. In fact, you cannot lead an ordinary life if you become a popular and vishesha jivah. A samanya jiva vote to become a vishesha jiva without knowing that vishesha jiva status also is vishesha samsara. Then they get vairagyam and work to become vishesha jiva. They get jnanam and when the vishesha jiva works for jiva and his achievement is vishesha jivan mukti and when such mukti comes to them, they are not interested in such vishesha jivan mukti. In every yuga they may change the body but they continue to be a jivan mukta. You cannot work for vishesha jivan mukta but you can become a vishesha jiva and then work for jivan mukta status and thereafter you become a vishesha jivan mukta. Then there is a last question. If one says I will become a vishesha jiva and then work for vishesha jivan mukta. To become a vishesha jiva you have to become vishesha anatma and that is dealt with karma Upasana kanda and meditate upon relevant object of meditation. Vedanta strongly criticize all the anatma samanya or vishesha anatma. Upanishad will not glorify vishesha jiva and Vedanta criticizes even devatas and Indra who are nothing but belong to category of vishesha jiva. By becoming a vishesha jiva and then become vishesha jivan mukta. One should not prefer to become a vishesha jiva and vishesha jivan mukta. Now I will give you the word for word analysis analysis of this sutra, avasthithi means embodies existence adhikarikanam means jivas with special duties whom I call as vishesha jivan muktas; yavadadhikaram means extends up to the end of the duty. I will give you the significance of the words. Avasthithi means continuation of embodied existence; in each existence jnanam and memory will continue; adhikarikanam refers to the special category of the jivan muktas. Yavadhadikaram means until that special duty allotted by the

Lord is exhausted; the Lord will require someone for doing such job in every sristi; now the last point before conclusion is why should this topic be discussed in this pada at all.

This discussion comes because we did talk about krama and sadhyo mukti and we said that upasakas will get Gathi to travel and jnani will get liberation without travel. We talked about two types of muktis and two types of margas etc. Vyasacharya talks here the unique exception of the unique jnanis who take to another body in the next janma. With this 32<sup>nd</sup> adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 20 Aksharadhyadhikaranam [33]**

The negative attributes of Brahman mentioned in various texts are to be combined in all meditations on Brahman.

### **Sutra 3.3.33 [392]**

#### ***Aksharadhiyam tvavarodhah samanyatadbhavabhyumaupasadvattaduktam***

But the conceptions of the [negative] attributes of the imperishable [Brahman] are to be combined [from different texts where the imperishable Brahman is dealt with as they form one vidya] because of the similarity [of defining the imperishable Brahman through denials] and the object [the imperishable Brahman being the same as in the case of the upasad [offerings]]. This has been explained [by Jaimini in the Purva Mimamsa].

The negative attributes of the imperishable are now examined as the positive attributes were examined in sutra 11 of this section. .

First I will give the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here the topic is the nisheda vakyani occurring in several places regarding Brahman and whether we can combine all the vakyams as one Brahma Vidya is the question here. The features contained in one vakyam can be combined in another place is the discussion. We take two sample nisheda vakyams. Nisheda vakyam is the statement revealing Brahman through negation of attributes or negation of anatma. The first one is 1.1.5 of Mundaka Upanishad; the Brahman has not attribute of perceptibility; it does not have the attribute of graspability; it does not have any gotra; it does not have any colour or it does not have chatur varnam nasti; also apani badham sarira nisheda jnanendriya nisheda etc. Another famous mantra is 3.8.8. Of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. These nisheda vakyams occur in the various Upanisads and siddhanta says that we can combine them because all of them come under one Brahman only. Vyasacharya gives one Brahman that the subject matter is one. They uniformly reveal one Brahman alone. The object revelation and subject of discussion is only one Brahman. All of them use the same method to reveal Brahman and the method is by negation. It is negation of all the attribute; subject matter being the same it comes under upasamhara. The features of Brahman mentioned in different Vedas can be combined together. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 290

### **Topic 20 Aksharadhyadhikaranam [33]**

The negative attributes of Brahman mentioned in various texts are to be combined in all meditations on Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.33 [392]**

#### ***Aksharadhiyam tvavarodhah samanyatadbhavabhyumaupasadavattaduktam***

But the conceptions of the [negative] attributes of the imperishable [Brahman] are to be combined [from different texts where the imperishable Brahman is dealt with as they form one vidya] because of the similarity [of defining the imperishable Brahman through denials] and the object [the imperishable Brahman being the same as in the case of the upasad [offerings]]. This has been explained [by Jaimini in the Purva Mimamsa].

The negative attributes of the imperishable are now examined as the positive attributes were examined in sutra 11 of this section. .

We are doing the general analysis of this sutra. Here Vyasacharya analyses all the nisheda vakyams on Brahman. This nisheda mugha pratikaranam occurs in several Upanishads and Vyasacharya establishes that all of them should be clubbed together and be taken as Brahma Vidya. If certain aspects of Brahman are not mentioned in one place can be clubbed at other places and this pooling is called gunaupa samhara. We have taken the examples of 3.8.8 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad and 1.1.5 and 6 of Mundaka Upanishad. In this adhikaranam the word chosen is Aksaram for Brahman. Vyasacharya gives the reason in this sutra is that in all the context Upanishad is using the same nisheda method. The negation method means negation of all other things other than Brahman and Brahman will remain ultimate unnegatable witness. This is indirect method of arriving at the ultimate Brahman. Not only the method is the and also the revealing entity is the same Brahman. Brahman is mentioned in all the places as the object of revelation. Thus it can be taken as eka vidya is Brahma Vidya. Vyasacharya feels that he has to clarify it further and he gives an example from Purva Mimamsa. I will explain the Purva Mimamsa example here.

Aupasatavat is the example. The first term to understand this is jamatadniya yaga a relatively bigger yaga running a few days. This is performed by Jamadagni rishi. The next word you should know is upasat homa a minor or secondary ritual that is prescribed as a part of a bigger yaga. The third word you should remember is purodasa pradhanam. Purodasa is a small preparation made out of rice. This looks like mini idli. They make a grain preparation and take it on a clay vessel and this preparation is called purodasah. It is offered as an oblation in the upasat homa, which is a part of Jamadagni yaga. This offering is called purodasa pradhanam. The next word you should remember is advaryuh, the yajur Veda priest who employs the yajur Veda part in yajur yaga. Advaryu alone is entitled to offer purodasa pradhanam. Sama Veda priest cannot offer purodasa. If Veda asks you to do you do or else you do not do. The next point to be noted is when this is done in jamadagni yaga certain

mantra is prescribed for chanting when the purodasa pradhanam takes place and the mantra recited is called aupasada mantra. In the sutra Vyasacharya refers to aupasada. This aupasada mantra prescribed for the above upasat homa is taken from Sama Veda. The general rule is sama Veda mantra is to be chanted by Samaveda priest and therefore in the normal course it should be chanted by Sama Veda priest. A particular controversy arises and it is that this mantra is to be chanted at the time of purodasa pradhanam done by Yajur Veda priest. The question is whether this mantra is to be chanted by Sama Veda priest or yajur Veda priest and the conclusion arrived at is that it should be chanted by yajur Veda priest. Even though the mantra relates to Samaveda, it is allowed to be chanted by Yajur Veda priest. The application of a mantra has got a primary role even though every mantra has an origin or a source. Even though origination is associated with every mantra, the filed application is more important factor as the application alone gives the phalam. He calls viniyoga is mukhya factor and utpatti as gauna factor. Samaveda priest should chant Utpatti factor wise if you analyse the mantra and from viniyoga point of view, it should be chanted by yajur Veda priest. More than the source of Veda look for the application factor.

In the same way, even if it is atharvana Veda mantra, the application is for Brahman revelation the same application atharvana Veda mantra can jump from Mundaka Upanishad and join Brihadaranyaka upanisad and such jump is permissible on the analogy of the above purodasa mantra. Yajur Veda words can be brought to Mundaka Upanishad mantra also. Veda jump because application is permissible. This is the example part. Vyasacharya says that I need not explain this to all of you because Jaimini has explained the jump in detail in Purva Mimamsa sutra 3.3.8. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. Avarodhah the inclusion; akssharadhiyam of all the negations in the context of the revelation of Nirgunam Brahman [is proper]. Samanyatadbhavabhyam means because of the similarity of the method and the oneness of the subject matter. Aupasadavat means like the mantras used in the upasadaritual. Tad uktam means this has been said [in the Purva Mimamsa sastra].

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Aksharadhiyam means Nirgunam Brahman; in Mundaka Upanishad also the same word is used; dhi means the knowledge derived through negation; here we gain knowledge that Brahman is free from colour, free from all attributes etc. Or by implication it is nisheda sabdah the words which give the negative knowledge. The negative words revealing Brahman are found in every Upanishad. Refer to Mundaka Upanishad, Brihadaranyaka upanisad and Kathopanisad. Tu stands for emphasis. Avarodhah means pooling together or grouping together. Whatever words are missing in Brihadaranyaka upanisad can be taken from the other Upanisads. Samanyatadbhavabhyam means the similarity of the method; the method intended here is negation method of revealing. There is positive method of revealing sathyam, aanandah and the positive method is called vidhimugha pratipadhanam. Tat bhavabhyam means Brahma bhavah. Bhavah means reference or presence. In both these places, Brahman is very much present as the subject matter of revelation. Aupasadavat means as in the case aupasada mantra jumping from one Veda priest to another Veda priest. [for detail see the analysis part of the sutra]. Adhi Sankaracharya says the mantra used is agner vehe adhvaram this occurs in Sama Veda and it comes out of Yajur Veda priest in Aupasata yaga. Tat uktam means this idea has been discussed already. The sutra is 3.3.8 of Purva Mimamsa sutra. In this sutra Jaimini says when the origin is a factor and application is another factor. And he says application factor is mukhya factor while utpatti factor is secondary. With this the 33<sup>rd</sup> sutra is over.

## Topic 21 Iadadhikaranam [34]

Mundaka III.1.1. And Katha 1.3.1. Constitute one vidya

### Sutra 3.3.34 [393]

#### *Iyadamananat*

Because [the same thing is described as such and such and such.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. This is relatively simple adhikaranam and the portions taken for analysis is 3.1.1. Of Mundaka Upanisad and the same mantra is repeated in 4.7 of Svetasvatara Upanishad. The third mantra is 1.3.1 of Kathopanisad. Guham pratistou parame patharthe. Here the discussion is whether all the three mantras deal with eka vidya or pinna vidya because of Veda difference. Because of differences in Vedas whether the teachings in the Veda are one and the same or not is our argument. In karma kanda rituals occur in several Vedas and because Veda difference there is differences and one cannot be combined with the other. For Sama Veda people upa karma exercise is very complicated one. If a person has entered in Karma Kanda and comes to Vedanta, Mundaka Brahman and kathopanisad Brahman are one are difference doubt may rise. Therefore, we clarify that all are one and the same. The conclusion is that vidya is the same only because the subject matter is one and the same. The central teaching is the same in all the three mantras. Here Vyasacharya says that subject matter is two things and they are Jivatma and Paramatma. If you go back to the two Upanishad and analyse the Upanishad, you find jivatma and Paramatma bedah. The whole things start with duality. Then the Upanishad conveys the problem and says because of the difference alone Jivatma suffers. Jivatma is estranged from Paramatma. If the samsara problem is to go away, the estranged jiva should realize it is Paramatma through jnanam. Thus aikyam is talked about in Mundaka, katha and also in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Here the journey is indriya journey. Jivatma travels through the various stages in the forms of kosa and reach Brahman ultimately. The yat means the same number of topics. Because of the same number of topic we have to conclude that they refer to the same only.

Now we will come to the general analysis of the sutra. First we talks of beda and ultimately end with abeda. Now we will go to the word analysis. Iyat amananat means since the three Veda mantras deal with the same specific topics [their teachings are to be treated as one]. Now we will come to the significance of the words. It is a common word consisting of two-words iyat and amananat. Iyat means this much the same specific number of topics; here Jivatma and Paramatma are mentioned. Amananam means discussion or teaching. Here Adhi Sankaracharya raises an objection and answers. The Purva Paksi may raise this objection. There are two birds seated on one tree one is the eater and the other does not eat the fruit and one is bokta and the other is abokta. [Mundaka Upanishad] but in Kathopanisad it is said that it refers to two boktas. Hence there is doubt due to difference of bokta abokta in the above two Upanishads. Adhi Sankaracharya says that we have already discussed this before. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 291

### **Topic 21 Iadadhikaranam [34]**

Mundaka III.1.1. And Katha 1.3.1. Constitute one vidya

#### **Sutra 3.3.34 [393]**

#### ***Iyadamananat***

Because [the same thing is described as such and such and such.

We have completed sutra number 24. Here Vyasacharya establish that Atma vidya occurring in Mundaka and Kathopanisad are one and the same although both relate to difference Vedas. The same mantra occurs in Svetasvatara Upanishad also. The topic discussed is Jivatma and Paramatma. First the difference between jivatma and Paramatma is seen and jivatma and Paramatma beda is samsara and once we do not see the beda then it concludes with aikya darsanam which is moksa. The objection raised by Purva Paksi is that in Mundaka it is presented that one of the bird is bokta and the other is abokta. Therefore in Mundaka bokta and abokta pair is mentioned. But in Kathopanisad both the entities are aboktas. How can we say that vidya is aikyam when there is difference between Mundaka and katha Upanishad? Adhi Sankaracharya says that his point has been discussed in 1.2.11 of Brahma Sutra we have analysed this and said that in Kathopanisad two boktas are not discussed and one is Paramatma and the other is Jivatma. Two atmas are mentioned here in one sariram and if both are Atma what is the logical problem we have to see. If both are two different Jivatmas or not. If two Jivatma sit in one sariram, it is not possible and there will be lot of problems. Therefore, mantra cannot talk about two bokta Jivatmas. Can we say that the mantra talks of one bokta Jivatma and bokta Paramatma? Both residing in one body is not possible and if Paramatma is also bokta then Paramatma will be a samsari. If Paramatma is a samsari reaching or discovery of oneness with Paramatma is not going to help us in anyway. Upanishad makes it clear that Paramatma is abokta. Not only that in the same katha mantra Upanishad compares Jivatma and Paramatma to the shade and the light. How light and shade be one when both are diametrically opposite. Therefore, we have to conclude that one is bokta and the other is abokta. Then how did Upanishad use the dual number? Experiencing karma phalam should be in singular only and how do you account for the dual number. Adhi Sankaracharya answers in guhapratista adhikaranam. During the rainy season, the keralite take an umbrella. One or two may not carry an umbrella with them. Yet we have an expression that all people carry umbrella but we know that there are non-carrier of umbrella. Those people do not carry umbrella is taken to the majority and they come into the other group. Thus we say that all carry umbrella. There is a tree with seven leaves in one bunch. Most of the bunches of leaves have seven leaves but there also we find that there are less than or more than seven leaves. But we call the tree with seven leaves. In the same way boktritvam belongs to Jivatma only. Because of the proximity ppor Paramatma also gets the attribute of boktritvam. Therefore do not take the dual number seriously and do not start to dual taking the duel number seriously. Therefore Jivatma is bokta and Paramatma is abokta. Therefore vidya aikyam is established. The corollary is that the description of Atma which

are mentioned in Mundaka and katha should be pooled together. Rukma varnam means Self effulgence Brahma yonitvam and it means the cause of brahmaji and they should be transferred to what is said about Atma in Kathopanisad. Atma is protector and Atma acts as bridge to reach moksha. It helps samsari to cross samsara. These are the description in Kathopanisad. Descriptions in Kathopanisad should be taken to Mundaka Upanishad. This is called gunopasamhaha

## **Topic 22 Antaratvadhikaranam.[35 - 36]**

Brihadharaynaka upanisad III.4.1 and III 5.1 constitute one vidya.

### **Sutra 3.3.35 [394]**

#### ***Antara bhutagramavatsvatmanah***

As the Self is within all, as in the case of the aggregate of the elements, [there is oneness of vidya].

Two passages from Brihadharaynaka upanisad are taken up for discussion to show that they relate to the same vidya.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. Here the analysis is Brahma Vidya occurring in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In the Brihadharaynaka upanisad ushastha questions yajnavalkya 'explain to me the Brahman which is present intuition not hidden – this Atman or Self which is within all and it is innermost of all the kosas. Prana maya is inner all right but it is inner to mano maya. All the kosas are not absolute antara and superlatively inner is the Chaitanyam which means Chaitanyam is inner to everyone. This sarvantara Atma is saksat aparoksat means it is ever known to us even without the requirement of any instrument of knowledge. You are knowable to me only if I use the sense organs of eye. Everything in creation is knowable through prana vyaparah and Atma is one you can know without any effort. This is the meaning of the mantra. The problem is that the same mantra occurs in two sections. One is 3.4.1 ushastha Brahmanam and the other is in 3.5.1 of Kahola Brahmanam kahola is the name of the person who challenges Yajnavalkya. The confusion here is whether both should be taken as the same vidya or different vidya. Whether the teachings are one or different? Purva Pakshi says that they are to be treated as two different vidyas and if both are same the Upanishad need not repeat the same. Since sastra takes the trouble saying the same you have to take it as different vidya. Our answer is that both are one and the same only. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya gives one reason for taking both as one vidya. Vyasacharya says that the ultimate inner essence can be only one. If there are two the question will come which is inner to inner one. The word sarvantarah is used both the Brahmanams. Since sarvantarah can be only one Atma, both must deal with one and the same Atma only. Since the knowledge is one, the vidya also must be one only. This is one logic given by Vyasacharya.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives another logic. He says observe 3.5.1 carefully. Here there is a word eva. This is used as an addition. The word eva means the same. Whichever sarvantara



Atma discussed in Ushasta Brahmanam itself is repeated in Kahola Brahmanam it is implied meaning of the sutra. Then Purva Pakshi raises a question if the same is repeated in both Brahmanam will there not be punarutti dosha. For that objection by Purva Pakshi the answer will be given in the next sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Swatmanah means [because of the revelation] of the same Self antara means as the innermost one the teaching is the same [vidya aikyam eva] bhutagramavat like the Self in all the living beings revealed elsewhere. This is the running meaning of the sutra. Now we will see the significance of the words. Antara means the innermost Self. Innermost can be only one and it cannot be many. Therefore in both the Brahmanam it refers to the same Atma only. Bhutagramavat like the one referred to elsewhere. That is Svetasvatara Upanishad 6.11<sup>th</sup> mantra. Here for us two words are relevant. One sarva bhutantaratma Atma is inner essence of all the jivas. That means bhutagrama. There Atma is revealed as sarva bhuta antaratma. In the first line Upanishad says ekah which means that sarva bhuta Atma is only one. If Atma is one, Atma vidya can be only one. Swatmanah means the same Atma [being revealed]. 4121

## **Topic 22 Antaratvadhikaranam.[35 - 36]**

Brihadharaynaka upanisad III.4.1 and III 5.1 constitute one vidya.

### **Sutra 3.3.36 [395]**

#### ***Anyatha bhedanupapattiriti cheenopadesuntaravat***

If it be said [that the two vidyas are separate for] otherwise the repetition cannot be accounted for, we reply not so, [it is] like [the repetition in another instruction [in the Chandogya upanisad]

This sutra has two parts the first one is Purva Pakshi and the latter one is siddhanta. Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Purva paksha says that if you treat both as one, how will you remedy the defect of repetition of the same vidyas in two places. That mantra bedah or Brahmana bedah you cannot explain if you talk of vidya abedah. In short punarutti dosha has not been remedied.

In the second part siddhanta answers this point raised by Purva Pakshi.. It is said that even though Atma is same, two different aspect of Atma is talked about here. Two aspects of Atma is this. Atma uses prana as the instrument and Atma uses apana, vyana etc., as instrument. Atma is karanam and it is different from the instrument as person is different from the instrument. By extension it is different from jnanendriya and karmendriyas. Atma is the witness even the mind and the thought. Atma is different from manomaya kosa also. Leaving aside the detail the essence of ushasta Brahmana is Atma is different from sarira and kosas. Atma is the witness different from the ksetram the body.

But in kahola Brahmana the focus is the freedom of the distinguished Atma. Atma is different from sariram and that Atma is ever free. The Consciousness is free from hunger and thirst, old age and death, sorrow and delusion, sukha and dukha, and in short it is free from samsara. Ekah eva Atma but there are two different features are mentioned here. In fact in Chandogya

upanisad Atma is given 8 or 9 examples are given and in each example each aspect of Atma is talked about. Thus there is no punarutti dosha here. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Anyata means without the acceptance of difference in the teaching that is without the acceptance of vidya bedah; the difference in the mantra [Brahmanam] is improper. Up to this is purva paksa. Sectional difference should prove teaching different. We say that it can be teaching of two different aspects. Iti chet if this is your contention, na it is not correct; upadesantravat means it is proper as in the case of the teachings elsewhere. This is the running meaning.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Anyata means otherwise; otherwise means without accepting the teaching different; bedah anupapattih means beda and anupapattih; beda means section difference; one mantra occurs in fourth Brahmana and the other in the fifth Brahmana; anupapattih means illogical; this is the view of purva paksa point of view. Iti chet is our statement if this is Purva Paksi contention then na that problem is not there; sectional differences are possible with the same teaching; upadesantravat means it is explained elsewhere which means tat tvam asi maha vakya in Chandogya upanisad from 8<sup>th</sup> section to 15<sup>th</sup> section where tat tvam asi is explained in eight or nine places giving different aspects of Atma. This is the significance of the upadesantravat. With this, this adhikaranam is over. More in the next class. .

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 292

### **Topic 23 vyatiharadhikaranam.[37]**

The sruti prescribes reciprocal meditation in Aitareya Upanishad II.2.4.6

#### **Sutra 3.3.37 [396]**

#### ***Vyatiharo vishimsanti hitaravat***

There is exchange [of meditation], because the texts distinguish [two meditations]; as in other cases.

The Aitareya aranyaka says with reference to the person in the sun,'what I am, that He is; what He is, that am I' [Ait. Aranyaka II.2.4.6]

I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here Vyasacharya analyses a mantra from Aitareya aranyakam as above. The mantra is *tad yoham saha asou and yo sou soham*. Here the Veda prescribes jivatma and Paramatma aikya Upasanam. It is called ahamgrah Upasanam that is considered an important stage before gaining jnanam. Normally when we do Isvara Upasanam Isvara is invoked on any sacred symbol which is different from me like saligrama. Shivalinga etc. This Isvara Upasanam is called beda Upasana because Isvara is different from me. Later before coming to jnanam or before coming to Vedanta in upasana kanda abeda Upasanam is prescribed and Isvara is invoked upon oneself. The symbol is not an external object and I myself become the symbol. At the time of Upasanam Isvara does not know Jivatma Paramatma is a fact. Only if you know that it is jnanam. If I imagine and visualize I am Isvara and when I invoke Isvara on me, I know that I am not Isvara but I consider myself as Isvara for the sake of puja. If a stone can serve as a symbol, why cannot I myself be a symbol for invoking the Lord on myself. But he swears that I am not the god. Since aikyam is not a fact for the upasaka and aikyam is only an imagination, it is called abedda Upasanam. If someone practise abeda Upasanam for a long time, it will be easier to gain abeda jnanam ultimately. That is why in Upadesa sara it is said that between beda Upasanam and abeda Upasanam is superior to the former. Between abeda Upasanam and abeda jnanam the latter is superior. The former will give the maximum krama mukti and abeda jnanam will give jivan mukti. This is aikya Upasanam or ahangraha Upasanam. This is talked about in the aitareya aranyaka mantra. I alone the Jivatma obtaining in this body, this Jivatma alone is asou which means Surya mandala varti Paramatma. Paramatma is generally invoked in Surya mandalam. The word asou means that Paramatma who is invoked in Surya mandala both are one and the same. I am he; I is equal to Jivatma and he is equal to Paramatma. Veda makes another statement reversing the same idea that Paramatma in Surya mandala and that Paramatma is I this Jivatma obtaining in this sariram. That means 'he is I' the second statement is I is He. Grammatically there difference. When I say I am he, I am the subject and he is the object and when you say He is I, he is the subject and I am the object. They are reversed in the two sentences. There is visheshana viseshya differences and there is uddeshya vidheha differences. This reversal of subject and predicate is called vyathikarah. It is mutual exchange of positions. Our problem is since there are two

expressions in the mantra one being I am He and the other is He is I. Should we treat both as two separate meditations or should we treat it as one meditation only. Purva Pakshi says that this should be treated as one meditation because aikyam is the subject matter. Since aikyam is talked about in both, it is eka vidya. Now siddhanta says that it is not and they should be treated as two separate Upasana.

Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that we have to treat it as separate Upasana since Veda purposely says differently. Even though there is aikyam there is subtle difference. When you say I am He, then Isvaratvam is superimposed on jiva and when we say He is I jivatvam is superimposed on Isvara. Therefore there is subtle difference which the sruti wants to make it clear and therefore there are two expressions. When it is said the Purva Pakshi says why cannot we take it as one aikyam and you can say the second time repetition is only for emphasis it is said as we did in the previous class. Here why cannot we take that there is one Upasana is repeated twice. For that siddhanta says that you should know there, it is knowledge and here it is Upasanam. There is difference between Upasanam and knowledge. In knowledge alone doubt is possible and you have to accept it as a fact. Therefore, doubt is possible and therefore different arguments are to be given. Here it is only an invocation on a particular locus. There is no knowledge involved and no understanding is involved. Upasana is karma, karma is involved in Upasana and understanding is not doing an action. Therefore you have to treat them as two separate actions. There is no knowledge involved here. I am he is an action number one and he is I is action number two which is invocation number two. In the first invocation, jiva is the locus and in the second invocation, the locus is Isvara. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya argues that these are two separate Upasanam with two separate locus. Then Purva Pakshi argues further that when you do Upasana normally we invoke a superior thing upon an inferior thing. That being the Upasana how can you explain the two Upasanas. Two Upasanas I can appreciate the first one is I am he the Isvaratvam is superimposed on jiva. But how do you explain the second Upasana in which jivatvam is superimposed in Isvara. Jivatmatvam is inferior thing superimposed in superior Isvara. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says that already you have superimposed many inferior features on Paramatma. Originally, Paramatma is nirguna. Already you have superimposed on Nirgunam Brahman many rupam like Shiva, Vishnu etc. Rupam means limitation. You invite the Lord and send back the Lord and you offer snanam during puja. Offering snanam to Lord is an indirect result to the Lord. Already you have made many kalpanas, rupam etc., and along with that your jivatvam also is superimposition on Paramatma. The first mistake I committed is that I have given you a form thus limited your character. Next in every sthuti I did for you is another insult. Lord is indescribable yet I called you by many names. Identifying through specification I have limited your names. In every religion and philosophy one question is there as to is evil included in god. If god has evil then what is the difference between god and me. Evil is mithya and it can be included in Lord but Lord is not affected by our inclusion. Any name of the Lord is to exclude him. The third mistake I have committed is that every pilgrimage that I have undertaken is indirectly saying that you are not here. Every thirtha yatra limits you. These three dosahas I have done in the name of a great devotee. For this the jnani asks for a pardon from the Lord. It is o.k. Until advaida jnanam comes. Now we will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Vyatiharah means two meditations with subject predicate exchange [are intended in this mantra] hi visimshanti because of the scriptural words specify so; itaravat as in the other cases; now I will come to the significance of the words. Vyatiharah means subject predicate exchange; this exchange is meant by the word vyatihaha and this indicates two meditation; it is not one aikya jnanam but it is twofold aikya Upasanam. Visimshanti means two specify in

one statement yogam sosou and in another statement, it is said sosou yogam. We should respect sruti specification. Hi means the reasoning; and itaravat means as in other cases. Two specifications are made with intention of two Upasanams with one locus on Isvara and another on Jivatma. All these occur in ahamgrah Upasanam. If the same mantra occurs in knowledge section, we will not treat them as two different thing and we will treat it as eka vidya. In Kaivalyam it is said that tvam eva avastatriya saksi Chaitanya Paramatma with this 37<sup>th</sup> sutra is over.

## **Topic 24 Satyadyadhikaranam [38]**

Brihadharaynaka upanisad V.4.1 adn 5.5.3 treat of one vidya about satya Brahman.

### **Sutra 3.3.38 [397]**

#### ***Saiva hi satyadayah***

The same [satya vadya is taught in both places], because [attributes like] satya etc., [are seen in both places]

First, I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. Here the subject mater is two mantras occurring in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 5.4.1 and 5.5.2. 5.4.1 says that 'He who knows this great glorious first born [being] as the Satya Brahman, conquers these worlds' and again in 5.4.3 it is said ' that which is satya is that sun the being who is in that orb' and the being who is in the right eye... he destroys evils'. Now a doubt arises whether these two satya vidyas are one or different. Here we get Hiranyagarbha Upasanam. First one occurs in fourth and fifth sections. In both the Brahmanam Hiranyagarbha Upasana is prescribed. In both the Brahmanam Hiranyagarbha is presented as Satyam Brahma. Here the word Brahman refers to Sagunam Brahman only. It is called Brahman because Hiranyagarbha is all pervading. Hiranyagarbha is also called satyam and this satyam means that which is a mixture of sat and tyad. Sat and tyad is Hiranyagarbha and sat means murtha sariram and tyad means amurtha sariram. On who has got virad sariram and formless sookma sariram also and that is called Hiranyagarbha Upasana it is said. The controversy is should we treat the two Hiranyagarbha Upasana as 'one and the same' or different. If they are treated as different then guna upasamhara will not be there and the descriptions in both can be clubbed together. Purva Paksi says that they are two different Upasanas. Siddhanta says that both are one. Purva Paksi gets the doubt because he says the phalam given in these two Brahmanas are different. The phalam in fourth Brahmana is loka jayah; means superior lokas will be attained in the next janma. Certainly, it is not moksa. But the phalam given in the 5<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam is papa nasah. It comes in the end of the Brahmanam. Therefore the Upasanas are different. The conclusion will be that they are one Upasana only. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. He asserts that they are one and the same Upasana only because of valid reasons. The valid reason is left to the reader. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer that the valid reason is that the Upanishad mentions that the Hiranyagarbha which was talked before. If you study the mantra it is clear that both are the same. Tat yad tad satyam now Adhi Sankaracharya argues there is an expression that Hiranyagarbha which was talked there in the previous Brahmanam that alone is satyam. Because of the usage of the appropriate pronoun the same word satyam is used and therefore

the satyam mentioned before is discussed in the fifth chapter also. The Purva Paksi question remains as to how do you account for two phalams. This is will be done in the next week.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 293

### **Topic 24 Satyadyadhikaranam [38]**

Brihadharaynaka upanisad V.4.1 adn 5.5.3 treat of one vidya about satya Brahman.

#### **Sutra 3.3.38 [397]**

#### ***Saiva hi satyadayah***

The same [sathya vadya is taught in both places], because [attributes like] satya etc., [are seen in both places]

We now see the general analysis of sutra 38. Here Vyasacharya analyses the Hiranyagarbha Upasanam occurring in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 5<sup>th</sup> chapter as well as in the 4<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam. The question here is that whether the Hiranyagarbha Upasana given in the two Brahmanam are one and the same or different. Purva Pakshi says that they should be treated as separate Upasanam due to phala bedah. One is accomplishment of higher loka and another is papa nasah. Because of the phala beda the Upasanam must be treated separately and guna upasamhara rule will not apply. But Vyasacharya says no and he gives the reason indicated in the word 'hi'. Hi means because of the valid reason and Adhi Sankaracharya gives the reason. The reason given by Adhi Sankaracharya is that in the 5<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam tat yad sat is sathyam. That Hiranyagarbha mentioned as satyam in the previous Brahmanam. Satyam here does not mean Paramarthika sathyam but murtha amurtha Prapancha. The same Hiranyagarbha Upasana is talked about in both the Brahmanam and therefore guna upasamhara should be applied. Purva Pakshi question here is that if it is the same Upasana why should two phalam are mentioned one being loka jeyam and the other is papa nasah.

The answer Adhi Sankaracharya gives is look at the fourth Brahmanam closely. In the two mantras in the fifth Brahmanam prescribes another anga \Upasana as a part of main Hiranyagarbha Upasana. Anga Upasana means a secondary Upasana which should go along with anga primary Upasana which is said in the 4<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam itself. Yaksam means adorable and pratamajam means first born. Anga Upasana here is the same Hiranyagarbha Upasana is described as endowed with vyahriti avayavah. Bhur buva suva is called vyahriti mantra. The Upasana here described as vyahriti avayava Hiranyagarbha which means Upanishad presents three mantra as the limbs of Hiranyagarbha. Buhu is head buvah is two hands and suvah is two legs. At the end of the vyahriti avayava Hiranyagarbha description the Upanishad gives a secret name for the Hiranyagarbha and that secret name is ahar at macro cosmic level and aham is at micro cosmic level. Akshi Purusa rupa Hiranyagarbha aham utyate. Then the Upanishad says that one who meditates upon the secret name will get the phalam of papa nasah. Therefore the papa nasa phalam is not the phalam is not for the main Hiranyagarbha Upasana. Therefore there is one phalam alone which is a mixture of loka jeya and papa nmasah. You have to take both the Upasanam together and then you get the phalam of papa nasah. The main ans subsidiary Upasanam will give you the phalam of papa nasah. Add both Brahmanam and make one of both anga and anga and combine both together and then you get the phalam of loka jeya and papa nasa. The word satyam is common to both the



Upasanas. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra.

Sa eva the same Hiranyagarbha Upasanam alone [is taught in the fifth section also]. Hi means because of valid reason satyadayah therefore attribute like satyam [are to be included in the fifth section also. Now we will come to the significance of the words. Sa means Hiranyagarbha Upasanam; Upasanam is known as vidya also. Sa means vidya here. That is Hiranyagarbha vidya; eva means emphasis the same or Hiranyagarbha Upasanam alone is talked about; or you can take it as the same Hiranyagarbha Upasana alone is talked about; the Hiranyagarbha Upasana mentioned in 4<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam is repeated in the 5<sup>th</sup> Brahmanam of fifth section of Brihadharaynaka upanisad also; the reason is said here by the word 'hi'. Vyasacharya does not specify and the valid reason is the pronoun tad. Satyam are used in the fifth Brahmanam also for the sake of pratyavijna purposes. Before the sarvanama sabda also there are few lines and those few lines of fifth Brahmanam are the explanation of pradhamaajam occurring in the fourth Brahmanam. This shows that both the Upasanas should be taken as one. This is also an additional reason. Satyadayah means satyam means the attribute of satyam; the meaning of satyam means murtha amurtha Prapancha; adhi means etc. Which means the other three gunas mahad [great], yaksam [adorable] and pradhamaajam means the first born. Out of Isvara the first one created is Hiranyagarbha. They are three attributes mentioned in the fourth Brahmanam are to be transferred to fifth Brahmanam also which is called guna upasamharah. The additional papa nasa phalam should be transferred to the fourth Brahmanam also. With this the 38<sup>th</sup> sutra is over and with that 24<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over.

## **Topic 25 Kamadyadhikaranam [39]**

Attributes mentioned in Chandogya upanisad Viii.1.1. And Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.33 are to be combine don account of several common features in both texts.

### **Sutra 3.3.39 [398]**

#### ***Kamaditaratra tatra chayatanadibhyah***

[Qualities like true] desire etc., [mentioned in the Chandogya upanisad are to be inserted] in the other [i.e., in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad] and [those mentioned] are also to be inserted in the Chandogya upanisad [being the same in both].

Dahara vidya of the Chandogya upanisad and the Brihadharaynaka upanisad is now discussed.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of the sutra is the paramatma vidya occurring in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. He wants to find out whether these two vidyas can be treated as one vidya or different. First we will take up Chandogya upanisad 8.1 section Paramatma vidya is talked about. The section begins with daharam pundarikam and dahara means hridaya Akasa. Paramatma is described as one invoked in the hridaya Akasa. That Paramatma in dahara is talked about. That Paramatma is described in 8.1.5 and certain attributes or glories are talked about here. Ashta vidha guna of Paramatma is described. We have seen this elaborately in Daharadhikaranam. Papa rahitah Paramatma; without decay; without death;

soha rahitah sorrowless; hunger rahitah free from hunger; it is beyond thirst; satya kamah means the one whose desires are always fruitful; failed ambitions are not there for the Lord. Even small small desires are not got fulfilled in our life but for Lord there is nothing that is not fulfilled. Jivatma is one of unrealized desires and Paramatma is one whose desires are always realized. Satya sankalpah his wish or will are ever satyam. These are all the virtues of Paramatma mentioned here. In the sutra the word kama adhi comes and this indicates all these virtues. Kama means satya kamah adhi means the ashta gunas are indicated.

The other vidya mentioned is Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.22. It is sariraka Brahmanam. It is next to swayam jyothi Brahmanam. This is an important mantra. Here also Paramatma vidya is talked about with various virtues. They are sarvatra vasi the controller of all; the one who is in control of everything; in our case we have no control on anything. Bhagavan Paramatma is sarvatra isanah means Lord of all; Lord is presiding intelligence of everything.

The question is that is the Paramatma of Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad are one and the same Paramatma vidya and if both are one and the same vidya guna upasamhara can be transferred to one on the other. This is the question. Vyasacharya points out that both are one and the same Paramatma vidya only. This is the conclusion.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. The virtues have to be exchanged because in both the same Paramatma is visualized in the same locus that is the hridayam. In Chandogya upanisad in the first mantra it is said that daharam [8.1.1] which refers to hridaya Akasa. Body is small, within the body, hridayam is small, and within the hridayam Akasa is small and within the Akasa Paramatma is small. This mantra comes in Maha Narayana Upanishad. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad also the word hridaya akasa is explicitly mentioned [4.4.22]. Therefore the locus is common of Paramatma vidya is common to both. The important virtues are also common to both. One virtue mentioned in both is Paramatma setuh. It is a very famous expression in the Vedas. Sethu means embankment. In the field when they want to protect the water, you have the embankment of mud that protects the water and keeps it within the field. Similarly, Bhagavan is the embankment that keeps the whole universe within the universal physical and chemical laws. Everything goes within the law. Bhagavan keeps the dharma within the embankment setuh means the virtue of the Lord given in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad and because of these two common factors dharma gogritvam and dharma asriyatvam you should treat both as one and the same vidya. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Kamadi virtues like satya kama [mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.5 itaratra should be included [in Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.22] cha tatra means and [virtues like vasitvam means overlordship mentioned in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad should be included in Chandogya upanisad 8.1.5. Ayadaniphyah means because of the common features like the locus; now I will give you the significance of the words. Kamadi means satya kama and other virtues like satya sankalpa etc., itaratra means to be included in the other places which is Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.22; tatra cha means the virtues mentioned in Brihadharaynaka upanisad should be included in Chandogya upanisad [8.1.5] ayatanadibhyah is the main reason; ayatanam means the locus or the locus where Paramatma is invoked. For Paramatma locus is possible for invocational purposes and Paramatma by himself has no locus. Because Paramatma is all pervading and therefore he has no locus and locus means a location in space; then you say Paramatma is located in which part of space; space itself is located in Paramatma and when space is located in Paramatma and how can Paramatma be located in space. All pervading

Paramatma can be invoked in a particular locus, which is a deliberate compromise for the sake of worship or meditation. Otherwise, we may have to put the flowers all over the place. This is deliberate superimposition. We know it is wrong. Committing the mistake deliberately is ayatanam, which is mentioned in both Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Because of the two common features in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad, we treat them as one vidya. Adhi Sankaracharya has given additional features in his commentary, which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 294

### **Topic 25 Kamadyadhikaranam [39]**

Attributes mentioned in Chandogya upanisad Viii.1.1. And Brihadharaynaka upanisad 4.4.33 are to be combine don account of several common features in both texts.

#### **Sutra 3.3.39 [398]**

#### ***Kamaditaratra tatra chayatanadibhyah***

[Qualities like true] desire etc., [mentioned in the Chandogya upanisad are to be inserted] in the other [i.e., in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad] and [those mentioned] are also to be inserted in the Chandogya upanisad [being the same in both].

Dahara vidya of the Chandogya upanisad and the Brihadharaynaka upanisad is now discussed.

We have completed the 39<sup>th</sup> sutra which forms the 25<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the third pada. Here it is established that Paramatma vidya discussed in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad are one and the same Paramatma vidya only the reason being ayadanadapyah. The main feature common to both is the locus of invocation. In Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad the locus is hridayam. The second important feature is sethutam the Paramatma serving as a limit or embankment to keep an order in the universe. He is the controller of everything and every function in the universe. It is literally a mud embankment between two fields. Adhi Sankaracharya adds an additional feature and he says even though Chandogya upanisad 8.1 has Paramatma vidya only and Brihadharaynaka upanisad also is Paramatma vidya, in Chandogya upanisad it is saguna Paramatma Upasanam and Paramatma includes his attributes and it is guna sahita Upasanam. But in Brihadharaynaka upanisad the vidya is jnanam without any attributes or nirguna Paramatma jnanam and one is saguna vidya and the other is nirguna jnanam. In the context of Chandogya upanisad when a person thinks of Paramatma and he has to include the Paramatma's virtues also and he has to see Paramatma as a master and himself as dasa and he can ask for some prayojanam which is maximum up to Brahma loka. Therefore division between upasaka and uapsya is maintained. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad the very same Paramatma is taught of and at the time of thinking of Paramatma attributes are separate and vachyartha is replaced by lachyartha Paramatma. Paramatma is superior to me only because of the attributes and once you remove the attributes the separate goes away. After this jnanam the lachyartha Paramatma jnanam in Brihadharaynaka upanisad, the jnani looks for the attributes but it is not seen as intrinsic but seen as vyavaharika glory of Paramatma. Thus Paramatma is one and the same and vachyartha is taken in Chandogya upanisad and lachyartha is taken in Brihadharaynaka upanisad; division is taken in Chandogya upanisad and division is removed in Brihadharaynaka upanisad. There is one more point we have to note is that this adhikaranam is to be read with dahara adhikaranam 1.3.14 of Brahma Sutra. The reason is that in Chandogya upanisad the Upasana is upon the Paramatma is not clearly mentioned. The word Paramatma is there indicated as akasah and therefore the word Akasa refers to Paramatma or

not we have to arrive at first and then we have to conclude it is Paramatma vidya and Chandogya upanisad Paramatma vidya and Brihadharaynaka upanisad Paramatma vidya are one and the same you should arrive at ultimately. With this 25<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 26 Adaradhikaranam [40 – 41[40]**

Pranagnihotra need not be observed on days of fast.

### **Sutra 3.3.40 [399]**

#### ***Adaradalopah***

On account of the respect shown [to the pranagnihotra by the sruti] there can be no omission [of this act] [even when the eating of food is omitted]

This sutra gives the view of the Purva Paksin or the opponent.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutra. The subject matter of the adhikaranam is about the Vaisvanara Upasana discussed in 5.11 to 5.18 section a big Upasana. It is visvarupa Upasana and it is equal to 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of Bhagavad Gita. After talking about the Upasana 5.19.1 there is a statement tad yad baktam pradaman agacchedu tad bomium and it says a vaisvanara upasaka should look upon his regular eating itself as offering to the vaisvanara Isvara whom he has invoked on himself. Vaisvanara is visvarupa Isvara or virad Isvara. He should look upon his regular consumption of food as oblation offering. For vaisvanara upasaka it is a prescribed duty and it is called pranagnihotra yaga. Such an upasaka who looks upon eating as an offering practices agnihotra at the time of eating. Not only that this ritual which is nothing but food converted into an offering is supposed to be glorious by the Upanishad. Elsewhere it is said that suppose an adhiti comes to a house and according to sastra the yejamana of the house is not supposed to eat first and adhiti is like Lord himself. This is the general rule. Suppose the yejamana happens to be vaisvanara upasaka, and adhiti comes and then what is the rule is the question. If it is vaisvanara pranagnihotra ritual, the adhitit need not be fed first and the vaisvanara upasaka can eat first for he offers first to the Lord which is vaisvanara himself. The vaisvanara upasaka pranagnihotra ritual is respectfully treated by the sruti. What is our problem? Why it is included in Brahma Sutra.

Once eating is treated as agnihotra ritual, it is seen that agnihotra is a nithya karma and there should not be any break at all. If such upasaka's eating is agnihotra the question comes is the eating also a compulsory thing and vaisvanara upasaka eat everyday compulsorily. Suppose it is an upavasam day [ekadasi] can a vaisvanara upasaka skip the agnihotra ritual and will there be violation to his karma. The answer is that the Purva Paksi says since his eating is a ritual he has to compulsorily eat even on an upavasam day or even when he is not well. Even if he does not eat regular food, he should take something at least something not to discontinue the agnihotra ritual. At least some milk he has to consume and complete the ritual. Siddhanta says that there is no rule that he should eat compulsorily. It is seen as agnihotra ritual, only to see that it is as sacred as the agnihotra ritual. It is said for glorification of the eating and it does not mean that he should eat compulsorily. The Upanishad does not say that vaisvanara upasaka should eat to perform the agnihotra and it only says if and when he eats, whatever he regularly consuming the regularly consumed food should be taken as offering to vaisvarana.

Therefore look upon eating as agnihotra is the vidhi and you have to necessarily eat for the sake of Agni hotra is not there. Now we will go to the general analysis of the first sutra.

This is first sutra. Here Purva Pakshi says that the upasaka's eating is reverential manner and he should not break the eating. This is the essence of the sutra. Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Adaradalopah means pranagnihotram because of the reverence attached to it by the scriptures. Now we will see the significance of the word. Adarat means reverence for the regular eating of vaisvanara upasaka. We find the reverence in the jabala sruti. Oorvaha adhitipyaha asniyah vaisvanara upasaka should eat even before the adhiti. Because of this; alopah means no break should be there. Everyday he has to eat even if he is ill he should take milk or something. This is Purva Pakshi conclusion.

## **Topic 26 Adaradhikaranam [40 – 41][40]**

Pranagnihotra need not be observed on days of fast.

### **Sutra 3.3.41 [400]**

#### ***Upasthite'tastadvachanat***

When eating is taking place [the pranagnihotra has to be performed] from that [i.e., the food first eaten] for so [the sruti] declares.

In this sutras Vyasacharya says that Veda is very clear and you are unnecessarily getting confused. He asks Purva Pakshi to look into Chandogya upanisad mantra. Suppose the vaisvanara upasaka is seated for consuming the food, the first food that is served should be treated as the offering to the vaisvanara. The Upanishad does not ask the person to consume milk or something and the Upanishad says that you offer whatever comes first you offer that to the agnihotra. On a fast days you do not eat and there is no need to offer anything to vaisvanara. It is not a compulsory thing. There is nothing specially offered to vaisvanara but the food served for eating.

Now we will see the word for word analysis of the sutra. Athah means offering should be made from the food; upastite when it is available; tad vacanat means because that is the instruction. Now we will see the significance of the words. Ujpasite means if and only if food is there on your place when you are seated for regular consumption. When the food comes athah from the served food which has been prepared for bojanam [oblation should be made]. There is nothing to be specially designed for this Upasana. Tad vacanat means because that is said in the Upanishad [Chandogya upanisad 5.19.1] the regular food which is your share you offer oblation to the vaisvanara agnihotra.

## **Topic 26 tannirdharanadhikaranam [42]**

Upasanas mentioned in connection with sacrifices are not their parts but separate.

### **Sutra 3.3.42 [401]**

***Tannirdharananiyamastaddrishteh prithagghyapratibandahah phalam.***

There is no rule about the inviolability of that [i.e, Upasanas connected with certain sacrifice] that is seen [from the sruti itself] for a separate fruit [belonging to the Upasanas] viz., non-obstruction [of the results of the sacrifice].

This sutra states that a meditation or Upasana prescribed in connection with a ceremonial rite is not compulsory.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of the sutra is that there are certain Upasanas mentioned in certain Upanishad specially in Chandogya upanisad [karmanga upasanai] which means meditations practiced along with the vedic rituals. They are not independent Upasanas but a part of the vedic rituals. In the rituals various materials are used and the materials can be used as symbol for the Upasana. The fire used in naciketus ritual can be used as a symbol and upon that fire vaisvanara can be invoked and the alambanam is anything used is alambanam and here the fire itself is the symbol for the Upasana. In Chandogya upanisad the first mantra [1.1.1. Of Chandogya upanisad] prescribed a karmanga Upasanam which is called Udgita Upasana and in this karmanga is samaveda Omkara is the integral part of any ritual. Samaveda Omkara is in musical form. It has to be chanted in high pitch and therefore it is called Udgita. Upon the Udgita varieties of devatas are to be invoked treating Udgita or Omkara as alambanam. Those upasanas are called karmanga Upasani. The devatas to be invoked on such occasions are given in the first mantra of Chandogya upanisad.

The controversy is that are these Upasanas are compulsory part of the ritual or they are the optional one. If you take the Kathopanishad nachiketus Upasana is there and thus this vaisvanara Upasana is compulsorily done every time or one time without Upasana. Is karmanga Upasana compulsory or optional. The answer is that it is optional only. A person who wants to add the Upasana he can do that or if he does not want it he can do the ritual only without the Upasana.

Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. The Udgita Upasana is not compulsory. It is so because of the Upanishad statement itself we come to know this. The statement hints at the conclusion. The statement is 1.1.10 of Chandogya upanisad yadeva vidyaya karodhi tadeva viryavat taram bhavati which means the Upanishad says when a ritual is performed along with Upasana then the ritual becomes more efficacious. This is the statement. If you do not add the Upasana the ritual will become inefficacious it is not said. This means without the Upasana also the phalam will be there. Upanishad has not said that without Upasana there is no phalam. It only says if you add the Upasana the result will improve but it will produce the result. Karma is valid by itself and Udgita Upasana is optional. Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra.

Tannirdharananiyamah means the subsidiary meditations are not compulsory; taddrishteh means it is indicated in the sruti itself; apradhibandhah means the destruction of papam hi is indeed; pratik phalam means a separate result. Now we will see the significance of the words. . Tannirdharananiyamah tad refers to karmanga in this context Udgita nirdharana means Upasanam; it means karmanga Udgita Upasanam; aniyamah means not compulsory or optional; tad drishteh means sruti vakya darsanat. Sruti vachanam kept in mind is 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Without Upasana also karma will give the benefit. Prithak hi apratibandhah phalam means separate or extra result is mentioned in that 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad and the very extra indicates means without the Upasana also one will get the benefit of the ritual. In this context extra punyam. Literally, it is papa nasah. Additional punyam is

the result and this will be lost if the additional Upasana is not done but the ritual will give its usual result. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 295

### **Topic 26 tannirdharanadhikaranam [42]**

Upasanas mentioned in connection with sacrifices are not their parts but separate.

#### **Sutra 3.3.42 [402]**

***Tannirdharananiyamastaddrishte prithaghyapratibandahah phalam.***

There is no rule about the inviolability of that [i.e, Upasanas connected with certain sacrifice] that is seen [from the sruti itself] for a separate fruit [belonging to the Upasanas] viz., non-obstruction [of the results of the sacrifice].

### **Topic 27 Pradanadhikaranam [43]**

Meditations on Vayu and prana are to be kept separate notwithstanding the essential oneness of these two.

#### **Sutra 3.3.43 [402]**

***Pradanavadeva taduktam***

As in the case of the offerings [Vayu and prana must be held apart]. This has been explained [in the Purva Mimamsa sutra]

The sutra compares the case under discussion to a parallel one 17 of Brahma Sutra.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is the enquiry into two Upasanas prescribed in Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In Chandogya upanisad there is an Upasana called samvarga Upasana where Vayu devata is meditated upon as samvarga and prana devata is meditated as samvargah. The word samvarga means that which dissolves everything. It is laya karanam. Vayu is called samvarga because the resolution takes place in the reverse order. Whatever order the five elements are created but the same gets resolved in the reverse order. Vayu is resolver of three elements and whatever else is created out of the three elements. This is at macro level. At micro level all our activities are resolved in sushupti. All the functions including ahankara are resolved during sushupti. During sushupti prana is alive and active and that prana is seen as the resolver of all other activities. Adhideivam samvarga is Vayu and Adhyatmam samvarga is prana. The Vayu samvarga Upasana at Adhideivam level and the prana samvarga Upasana at the Adhyatmam level are prescribed in 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of Chandogya upanisad respectively. In Brihadharaynaka upanisad also we get Vayu and prana Upasana 1.5.21 and 1.5.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. We get again Vayu and prana Upasana and here Vayu is visualized as the greatest devata. Sreshtatvam is the glory of Vayu at the macro level. At micro level prana is seen as sreshtaha the greatest. Brihadharaynaka upanisad explains why prana is sreshtah. The story is there. In both

Chandogya upanisad and Brihadharaynaka upanisad. All the organs were functioning and all were getting tired after some time. Kala entered the organs and because of the influence of kala, all organs got tired. Every organ gets pained except prana tattvam or breathing. Prana is continuously functioning and even in sleep it functions and if prana goes on strike the fellow is out. Correspondingly, the samasti prana is sreshta tattvam because Vayu alone gives power to all the other devatas. This is the subject matter.

The controversy is that the Purva Paksi suggests that this Vayu and prana Upasana need not be separately practiced and both of them can be clubbed together and called one samvarga Upasana. Similarly Vayu and prana sreshtatvam need not be taken as two but they are one only. The reason for this is that the samasti devata alone is blessing the vyasti the individual organ. The samsti devata is located in Adhyatmam and adyatma devata is none other then the adhideiva devata enclosed in the body. For this sruti quotation is 1.1. Of Aitareya Upanishad. Here it is said that every devata enters the body of every individual. Surya devata enters caksur indriyam, Vayu enters the ear, and there is a series of entry of adhideivam into the adhyatmam. Macro enclosed in a container is micro so argues Purva Paksi. At the time of vidheha muti it is said that all the devatas in sense organs go back into corresponding samasti. When jnani dies the Surya devata located in the eye merges back into samsti. Vyasti and samasti are essentially 'one and the same'. Siddhanta will say that though they are essentially same, they are different being macro is macro and micro is mircro. Hence, one should practise adhyatma Upasana and adhideiva Upasanam separately and hence they are enumerated separately in the sruti. Therefore, we have to accept the difference. Vidya aikyam is Purva Paksi and vidya bedah is siddhanta. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we will see the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that the adhyatmam and adhideivam should be treated independently. Essentially devata is there and there are incidental differences are there. In support of that Vyasacharya quotes a Karma Kanda mantra. In a particular yaga oblations are offered to Indra. There Indra is described in three different ways. Indraya rajne indraya adhirajaya and indraya swarajne. In each time Indra is given different description. To that Indra prodasam ekadasa kabalam. This prodasa material should be given to Indra who is raja, swaraja and adhiraja. Now purva paksa asks the question that since Indra is one and the same and adjectives are different should we give one oblation or we should give three oblations. In Purva Mimamsa sastra they have come to the conclusion three separate oblations must be given since sastra separately enumerate them. There the pradhanam [prodasa offering] and since they are treated as separate karmas even though Indra is one and the same. Oblations actions are treated as separate action even though Indra is one. The difference is there in the glory or attributes. Even though adhyatma devata should be treated separately and adhideiva devata should be treated separately like pradhanavad.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Pranavavad eva like the offerings to Indra [the meditations are separate]. Taduktam means this has been said in Purva Mimamsa. Now we will see the significance of the words. Pradanavat means purodasa pradhanam [offering] purodasa is a material made of rice etc. Vat means like; just as the purodasa offerings are treated separately even though the receiver of purodasa is the same Indra. It is because of the three different description raja, swaraja and adhiraja. This raja, swaraja, adhiraja mantra comes in Taittiriya samhita of yajur Veda. Taduktam means this has been already established in Purva Mimamsa that one and the same person is treated separately if the descriptions are different. One is micro cosmic angle and the other is macro angle. Nana

va devata is the Purva Mimamsa sutra. Devatas are treated as many because of distinct description of the devatas. With this 28<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and 43<sup>rd</sup> sutra is over.

## **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

### **Sutra 3.3.44 [403]**

#### ***Lingabhuyastvat taddhi baliyastadapi***

On account of the majority of indicatory marks [the fires of the mind, speech, etc., in the agnirahasya of the vajasaneyins do not form part of the sacrifice], for it [the indicatory mark] is stronger [than] the context or the general subject matter]. This also [has been explained] in the Purva Mimamsa sutras by Jaimini].

The indicatory marks are of greater force than the context or the leading subject matter [prakarana]. This has been explained in the Purva Mimamsa III.3.14]

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with nine sutras. The subject matter of the adhikaranam is in satapata Brahmanam of shukla yajur Veda there is a portion 10.5.3.1. Tad shadkrimsa sahasrani apasyad atmanah agnim arkan manomayan manaschidah. This is in Adhi Sankaracharya's bashyam. The word relevant is manas chidah agnim. This expression means the Veda says one has to look upon the functions of every organ as a type of fire. It is like the flame arising from the organ. Fire is the energy and functions are also energy from the organs. All the jnanendriya functions are like fire and karmendriya functions are like flames rising from the karmendriya so also the andhakaranam. So everyday we kindle the fires from our organs. Since they are not actual fires and as they are not actual fires, they are imaginary fires and hence they are visualized as manomaya Agni/ everyday getting up is like kindling the fire and in the night the fire is extinguished when we go to sleep. The fires in the form of verbal functions; the fires in the form of ocular activities and daily we kindle fire. In one year there are 360 days and thousands of fires are created everyday through jnanendriya karmendriya and in one year thousands fires per day and in one year 360 thousand fires we kindle. In short many fires are daily kindled in the form of functions of the organs. The question is that this is the visualization presented by the Veda. As we get up the fires are kindled which means we become activated. We visualize fire in every activity. The functions of the organs are seen as fire. Up to this is the context.

The controversy is this statement of the imaginary fire occurs in the context of a big ritual called jyotistoma yagah. This is a form of Upasana. The controversy is since the Upasana occurs near a ritual whether the Upasana should be treated as karmanga Upasana or whether this Upasana is swatantra Upasanam, any one can practise whether he does the ritual or not. Karmanga means it is a part of a ritual. You have to do a ritual. This analysis is elaborate because many important Purva Mimamsa sutras are elaborated. Purva Paksi says that this is the karmanga Upasanam. Siddhanta says that it is an independent Upasanam and you can daily practise visualizing the flames coming out of you. He gives a fiery speech. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we come to general analysis of the first sutra. Vyasacharya says that this Upasana is not a part of any ritual. The reason is we have many clues to arrive at such a conclusion. The clues in Purva Mimamsa are called as lingam. Then he says that these clues are more powerful than the context. These are technical aspects of Purva Mimamsa. Since this context is jyotistoma ritual is the support but Vyasacharya says that he clues are more powerful than the context. Refer to 3.3.14 of Jaimini sutra from ritualistic angle we will know whether it is a part of another ritual or it is an independent ritual. This is part of that and each one will not give independent result. This is called viniyojaka pramana or application analysis. This gives six pramana to establish the application of a ritual. Six pramanams are given for application of the ritual. Then we have to see which pramana is more powerful than the other. Purva Paksi has context as pramana which is called prakaranam and siddhanta has lingam [indicatory clues] as pramana and Vyasacharya says that lingam is more powerful than the prakaranam. Vyasacharya does not say what are the indicatory marks. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes the indicatory marks and establish the fact.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Lingabhuyastvat [the fires] visualized on the functions of the organs are not a part of any ritual. Because it is indicated by many clues. Tad hi means the verbal clue is indeed baliyah means superior [to the context]. Tad uktam means this has been said in the Purva Mimamsa [sutra number 3.3.13] this is the word meaning. Now we will do the significance of the word. Lingabhuyasvat means that these Upasanas are not part of any ritual but they are independent meditations. Bhuyatvam means plenty. There is an abundance of clues to support my contention. It is not part of jyotistoma karma. Tat hi means the indicatory mark or lingam baliyah means more powerful or superior. Lingam is more powerful than the context. Lingam prakaranat baliyah. The last portion is tad uktam. It is said in Purva Mimamsa. The sutra enumerates the six pramana to find out the application sruti, lingam, vakyam, prakaranam, sathanam, and samakya is pramana six the method to find out the application for the ritual. Lingam occurs previously, prakaranam occurs latter, and hence former is powerful than the latter. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 296

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.44 [403]**

#### ***Lingabhuyastvat taddhi baliyastadapi***

On account of the majority of indicatory marks [the fires of the mind, speech, etc., in the agnirahasya of the vajasaneyins do not form part of the sacrifice], for it [the indicatory mark] is stronger [than] the context or the general subject matter]. This also [has been explained] in the Purva Mimamsa sutras by Jaimini].

The indicatory marks are of greater force than the context or the leading subject matter [prakarana]. This has been explained in the Purva Mimamsa III.3.14]

Now we see the 29<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of the third pada of the third chapter known as lingabhuyastvatadhikaranam with nine sutras. The subject matter here is a fire is visualized in the functions of our organs including the mental function. We see the activities of the organs as the fires emanating from the organs and andhakaranam. The organs are kindled by the mind. Here the word manaschidah is plural in number. Vakchidayah agniyah etc. There are several fires kindled in the form of functions of the organs. Such fires run into thousands. This occurs in Agni rahasyam portion of satapata Brahmanam belonging to shukla yajur Veda. This occurs in the jyotistoma yaga. The controversy is since the visualized fire occurs in jyotitoma yaga should we take it as independent Agni Upasana or take it as secondary to jyotistoma yaga. Siddhanta says that it is swatantra Upasanam. The pramana given here is indicatory clues, which are many in number to establish it as swatantra Upasana. The ritual is anga karma and Upasana is anga Upasanam. Anga Upasanam means subsidiary Upasanam. Angi Upasanam means it is independent upasanam. For this we have six pramanam exclusively used to find out whether the ritual is primary or subsidiary. The six pramanam is given by Jaimini in his sutra 3.3.13. [refer to sutra 25 ibid.] In these six pramana lingam comes as second pramana and it is more powerful than 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> pramanam. This siddhanta was given in 44<sup>th</sup> sutra which we completed in the last class.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Lingabhuyastvat means plenty; it is a compound word. The abundance of the linga pramanam. It is not one clue but there are many clues to support our view. Because of this pramana we conclude that Agni darsanam swatantra Upasanam. This Upasana is independent. Taddhi baliyah means this linga pramana the indicatory clue is baliyah means superior and stronger than the latter four pramanams. Hi means indeed the emphasis. Definitely stronger than the other four. This is established in Purva Mimamsa sutra. Tat api means tat api uktam means this has been said by Jaimini sutram. The superiority of lingam to other pramanam has been said already. Api is there to

join this to the previous sutra. Already we have referred to Jaimini sutra and here we refer to another Jaimini sutra. With this the first sutra is over.

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.45 [404]**

#### ***Purvavikalpah prakaranat syat kriyamanasavat***

[the fires spoken of in the previous sutra are] alternative forms of the one mentioned first [i.e., the actual sacrificial fire] on account of the context. [they] ought to be part of the sacrifice like the imaginary drink or the Manasa cup.

An objection is raised to the preceding sutra.

Now we get two purva paksa sutra. Siddhanta will come again later again in sutra 47. Purva paksa says that this Upasana [Agni Upasana in our organic functional] should not be taken as independent Upasanam but should be taken as a part of jyotistoma Upasanam. He says it is so because this Upasana is mentioned in the context of jyotistoma yaga. This context is called prakaranam to establish his conclusion. He argues that this Agni which he calls manasa Agni, visualized fire and not actual fire is given as an alternative part the original fire required for jyotistoma yaga. In the satapata Brahmana in Agni rahasya the actual fire is mentioned. One has to kindle the fire and protect and create a homa kunda. Latter this manasa Agni, the visualized fore is prescribed as an alternative for the original fire. Original fire is karma angam and the visualized fire also must be karma angam alone. This is the view of Purva Paksi. Then he continues further that if you are not convinced by this argument, he says he will quote an example of huge fire called dvadasaha ritual. It means that the ritual takes 12 days. In that ritual they have to offer soma rasa into the fire. And the Veda says that in certain cases we can optionally replace the actual soma juice by the visualized soma juice also. There in the Purva Mimamsa sutra a conclusion is made that the actual soma rasa is a part of the ritual and if the actual soma rasa is part of the ritual the visualized soma rasa cannot be independent one and it is also a part of the ritual. The Purva Paksi arrives at such a conclusion. Here it is similar case. Here it is visualized Agni. So also, the visualized fire is a aprt of the ritual because actual fire is part of ritual. There it is dvadasada ritual and here it is jyotistoma ritual. Therefore, this Agni is karmanga Agni only. This is the general analysis of this sutra.

Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. Prakaranat means because of the context purva vikalpah the visualized fire which is an alternative for the original fire mentioned earlier. Syat kriya means has to be a part of the ritual. The whole sutra is purva paksa sutra. Manasavat means like the visualized soma rasa. This is the running meaning.

Now we will go to the significance of the words. Purva vikalpah here the word vikalpah refers to alternative visualized fire; previously mentioned real fire; the visualized fire which is an alternate fire mentioned in Satapata Brahmana of shukla yajur Veda. Syat kriya here the word kriya represents karmangam; therefore the fire visualization is only a part of a ritual and

it does not have the main status like the manasa soma juice; soma is the name of a creeper. It is supposed to be nourished by the moon, hence it is called soma latha, it is taken for some rituals, and the juice taken from the creeper is called soma rasa. The crushing is also in the form of a ritual. Brining the soma creeper is a ritual; crushing is a ritual and the soma rasa is used as an oblation in a yaga. Soma latha is purchased by gifting a calf of one year old brownish in colour. You have to crush it either in the morning or afternoon or in the evening and at the time of crushing you should chant a mantra. The Veda in this dvadasada ritual says that you can get soma rasa visually. The mantra is anaya tva patrena samudram rasaya praja patyam manograham ityati manograham means manasa soma rasah. Manasa soma rasa is not independent. So also manasa Agni cannot be independent and it is an anga of a ritual.

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.46 [405]**

#### ***Atidesascha***

And on account of the extension [of the attributes of the actual fire to those imaginary fires]

Objection to the sutra 44 is continued by presenting another argument in support of sutra 45.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Purva Pakshi says that there is further proof to show that the manasa Agni is karmangam. He says that the Veda portion later glorifies this manasa Agni and it does sthuthi. Sthuthi mantra goes tesam ekaika eva tavan yavan asou purvah is the glorification mantra. This manasa Agni each visualized fire is as glorious as the original fire. Purva Pakshi says if the glory is to be extended to the visualized fire. Purva Pakshi says that extension is possible only if they are similar. Previous Agni is glorious because it is used in jyotistoma yaga and if the visualized fire has to have to the same glory, it has to be the same as jyotistoma fire. This is the argument of the Purva Pakshi.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Atidesascha because of the extension also [the visualized fire is a part of the ritual]. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Atidesas means because of the extension of the glory. The original fire has the glory and the glory of the previous fire is extended to the visualized fire. Cha means also. Because this is the second proof the Purva Pakshi gives. This is also Purva Pakshi sutra. Now we will go to the answer given by the siddhanta in the next sutra.

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

**Sutra 3.3.47 [406]**

***Vidvaiva tu nirdharanat***

But [the fires] rather constitute the vidya because [the sruti] asserts it.

Objection raised in sutras 45 and 46 are now refuted.

In fact, we have already given our siddhanta view in the first sutra of this adhikaranam [44]. We gave the proof linga pramana. Since we have already given the siddhanta the question will come as to why we should give the answer again. In the first sutra [44] we have given the proof in support of our conclusion. Purva Paksi has given their argument through prakarana. We already know that linga pramana is stronger than the prakarana pramanam. Normally linga must defeat pramanam. But Adhi Sankaracharya and the commentators say that there are certain cases that the lingam is not that strong and weak also. Lingam is the indicatory clue. I will give you an example. Suppose an Education minister is invited for the Music festival in one of the sabhas. Therefore, they call the unconnected nastika Education Minister. He says that music is wonderful even for the school and colleges. It gives concentration and all that. In the Newspaper the speech will come in the front page. The clue is music is good for school and colleges and he introduces we assume that the music will be introduced in colleges and school. However, nothing happens. Even though, the minister makes the statement that is not powerful because the context is the glorification of the music. This is called arthavada and arthavada need not be factual. Glorification statement need not be taken literally. Any lingam occurring in arthavada portion should not be taken seriously because it is weaker clue. If the Minister talks about the importance of the music in seminar for education, then what he says is much more powerful than in the music festival. Therefore Purva Paksi may think that our lingam is not powerful and therefore siddhanta wants to reinforce and say that we have sruti pramana also to assert our conclusion. Thus we get sruti pramana in addition to linga pramanam. The details in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 297

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.47 [406]**

#### ***Vidvaiva tu nirdharanat***

But [the fires] rather constitute the vidya because [the sruti] asserts it.

Objection raised in sutras 45 and 46 are now refuted.

This sutra is a part of the lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya analyses a mantra from satapata Brahmanam. Here the debate is whether the Upasanam is to be treated as swatantra Upasanam and capable of giving the phalam by itself or because of the proximity to jyotistoma yaga this may be treated as subsidiary ritual to the jyotistoma yaga and this will be treated as karma anga ritual. Then it will be a part of the ritual and the Upasana will not have the capacity to produce the result by itself. The jyotistoma ritual in the normal course will give the phalam. This Agni darsanam is anga or angi Upasana whether it is prime or subsidiary Upasana is our question. Siddhanta view was given in sutra 44 and purva paksa sutra was given in sutra 45 and 46. Purva Paksi claims that this is an anga Upasana and siddhanta claims that this is an angi Upasana. Purva paksa has prescribed a method of arriing at the right conclusion. Siddhanta points out that this is the independent meditation indicating the linga pradhanam. Purva Paksi claims that this is an anga Upasanam based on prakarana if you want to have an example it will be simple to understand this. You go to kasi and do abhisheka and chant rudram five times. In this commandment I have not told you abhishekam to which deity I have not told you. The vidhi does not tell to which deity and on which date. In Kasi there are so many deities. When several deities are there how to know to which deity you will do the abhishekam. My vidhi is not direct. I have given you the lingam. Chanting rudram will give you an indicatioin that abhishekam to Lord Visvanatha. If I say do abhishekam to Viswanatha it is sruti pramana. Chanting rudram is lingam. Suppose I say use this particular material and you take it for granted that it should be used for rudrabhishekam. This material you do not use for cooking this is prakarana pramanam. If I say bring it back to me and the pronoun is in the proximity of another statement and the proximate statement helps me understand and this becomes vakya pramanam. These are the pramanams used here. When Veda commandments you do not have any cross checking. And you have to use rigourous troubles to understand the exact meaning. You can question the author when the author is available. In the case of sruti the author is not available. Here Purva Paksi has also the pramana in support of his view. That is prakarana pramanam and siddhanta has got linga pramanam, in his support. Now which one we will accept. Between lingam and prakaranam, linga pramana is stronger than the prakaranam. Therefore the controversy is as though resolved. In the first three sutra itself the controversy is resolved and the Upasana is swatantra. In the normal course the controversy must be over with the third sutra. Then why

Vyasacharya wrote fourth and fifth etc. Sutra. Even though in the normal course lingam is stronger there are occasions lingam is weaker. Which one stronger and which is weaker is decided is when the indicatory mark occurring in vidhi vakyam it is prabalam. It is the statement of commandment. Indicatory mark occurring in statement of commandment is stronger and the one occurring in artha vadha vakyam is weaker statement. In glorification exaggerations are possible. Glorification need not be literally true thing. The next question is when we have quoted lingam in support of our view in 44<sup>th</sup> sutra, the question is whether we depended prabala lingam or durbala lingam is the question. Our lingam is durbala lingam. It is artha vadha lingam. Sarvani bhutani chinvanti is the statement about which Vyasacharya will come lingam. This lignam occurs in arthavadha vakyam, it is durbala lingam, and it cannot negate prakaranam. When lingam is weaker it cannot negate the prakaranam. Hence Vyasacharya gives some more pramanams in the following sutras. Now the linga pramanam is along with the sruti and one with sruti support is reinforced lingam. It is like Sugriva is capable of fighting Vali the prakaranam with the help of Rama the sruti vakyam. The sruti support is given here.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sruti. Vyasacharya says that sruti itself points out that this meditation is independent only and it is not a part of any karma. The sruti support is the following statement that occurs in Satapata Brahmanam. All those fires that we are talking about, [36000 fires] are only mentally visualized fire alone. Eva means only. Only means the emphasis to assert the point. In this context, nirdharanam means it is an independent fire only and it is not a part of ritual. Nirdharanam supports the independence of the meditation and since this emphasis is occurring in sruti itself, it is called sruti pramanam. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Vidya eva tu means [the visualization of the fire] is an independent form of meditation only. The emphasis is there in 'only'. Nirtharanat means because of the emphasis in the sruti statement. Now I will come to the significance of the words in the sutra. Vidya eva tu means it is an independent meditation only. Vidya here means swatantra Upasanam. Tu indicates the negation of the Purva Paksi that occurred in the previous two sutras. Nirdharanat because of the emphasis and the emphasis is made by the use of the word 'eva' which means 'only'. Adhi Sankaracharya elaborately analyses the word 'eva'. With this the sutra 37 is over.

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.48 [407]**

#### ***Darsanaccha***

*And because [in the text indicatory marks of that are] seen.*

The indicatory marks are those referred to in sutra 44. In fact the internal indications show that it is a vidya and not a karmanga.

Here Vyasacharya mentions the linga pramanam once again. He mentions again because previously when he mentioned linga pramanam independently and it is a durbala lingam and therefore Purva Pakshi attacked. Now he brings linga pramanam once again which cannot be attacked now which the linga pramana is backed by the sruti pramanam. Sutra 44 is unsupported by lingam and now sutra 48 is supported by the sruti. Here you can note the lingam. Sarvata sarvani bhutani chinvanti and this mental fire the visualized fire is operational alive or functioning all the time. The fire in the form of the organic function, the function of the various organs sarvani bhutani chinvanit are active in all the being all the time. Here the crucial word is sarvata all the time. Sarvata helps us Vyasacharya claims if the visualized fire is a part of jyotistoma yaga then the visualized fire can exist only during the performance of jyotistoma yaga with limited duration. But Veda says sarvata bhutani indicating that the fire is active all the time. That means it is not the fire connected with the yaga and it is independent and the fire is active all the time. . Even during sleep even though some organs are not operational, the prana is operative. The fire is active even during sleep in the form of prana vyapara. If it is karmanga it will have limited duration. That is the clue to show that his fire is not the part of jyotistoma yaga. The sruti pramana and linga pramana we have got.

Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Darsanat since many clues are found [in favour of the independent meditation] it should be accepted. Now I will give you significance of the words. Darsanat means since we find in the Vedas [linga darsanat] in support of swatantra Upasanam. It should be accepted as swatantra Upasanam only. Cha means also. It means in addition to what is said in the previous sutra. Thus there is sruti and linga pramanams are there in our favour. Adhi Sankaracharya gives vakya pramanam also. Vakya pramanam means another proximate statement that supports us. Vidyaya hivaide evan vidah chaidah bhavanti is vakya pramanam and this means that this fire [36000 fires] mentioned in the sruti is mental in the form of independent meditation. Thus sruti, linga and vakya pramanams are in support of our view.

## **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

**Sutra 3.3.49 [408]**

***Srtyadibaliyastvaccha na badhah***

*[The view that the agnis or fires constitutes an independent vidya]  
cannot be refuted, owing to the greater force of the sruti etc.*

Objection raised in sutras 45 and 46 are further refuted.

First, I will do the general analysis of the sutra. This is a consolidating sutra. Because of the three pramanams Vyasacharya says that my stand cannot be negated by the Purva Pakshi. This is the final verdict. Now we will come to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha and srutyadhibaliyastvat means since pramanams like the sruti are [superior to prakarana pramanam] badhah the negation [of independent meditation na is not proper. Now we will see the significance of the words. Srutyadhibaliyastvat sruti refers to sruti pramanam, which

is the first of the six pramanams; adhi means etc., etc., refers to other pramanams; here you should take lingam and vakyam; sruti linga vakya pramanani; baliyah means stronger. Stronger than what? Stronger than the prakarana pramanam. Therefore my view cannot be dislodged easily. In the next sutra Vyasacharya will give further support in addition to the sruti, linga, vakya pramanam to establish the swatantratvam of the meditation.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 298

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

#### **Sutra 3.3.50 [409]**

#### ***Anubandhadibhyah prajnantaraprithakivavat drishtascha taduktam***

On account of the connection and so on [the fires built of mind etc., form an independent vidya] in the same way as other vidyas [like sandilya vidya] are separate; and it is seen [that in spite of the context a sacrifice is treated as independent]. This has been explained [in the Purva Mimamsa sutras by Jaimini].

The argument in refutation of sutras 45 and 36 is continued. This sutra gives additional reasons in support of the view set forth in sutra 47.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. This is further support to the Siddhanti's conclusion. In the first place Vyasacharya says that he will give further support to his conclusion the fires of the various functions of the organ and whether it should be part of the ritual or independent is the question. Vyasacharya says that this is not part of the jyotistoma ritual at all. The visualization given in satapata Brahmanam we find even the other parts of rituals are presented as visualization. Not only the fire is to be visualized but also the Agni gunda and various offerings and vessels used for offering and all other ritualistic accessories are presented as visualization. If only one part is visualization and other portions should be actual and this part is visualization we can say. The actual portion and if one portion is not available we can say that is visualization. When everything is visualization it cannot be a part of the visualization. In the case of part of visualization, it can be a part of some thing. When everything is visualization like Shiva manasa puta, it is independent of itself and it is swatantra ritual. It is presented as mental visualization and therefore it is swatantra Upasana. All accessories are connected to various organs and there is nothing outside. In the sutra there is an adhi pada also which means further support is there. . Not only because of total visuslisation but because of also previous linga vakya pramana it should be swatantra pramanam. Adhi Sankaracharya adds one more point. This is refutation to purva paksa given in sutra 46. There purva paksa said that this manasa Agni the visualized fire is glorified as having the attributes or greatness of original fire. Whatever the original mahima is there, the same mahima is there for the visualized fire also. This is extension of the glory the glory belonging to actual fire is given to the visual fire. There purva paksa argued that glories are similar by extension you have to conclude that the actual fire is a part of the ritual, the visualized fire also is part of the ritual because of the similarity. The actual fire is a part of the ritual and visualized part of fire is also part of the ritual. This is also refuted here by the word adhi. The answer we give is just because the glory is equal the utility is also equal. Glories are equal because both are fire. One is actual fire and the other is visualised fire.

Mahimas are equalized only because of the commonness of agnitvam, therefore the glories are similar. You should not extend it to their employment.

In the second part of the sutra Vyasacharya says that every Upasanam is not karmangam. Ritualists understand meditation as part of ritual only because he is used to many karmanga Upasanam like Vishnu Sahasranama parayanam. Since we are used to karmanga Upasanam we think every Upasanam is karmanga. Not all Upasanams need be karmangam and independent Upasanams are there in the Vedas just as many other independent upasanams like sandilya vidya etc. Therefore it can be included in that.

Third part of the argument is the negation of the Purva Pakshi important argument; it is that this Upasanam occurs in the jyotistoma yaga context. Therefore, he feels that it must be a part of jyotistoma yaga. This is the most important argument of purva paksa. There are many other cases also where the rituals and Upasanams occur in a particular context and still they are treated independently. Therefore we have enough cases are there out of context if there are sufficient reasons. Again we have to enter Purva Mimamsa to show that such cases are there. In your own ritualistic cases the cases are taken out of context and treated separately. There is a yaga called raja suya yaga. This is a very big yaga. It is to be performed by a raja or ksatriya or a ruler. That means a Brahmana cannot perform the yaga. This yaga is elaborately treated in Veda purva. In this context there is another ritual presented aveshti yaga. This ritual occurs in the raja suya prakaranam. There is a discussion in Purva Mimamsa sutra as to whether the aveshti is part of the yaga or otherwise as it is presented in the raja suya prakaranam. In the Purva Mimamsa an elaborate analysis is done and the conclusion is that aveshti yaga should be treated as independent yaga because other supporting reasons. Although the context supports it should be [art of raja suya yaga, the other powerful given for treating it as independent is that the Veda says that the aveshti yaga can be done by three varnas brahmana, ksatriya and vysya. Whereas rajasuya one varna is eligible. Naturally these two yagas must be separate. The Purva Mimamsa concludes that aveshti yaga is superior as it is more commonly available. Because of other powerful reason we take the aveshti yaga out of the raja suya yaga. Here visualization of fire occurs in the jyotistoma yaga yet we have to treat it as independent Upasanam.

The fourth part is that this is not my conclusion and this is a conclusion by Jaimini himself in his Purva Mimamsa sutras. Therefore it is possible to take a thing out of the context also. Normally it is not done but in extraordinary context it can be treated separately provided there are powerful reason to do so. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now I will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Anubandah because of the connection and other reasons the visualization of the fire is an independent meditation. Prajnanataraprithaktavavattm it is like other independent meditations. Drishtah it is seen elsewhere cha tat uktam means and it is said by Jaimini.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Anubandhadibhyah mesn the word anubandha literally means connection not only of fire but also other accessories are visualized as organic function. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a huge portion from satapata Brahmana the beginning of the portion is te manasa eva adhiyente manasa chiyante .....manaschitsu manomayam eva kriyate. The significance of the sentence is even vessels are visualized as organic function. The best example is Shiva manasa puja. Adhi means etc. Which refers to all other reasons also. This Upasana is swatantra Upasanam. Prajnantaraprithaktvavatt this is a word having four small words. Prajna means Upasana; antara means other Upasanam; prataktvam means other independent Upasanams; vat means

similar to; it means this Upasana is similar to the other independent Upasanas. As other Upasanas are not part of the ritual, this is also not the part of the ritual but independent Upasana. Drdistashtah other independent Upasana example is sandilya vidya. Drishtah means similar cases have been seen in the ritualistic portion of the Vedas. To take it out of context and taking it as independent is there in the Vedas. Aveshti yaga is one such example. Tad uktam this is said by Jaimini himself in his Purva Mimamsa sutra. 11.4.7 of Jaimini sutra supports their view. Sutra is kartrtyayam iti chedna varnatriya samyogad. For details see above. Now we will go to the next sutra.

## **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

### **Sutra 3.3.51 [410]**

#### ***Na samanyadapyupalabdhermrityauvanna hi lokapattih***

In spite of the resemblance [of the fires to the imaginary drink, they do] not [constitue part of the sacrificial act] because it is seen [from the reasons given, and on the ground of sruti that they form an independent vidya] as in the case of death; for the world does not become [fire, because it resembles fire in some points]

The argument is refutation of sutras 45 and 46 is continued.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. This sutra refutes another argument posed by the purva paksa. This argument purva paksa gave in sutra 45. The argument given is in some other yaga dvadasada yaga, in the context of 12 days yaga Veda talks about visualized soma rasa. The technical word used was manasa graha. The visualized soma rasa in the ritual is to be used for a ritual where visualized soma rasa is a karma anga. It is not an independent Upasana but it was presented as karmanga there. Now purva paksa argues just as visualized somarasa is karmanga here visualized fire also should be used as karmanga as the visualized status is common in both the places. Because of the manasa in both the places, it should be karmanga. Now Vyasacharya says that argument will not hold water.

The answer is that sometimes we use a particular word to describe because of certain similarity. A person may be called a lion because of certain similarity. Lion is the king and this person is a king and a leader. Because of certain common feature, you may use a word that does not mean all other features also should be common. If one feature is responsible for employment of particular word that does not means other features are also common. If someone is called a lion because of some common feature, it does not means that he should walk with four feet. He need not eat meat like lion but he may be a vegetarian. Manasa commonness does not prove both should be karmangam manasatvam should not be the reason to extend it to other features. The word mrithyu is used for several devatas in the Veda. In Satapata Brahmana adhitya devata is named mrithyu and Brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.2.10 says mithyu is compared to Agni devata. Just as mrithyu is the controller of everything the common title is given for adhithya and Agni and because of the common features you cannot says Agni and adhithya are common even though mrithyutvam is common. Similarly manasatvam is common word is used for somarasa and Agni and because of commonness the

word manasatvam is used and you cannot extend it to further. Another example is in the Chandogya upanisad 5.4.1 pancagni portion the various lokas are compared to Agni and are called Agni. buloka is called Agni; swarga loka is called Agni; it is called because of some common features and the jiva is refined when it comes through various lokas. This comparison is for one features and you cannot therefore you cannot say earth if fire. Don't extend any expression too much. This is the essence of this sutra.

Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. na means visualization of the fire is not a part of a ritual; samanyad abhi means in spite of its similarity to visualization of somarasah. Upalabhde means because we see enough pramanams to show that it is independent. Mrithyuvat means like mrithyu like Lord of death; nahi lika pattih means the world does not become fire [because of such a comparision] in the scriptures. This is the running meaning.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Samanyad abhi means similarity between manasa Agni and manasa soma rasah. Both are visualization abhi even though there is such a similarity both cannot be taken as karmangam one is karmangam and one is independent. Upalabdhe because we see enough pramanams to treat manasa Agni as independent one and somarasa as angam. It is not a capricious decision. The example is mrithyuvat like the death rupa Agni devata and mrithyu rupa adhithya devata. Even though both have similarity in mrithyu both are not same. lika pattih means lokasya Agni apattih. the world does not become fire just because it is compared to fire due to certain common feature. Partial comparision does not mean total identity. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 299

### **Topic 29. Lingabhuyastvadhikaranam. [44 – 52]**

The fires in agnirahasya of the Brihadharaynaka upanisad are not part of the sacrificial act, but from an independent vidya.

**Sutra 3.3.52 [411]**

#### ***Parena cha sabdasya tadvidhyam bhuyastvattvanubandhah***

And from the subsequent [Brahmana] the fact of the text [under discussion] being such [i.e. enjoining an independent vidya] [is known]. But the connection [of the fanciful agnis of imaginary fires with the actual fire is] on account of the abundance [of the attributes of the latter that are imagined in these fires.

In this sutra Vyasacharya one more support for his conclusion. The support is purva apra prakaranam means the sections occurring before this Upasanams and after the Upasanams deal with swatantra Upasanams only. therefore in between also karmanga Upasanam cannot come and taking into account of the flow the middle one deals with independent Upasanam alone. adhitya mandala Purusa Upasanam meditation upon Isvara as located in solar disc [done in sandhyavandanam] is the former topic which is swatantra Upasanam; the latter section also is an Agni Upasanam which is swatantra Upasanam and the swatantra Upasanam is glorified here; the upasakas will go to Brahma loka and others will go to less higher loka and previous and latter sections deal with swatantra Upasanam and therefore the middle one should be swatantra Upasanam only. if the middle section between the former and the latter section deals with swatantra Upasanam why should it discuss the jyotistoma karma which is in the proximity of the karma Upasanam that leads us to doubt as to whether it is swatantra Upasanam or not. For that Vyasacharya gives the answer nearby there is proximity of karma only because in this particular Upasanam various functions of organs are visualized as various accessories of karma as in Shiva manasa puja. The visualization involves the accessories there is mention of lot of ritualistic components. Therefore the Upasanam is swatantra alone.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. tad vidhyam such a nature; sabdasya of the present text [is known] parenaca by observing the latter and [former section]. Tu however; anubandhah its connection with [the ritualistic fire] bhuyastvat is because of the abundance [of the attributes of the ritualistic fire in the visualized fire].

Now we will see the significance of the words. Tatvidhyam means of such a nature. here such a nature means Upasanam being swatantram independent nature of Upasanam; the Upasanam is independent is known because of the former section and cha represents the latter section the independent nature of the middle section is understood; bhuyastvat means abundance of common features between the ritualistic fire and visualized fire, the actual fire used in the ritual and the internal fires; the common features are many; one is surrounded by ritualistic accessories vessels, homa kunda, oblations etc. various attribute are there the various

connected accessories; in the mentally visualized fire also there is visualization of homa kunda is there pathrams are there and therefore accessories many are there in both the cases and therefore it is in the proximity of jyotistoma yaga as in the manasa pusa. The abundance of attributes are seen in both the cases and therefore it is in the proximity of karma; anubandhah means closeness of jyotistoma karma portion not because of karmanga Upasanam but because many karma accessories are visualized. Totally, Vyasacharya gives five arguments such as the sruti, linga, vakya and anubandha and purva apara vichara and on the basis of these argument the one under discussion is independent Upasanam. These are not relevant to us because the vedic Upasanams have been replaced by puranic Upasanams and during Vyasacharya days vedic Upasanams must have been popular and therefore these doubts might have been there and hence Vyasacharya has clarified the doubts. Thus this adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 30 Aikatmyadhikaranam [Sutras 53 – 54]**

Atman is an entity distinct from the body

#### **Sutra 3.3.53 [412]**

#### ***Eka stmanah sarire bhavat***

Some [maintain the non-existence] of a separate Self [besides the body] on account of the existence [of the Self] where a body is [only]

In this topic the existence of an Atman apart from the body is taken up for discussion. Unless there is a soul apart from the body, there is no use of the scripture teaching liberation. Nor can there be any scope for ethical commands, which are the means of attainment of heaven, or for the reaching that the soul is Brahman.

First I will give you a general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras. Here the subject matter is an incidental one. It is not very much in the flow of the topic. The topic is, is there Atma different from the body at all. There is a fundamental doubt. The karma Upasana etc., are supposed to take jiva to moksha or krama mukti etc. all these are based on the assumption that the Atma is different from the body. Atma of Upasana will take to Brahma loka through Shukla Gathi and from there the karma kandi will gain liberation. Therefore Vyasacharya introduce carvaka madha purva paksa here and negate carvaka madham, the materialistic philosophy who claim that body alone is the Atma. Carvaka believe in Atma but the meaning of Atma according to them is different from what we say. He says that Atma is nothing but he body. Atma means sentient body. When body is born Atma is born and when the body is gone Atma is gone. He does not accept Sookshma Sariram in body. Other than brain he does not believe in the mind etc. mind and Sookshma Sariram survive and they say when the mind goes physical sariram goes. He says that there is no Atma other than the body and he does not believe in shrardha etc. the first sutra refers to purva paksa and second sutra is siddhanta. Our siddhanta view is that there is Atma, which is different from the body. This is the topic of this adhikaranam.

Then the question comes why should Vyasacharya discuss in the Vedanta sutra and not in the Veda purva bagha itself. Belief in Atma is different from the body is required in the karma kanda and why is it brought to the jnana kanda. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is necessary in

the Veda purva bagha and commentators have established that Atma is different from the body but there is no direct Jaimini sutra to establish that but it is indirectly hinted and is taken for granted that body is different from Atma. The Sabara Bashyam on purva mimamsa establishes this fact but however the Jaimini sutra is silent about it. That is why Vyasacharya has chosen to establish this fact and therefore this sutra is added here. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. The purva paksa argues that there is no Atma different from the body. They say that Atma is the body and they do not say that there is no Atma in the body. In support of that they give an argument also. As long as the body is there, there is selfhood that claims that I am the body. There is transacting Self that claims individuality and that transacts with the world. When the body is gone, there is none to claim that I am. But after the body is gone there is none to claim I am. In fact, it is total destruction of the whole thing. When the body is, the 'I' concept of Atma is there and when the body is gone the very 'I' concept is gone. The body is a live being as long as Atma is there and when the body is gone the live being is gone. Therefore the the purva paksi conclude that the body is Atma. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. eke some people [negate the independent existence atmanah of the Self; bhavat means because it exists sarire only when the body exists; this is the running meaning. now we will see the significance of the words. Eke means some philosophers or caravaka or the materialistic philosophers; most of them are asthika philosophers only; even Jaina darsanam, Atma other than the body. of the 12 darsanams 11 believe in Atma other than the body. atmanah means deha vidhirikta Atma, a separate Atma [the existence they negate]. Their logic is when the body is Atma is; when the body is not, Atma is not. The vyatireka logic is not given here. When the body is absent there is no live transacting individual with I concept. This is purva paksa argument negating the existence of the Atma. The answer is given in the next sutra.

### **Topic 30 Aikatmyadhikaranam [Sutras 53 – 54]**

Atman is an entity distinct from the body

#### **Sutra 3.3.54 [413]**

#### ***Vyatirekastadbhavabhavitvanna tupalabdhivat***

But not [so]; a Self or soul separate [from the body does exist because [Consciousness] does not exist even when there is the body [after death], as in the case of cognition or perceptive Consciousness.

The statement in the preceding sutra is refuted.

In this sutra Vyasacharya replies. The main part of the reply is that your anvaya vyatireka logic is defective. Adhi Sankaracharya gives a few additional arguments also. Vyasacharya says that this can be discussed by taking the word Consciousness. It is better to ask whether there is Consciousness different from the body or not. Vyasacharya asks caravaka whether there is Consciousness different from the body or not. Purva paksa uses the word to Atma and Vyasacharya reduces it to Consciousness. Caravaka says there is no independent

Consciousness at all. There is no Consciousness separate from the body and there is no Consciousness separate from the matter. Like some modern scientist saying that Consciousness is the property and it is generated by the combination of matters. Because of panca bhuta samyogah, Atma comes into being. He believes in only pratyaksam. Bhuta samyogad Chaitanyam jayate. This generated Consciousness is the property that matters. They give the example like your eating betelnut. When you eat betel leaves green in colour, lime is white in colour, nut is brown in colour, and all of them join in mouth you get reddishness. Red colour is neither in betel, nor in lime or in the nut yet you get reddish colour when the three are combined in the mouth. There is no independent Consciousness is the view of caravaka. Vyasacharya says that this argument has got logical fallacy and therefore it is not correct. That we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 300

### **Topic 30 Aikatmyadhikaranam [Sutras 53 – 54]**

Atman is an entity distinct from the body

#### **Sutra 3.3.54 [413]**

#### ***Vyatirekastadbhavabhavitvanna tupalabdhitvat***

But not [so]; a Self or soul separate [from the body] does exist because [Consciousness] does not exist even when there is the body [after death], as in the case of cognition or perceptive Consciousness.

The statement in the preceding sutra is refuted.

In the last class, I introduced sutra 54. It is an incidental topic away from the main topic of guna upasamhara. It is an aside topic for the flow of our discussion. While teaching the teacher or the author remembers some particular idea and then the teacher before communicating it to the student, the teacher has tremendous mind control and he should be able to quickly decide as what he should tell while he teaches the student. He should ask whether the topic goes with the flow of the topic and he should immediately censor it and cut it off. This control is needed particularly for the teacher. Sometimes he takes it that the topic is needed and it cannot be given up as the aside topic will help during the course of his future teaching, as the topic is important although it is not required for the flow. Similarly, Vyasacharya teaches Upasana topic and the upasaka travels after the fall of the body either go to higher loka and fall or attain krama mukti. Suddenly Vyasacharya remembers that all the topics are relevant only when you accept the Jivatma, which is different from the body, and this is taken for granted throughout the pada. Vyasacharya feels that this should not be taken for granted and has included it here and stresses that Atma is different from the body. Vyasacharya might have felt that there is a caravaka going through the Brahma Sutra and hence he makes it clear that Atma is different from the body. Here the purva paksha was given in sutra 53 and there he says that I am the body and body is the Atma. In the sutra anvaya logic is given and vyatirikta logic we have to supply. In the presence of body there I the live individual and in the absence of the body, there is no live individual. This is vyatireka logic. Punya papa life after death etc., have no relevance according to Caravaka. They even accuse that they are cock and pull story invented by the Brahmins to earn money etc.

The answer is given in the sutra 54. Vyasacharya says let us leave the Atma alone because with regard to the definition of Atma there are so many philosophers have different views. Vyasacharya takes the examples of something, which is more relevant. The example Vyasacharya has taken in the place of Atma is upalapti. Upalapti means the Consciousness. Therefore Vyasacharya addresses the caravaka and asks what is your view with regard to the Consciousness principle. He says the view is exactly the same as that of Atma. That means there is Consciousness separate from the body. caravaka does not believe in independent Consciousness because of the anvaya vyatirikta logic as mentioned above. When the body is

Consciousness is and when the body is gone Consciousness is gone and therefore there is Consciousness other than the body. He further says that Consciousness is a product of matter and after being produced it remains as a property of matter. When matter is in particular configuration Consciousness is generated and many scientists also hold this view. It is a phenomenon they say. Now Vyasacharya wants to point out that this reasoning is fallacious first with regard to Consciousness we will prove his reasoning is wrong and if reasoning is wrong the conclusion is wrong. Vyasacharya mentions only one logical defect but Adhi Sankaracharya gives many more logics. Up to this we have seen in the last class.

The five doshas are one is anvaya dosha; second is vyatireka dosha, third one is yukti virodha dosha and anubhava virodha dosha and karma kartru virodha dosha' we will see each one.

First Vyasacharya himself in his sutra gives one. caravaka said that there is anvaya and vyatireka. Anvaya is co-presence and vyatireka means co-absence. First we will take up simultaneous presence. He says whenever there is body there is Consciousness. There is a dead body, which is sarira bhavah, but we don't experience Consciousness. Sariram is there but Chaitanyam in the form of sentiency is not there. In dead body your anvaya fails.

Now we go to the second argument vyatireka. He says sarira abhave chaitanya abavad. In the absence of the body there is absence of Consciousness. How do you say that? caravala answers that I don't experience Consciousness when body is dissolved. Then Adhi Sankaracharya argues that non-experience of something is the absence of that thing. Non-experience does not prove non-existence. The non-experience can be due to two reasons. One is the non-existence itself; non-existence may be one reason.

There can be another reason also. It is existence but there is no condition for its experience. There is no instrument, the instrument is inadequate, or the condition for experience is absent. Here there are electro magnetic waves in the music halls. A radio or T.V. as even tune the instrument you get all music and other programmes. The waves exist but our instruments are incapable of experiencing the music. I cannot say microwave is absent but I don't experience because of the inadequacy of the instrument, there should be conditions for experience that is prakasa either Surya prakasa or chandra prakasa or electric prakasa should be there to experience you. Can I conclude that there is nothing there?

Non-experience of people is non-existence of people. Therefore, after the fall of the body, you cannot conclude that the Consciousness is absent but you may have a doubt that Consciousness may not be there. To say it is not there is fallacious argument. For this I will say that Consciousness may be present also. You cannot negate that Consciousness is not there and if you negate it is not correct. If he argues that, I cannot assert the absence of Consciousness and you cannot assert the presence of Consciousness. it is because you have no logic to prove the existence of the Consciousness.

Then Vedantins say that we agree we cannot logically assert the presence of Consciousness and at the same time, you cannot prove the absence of Consciousness. we can only say it may be or it may not be. Since logically it cannot be proved, hence we come to sastra. Here our aim is to show that if caravaka says that the nonexistence of Chaitanyam is fallacious. Non-experience is not non-existence.

The third argument is yukti virodhah. Our experience shows that every object I experience outside are all inert in nature. All the external world of objects is inert in nature. This is the

generalization I derive from experience. Extending that the body is also a panca indriya vishayam. Therefore our conclusion must be dehah jadah drishyatvad gatavad. Consciousness cannot be part or property of the body and it goes against the vyapti. Not only drishyam dehaga jadah boudhikatvad gatavad. It is product of the matter. Like a pot that being so if you conclude that body alone is boudhikam and it is chetanam if you say it is against the norms and it is yukti virodhah.

Fourth it is anubhava virodha. Body is experienced means it is the property of the body is also experienced by us. it is our anubhava. sabda rupa of the body experienced if all the properties are indriya vishaya, Chaitanyam also would have been indriya vishayam if Chaitanyam is also a property of the body. But with my sense organs I experience all the properties of the body and I don't see any extra property in the form of Chaitanyam. I don't experience Consciousness too. I don't see any difference between your body and the chair and your body and your carpet. If Chaitanyam were the property I would have experienced but I don't experience.

Fifth one is karma kartur virodhah. If I have to experience an object the object must different from the subject and also be away from the subject. A subject can never experience itself just as eyes can never perceive itself. To perceive itself the eye should be away and be different. This we extend to perceiving power or property of the eye also. The eye has got perceiving property. The perceiving property of the eye can perceive every object but perceiving property cannot perceive itself or the substance eye upon which the property is resting.

Now the property has the perceiving power. Perceiving property can objectify everything but two thing one perceiving property itself and also the substance upon which the property is resting that is its own asraya or its own locus. Guna cannot objectify its own asraya gunam also. guna cannot objectify its dravyam. Dravyam the substance cannot be separated from guna and place it in front for the purpose of perceiving. This is not possible. a property cannot objectify itself. It cannot objectify its own substance. Suppose Chaitanyam is the property of the body, Chaitanyam becomes gunah and the locus substance is the body.

Adhi Sankaracharya argues if Consciousness is a property located on the body then the Consciousness will be able to objectify everything except Consciousness itself by rule number one [guna cannot objectify guna] and Consciousness cannot objectify its own locus body also. then by rule number two your Consciousness will never be able to objectify your own body which means you will not experience your body. Every time some one has to tell that your body is fat or weak etc. this is a foolish logic. Consciousness is a property and property objectifying its own substance is fallacious. It is kartru karma virodha doshah. This is the fifth defect in caravaka madham. Consciousness cannot be the property of the body and therefore Consciousness must be separate from the body. This we confirm with sastra pramana and it says jnanam is eternal by saying sathyam jnanam anantam Brahma.

Then caravaka may ask how Consciousness is not experience when the body is dead. Our argument is that the medium for experience is not there. Surya prakasa can be experienced only when the medium is there. This is the general analysis of the sutra. once I have establish Chaitanyam different from the body, then I can say this Chaitanyam is called Atma and it is the real meaning of I and therefore Atma is different from the body.

Now we will go word for word analysis of the sutra. na tu it is never so; upalabdhitvat like the Consciousness; vyatirekah means Atma is different [from the body]; tatbhavabhavitvat means

since its expressions are absent even when the body is present. [after death] this is the general meaning of the word. the significance of the word we will do in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 301

### **Topic 30 Aikatmyadhikaranam [Sutras 53 – 54]**

Atman is an entity distinct from the body

#### **Sutra 3.3.54 [413]**

#### ***Vyatirekastadbhavabhavitvanna tupalabdhivat***

But not [so]; a Self or soul separate [from the body] does exist because [Consciousness] does not exist even when there is the body [after death], as in the case of cognition or perceptive Consciousness.

The statement in the preceding sutra is refuted.

Caravaka madham is fundamental obstacle to vedic culture. Karma Kanda, upasana kanda as also the jnana kanda is not possible until we accept that Atma is different from the body. Atma going to higher lokas after doing vedic rituals relating to Karma Kanda is not possible without accepting Atma is different from the body; so going to Brahma loka after doing the various upasanas is not possible if Atma is different from the body and so also after jnanam Jivatma cannot gain liberation if the Atma is not different from the body. Thus the very foundation of the vedic culture will be jeopardized if we do not shake the foundation that Atma is different from the body. This has been established in the sutra by Vyasacharya and reasserted by Adhi Sankaracharya by giving various pramanams in support of the siddhanta's views. Up to this, we saw in the last class.

Now we will see the significance of the words of the sutra. We should take na and tu together and it means Purva Paksi is never correct. Caravaka is never correct who says that Atma is never different from the body. vyatirekah means different; body is different from Atma; tadbhavabhavitvat means the reason is incorrectness of purva paksi's or the fallacy of Purva Paksi's reason. He says that only when the body is Atma is. This is the logic given by caravaka, which is said to be incorrect. Vyasacharya says in the dead body sariram is there but life sentiency is not there. The expressions of Atma is absent; hence your anvaya is not correct; upalabdhivat means like Consciousness whatever Consciousness we can give to show that Consciousness is different from the body can be extended to Atma is different from the body. The logic for Chaitanyam can be extended to Atma also. Just as Chaitanyam is different from the body, Atma is different from the body.

### **Topic 31 Angavabaddhadhikaranam [Sutras 55-56]**

Upasanas connected with sacrificial acts [i.e., udgitha Upasana] are valid for all schools

#### **Sutra 3.3.55 [414]**

***Angavabaddhastu na sukhasu hi prativedam***

But [the Upasanas or meditations connected with parts] [of sacrificial acts are] not [restricted] to [particular] sakhas according to the Veda [to which they belong], [but to all its sakhas because the same Upasana is described in all]

There is no rule that angavabaddha [karmanga] Upasana to each sruti sakha is ep` and should be confined to it alone.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with two sutras and now we revert to the Upasana. The subject matter here is karmanga Upasanani. It means when a big ritual is performed as part of the ritual certain meditations are prescribed for which certain alampanams are prescribed. Shivalinga is the alampanam for Lord Shiva upasana; saligramam is the alampanam for the Vishnu upasana and the fire becomes the alampanam for Nachiketusa Upasana. Karmanga Upasana is the nachiketusa ritual and virad is the virad Upasana. Therefore these Upasanas are called anga asrita Upasana the meditations based on any part of the ritual. Sometimes the ritualistic fire is used as alampana and sometimes the mantras are used as alampana. The best example is udgitha Upasanam mentioned in 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad. may you meditate upon the adgitha which is nothing but Omkara. Omkara which is musically chanted is called udgitha. Rigveda Omkara is not called udgitha. It has to be loudly chanted. During the ritual Omkara has to be chanted and that Omkara has to be taken as the alampanam and therefore udgitha is taken as angam and each Upasanam is called anga alampana Upasana. The various deities to be invoked are varieties of natural forces are invoked with the alampanam of udgitha as a part of the ritual. This is subject matter for analysis.

The debate here is this udgitha alampana Upasana is given in Chandogya upanisad. it belongs to samaveda. Samaveda has got several branches. One and the same Veda has got several branches. They say that originally the four Vedas had 1180 sakhas of which only 10 or 11 survive. In Gautama sakha of samaveda there also udgitha will come. thus udgitha mantra comes as a part of several branches of sama Veda itself. The doubt here is that the udgitha asrita Upasanam is relevant to one sakha of samaveda or when the udgitha mantra comes in other branches of samaveda. Purva Pakshi says anga Upasanas are to be practiced only in one sakha because scripture mentions it in one sakha only. purva paksha madham restrict angasriya to one sakha only. the sthana pramanam restricts angasriya Upasana to particular sakha only.

siddhanta says no and says angasriya Upasana can be extended to the other sakhas of the same Veda. Now we will come to the general analysis of the first sutra. here Vyasacharya only makes a statement that angasriya Upasana are not restricted to one branch only and it can be extended to the other branches of the same Veda. Vyasacharya does not give any reason for this. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the valid reason. The reason is the sruti pramanam. Sruti uses the word Udgitha and it does not restrict the udgitham to that particular sakha. Udgitha in general is alampanam. Sruti pramana says it is general rule wherever udgitham comes it can be used. Adhi Sankaracharya says that sruti pramana is stronger than sannadhi pramana and conclude that Omkara Upasana can be extended to the other branches.

Now we go to word for word analysis of the sutra. angavabaddhah meditations on factors connected with rituals; na sakaha tu means are not restricted to the particular branches; pativedam in a particular Veda only; hi means because [the basic injunction is general. Now

we will come to significance of the words. Angavabaddhah means the meditation based upon anga [an accessory of the ritual] upon that Upasana is done; na sakhasu means they are not restricted to particular branch only; the word hi indicates because vedic injunction is general. Refer to 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad where such restriction is not given; prativedam means every Veda. Now we will go to the next sutra.

### **Topic 31 Angavabaddhadhikaranam [Sutras 55-56]**

Upasanas connected with sacrificial acts [i.e., udgitha Upasana] are valid for all schools

#### **Sutra 3.3.56 [415]**

#### ***Mantradvivirodhah***

Or else there is no contradiction [here], as in the case of Mantras and the like.

The discussion commenced in sutra 33 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Siddhanta says that sruti pramana is in our support that sruti pramana cancels the contradicting sannidhi pramana. This is the content of the previous sutra. While answering the previous sutra we accepted the sannadi pramana. In this sutra Vyasacharya says that sannadhi pramana virodha pramana is not at all there. Previously we overruled the dosha and now we say there is no dosha at all. For this Vyasacharya gives a technical answer. There are many examples where one mantra is extended to many other mantras. Extending a part belonging to another branch is very common to Vedic ritualistic approach and this we do to the karmanga Upasana also. This is common to Purva Mimamsa and why this cannot be done in our case is the argument of Vyasacharya. In the Vedic ritualistic literature there is a portion called Maitrayaniya Samhita Prayoga Sutrani. These are set of sutras which talk about the method of performing rituals. There are many rituals where the priests have to prepare various materials taking rice etc. grains. For this he has to grind the rice to prepare purodasa etc. to offer in the fire. Before grinding the rice he has to take the grinding stone. The stone to be used for grinding the purodasa which is to be used for offering in the ritual. For taking the stone we have to chant certain mantra. This is called Asmadhana Mantra for taking the stone for grinding the rice etc. This is given in the above sutra. And this Prayoga Sutra mentions two sutras and it is said that priest can chant any of the mantra. One mantra is kutkutaka api. Then the other mantra is kutaruhu asi one of the two mantras must be chanted at the time of taking the asma. Naturally, the priest will look for the mantra. Since it is in the Maitrayini Samhita Prayoga Sutrani. This is a saga of the Yajur Veda Sakha. The priest looks for the mantra in the above Samhita. Here he is able to find only one mantra. It is also said that it occurs 1.1.6 where kutkuasi mantra is there. As an option the other mantra is not there in the above Sakha and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya argues from this it is clear that the kutarukasi mantra occurs in some other branch. Two mantras occurring in two different mantras can be used in two different Samhitas. Kutarurasi mantra is not there in the above Samhita. He uses a mantra from another Sakha. Therefore, the conclusion is that there is no restriction that a portion applied for a particular ritual has to be done in that Sakha only and it can be extended to another Sakha ritual also, and therefore karmanga Upasana mantra can be extended to another Sakha. I will give another example in support of our argument.

There is another mantra occurring in the above samhita itself. Ritavo vai prayajah samanatra hotavyah this mantra says that prayaja is a subsidiary ritual. It is called prayaja home consisting of five oblations. This is an anga homa subsidiary ritual a part of darsa purna masa yaga. it is an angi ritual. This prayaja homa is mentioned in the above branches but it does not mention the five oblation details. Now how do you know how many oblations are there. This can be solved only when you study darsa purva yaga mentioned in another samhita where the details are given. The very fact that the details missing in one sakha and taken to another sakha makes it clear that such interchange can be done if the yaga is 'one and the same'. Similarly, the udgitha mantra can be taken to another Sama Veda Upasana. Hence, there is no contradiction at all. Previous sutra said that sannadhi virodha is overpowered and here it is said that sannadhi virodha is not there.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. va means moreover; avirodhah means there is no improperness mantradivat as in the case of mantra etc. this is the word meaning. now I will give the significance of the word. avirodha means there is no sannadhi virodha or sthana virodha as in the case of the ritualistic portion. Mantradivat means as in the case of mantra the mantras kept in the mind as indicated in the preceding paragraph. Adhi means prayaja homa example. One sakha can be extended to another sakha. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 302

### **Topic 32. Bhumajyayastvadhikaranam [sutra 57]**

Vaisvanara Upasana in one entire Upasana.

**Sutra 3.3.57 [416]**

***Bhumnah kratuvajjyayastvam tatha hi darsayati***

Important [is given to the meditation] on the entire form [of vaisvanara] as in the case of sacrifice for thus [the sruti] shows.

The Vaisvanara vidya is discussed here.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. the subject matter is the vaivanara or virad Upasana elaborately dealt with in the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad. [from 11<sup>th</sup> section to 18<sup>th</sup> section] it is popularly known as vaisvanara vidya. This vidya is given by King Asvapati. Kaikeyi is supposed to be the daughter of the King Asvapati who is a great jnani. He gave this vidya to six Rishis including the Uddalaka indicating that even the kings were learned in those days. 5.18.2 of Chandogya upanisad gives the description of vaisvanara or virad. This alone is referred to in Mandukya Upanishad. the seven limbs of the vaisvanara are the panca bhutas, the space is taken as the very body of vaisvanara; all pervading space is all pervading body and air is taken as the prana of vaisvanara; fire is taken as the mouth of vaisvanara; through sabda pramana illumines through knowledge; jalam principle is taken as the lower abdomen below the naval; the Prithvi earth is taken as the feet of vaisvanara which we get in Vishnu Sahasranama; five bhutas are the five limbs of vaisvanara; the sun is taken as the eyes of vaisvanara as the sun illumines everything eyes illumines everything; the heaven is the head of vaisvanara; these are the spata anga vaisvanara Upasana mentioned in 5.8.2 of Chandogya upanisad. the names of the rishis are also given. The leader of the group of Uddalaka. Uddalaka is intelligently honest to say that he did not know anything about vaisvanara vidya. But the great king knows and all the rishis joined by Uddalaka went to King Asvapati. Each one says that I do practise vaisvanara Upasana in my own way. One says he takes heaven as vaisvanara; another says fire as vaisvanara and thus instead of taking heaven etc., as limbs of vaisvanara and mistake it for vaisvanara instead of taking it as the limb of vaisvanara. Then they meditate upon the anga as the total angi. Asvapati says it is good and he mentions the Upasana phalam taking a part as a whole just as looking at Tamil Nadu as India. Then Asvapati says it is not the whole and he says that it would give negative result. If you take it as total vaisvanara you would have lost your head. If you wrongly meditate the sun as the total vaisvanara you would have lost the eye and so on. Ange angi Upasana is criticized and after criticizing their Upasana, Asvapati says that I shall teach the total. Then he says heaven is not vaisvanara and it is only the head of vaisvanara. The wrong Upasana done by each rishi ange angi dristih taking a part as the whole, is called vyastha Upasanam which was practiced by each rishi. On the other hand when you take all of them, in each one of them you see only a limb of the vaisvanara and combining all the anga you get the total vaisvanara dristi.

asvapathi joins all the angas and presents the angi. This total Upasanam is called samastha Upasana. Angi dristi is vyastha Upasanam and sarvani angani is called samastha Upasanam. When you study vaisvanara from section 11 to 18 we get two types of Upasanas. We have vyastha Upasanam and samastha Upasanam. For both type of Upasanam phalam is given. Vyastha Upasanam, phalam and ninda are mentioned. Here what we focus is that for each vyastha Upasanam phalam is given and for samastha Upasanam also phalam is given. The controversy is thus Chandogya upanisad teach both vyastha and samastha Upasanam or does Chandogya upanisad teach only samastha Upasanam. The Purva Paksi view is that both vyastha and samastha Upasanam are taught. Anga Upasanam and angi Upasanams are taught and this is the Purva Paksi view. The logic he gives is that for each Upasanam phalam is given. Samastha Upasanam comes 5.18.2 and vyastha Upasanam us given in 5.18.1. Siddhanta says that there is only samastha vaisvanara Upasanam only. Bhuma Upasanam is there which is nothing the samastha vaisvanara Upasanam. That is the only teaching. vyakta Upasana should be ignored and it should not be practiced.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says samastha Upasanam alone should be taken. He says that for samastha Upasanam only the phalam is clearly given 5.18.1. Then the question comes why should not you take the vyakta Upasanam also. Vyasacharya does not give the detail. But Adhi Sankaracharya says that Asvapathi criticizes them. The criticism is that if you take the limb as total vaisvanara then you will lose that particular limb. Any limb taken as the whole the phalam is loss of that limb. Therefore, you cannot practice that vyasti Upasana. Then naturally the question comes if the individual Upasanam is not to be practiced why should the Upanishad give the phalam is given for each vyasti for that Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer that phalam is given even though the individual Upasana is harmful but they are valid as part of the total Upasana. You should not ignore them but join as total and as part of the total individual will be meditated because the total meditation includes the individual meditation. There is something that when they are total it is important but when individually it is not worth. Teeth on place they get all the respect but when the tooth comes out you have to throw away. So also is the hair. When separated the hair is unholy. The same is the case with the nail. Manasyah when he has power he has value and when power goes he is not respected. Each anga will be criticized if they are separated from vaisvanara. Therefore, only one Upasana is there. Individual limb give phalam not in a separate way but as part of the whole. Here gives an example of a huge ritual. There are many secondary rituals in the huge ritual and they are called anga karmas. According to karma kanda each part of the ritual is supposed to produce a special adhristam. Separate adhristam is generated by anga karma only when it is practiced as part of the whole. That punyam is called panda purvam, panda pruvams will join, and then the whole will produce parama purvam. Anga should be the part of the total and you treat the whole thing as one karma. Similarly vaisvanara Upasanam is one Upasanam and all anga Upasanam will produce phalam as total and individually. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give word for word analysis of the sutra. kratuvat as in the case of the vedic ritual jyayastvam means its importance bhumnah of the total vaisvanara is to be accepted hi because darsayati tatha the sruti declares so; now I will come to the significance of the word. Bhuma means samastha vaisvanara; Bhuma occurring in 7<sup>th</sup> chapter Chandogya upanisad there the word Bhuma means Brahman but here it is total Vaisvanara. Here Bhumna Upasana is samastha Vaisvanara Upasanam. Jyayastvam means prime teaching. there is only one Upasana that is the teaching and the others serve as supporting ones. Here it means importance or tatparyam. Other anga Upasanams have no importance. They cannot exist independently. Kratuvat means vaidhikam karma; tathadarsayati sruti declares so in 5.18.1

and 2 of Chandogya upanisad. samasti Upasanam is mentioned and phalam is mentioned without samasti Upasana nindha. It is not criticized whereas in vyasti Upasanam Upasana is mentioned phalam is mentioned but the individual status is criticized. Ninda rahita phala vakyam is our support. Ninda sahita phala vakyam is against the Purva Pakshi. With this sutra 57 is over. the adhikaranam is also over. now we will enter the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 33 Sabdadibhedadhikaranam.**

Various vidyas like the sandilya vidya, dahara vidya and so on are to be kept separate and not combined into one entire Upasana.

#### **Sutra 3.3.58 [417]**

#### ***Nana sabdadhibhedat***

[the vidyas are] separate, on account of the differences of words and the like.

First I will give you the general introduction to the adhikaranam with one sutra. the subject matter of the adhikaranam is that there are many saguna Brahma Upasanams prescribed in the Vedas. They are Isvara Upasanams like dahara vidya. Meditating the Lord on your own heart 8.1 of Chandogya upanisad; then Sandilya vidya where Isvara is meditated upon jagat sristi sthithi laya karanam and then we have Vaisvanara vidya. In all of them the object of meditation is Isvara alone. Isvara is only god that is invoked. But devatas are many in number. God with capital G is only one. devatas are nothing but exalted Jivatma. Indra is not Isvara but he is jiva alone and he is superior jiva because of superior karma. Later they become jivan mukta by knowledge. even jivan mukta is jiva and not Isvara. even though Isvara is one many Isvara Upasanams are given with different types of description. Upasanams are many but upasya devata is only one. in different puranams one and the same Isvara is given many names. They are several descriptions of one Isvara. the controversy is since upasya devata is one Isvara mentioned in different branches of Upasanam can we club all of them into one Isvara Upasanam. Or we should treat it different Upasanams. Purva Pakshi says just as in the previous adhikaranam, they contend that all of them should be combined and it should be practiced as one Isvara Upasana. Vyasacharya refutes that approach and says even though Isvara is one only, but Upasanams are treated differently in different Vedas and sakhas and should be treated as separate Upasanams. Sandilya and dahara vidya should not be combined.

Now we will come to general analysis of the sutra. here Vyasacharya says even though upasya is one Isvara, the Upasanams should be treated separately because of the difference in four factors such as Sabda bedah, guna bedah, phala bedah and nama bedah. Sabda bedah means the very injunction is given in different words. In one place it is said upasita, in another place it is called Veda. This is supposed to be very important and in ritualistic portion the very expression is very important. Then the second one is guna bedah the virtues of Isvara. the descriptions are different in dahara vidya, vaisvanara vidya, sandilya vidya etc. the features of the gods are also different. Krishna is not fair in colour and he is black; parvathi is shyamala; Vishnu is supposed to be fair etc. the number of hands, head, arms etc., vary. Then there is phala bedah. The results are also different. Nama bedah. One is sandilya vidya and the other is dahara vidya. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 303

### **Topic 33 Sabdadibhedadhikaranam.**

Various vidyas like the sandilya vidya, dahara vidya and so on are to be kept separate and not combined into one entire Upasana.

**Sutra 3.3.58 [417]**

#### ***Nana sabdadhibhedat***

[the vidyas are] separate, on account of the differences of words and the like.

We now see the sutra 58 relating to 33<sup>rd</sup> adhikaranam. here Vyasacharya analyses saguna Brahma or Isvara Upasanas which is called in different names at different places particularly in Chandogya upanisad. Vyasacharya is analyzing whether all of them should be treated as one Upasanam since the upasya devata being one is the question. While Purva Paksi says that, all the Upasanams should be combine as the one but siddhanta argues it cannot be done so because attributes, nature, phalam and names are different. Vyasacharya concludes even though the Isvara is one, the description at different places are different. Sabda etc., includes four factors, which are different in each Isvara Upasana even though Isvara is one. The first factor is sabda, second is guna and third is nama and fourth is phalam. Brahman is without attribute but vishistadvaidins points out that does not means Brahman has no attributes but Brahman has so numerous attributes which cannot be explained. if you combine all Upasanas and combine them together, you cannot think of all attributes the mind will be confused which attributes should I think at what context. Therefore, it is better to confine to one ishta devata. Therefore, when you close your eyes one devata will come to your mind. Then alone you can concentrate your mind. Therefore the second factor is guna bedas you should not combine them as one. The phalam given is different depending upon the virtues highlighted. If the virtue is knowledge, the phalam will be different. Finally, samakya bedah, which means the Upasanas, have different names. This is important in Purva Mimamsa. Certain karmas are treated differently only because of the names in the Vedas are given different. Therefore nama beda ca Upasana bedah. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you word for word analysis of the sutra. nana different meditations on saguna Brahman are to be taken differently. Sabdadibhedat means because of the differences in injunction the vedic commandments are different. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Nana means there many different Isvara Upasanas even though Isvara is one; Isvara eka although invocations are done differently; sabdadibhedat sabdah means vedic commandments or injunctions; adhi means etc., etc., indicates guna, phala and nama; because of the difference in the four factors Upasanas are also different. With this the sutra 58 is over. now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 34. Vikalpadhikaranam [Sutra 59]**

Anyone of the vidyas should be selected according to one's own opinion or choice.



**Sutra 3.3.59 [418]**

***Vikalpo'visishtaphalatvat***

There is iption [with respect to the several vidyas because theresult [of all the vidyas] is the same.

The most important vidyas are sandilya vidya, Bhuma vidya, dahara vidya, Upakosala vidya, Vaisvanara vidya, Udgita vidya, anandamaya vidya and akshara vidya.

First, I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. From this adhikaranam we will change the topics slightly. Here as well as the next two adhikaranam the topic is anushtana prachara vicarah means the application of different Upasanas. For this purpose the Upasanas are divided into three types. The first one is called ahangraha Upasanani, second id pratika Upasanani and the third one is karmanga Upasanani. In the three adhikaranams these three are discussed elaborately.

Before entering into this vichara, I will make some remarks about the three Upasanas. Ahangrah Upasana is one in which Isvara is invoked upon the upasaka himself. I look upon as the Vishnu, Shiva, devi etc. we do not talk about the knowledge but it is sheer imagination that I am sakshat Vishnu, Shiva, Devi etc. the first significance of the ahangraha Upasana is they are abedah and there is no difference between upasya and upasaka. The next feature is all the ahangrah Upasanas are prescribed for Isvara aikya praptih. Either Isvara aikyam is knowledge or jivan mukta or Isvara aikyam by going to Brahma loka and it is called krama mukti. Therefore phalam is the same in all ahangrah Upasanas. One practiseses Shiva ahangrah Upasana and another practices Vishnu ahangrah Upasana and one devi ahangrah Upasana and all invoke one and the same Isvara upon himself or herself and as a result of that krama mukti is phalam for all of them. naturally all the ahangrah Upasana is practiced for Isvara prapti. other than Isvara he does not have any desire. It is another name for nishkama Upasana. And it is Isvara prapti phala Upasana. This is uniqueness of ahangrah Upasana. There is one more feature; in ahangraha Upasana the phalam is Isvara pratpti. Before that Isvara pratpti even while leaving this body ahangrah Upasana will get sakshat kara and he will get Isvara pratpti. It is an intervening factor and it is a 'via-media' through which one gets Isvara prapti later in ahangrah Upasana. The saksat kara is defined as teevra devata abhimana because of constant invocation of particular deity it becomes so entrenched the feeling that I am upasaka, that feeling is suppressed, and he gets the feeling that I am the devata himself. This will be analysed here.

The second one is pratika Upasana. Pratikam means external symbol for invoking Isvara. that means the symbol is not myself but upon another external object like saligrama, shivalinga etc. pratika Upasanas are always beda Upasanani. Upasya upasaka beda is involved. These Upasanas are prescribed for attaining the worldly results. Various desires will be fulfilled including going to several lokas. Hence, they are sakama Upasanams. In pratika Upasana saksatkara is not involved and upasaka does not want aikyam with upasya devata and what he wants is adhrista dwaraka phalam.

The third one is karmanga Upasanani other called as anga asrita Upasanani. These Upasanas exist separately and they exist only as a part of ritual. They are para tantra Upasanani. They are dependent Upasanas. They are subsidiary ones. In these karmanga Upasanas the symbol

taken for invoking the devata is any accessory associated with the ritual. It may be the Agni used for the ritual or it may be particular mantra like Omkara mantra etc. here god is invoked upon any angam.

Now we will come to general analysis of the sutra 59. The controversy is whether one upasaka can practise different ahangrah upasanani or whether he should confine himself to one ahangrah Upasana. Purva Paksi says several ahangrah Upasanas can be practiced. For that Vyasacharya gives, the answer choose one only. Although all of them are Isvara Upasanas, choose one. We accept there are many but advice you should confine to one chosen Upasana. The reason for choosing one is several reasons. If you practice Vishnu for sometime and change to Shiva Upasana first there will be difference and secondly no meditation will get well rooted. That bhavana should become teevra and hence invoking upon oneself one type of Isvara one should confine himself to one ishta devata. Ishta devata is chosen not because one is superior to another and it is chosen because our mind should be entrenched in one particular fashion. It does not mean that other devatas should be hated. We should look upon other devatas are but vesham of my ishta devata. But for daily abhyasa I should confine to one devata. The second reason given in the sutra is that one particular Upasana itself is capable of giving Isvara pratpti and then why should you select the other Upasanas. Karama mukti destination by different upasakas by confining to one devata alone. we do not talk about jivan mukta here. Phalam is the same. hence one ishta devata is enough.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. vikalpah means there is option [with regard to] the meditation on the Lord. Avishista phalatvat because the result is the same. now we will see the significance of the words. Vikalpah means options with regard to ahangrah abeda nishkama Isvara Upasana. You can take either sandilya vidya or dahara vidya can be chosen from among the various vidyas. You need not practice all of them simultaneously. For all these Upasanas the result is the same one, is here itself saksat kara and the other is Isvara aikyam. As far we are concerned we are interested in jivan mukti after getting jnanam. more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 304

### **Topic 35 Kamyadhikaranam [Sutra 60]**

Vidyas yielding particular desires may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.60 [419]**

#### ***Kamyastu yathakamam samucchiyeranna va purvahetvabhavat***

But vidyas for particular desires may be combined or not according to one's desires on account of the absence of the previous reason [mentioned in the previous sutra]

This sutra shows an exception to the previous sutra that more vidya than one may be combined where the object is other than the realization of Brahman.

First, I will give you the general introduction of this adhikaranam with one sutra. the subject matter of the adhikaranam is second type of Upasana or beda Upasana where Isvara is invoked on any other locus other than me. Therefore here I am different and Isvara is different. It may be vedic fire or any accessory or any external locus other than myself is called pratikam. It is necessarily a beda Upasana and it is prescribed for attaining various phalams. The Vedas talk about any number of kamyas Upasanas. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two Upasanas one is 3.15.2 of Chandogya upanisad where the Vayu devata is meditated upon as the son of dk devata. When you meditate upon dk devata putrah, the phalam is that he will not have any sorrow like the putra soha. This is kamyas Upasana only. Another Upasana is 7.1.5 of Chandogya upanisad where Brahman is meditated upon the words or nama. The nama is taken as the pratikam and upon which Isvara is invoked. A person can move about freely. The controversy here is since there are several kamyas Upasanas should the upasaka practice only one Upasanas or do many Upasana. Vikalpa was the suggestion given in the previous adhikaranam. Here it is neither vikalpa nor samuccaya. There is no commandment for either choosing or combination and it is left to the upasaka to do what he likes. If you have no kama you need not do kamyas Upasana at all and if you have one kama only follow one kamyas Upasana and if you have two you can combine two kamyas Upasanas and if you have three kama you can combine three kamyas Upasanas. The rule regarding the kamyas Upasana is etheshtam and the choice is left to the upasaka. This freedom of choice is given because eka saksatkara is very important; the oneness with god is necessary to do such Upasanas. Here you have to give up individuality. Ahankara or the individuality has to be displaced by samasti vichara. You should never claim anything or any person as your own. Give up the individuality and learn to identify with Isvara and in culmination of death also individuality should disappear and devata should occupy the mind because of the sheer intensity if Isvara chintanam. Is saksatkara should happen your concentration should be with one devata. Only if you confine to one devata, intense concentration will be there. you can invoke any god as you choose when the Upasana is kamyas Upasana but in ahangrah Upasana you cannot do that. since saksatkara is not applied here, there is no vikalpa rule. therefore you can do as you like. This is the general analysis of the stura.

Tu means however; kamyah means desire based meditations or desire prompted meditations samuchiyeran may be combined; na va or not; yatha kamam depending on the desire; purvahetabhavat since the above mentioned reason is not applicable here; this is the word analysis. Now we will see significance of the words. Unlike the abeda Upasana, kamyah refers to kamyas Upasanas for fulfilling the desires; Veda Upasana, pratika Upasana tadastha Upasana are the same. With regard to the Upasanas, you can combine many Upasanas if you have many desires. Nava means you need not combine; if you have only one desire you may follow one Upasana. If you say even you do not have one desire, you need not do any Upasana. The reason is purva hetu abhavat the conditions mentioned in ahangrah Upasana are not there. the conditions are nishkama and satksat kara intense and continuous meditation is required. Therefore, one should not have any distraction. And then you have to concentrate on one devata. In kamyas Upasana, you can change the devata every day. That is the difference between the previous sutra and the present one. with this second Upasana namely beda Upasana is over.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.61 [420]**

#### ***Angeshu yathasrayabhavah***

With regard [to meditations] connected with members [of sacrificial acts] it is as with [the members] with which they are connected.

This is the last adhikaranam of the third pada. First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with six sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is karmanga Upasanani. The uniqueness of karmanga Upasana is that it cannot be practiced independently and it is a subsidiary Upasana. Therefore, since the subsidiary Upasanas do not exist independently, as it is karmanga, and if you practice independently it will not give any adhrista phalam. the previous two Upasanas are swatantra Upasana independently and it will vie phalams. Karmanga Upasanas are also called anga asrita Upasanani. When an Upasana is prescribed as a part of the ritual, the symbol used for invoking the devata will generally be a part of the rituals only. it may be even one of the priest himself, or the fire used for the ritual or even a mantra used for the ritual. The anga will serve as the pratikam. Anga is also known by the name asrayah. Asrayam means symbol used for invoking the devata. The controversy is whether the karmanga Upasana should be compulsorily practiced along with the ritual or optional. The example for the karmanga Upasana taken by Adhi Sankaracharya is Omkara Upasana prescribed in first chapter of Chandogya upanisad. it is full of karmanga Upasanas. Omkara is the karmanga there. Omkara occurring in samaveda is called udgitha. It is musical. In other Vedas it is non-musical. This musical Omkara udgitha is karmangam for many rituals. Therefore udgitha is karmangam in all samaveda rituals. Upon this karmanga udgitha several Upasanas are prescribed in Chandogya upanisad first chapter. All are called karmanga Upasanani. These Upasanas are to be compulsorily done or it is optional. Purva Pakshi holds the view that karmanga Upasanas are to be done along with the rituals. Siddhanta will say it is optional and one can combine or need not combine. The first sutras are purva paksha sutras

and the last two relate to siddhanta. Vyasacharya says it is not compulsory to combine the Upasanas.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the first sutra. Purva Pakshi argues that karmangams are to be compulsorily included in the karma. Every karma angam or the accessories of the rituals are incomplete without the ritual or the accessories of the main Upasana. Fire, priest, dakshina etc., are karmangam. Even if one anga is not included the ritual is futile. Any ritual is complete only if you include angas. Upasanams come along with angas since angas are the asraya for the anga Upasanas. If asraya is to be included asrita Upasana is also compulsory. Just as asrayam is included so asrita Upasanam also should be included. The word for word analysis of the sutra we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 305

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.61 [420]**

#### ***Angeshu yathasrayabhavah***

With regard [to meditations] connected with members [of sacrificial acts] it is as with [the members] with which they are connected.

In the last three andhakaranam Vyasacharya analyses the method of practicing the Upasanas. We have done the general analysis of the sutra in the last class.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. angeshu means with regard to meditations upon the accessories; yatha asrayabhavah just as the accessories are included in the rituals [the meditations are also to be included]. Now we will see the significance of the words. Angeshu means here angam refers to anga asrita Upasanani accessory based meditations; the final meaning is that accessory of the ritual will serve as symbol of the Upasanam. In nachiketetus ritual, the fire is taken as the symbol for the Upasana. The karmanga is called asraya when it serves as symbol for the Upasana. Karmanga asraya are compulsorily present [in the same way karmanga asrita Upasana also should be compulsorily present. Fire is compulsory in nachiketetus ritual but we fire based Upasana is optional. This is the view of siddhanta. This is the first argument. now we will see the next sutra.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.62 [421]**

#### ***Sishtescha***

And from the injunction of the sruti.

An argument in support of the objection raised in sutra 61 is adduced. This is because the Upasanas depend on the stotras.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. here the Purva Paksi says that both karma angam and karmanga asrita Upasanas have the same status. Nachiketetus ritual and nachiketetus based meditation have got the same status because both of them are enjoined by the scriptures. Karmangasm are also prescribed by the Vedas and

karmanga asrita Upasanas are also prescribed by the Vedas. When both are prescribed by the Vedas both of them are to be taken as compulsory part of the ritual. Karmangam is compulsory part of karma. In the same way karmanga asrita Upasana also is compulsory part of karma. Claiming one is compulsory and the other optional is not correct. This is the injunction of the Vedas. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. sishtescha means because of the vedic injunction also [the meditation should be included] now I will give you the significance of the words. Sishtihi means sasanam or vidhi. Because of the vedic injunction of both karmanga and karmanga asrita Upasana also. because of that also Upasana should be included.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.63 [422]**

##### ***samaharat***

on account of the rectification.

A further reason is given by the opponent. Another argument in support of sutra 61 is adduced.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. here Vyasacharya says in Chandogya upanisad Veda prescribes a particular Upasana. Refer to 1.5.5. there Upasana talks about an Upasana to be practiced by samaveda priest as a part of the ritual. The Upanishad prescribed there is meditation upon aikyam of samaveda Omkara and rg Veda Omkara. Samaveda Omkara is called udgitha and rg Veda Omkara is called pranvah. Pranava udgitha Upasana is to be practiced and Chandogya upanisad says that if ugatha practices the Upasana as a result of this whatever dosha is there in samaveda chanting those doshas will be rectified. Since always there can be doshas in the ritual that too in samaganam because ganam is tougher then chanting. Therefore udgatha brings a rectification in the sutra. samaharah means rectification or correction. Since the dosha nivrutti is compulsorily required in any ritual, lapses are possible the parihara is required and as a parihara Upasana is required and from this it is clear that the Upasana should go with karma. Therefore the Upasana becomes a part of the ritual. In every ritual the correction is an integral part of the ritual. Therefore also Upasana is compulsory. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. samaharat means because of the rectification [meditation should be included in the ritual]. Now we will see the significance of the word. samaharat means in this context it means pariharah. In the Chandogya upanisad the verb used is anusamaharati. Samaharah means pariharah. Because of this also Upasana is compulsory. Parihara is compulsory in every ritual and hence Upasana is compulsory for parihara.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.64 [421]**

#### ***gunasadharanyasrutescha***

And from the sruti declaring OM which is a common feature [of the Udgitha vidya] to be common to all the Vedas.

Another argument in support of the sutra 61 is adduced.

First I will give you the general analysis of this sutra. here Purva Pakshi says that Omkara is a unique anga and it is a part of all rituals prescribed in all Vedas unlike many other accessories. Therefore Purva Pakshi argues that karmanga rupa Omkara asrita Upasana those meditations which are to be practiced upon Omkara which is a part of the rituals occurring in all Vedas should be joined in every ritual. It is so because Omkara is common to all the Vedas. The question is where is it said that Omkara is common to all the Vedas. Refer to 1.1.9 of Chandogya upanishad where it is said so. With the help of Omkara alone all the three Vedas function as supported by Omkara. In all rituals, rg Veda Omkara is to be chanted sama Veda Omkara chanted by the corresponding priest. samsanam is the chanting of the rg Veda priest; udgitham is the chanting of the priest. therefore in every ritual Omkara has to be chanted by the priests involved in the ritual and because Omkara belongs to all the Vedas the Omkara Upasana should be used in all the rituals. Guna is a technical word used for the angam. Any angam is always dependent upon anga a part is always dependent on the whole. Angam is paratantram. Similarly any attribute is dependent on a substance. Hence guna is also paratantram. Therefore the word angam is translated as gunah. The word guna occurring in the sutra refers to karm anga Omkara and it is common to all the Vedas and therefore the anga asrita Upasana form all Vedas should be included.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. gunasadharanya rute and cha. Cha means moreover; gunasadharanyasruteh means since sruti declares Omkara to be common to all the Vedas [meditations from all Vedas should be included]. This is the word meaning. now we will see the significance of the words. Gunasadharanyasrutescha means karmanga bhuta Omkara, Omkara which is a part of a ritual, sadharanya means commonness or common. Sruteh means sruti declaration that it is common to all sruti statement kept in mind is 1.1.9 of Chandogya upanishad, when I say meditation is compulsory, it is karmanga asrita Upasanam. Up to this purva paksha argument. now in the following two sutras we will siddhanta views.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.65 [424]**



### ***Na va tatsahabhavasrutch***

This and the following sutra give the conclusion.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra that relates to siddhanta. Vyasacharya starts saying that all the arguments given by the purva paksa are not so. he says that the karmanga Upasanas are not compulsory because there is no sruti statement that says the karmanga Upasanas are compulsory. But we have sruti usages that point out karmangam is compulsory. Omkara chanting should be done but the Upasana is said to be compulsory. Whenever vedic rituals are talked about, it talks of various accessories, and how they should be employed etc. but in the description Upasanas are not included in a particular place as a compulsory thing. How to take a vessel, when to take a vessel and how to employ the vessel etc., are mentioned in the Vedas. The rituals give all the details but while detailing the ritual Veda does not mention the Upasana. It is silent. It does not include in the ritual the karmanga Upasana in a systematic manner. Karmanga Upasana is thus not compulsory. Hence the inclusion of karmanga Upasana is optional. In the same pattern anga Upasanas are not included in the ritualistic portion and from that it is clear that it is optional. There is another argument is given in one of the previous adhikaranam. in fact this particular topic has been discussed in 3.3.42 of Brahma Sutra. this particular adhikaranam is only to reinforce the same idea. There we have given another argument which we have to bring here. There it is said that even without Upasana karma can be done as per the Vedas. Refer to Chandogya upanisad where it is said marmanga Upasana may be included or may not included while doing a ritual. Without Upasana ritual will produce result and if you include the result will be increased benefit. Karma will not go waste without karmanga Upasana. The point is that the result will be less. Therefore sruti pramana abhavat. We cannot make it compulsory.

Now we will give word for word analysis of the sutra. nava this is not at all correct. Tatsahabhavasruteh means because there are no sruti statements which enjoins the compulsory inclusion of meditation. Now I will give the significance of the words. Nava means the Purva Paksi view is not at all coreect. The pramana is tatsahabhavaasrute means karmanga Upasana need not be compulsorily included. There are no sruti statement for compulsory inclusion of karmanga Upasana.

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.66 [425]**

#### ***darsanaccha***

And because the sruti [scripture] says so [shows it]

The sutra is adduced in support of sutra 65.

First I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. here also another Chandogya upanisad mantra is quoted here. 4.17.10 of Chandogya upanisad says that in every ritual there must be one priest called Brahma in addition to the other three priests connected with three Vedas.

Brahma has to know all the three Vedas and his job is to prescribe prayachittam whenever any priests goes wrong. He is to look for mistakes and do pariharam. If karmanga Upasanas are compulsory then the karmanga Upasanas themselves will do the rectification. Then Brahma will have no work. Whereas Chandogya upanisad says Brahma is part of a ritual to prescribe a parihara and from that it is clear that the karmanga Upasanas are compulsory. Since Brahma is mentioned karmaga Upasana is not compulsory. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give the word for word analysis of the sutra. cha means moreover; darsanat since sruti reveals this in Chandogya upanisad [meditation need not be included]. The significance of the word is since sruti indirectly reveals Brahma will do the parihara, karmanga Upasana is not compulsory.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 306

### **Topic 35 Yathasrayabhavadhikaran [Sutra 61 - 66]**

Meditations connected with members of sacrificial acts may or may not be combined according to one's liking.

#### **Sutra 3.3.66 [425]**

#### ***darsanaccha***

And because the sruti [scripture] says so [shows it]

The sutra is adduced in support of sutra 65.

In the last class, we completed the third pada of the third chapter of Brahma Sutra with 36 adhikaranam and 66 sutras. It appears to be a difficult pada because Purva Mimamsa is applied here. We have to enter the fourth pada and before entering, we will consolidate the whole study. The name of the third chapter is sadhanadhyaya. all the four padas of the third chapter deals with sadhana for moksa. of various sadhana the first pada of the third chapter elaborated the travel of jiva after death by taking pancagni vidya of Brihadharaynaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad. The purpose of this vicara is to know what is samsarah. Samsara literally means traveling from body to body. samsara means transmigration. It is not uniformly going upwards as the theory of evolution claims. They present the graph as uniform upward motion. But Vedantins say it is like that graph or like snake and ladder game and jiva helplessly travels from sariram to sariram. the purpose of the study is to give vairagyam. Vairagyam is considered to be the most important supplementary to the jnanam. vairagya rahita jnanam is scriptural scholarship. Jnanam will be gained only when you have vairagyam or detachment.

In the second pada of the third chapter, we had tad, tvam padhartha vichara. It dealt with nature of Jivatma and Paramatma, which is considered a very important sadhana. There I pointed out pada jnanam vakya jnanasya sadhanam. Knowledge of the word is necessary or is a means for the knowledge of a sentence. Sentence is made of words alone. therefore padam is an angam and vakyam is angi. Therefore tvam pada vichara and tat pada vichara was analysed. Similar Isvara swarupam was also analysed. It is sadhana for Maha vakya jnanam and this jnanam is needed for moksa. then varieties of vidyas were taken up predominantly saguna vidya or Isvara Upasanam. Nirguna vidya is Brahma jnanam. vidya is commonly used for saguna Brahma jnanam and nirguna jnanam also. we should be specific as to what we study as to whether saguna Upasana or nirguna jnanam. saguna Upasana is a very important sadhana for jnanam and moksa. it is only through Upasana samadhi shadka sambatti will come. therefore Upasana is very relevant. The only thing in Brahma Sutra Upasanas analysed are called vedic Upasana which is no more prevalent now. that is why this chapter is dry and out of context. now vedic Upasanas are replaced by puranic Upasanas or agama Upasanas. But Upasana is important. The discussion in the thid pada was which Upasanas can be combined and treated as one and which all Upasanas cannot be combined and should be

treated as different. The combination of attributes in various Upasanas was called guna upasamharah. But generally they name the third pada as guna upasamhara pada. this third pada we have completed and the essence is never neglect Upasanas. I will remind you that nowadays many people use the word Upasana in the name of physical worship of the Lord. It can be called only karma. Even oral worship cannot be called Upasana. It comes under kayika vachika karma only. it is merely a mental activity. The definition of Upasana saguna Brahma vishaya manasa vyaparah it is purely a mental exercise. No body is involved no speech is involved. A mental activity which is god centred is called Upasana. This mental exercise can be mental puja. The mental puja is also called Upasanam. Mental parayanam is called Upasanam and the mental pilgrimage is also called Upasanam. This Upasanam is very important sadhana because it gives three important virtues for the seeker and turns the extrovert mind to introvert. Our lifestyle is fast. Only Upasana develops Antarmugatvam. Upasana also develops Siddha suddhi in addition to karma yoga. This is the essence of the third pada. With this 3<sup>rd</sup> pada is over. Now we will enter the fourth pada for which I will give you a general introduction.

Class 306 continues in the next fourth pada.

BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 3, Pada: 4			
Classes: 306 to 339 = Sutras: 3-4-1 to 3-4-52			
Page Detail & Content			
<i>Class No</i>	<i>Page No</i>	<i>Chap-Pada-Sutra</i>	<i>Sutra Nos</i>
306	272	3 . 4 . 1 and 3 . 4 . 2	426 and 427
307	274	3 . 4 . 2	427
308	277	3 . 4 . 2 to 3 . 4 . 6	427 to 431
309	282	3 . 4 . 7 and 3 . 4 . 8	432 and 433
310	285	3 . 4 . 9 to 3 . 4 . 12	434 to 437
311	290	3 . 4 . 13 to 3 . 4 . 15	438 to 440
312	294	3 . 4 . 16 to 3 . 4 . 18	441 to 443
313	298	3 . 4 . 18	443
314	301	3 . 4 . 19 and 3 . 4 . 20	444 and 445
315	305	3 . 4 . 20	445
316	309	3 . 4 . 20	445
317	313	3 . 4 . 20 to 3 . 4 . 22	445 to 447
318	317	3 . 4 . 22 to 3 . 4 . 24	447 to 449
319	321	3 . 4 . 24 to 3 . 4 . 26	449 to 451
320	325	3 . 4 . 26 and 3 . 4 . 27	451 and 452
321	329	3 . 4 . 27 and 3 . 4 . 28	452 and 453
322	333	3 . 4 . 28 and 3 . 4 . 29	453 and 454
323	337	3 . 4 . 29 to 3 . 4 . 31	454 to 456
324	340	3 . 4 . 31 and 3 . 4 . 32	456 and 457
325	344	3 . 4 . 32 to 3 . 4 . 35	457 to 460
326	347	3 . 4 . 35 and 3 . 4 . 36	460 and 461
327	350	3 . 4 . 36 to 3 . 4 . 39	461 to 464
328	353	3 . 4 . 39 and 3 . 4 . 40	464 and 465
329	356	3 . 4 . 41	466
330	359	3 . 4 . 41 and 3 . 4 . 42	466 and 467
331	362	3 . 4 . 42 and 3 . 4 . 43	467 and 468
332	365	3 . 4 . 43 to 3 . 4 . 46	468 to 471
333	370	3 . 4 . 47	472
334	373	3 . 4 . 47	472
335	376	3 . 4 . 47 and 3 . 4 . 48	472 and 473
336	379	3 . 3 . 48 to 3 . 4 . 50	473 to 475
337	383	3 . 4 . 50 and 3 . 4 . 51	475 and 476
338	386	3 . 4 . 51 and 3 . 4 . 52	476 and 477
339	390	3 . 4 . 52	477
	392		

## **BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap:3, Pada: 4**

Class: 306

### **Introduction to the fourth pada of the third chapter.**

The fourth pada is also part of sadhana adhyaya and sadhana is the topic of this pada also. It is brahma vidya sahanani and technically they use the word brahma vidya anga sadhanani. Many of the sadhanas are useful for upasana also. Karma is not only useful for atma jnanam but it is useful for upasana also. If one does not practice karma yoga his mind will be turbulent. A non-karma yogi will not enjoy calm mind and generally, he will brood over either the past or will be concerned with future. Not only jnanam requires sadhana but also upasana needs sadhana. This anga sadhanas are broadly classified into two as bahiranga sahanani and andharanga sadhanani. The first one contribute in an indirect manner and the antharanga sadhanas are both which directly contribute. All types of rituals are considered as bahiranga sadhanas, which indirectly helps one to produce jnanam. Karma will come under bahiranga sadhanam. Charity, pilgrimage, yogasanas etc., relate to bahiranga sadhanas. Sarva abeksa jnaya anything for intelligent will contribute and will come inch by inch to vedanta. Vedanta sravanam mananam nididyanam are proximate means and they are closer to atma jnanam. They are called antharanga sadhanani. Rituals can be reduced; pilgrimage can be reduced but vairagyam should not be reduced. Bahiranga sadhans are droppable sadhans. Sadhana chadhustaya sambatthi should be there during sravanam, mananam and nididyanam. Technically ti is vidyanta sadhana vicarah. That is why every stage of life is called asrama. Brahmacharya asrama and grahasthasrama etc. Whatever we experience is some sadhana or the other that takes us near the atma jnanam. Every stage of life is an asrama only if i utilize that stage for jnana prapti. The pointer is always moksa. The destination is otherwise moksa. That is the topic of the fourth pada. This has 17 adhikaranams and 52 sutras. This is an important adhikaranam. The basis for karma yoga of bhagavad gita is fourth pada of brahma sutra.

### **Topic 1 purusharthadhikaraam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.1 {426}**

#### ***Purushartha'tah saladiti baadarayanah***

From this [brahma vidya or brahma jnana results] the purpose or the chief object of pursuit of man, because the scriptures state so; thus [holds] the sage badanarayana.

First i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with 17 sutras. This is called purusarthadhikaranam. This is the biggest adhikaranam in the entire brahma sutra. The subject matter is atma jnanam the controversy here is can the atma jnanam give the phalam independently or not. Purva paksi says especially purva mimamsa claims no and he argues atma jnanam can never give any benefit by itself. Atma jnanam has to be used as an angam of

vaidhika karmani. The entire veda is there to prescribe karmas to spritual seeker and the karmas alone can produce moksa and atma jnanam is only an angam of karma. By seeing an angam it makes the karma complete. Without a limb, the whole cannot be there. If a person does not have a limb he is called angaheenah. As long as a limb is missing a person is not the whole. Purva mimamsa argues a karma is whole only if all the angas are there and one of the angas is atma jnanam. Karma produces results and atma jnanam completes the karma. We the siddhantins says atma jnanam is not karmangam. On the other hand atma jnanam by itself can give the biggest phalam of parama purusartha moksa. It is independent and swatantra and it can stand independently on its feet and bless you. The jnanad kevala jnanad moksa phalam is emphasized here. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we will see the general analysis of the first sutra. Jnanam can give result by itself because it is declared so in the veda itself. Jnanam is karma angam, along with jnanam rituals should be practiced, and sannyasa should never be taken. Purva mimamsa is against sannyasa. This is the essence of the first sutra.

The pramanam is 1.3.9 of mundaka upanishad that one who knows brahman merges with brahman. Brahma praptih alone is the moksa or the highest purushartha. Brahma is immortal and therefore brahma praptih is amrita praptih. It says that mere knowledge alone is sufficient to gain moksa. You do not require to do any karma. The next one is 2.1 of taittiriya upanishad. The knower of brahman attains the hgiherst purushartha. Third one is 7.1.3 of chandogya upanisad one who knows the atma crosses over sorrow. Jnanam removes sorrow. The first two are for sukha prapti and the third one relates to dukha nivrutti. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now i will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. There is direct benefit athah from self knowledge; sabdad means since this is declared by the sruti; iti badanarayanah this is the view of vyasa. Since vyasacharya resided in badrinat he is called badanarayana. Now we will come to the significance of the words. Purusartha means bhalam; any result is called purusartha. Any result is sought after by the human being and hence any phalam is called purusartha. In this context purusartha is moksaphalam. Atah means from this literally from this and here a pronoun is used. Here this refers to vidya or knowledge. We arrive at the meaning of the pronoun 'this' and this is the first sutra of the pada. And then what does it means by 'this'. The previous pada has analysed vidya and therefore the word atah should refer to vidya alone. Vidya can produce swatantra phalam without joining karma., in the previous pada two vidyas are talked about that is saguna brahma vidya as also nirguna isvara jnanam. For that we answer we refer to both of them. Even saguna upasana can give independent result without resorting to karma. Nirguna brahma phalam produces sadhyo mukti and saguna brahma jnanam gives krama mukti. This is the meaning of atah. Sabdat means sruti vakyat. Because, it is supported by the sruti. It is veda pramanam. Three upanishad vakyams have been given as sruti vakyams. Iti badanarayana this is the view of vyasacharya that is the siddhanti.

Jaimini the purva mimamsa says it is not correct and he will elaborately object our view in the following six sutras. Jaimini represents purva mimamsa purva paksa. The objection is that jnanam can never give any benefit independently and it has to go along with karma. This topic we have very elaborately discussed in 1.1.4 of brahma sutra. There adhi sankaracharya has analysed this. This portion is the basis for introducing the fourth sutra. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 307

### **Topic 1 purusharthadhikaraam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.2 {427}**

#### ***Seshatvatpurusharthavado yathanyashviti jaiminih***

Because of the self is supplementary [to sacrificial acts] [the fruits of the knowledge of the self] are mere praise of the agent as in other cases thus jaimini cpines.

Sutras 2 to 7 are purva paksa sutras and sutra 8 to 17 relates to siddhanta.

We are in the first adhikaranam of the fourth section of the third chapter. This has seventeen sutras, here we alone we claim knowledge by itself is capable of giving liberation. Knowledge does not require any extraneous factors to assist liberation. For arrival of knowledge we need other factors upasanam. Puja, pilgrimage etc., for rise of knowledge and once knowledge has come it is capable of giving liberation. Kevala jnanat eva purusarthah. Here parama purusartha moksa is the phalam. Bramavid apnoti param. Various upanishad mantras support this contention. Now jaimini objects saying that it is not so. In his sutras jaimini argues that mere jnanam cannot produce any phalam much less the moksa phalam. In this sutra jaimini gives a very technical argument against siddhanta. In this sutra what jaimini argues is that wherever jnanad eva kaivalyam is mentioned all of them should not be taken seriously. He all of them are arthavadha vakyani. Artha vadha means that it is mere glorification not to be taken as a fact. It has exaggeration for glorification, should not be taken literally.

Purva mimamsa analyses veda purva bagha the ritualistic portion of the vedas. Ordinary enquiry is called vichara and reverential enquiry is called mimamsa. Vedic enquiry is called mimamsa. Veda antha enquiry is called utara mimamsa. This purva mimamsa deals with rituals and they are called vaidhika karmas. All of them involves several factors. Rituals require several accessories, yejamana, priests, yejamana's wife, mantras etc., are required to complete karma. Each factor is called karma angam. Angam is required to complete a yagna or any ritual. This composite ritual is called angi. Karma is angi and every factor is called angam. Angani put together will make one angi. Even if you want to do a ganapathi homa at home, you need many angas. For a big yaga you need various angas. This is one point you should remember. Then the technical word you should note is anga samskarah or karmanga samskarah. Samskara means refinement anga samskara means refinement of anga or make the anga fit for the ritual. Varieties of activities are mentioned for purification of anga. Sometimes it is the removal of husk from the paddy. The removal becomes a samskara. When you bring vilvam it is a samskara to clean the vilvam. Priest has to clean it with



proksanam. This proksanam is called anga samskara. Yejamana has to have upanayanam and wedding to do the ritual. He is fit for ritual only after doing upanayanam and sandhayandanam ritual to do any ritual. Similarly wedding is another samskara for both husband and wife without which they are unfit to do many of the rituals. Some samskaras are there for materials, some for yejamana and some for ritvik and samskaras are vast and varied. Even using the appropriate material is a samskara. If the ladle is to be used for operation, you have to use a wooden ladle which comes under ladle samskara making it from appropriate raw material. Thus all of them will be called anga samskara. This is the second point to be noted.

The fourth point is that not all angams and anga samskaras can produce any result by themselves. Suppose someone pluck the vilvam tree. Even the trees are purified. For all this there is no benefit and benefit comes only when samskrita karmanga the purified flower is used for ritual and then the angi ritual alone will produce phalam. Angi alone will produce phalam and angam will assist angi to produce the phalam. The secondary materials and rituals will help the primary ritual to produce the result. Angam is valid with angi and is invalid by itself. Kevala angam and anga samskaram are nisphalam. Angam nisphalam. If angam is sapalam by itself, if a part is valid by itself it will no more be called a part and it will be independent ritual by itself. If a ritual is primary or dependent is decided by whether it has phalam or not. Thus any amount of vilva proksanam will give any exercise for hand and you will not get adhrista phalam. The very same phalam will give you archana phalam if you use it for shiva archana.

The fifth point that purva mimamsa says is that in some places in vedas for dravya samskara also phalam is mentioned. Dravya samskaran is only an angam and it has to be nishkalam only. But phalam is mentioned in the vedas. In purva mimamsa it is a big debate as to how to handle the veda vakyas. Logically angam should not have any phalam. Vedicly anga is given a phalam. This is issued in purva mimamsa adhikaranam. This we have to utilize in brahma sutra adhikaranam. Therefore i will briefly mention that occurs in purva mimamsa. It is called parna mayi adhikaranam and this adhikaranam of purva mimamsa analyses veda vakyam. The veda vakyam here says *yasya parna mayi juhoo bhavati na saha papam slokam srnoti* the meaning of this vakyam a vedic ritualist whenever he perform a ritual he has to use a particular ladle or wooden spoon to offer oblations or materials. This spoon is referred to in this mantra is juhoo. The veda says parnamayi juhoo bhavati the spoon should be made of palasa tree in this context. Parna mayi means made out of palasa tree. That is samskrita dravyam bhavati. It is samskrita karmanga dravyam. The wooden ladle and its samskara making out of the appropriate tree are angam. They can become angam only. It has to be logically nisphalam as it cannot produce any result. However, here veda gives a phalam. . The phalam papa sloka asravanam. Apapa sloka asravanam is the phalam. Papa slokam is negative news. Na srnoti means that yejamana who uses parnamayi ladle will not hear dukha news. He will have only mangala sravanam. In the parnamayi adhikaranam they have analysed what to do with the phala vakyam. The phalam mentioned there should not be taken literally. Really speaking it is nishphalam only by itself. Then why should phalam is mentioned and it is only to encourage the yejamana and impress upon him not to use any other juhoo. We should not take it as phala vakyam as it is only an arthavadha vakyam. The result will come only when the ladle is used in the ritual and ladle will then contribute in the final ritual mentioned in the veda. Therefore, they have come with a general rule. Anga phala bodhaka vakyam is arthavadah. A statement, which promises phalam for karma angam, is arthavadha. Angi phala bodhaka vakyam is phala vakyam. Since this law is established in parnamayi adhikaranam it is called parnamayi nyayah. It is this law anga phala bodhaka

vakyam arthavadha which we is quoted here. This we have to apply this in atma jnanam. Purva mimamsa says atma jnana phala bodhaka vakyam is also an arthavadha like parnamayi vakyavad..atma jnanam is also an angam and atma jnana bhola vakyam karma angatvat. He argues without atma jnanam a person can never become an yejamana of a vedic ritual. In fact, atma jnanam alone makes him eligible for a karma. Yejamana is one of the karma anga. Without kartru karaka how karakam come. Just as vilvam require proksana samskara, a ritualist need a samskara and atma jnanam alone makes him a samskrita purusa to perform a ritual. Most of the vedic rituals talks about attainment of higher loka prapti. Also it talks about purva janma papa nasa etc. It means if i look upon myself as the body i know at the time of death i will be finished on death. Therefore, i can never talk about going to another loka after death. A materialist will never accept swarga, naraga, will not perform shrardha. He will says father is dead and gone and where is the question of he going to some other loka. He will not believe in para loka. He cannot perform any vaidhika karma either for his ancestors or for his own gathi. This is possible only if i believe that i am different from the body. This happens only when i accept deha vyatirikta atma. People ask what is the proof for the existence of swarga and naraga and therefore the performance of shrardha is reducing. They do not accept soul. Purva mimamsa argues only if you accept soul you will accept punya papa and swarga and naraga. Atma jnanam only makes one eligible for religious activity. Then atma jnanam become karma anga samskara. Faith in veda pramana and faith in the knowledge that i am different from the body makes one eligible for vaidhika karmani.

Third point like the parnamayi vakyam, since it is karmanga phalam all the vakyams are arthavadha vakyams. After listening you should do lot of ritual. This is only an appetizer for yajna anustanam. Atma jnanam is require for vaidhika karma. Therefore atma jnanam is karma angam. Then atma jnanam is nishphalam by itself; then the fourth point is artha jnana phala vakyam is artha vadha. All the pramana vakya quoted by siddhanta are said to be artha vakyam as per purva mimamsa. Therefore they do not support siddhanta as per jaimini. The attainment of swarga alone is moksa as per purva mimamsa. Going to heaven is seen as moksa or eternity as per purva mimamsa. This is the general analysis of the second sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Seshatvat means since the self is connected with karma, purusarthavadha such statements of direct benefit [are only figurative]. Figurative means arthavadha. Yatha anyeshu as in other cases. Iti jaimini means this is the view of jaimini. There is some incidental point which i will give you. Vyasacharya is supposed to be the guru of jaimini and jaimini is sishya of vyasacharya. If sishya becomes purva paksa of guru it is credit of guru or discredit. After elaborate teaching if jaimini jnanam nishphalam it is fundamental mistake by sishya of vyasacharya. This is the worry of some of the sub-commentators. Jaimini is not a real purva paksa and he knows vedanta very well and he knows atma jnanam will give moksa. But still to show that this discussion must be in the form of guru sishya dialogue vyasa and jaimini names are given it is said. Jaimini is seen to be acting as purva paksa. The significance of the words we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 308

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.2 {427}**

#### ***Seshatvatpurusharthavado yathanyashviti jaiminih***

Because of the self is supplementary [to sacrificial acts] [the fruits of the knowledge of the self] are mere praise of the agent as in other cases thus jaimini cpines.

We have completed the second sutra of the second adhikaranam. Here vyasacharya establishes atma jnanam is sufficient to give liberation without the help of any other sadhana like karma. This was given as a pratijna in the first sutra. This is revealed in the sruti pramanam itself. When this pratijna was given jaimini comes and says that this is not an acceptable idea and he elaborately presented that kevala jnanam can never give liberation and jnanam can serve as only as a karma angam. Atma jnanam can only enhance the efficacy of karma and this enhanced karma will give liberation. This he wants to establish in these sutras. In the second sutra he gives the important and technical argument which we understood in four stages.

First point he gave was atma jnanam is only makes vedic ritualist eligible for performing vedic ritual. Therefore it is kartru samskara rupam. Only when we have atma jnanam we accept that there is jivatma different from the body and we also comes to know the death of the body and this jivatma can acquire punyam and it can travel to swarga with the help of acquired punyam. The existence of the soul the travel of the soul, and its acquisition of punyam and going to swarga can be known only through veda pramana and the materialist can never accept deha vyadirikta atma. Thus he can do punya karma and go to higher loka and avoid papa karma and avoid lower loka.

The second point is that atma jnanam is karma angam. It can only be a portion and it can be only a karma angam bhavati. The third point is that therefore atma jnanam is swatah nishphalam. Angam can never independent result and angi alone can produce result. It can only assist angi to produce result and by itself it cannot give any benefit. Atma jnanam is nishphalam. The fourth point relevant here is therefore atma jnana phala bodhaka vakyam artha vadhah. This statement you should understand and then only this adhikaranam is relevant. Wherever the veda says atma jnanam gives independent result should be taken as artha vadha. Any karma phalam is logically anithyam and if somewhere says karma phalam is nithyam you interpret it as artha vadha. In the same way the various statements atma jnanam gives moksa is artha vadha alone. Wherever the atma jnanam is said to give phalam is artha vadha. Therefore all the pramana vakyams quoted in the first sutra by vyasacharya are artha vadha and we should not take them seriously. As an example he quoted parnamayi vakyam where phalam is mentioned for using appropriate ladle for a ritual for which there is no phalam. Phalam is mentioned in purva mimamsa kanda and that phalam is mentioned as artha vadha. There the statement of purva mimamsa is dravya samskara karmasu pararthatvat

phalsruti arhtavadhasyat. Therefore jnanad kaivalyam is not a fact. Now i will give you the significance of the words in the second sutra.

Seshatvat means angatvat; it is vaidhika karmangam atma jnanam is vaidhika karmangam. Therefore atma jnanam is nishphalam. Purushartha means moksa phalam and vadha means vedic statement. Therefore, purushartha vadha means vedic statement which mentions moksa phalam for jnanam [arthavadhah]. Arthavadhah means not to be taken seriously. Since self-knowledge is a part of ritual, wherever result is mentioned for self-knowledge should be taken as figurative and not factual. Yatha anyeshu means as in other instances like parnamayi vakyam juhoor bhavati. That vakyam is phala bodhaka vakyam. That veda vakyam is artha vadha. Adhi sankaracharya gives three different instances. But did not give all the three examples. One more interesting example is this. Yat anthe caksur eva braturasya vingte according to veda a vedic ritualist has to apply the colerium [kanmai] at the time of ritual. That is presented as karmangam. It struck me because at the time of wedding to kasi yatra, he is way laid by the girl's family etc. When the bridegroom goes, the [kanmai] is applied for drishti. For this there is veda vakyam for entry into grahasthasrama is entry into vedic ritual. Here this example is quoted this application of anjanam is karma angam and it does not have any result by itself. Yet veda gives a result and it yejamana samskara and this also should be taken as arthavadha vakyam. Therefore yatha anyeshu. Iti jaimini this is the view of jaimini maharishi. He is functioning as purva paksi to vyasacharya yet he is an advaidin only and he takes the role of purva paksi but he is not really a purva paksi. Now we go to the third sutra.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.3 {428}**

#### ***Acharadarsanat.***

Because we find [from the scriptures such] conduct [of men of realization]

The objection raised in sutra 2 is strengthened.

First i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here purva paksi argument is that veda talks about the lifestyle of many jnanis like janaka. Janaka was great jnani as seen from brihadharaynaka upanisad. In the veda it is mentioned janaka performs many yagas 3.1.1 of brihadharaynaka upanisad] the very beginning of the mantra is that he has performed very, very big yagas involving big dakshinas. That means janaka was a great ritualist and he became a great jnani also. From this it is clear that janaka used jnanam as karma angam and he had regular rituals. He wanted to boost his karma with the teachings. Lifestyle of jnanis supports our view is the view of jaimini.

Now we will go to word for word analysis of the sutra. Achara darsanat to the scriptural reference to the performance of karma by jnanis jnanam is karmangam. Atma jnanam is only a ritual and not swatantram. Now we will see the significance of the words. Achara and darsanat are two words. Acharah means jnaninam karma anustanam. Performance of vedic rituals of great jnanis like janaka. Darsanat means we come to know or we understand. We do not janaka performing rituals and we learn through veda pramanam alone. Therefore, kevala

jnanam does not give moksa and learn vedanta and continue all vedic rituals systematically and elaborately without that knowledge will not give liberation.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.4 {429}**

##### ***Tacchurteh***

Because scripture directly declares that [viz., that knowledge of brahman stands in a subordinate relation to sacrificial acts]

The sruti also says that vidya is an anga of karma.

Firsts i will give the general analysis of the sutra. Purva paksi says that veda clearly indicates that vidya is an anga. 1.1.10 of chandogya upanisad says that yadeva vidyaya karodhi sraddaya upanisada tadeva virya vastaram bhavati and it says whatever ritual you do, do it with jnanam. From this it is clear with jnanam when karma is performed, karma will give more benefits. The very same karma supported by jnanam is more efficacious. Purva mimamsaka further argues the mere karma will give finite result and karma with vidya will give nithya phalam or moksa. This is the argument of the purva paksa. Therefore jnanam karmanah angah. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now i will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Tacchruteh means since this is mentioned in the sruti itself [jnanam is karmangam]. Jnanam is karmangam and therefore jnanam is nishphalam and it is arthavadha vakyam and therefore pratijna given in first sutra is wrong. Now i will give you the significance of the words. Tacchruteh is tad chruteh. Chruteh means sruti pramanam. Tad means this idea. This idea that jnanam only enhances the result of karma and it does not do anything and such an idea is given in the sruti, the sruti statement is chandogya upanisad 1.1.10.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.5 {430}**

##### ***Samanvarambhanat***

Because the two [knowledge and work] go together [with the departing soul to give fruits of actions]

The objection in sutra 2 is continued.

Purva paksi continues and he gives further support. First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. He refers to 4.4.2 of brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam. This mantra talks about the jivatma leaving the body at the time of death. The departing soul is followed by the

knowledge and the work it is said in the above sruti vakyam. The adhikaranam and prana etc., go through the hole of the body. That jivatma is accompanied by three things such as vidya [jnanam], karmani [karma] and is the purva prajna the vasanas. Incidentally, there is difference between karma phalam and vasanas even though both are generated by karma. For example when i regularly take coffee, because of the regularly taking i get habituated to coffee. This habit is called vasana. Our tendency to repeat is vasana. Similarly is the smoking habit. Whereas damage done by the liquor or coffee done to the system is called karma phalam. That karma phalam will be there and it will continue even if you break the vasana. Sometimes you may stop the karma phalam and vasana will continue; sometimes you may stop vasana but karma phalam may continue. Therefore purva paksi says jnanam is never independent and it goes along with karma. This is general analysis of the sutra.

Now i will give you the word for word analysis of the sutra. Samanvarambhana since karma and jnanam go together along with jiva [jnanam is karmangam]. Now i will give the significance of the words. Samanvarambhanam means saha gamanam traveling along. Vyasacharya wants to remind of brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam 4.4.2 where the verb used is samanvaradete. Both go together with jivatma. There is no swatantra jnanam and it always goes together.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.6 {431}**

#### ***Tadvatu vidhanat***

Because [the scriptures] enjoin [works] for such [only who understand the purport of the vedas.

The objection begun in the sutra 2 is continued.

This is another small and simple sutra. Here purva paksi further reinforces his conclusion. Here he refers to another vedic mantra which is taken from 8.15.1 of chandogya upanisad. In this mantra the content is what a vaidhika should do in his life. It says that he should be properly educated from proper acharya both in terms of loukika and spiritual knowledge. Only then he will have four purushartha. Promoting secular knowledge he will have only one knowledge that is earn and entertain. Earn for five days and entertain for one day. Even if you teach them yoga, they will use yoga to enhance the entertainment. Therefore veda says not to commit the mistake and it teaches to have both loukika and vedantic knowledge and have dharma and moksa and design the life to have artha kama pradhana in the initial stages and then slowly it should turn to dharma moksa pradhana. Therefore purva paksi says one should have veda jnanam in the beginning and veda jnanam is atma jnanam in brahmacharya asrama itself and then one should get married. Then one should according to chandogya upanisad after atma jnanam he should enter grahasthasrama, with atma jnanam he should perform all actions in the grahasthasrama. He should do all the vaidhika karmani. Read vedam and do all karma is essence of this mantra. Purva paksi says gain atma jnanam and perform the ritual and from this it is clear that atma jnanam is necessary for performance of vedic rituals. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will go to word for word analysis of the sutra. Vithanat since karma is prescribed tadvatah means for a person this vedic knowledge [atma jnanamm is karmangam]. This is the running meaning. Vidhanam since veda has prescribed that one should do karma and karma performance is compulsory. Tad dvatah means veda jnanavan. Purva paksi assumes veda jnanam is atma jnanam. Therefore atma jnanam is a qualification for karma and with that qualification one should do karma. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 309

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.6 {431}**

#### ***Tadvatu vidhanat***

Because [the scriptures] enjoin [works] for such [only who understand the purport of the vedas.

The objection begun in the sutra 2 is continued.

In this first adhikaranam of the fourth pada vyasacharya establishes that mere self-knowledge is sufficient to gain liberation without any assistance from karma. Karma only prepares the mind. We do not totally negate karma. Karma's role is indirect in preparing the mind. Since karma's role is only preparation of the mind, then one can drop the karma once he gains atma jnanam. Karma helps one to gain siddha suddhi and even without karma he can gain atma jnanam and also gain jivan mukti and viveka mukti. We negate the direct role of karma in producing moksa. Negation of direct role is not the negation if indirect role. The purpose of adhikaranam is the negation of direct role of karma in liberation. Jaimini's argument is that jnanam can only assist karma and ultimate liberation is possible only through karma assisted by jnanam. Jnanam is thus a karmanga.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.7 {432}**

#### ***Niyamaccha***

And on account of prescribed rules.

The argument begun in sutra 2 is concluded here.

First we will see general analysis of the sutra. Here purva paksi points out that sruti says that every sadhaka should perform vaidhika karma throughout the life. Karma cannot be renounced any time. Until death, karma has to be done. This is given in isavasya upanishad mantra 2. Anihotra is a sacrifice lasting to live a hundred years. One should perform karma to live long. Let us live hundred years doing karma. From this it is clear kevala jnanam does not exist at all and karma is there throughout life. It is jnana sahitam karma and there is no time when karma is absent. Logic also support this view. Therefore vedic injunction says karma should be eternally done and hence atma jnanam is a karma angam alone.



Now we will see word for word analysis of the sutra. Niyamaccha because of vedic injunction also [this is confirmed]. Now i will give you the significance of the words. Niyamaccha means vidhih and vidhih means commandment; the conclusion is that this is confirmed and it means purva paksi says that my argument is confirmed that atma jnanam is karma angam. Cha means also that the present argument is added to the argument given in the previous sutras.

## **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

### **Sutra 3.4.8 {433}**

#### ***Adhikopadesaattu baadarayanasyaivam taddarsanat***

But because [the scriptures] teach [the supreme self to be] either [than the agent] baadarayana's view is correct [or valid] for that is seen thus [in scriptural passages].

First, i will give the general analysis of the sutra. Here vyasacharya's answer begins. He gives answers point by point to purva paksi. Second sutra is refuted here.

The argument given by purva paksi is this. The argument is that anything used for refinement of accessories of karma or vedic ritual will not produce any result by itself. The result will be produced after the completion of karma using all the accessories. It is swayam nishphalam. He argues that atma jnanam is a samskara karma, which will refine a vedic ritual. Yejamana develops knowledge that i am not the body, i am the atma different from the body, and then he does the ritual with full faith that i am different from the body. Then alone one is attracted to the karma and karma phalam. All this is done to gain superior loka. Materialists with no jnanam will say that all rituals are redundant. Only if i know that i survive and i travel then only it will add punyam to jiva and it will help gaining a higher loka. Therefore purva mimamsa says deha vyatirikta jnanam is vaidhika karmani. Jnanam will give any phalam by itself, it will help vaidhika karma, and that alone will give phalam. Since karmanga jnanam is nishkalam if at all if any phalam is given in the sastra, all the phalam are arthavadha. This is in short the argument of purva mimamsa.

Now vyasacharya gives the answer. Vyasacharya says that veda gives deha vyatirikta atma jnanam that atma is different from the body. But the truth is that there are two types of deha vyatirikta atma. One type is predominantly purva bagha of veda and the second deha vyatirikta atma is dealt with in vedanta bagha or jnana kanda. The karma kandis have not understood this. They mix up the two and get confused. The two-deha vyatirikta atmas of which one of them is paricchinna karta atma. This alone is famously known as the traveling soul. The composition of this atma is made up of sookshma sariram, karana sariram, chidhabasa and chit is included but it does not travel. Chit is the chaitanyam. Chit is all pervading and sarvagatvat eva sthanuh. Paricchinna karta atma is sookshma sariram, karana sariram and chidhabasa. It is generally translated departed traveling soul and it require shrartham tarpanam etc.

Then vyasacharya says that there is another deha vyatirikta atma predominantly discussed in jnana kanda, which is ignored by karam kandis. In veda there is fertile and barren portion. Fertile portion is karma kanda and dry portion is jnana kanda. Unfortunately jnana kanda

deha vyatirikta atma number two the chit amsa excluding the sookshma sariram excluding karana sariram excluding chidhabasa is ignored by the purva mimamsa. Chit is aparicchinna akarta atma.

Then vyasacharya argues that first atma is karmangam as it is karta. Karta is one of the six karakas. Deha vyatirikta atma number one is anga and yejamana samskara is useful for vedic karma. But the second akarta atma can never be a karmangam. Akarta atma is not karmangam. The second atma jnanam does not refine karta and on the other hand, the second atma jnanam destroys the very karta. First atma jnanam will refine karta, second one will destroy karta, and therefore we say second atma jnanam is not a karmangam. That atma jnanam promises phalam and that vakyam cannot be karmangam. Your problem is because you apply parnamayi adhikaranam is applied in a wrong place.

Vyasacharya says study vedanta for every other mantra talks of aparicchinna atma. 1.2. 18 of kathopanisad. This mantra talks of deha vyatirikta akarta atma. In the next mantra it is said that atma is akarta abokta and after knowing i am akarta how can i be interested in vaidhika karma. This is the technical answer given by vyasacharya.

Now i will give word for word analysis of the sutra. Adhikopadesat tu means this is not so; vyasacharya refutes jaimini. Adhikopadesat means because a superior self is taught in vedanta. Baadaranayasya means the teaching of vyasacharya [is correct]. Taddarsanat means since superior self is clearly revealed in the sruti statement [it has to be accepted.] This is the word meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Tu means purva paksa refutation. Adhika upadesat means the superior atma distinct from atma of karma kanda; vedantins says jivatma in totally different context. For us jivatma is one with paramatma. The difference between karma kanda jivatma and jnana kanda jivatma is one is paricchinna karma jivatma and the other is aparicchinna akarma jivatma. Evam means in this manner that is based on the new information that there are two deha vyatirikta jivatma. When I say Jivatma is purushah or sthree I refer to Jivatma is gender centered Jivatma. Karma is performed by sariram. The moment I want to do ritual I come to the body level. Similar when we talk about traveling after death, we take Sookshma Sariram Chidhabasa have to be included. When I say you are nithya Brahman at that time we talk of Atma the Chaitanyam. Evam means srusti bedat. Atma Jnanam gives liberation. Therefore Baadaranayasya the teaching of Vyasacharya is correct. The second Atma is taught in Veda is clearly found in the Upanishad. The mantra kept in mind is Kathopanisad. Therefore Jaimini is wrong in this context. In karma kanda Atma Jnanam refers to deha vyatirikta paricchinna karmangam. I can do shrardham if I feel that other than the body there is an ancestor's soul, which has traveled to higher loka etc. Whatever lokas he has gone to, it has to go to him in the appropriate form as I have faith in Vedas. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 310

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.8 {433}**

*Adhikopadesaattu baadarayanasyaivam taddarsanat*

But because [the scriptures] teach [the supreme self to be] either [than the agent] baadarayana's view is correct [or valid] for that is seen thus [in scriptural passages].

We are in the first adhikaranam with 17 sutras. Here Vyasacharya analyses whether Atma vidya can give benefit independently or not. Our condition is that Atma Jnanam is swatantra and capable of producing Purushartha or highest phalam of moksa. This is our condition. Purva Mimamsa challenges our contention and he says Atma Jnanam is only a karma angam and it can assist vedic ritual and it alone give ultimate result of swarga. According to Purva Mimamsa swarga is eternal and eternity is moksa and therefore swarga is karma phalam and therefore it is moksa and moksa is karma phalam. For doing karma Atma Jnanam is an angam. He elaborately presented his views from sutra 2 to 7. Now Vyasacharya has started refuting the Purva Mimamsa contention from sutra 8. Sutra refutes the second sutra. We have completed the 8<sup>th</sup> sutra and our argument is that Atma vidya is not understood clearly. When purva paksa refers to Atma vidya it is number one obtaining in Karma Kanda and we talk of Atma vidya number two obtaining in jnana kanda. Atma vidya one is deha vyatirikta paricchinna kartru Atma vidya and what we talk is deha vyatirikta aparicchinna akartru Atma Jnanam. Our conclusion is Atma Jnanam number two is not karmangam. Now we will enter into the sutra 9.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.9 {434}**

*Tulyam to darsanam*

But the declaratioms of the sruti equally support both the views.

This sutra refutes the view expressed in sutra 3.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. This answers the Purva Paksi argument given in the sutra 3. Now we will see what is said in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sutra. Purva Paksi quoted 3.1.1. Of Brihadharaynaka upanisad where it is stated that janaka and Atma jnani performed yaga. Achara means janakati naminam acharah. Jnanis also were grahasthas and they performed vaidhika karmas. Thus the Atma Jnanam was an angam of vaidhika karma. This is the Purva

Paksi contention based on Brihadharaynaka upanisad 3.1.1. Here answer is given in this sutra. If you quote one mantra, all about the grahastha jnani, I will quote sannyasi jnanis vaidhika karmas are not there. In the case of sannyasis there is no vaidhika karmas. From that it is clear that jnanam is not a karma angam as in the case of sannyasis there is karma angam. Since vedic support is tulyam equal for you and me, support is equal both cannot win by the vedic quotation. Now the question is what is the vedic quotation we give in support of our argument. Adhi Sankaracharya says that Brihadharaynaka upanisad is full of sannyasa. The example 3.5.1 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad kahola Brahmanam first mantra. After gaining Atma Jnanam the Upanishad says these jnanis give up all karmas and live on biksas and lead a life of sannyasis. Veda says that they alone are the real Brahmanams and they alone help one gaining liberation. Therefore you cannot quote achara as your support.

Now we will go to the word analysis of the sutra. Darsanam ca tu scriptural reference is indeed tulyam a common support [for both]. This is the running meaning. Now I will give the significance of the words. Darsanam means sruti pramana or sruti vakyam; tulyam means sruti vakyam is equal to both. Sruti vakyams are there many. For purva paksa it is 3.1.1. Of Brihadharaynaka upanisad and for siddhanta quotes his own references from Upanishad. This sutra refuted third sutra.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.10{435}**

#### ***Asarvatrici***

[the scriptural declaration referred to in sutra 4] is not of universal application.

The refutation of the objection is continued. This sutra specially refutes sutra 4.

First we will remember the fourth sutra. There Purva Mimamsa said that there is sruti vakyam that says vidya goes along with karma in 1.1.10 of Chandogya upanisad. That mantra said that it is very clear that vidya reinforces the efficacy of karma. From this it is clear that Atma Jnanam is karmanga. Vyasacharya says that it uses the word vidya and it has not said Atma Jnanam. Vidya should be understood according to the context. In Upanishad vidya is used in two different meaning. One is saguna Brahma Upasana and another is nirguna Brahma jnanam. Even if there is a word nriguna Brahma Upasanam, there it should be taken as nriguan Brahma jnanam. The question is which meaning we should take in the context while taking the meaning of the word Atma Jnanam. In 1.1.10 of Chandogya upanisad we come to know that it is in the context of Upasana alone and nirguna jnanam starts only after 6<sup>th</sup> chapter alone. If you go to the first chapter the Upanishad talks about udgitha Upasana and therefore this mantra refers to saguna Upasanam and not all saguna Upasanam and it refers to saguna udgitha Upasana and you cannot take that mantra out of context and quote that mantra wrongly. The word vidya does not refer to all form of vidya and it refers to saguna Upasana vidya alone.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Asarvatrici means the Chandogya upanisad statement quoted by you [purva paksa] is not applicable to all vidyas. Now I will give the significance of the word. Asarvatrici sarvatrici means applicable to all. And

asarvatrici means not applicable to all cases. All cases means all types of vidyas which means saguna Upasana and nirguna jnanam you should not uniformly extend and you should take it applicable to saguna vidya alone and you should note that the context there is udgitha Upasana alone. You should not bring nirguna jnanam in this context. All this is because vidya has used the word loosely in all cases Sagunam and Nirgunam. With this the fourth sutra is refuted.

## **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

### **Sutra 3.4.11 {436}**

#### ***Vibhogah satavat***

There is division of knowledge and work as in the case of a hundred [divided between two persons]

The sutra specially refutes sutra 5.

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya refutes the 5<sup>th</sup> sutra given by the purva paksa. Here Purva Mimamsa quoted another Brihadharaynaka upanisad vakyam in his support. The vakyam quoted by him is 4.4.2 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad that states the departing soul is followed by vidya [knowledge] and karma [work] and past experiences. This statement takes as his support and he takes vidya as Atma Jnanam and karma as vaidhika karma and it is his wrong interpretation. Atma vidya sahita karma accompany the dead and traveling jiva and hence Atma Jnanam is karmangam only and it is not swatantram. Siddhanta answers this point in two stages. One is by Adhi Sankaracharya and the other is by Vyasacharya. Adhi Sankaracharya says that the word vidya in this mantra does not refer to nirguna Atma Jnanam at all and vidya refers to saguna Upasanam only. Vidya karmani means Upasana karmani only. This is clear from better reading of the mantra 4.4.2 and the latter mantras up to 4.4.6 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. In 4.4.6 that the travel after death refers to ajnanis who have desires and if ajnani travel with vidya and karma that vidya can mean only Upasana. Nirguna Brahma ajnani saguna Brahma Upasana phalam and that is clearly said in the mantra. The nirguna Brahma jnani does not travel at all. Where is the question of traveling with either karma or vidya etc. In the case of jnani his prana does not go out of the body. The Sookshma Sariram does not go out of the body. The first stage of answer is that the word vidya does not refer to Atma vidya. The second stage of answer is that even saguna vidya does not travel with karma all the time. It is o because this mantra is not talking about particular jiva but all ajnani jiva in general as to how they travel after death. You cannot travel they travel with vaidhika karma and vaidhika Upasanas because there are many people who are nasthikas. Nasthikas will not do vaidhika karmas as they do not believe in the vaidhika mantras. It says jiva travel with whatever karma they do whatever the knowledge they have vaidhikam or loukikam. Therefore karma and Upasana should not be taken as combination but should be taken as apportionment. Some travel with karma and some with karma and Upasana and some with vaidhika karma and some with loukika karma only and some with karma and Upasana and Upasana also vaidhika Upasana and loukika Upasana that is meditation upon wealth. Therefore the word vidya and karma do not refer to Atma Jnanam and vaidhika karma but generally refers to any karma and any vidya according to the performance of the persons; all karma will not go to all people and all vidya will not go to all

the people. Therefore, it is apportionment and not combination. Appropriate karma will go with appropriate person. . This is the answer and Vyasacharya gives an example. Suppose a person is called to take up a contract work and he is asked to do some cleaning or something. After the job is over, the employer gives one hundred rupees and he says that the money is to be paid to the workers. Money should be apportioned between the workers and the division will not be uniform and it will be decided according to work. When Veda says karma and Upasana it does not mean karma and Upasana for all and combination anga angi bhava is not meant here. This is the second stage of answer.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Vibhagah means apportionment [of karma and vidya is to be understood] satavat means like the apportionment of hundred [among the people]. Now I will give you the significance of the words.vibhagah means some will go with karma and some with vidya and in karma and vidya loukika and vaidhika. Vidya should not include Atma vidya that comes in 4.4.6 of Chandogya upanisad. Satavat means hundred indicates hundred rupees or any currency and it refers to satasya vibhagavat. Adhi Sankaracharya takes the hundred priests with different dakshinas or rates. The head priests distributes according to the type of work done by the priests.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.12 {437}**

#### ***Adhyayanamatravatah***

[the scriptures enjoin work] on those who have merely read Vedas.

The sutra specially refutes sutra 6.

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya refutes the sutra 6. In the sixth sutra Purva Paksi quoted a Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.15.1. The essence of the mantra is that every person should go to a Guru in Brahmacharya asrama and learn Veda and after vaidhika jnanam he should go to grahasthasrama and perform rituals. This Purva Paksi takes as his support. He says vedic study means Atma Jnanam because Veda deals with Atma jnanam. With that Atma Jnanam he should perform karma and therefore Atma Jnanam is a part of karma after gaining jnanam. Everyone should have vedic study and all should have Atma Jnanam and the question is which Atma Jnanam is meant here. In Brahmacharya asrama when one learns Atma Jnanam it is Atma Jnanam number one and not two. He will study the ritualistic portion and through all the study he will know the Atma vidya number one deha vyatirikta paricchinna vidya. This is needed for a grahastha otherwise he will not accept a soul and do shrardha etc. If they ave really gone through sastra, one will not give up shrardha karma. One may give money to orphanages but not in replacement of shrardha but is should be in addition to shrardha. We do not refer to Atma vidya two. Atma vidya two comes very much later. After Sravanam Mananam Nididyasanam etc., Atma Jnanam comes and therefore Chandogya upanisad quotation does not apply to Atma vidya.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Adyayana matra vatah the prescription of karma is only for one who has studies the Vedas. Now we come to the significance of the words. Adyayana matram means one who studied Vedas only and one is

to learn to chant the Vedas and learning also includes Atma number one deha vyatirikta paricchinna kartru Atma. Karma Kanda Atma vidya. This is meant in Chandogya upanisad mantra. It does not include the jnana kanda Atma. If in brahmacharya asrama he gains jnanam, Veda will say he is akarta where is question of karma. Adhyayana matravan means a person who has the knowledge of chanting and Karma Kanda Atma. Atma Jnanam never goes with rituals. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 311

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.12 {437}**

#### ***Adhyayanamatravatah***

[the scriptures enjoin work] on those who have merely read Vedas.

The sutra specially refutes sutra 6.

We have completed the first 12 sutras of the first adhikaranam of the fourth pada of the third chapter. In this important adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes knowledge itself is capable of giving liberation and jnanam does not require karma. This Purva Mimamsa is not able to understand because he has an important theory based upon which he looks at entire Veda that if you have to get something you have to do something. Without doing something you cannot get anything. It is his philosophy. According to him entire Veda is to make you do something. For artha and kama and dharma Purushartha you have to do something and for moksa you have do more thing. Knowledge will teach you how to do, when to do, how much to do etc., and knowledge helps you do sadhana and Vedanta vichara he accepts and he says that Vedanta vichara will give you jnanam but you have with jnanam do sadhanam. The knowledge you talk of will only help you do sadhana. The knowledge is not sufficient but do something with that knowledge to get some result. Doing alone will do something in future. Future happening event alone will give liberation. Jnanam will not produce phalam directly. This is his strong contention. Even Vedantic students have this feeling that after gaining knowledge one has to do something to get something. That sadhanam which is called doing a karma alone will give liberation. It is their unshakable faith and belief. This is the orientation karmaga Purva Mimamsa. He gives this from sutra 2 to 7. Then from sutra 8 Vyasacharya has been refuting each one of the Purva Mimamsa sutras. In the last sutra 12, Vyasacharya said that vaidhika Atma Jnanam is required to do karma sadhana but what you should know is vaidhika Atma Jnanam is two fold one is Veda purva janya Atma Jnanam and another is vedanta janya Atma Jnanam. First one is karmangam which will help you do ritual and what we deal with here is the second one and it is Vedanta janya aparicchinna akartru Atma jnanam and it is not karmangam but karma nasakam. There is no question of any karma after gaining knowledge.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.13 {438}**



### *Navishesat*

There being no specification [the rule does] not [specially apply to him who knows, i.e., a jnani.

First we will a general analysis of the sutra. This and the next sutra refute the sutra 7 of purva paksa. The purva paksa contention is that he quoted Isavasya Upanishad mantra number 2 that the first line is relevant and that says a person should do karma throughout the life even when he desires to live hundred years and he should do karam all the hundred years. From this it is clear that karma must be there throughout life. This means even when you choose to gain Atma Jnanam and from this it is clear that jnanam coexists with karma and there is no question of kevala jnanam and jnanam must go with karma throughout the life. Therefore jnanam is karmangam. It should continue until death. This is the contention of Purva Mimamsa. For this two answers are given.

Here Vyasacharya says that Isavasya says that one should do karma throughout the life. It has not been mentioned who should do karmas. The subject is not mentioned. There is no specification of who should do. Whether the rule is applicable to jnani or ajnani or whether it is applicable to both the sruti does not mention. According to the context we have to supply keeping the context in mind. The subject here is ajnani. As long as he or she is ajnani, one must continue to do karma since travel after preparation is involved. Travel means preparation. After death travel requires punya dollars and that can be gained only through karma alone. That punyam dollar alone will help travel after death. Therefore this mantra refers to traveling ajnani and for him karma is compulsory. For jnani there is no travel involved. Therefore the mantra is relevant to ajnani and do not quote this mantra in the context of a jnani.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. There are two words. Na means the vedic injunction is not meant for a jnani. Aviseshat means because there is no such specification. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Na means vidic injunction is not meant for the jnani. Aviseshat means there are no specifications which means that the vidhi is applicable to jnani or ajnani is not there and therefore we will have to see whether it includes jnani or not. On enquiry we find that jnani is not included here. Vedic ritual should never be given up. It is reemphasized that they have to be done. This means sannyasa should not be taken. Sannyasi cannot do dhanam tapas etc. In fact he should not do. Adhi Sankaracharya says that yagno dhanam tapas papanani maheshinam. Papanani means purifiers. All the karmas are meant for purification and therefore they are relevant until purification. It is not after purification. The vedic karmas are compulsory for those who are not purified and who wish to get purified. Similarly karmani kurvan eva means until siddha suddhi and jnanam comes karma is needed. After getting Atma Jnanam there is no need of karma.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.14 {439}**

### ***Stutaye'numatirva***

Or rather the permission [to do work] is for the glorification [of knowledge]

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. He takes the same mantra quoted by purva paksa. The mantra is kurvannevaha and this is the commandment directed towards ajnani and do not include it to a jnani. Second interpretation says that it is not a commandment but it only gives a permission to do karma. It is not an injunction but a permission. It is not an ajna but it is anujna. Ajna means you should do but anujna means you may do. This permission to do karma is directed to a jnani. A jnani is given permission to continue to do karma. That means he has permission to renounce karma and also has permission to do karma also. The first mantra of Isavasya deals with a jnani. In the mantra it is said that one should reject the world taking the world as mithya. You reject the world as mithya by seeing sathya Isvara. This refers to jnani who sees Brahman alone sathyam and everything else is mithya. That jnani is allowed to continue karma if he wants to do karma. For this Vyasacharya says he is allowed to do karma to glorify the the jnanam. Permission to do karma glorifies jnanam by showing that karma phalam will not affect you at all. Karma phalam will not taint a jnani. Jnani is not affected by karma and jnanam gives him immunity and serves as a kavacham even when problems are there, he has the jnanam raincoat. This applies to a grahastha. The second interpretation is very useful to show that jnanam will save him. Grahastha ashrama we have named wherever you are, it is ashrama only. You continue karma to glorify jnanam. He may take sannyasa. Taking external sannyasa is not very important. But jnanam is compulsory whether you want to renounce or not.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Va anumathih means it is a vedic permission to do karma; stutaye means for the glorification of knowledge. Now we will come to the significance of the words. Va indicates the second interpretation. That indicates the alternative interpretation. Anumathih means the permission, permission means vedic permission. Stutaye means for the sake of glorification of jnanam; jnanam here means pratama mantra ukta sthutaye the Atma Jnanam mentioned in the first mantra. Other than jnanam there is no method by which you can save yourself from karma. If you want to get immunity from karma, better study Vedanta. Karma affects and karma phalam affects you. There are many things you want to escape. But you have to do and enjoy doing whatever you have to do because of your designation. With this the refutation of sutra 7 is over.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.15 {440}**

#### ***Kamakarena chaikē***

And some according to their own liking [have abandoned all works].

The argument in refutation of Jaimini's views is continued.

With the previous sutra all the purva paksa sutra have been directly and specifically negated. In the following two sutras Vyasacharya establish jnanam will help you to gain moksa which

is your own nature. First we will do general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya refers to 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanishad. In this mantra the Upanishad says that all the wise people are fully satisfied with their wisdom itself. And we know this because after wisdom they do not go after any means or any ends. There is no pravritti towards sadhanam and there is no pravritti towards sadhyam. Similarly, karams are sadhanam and swarga is sadhyam. Through karma one gets swarga and through Upasana. One gets Brahma loka and through children one gets manusya janma. Three sadhanas and three sadhyas are mentioned in the Vedas. The jnani says that I am not interested in putra because he does not want to come back to manusya loka. He is not interested in karma and he is not interested in swarga. He is not interested in Upasana because he does not want to go to Brahma loka. Jnanis declare this. He does not want sadhans and sadhyas. Vedavit says that we have accomplished greatest goal through jnanam. He has gained highest Purushartha the moksa. From this we come to know that jnanam is capable of going fulfillment without requiring children or karma. When one gains Purushartha phalam is gained through jnanam, why should be after other things for fulfillment. Brahman is not an object of experience but tripti is experienceable. Because of this fulfillment one voluntarily give up the sadhana and sadhya. It is voluntary renunciation that we read in the Vedas.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha means moreover; eke means some jnanis renounce all the means and the ends ; kamakarena means voluntarily. Now we will come to the significance of the words. Cha gives further argument to what is given in the previous sutra. Eke some jnanis; there are many who continue to be grahastha, king etc. There are many who have renounced all sadhanams and sadhya. All they do without compulsion. You renounce only when you stand on your feet. A person renounces everything only when he is a jnani. The renunciation indicates tripti, which he gets as result of wisdom. Wisdom gives tripti and tripti leads to renunciation. Wisdom itself is capable of giving the tripti. In the five one day match series, suppose we win the first three, then the last two matches we will play and will try to win and when the game is going on Atman eva atmana tustah the success and defeat do not make any difference and that state of mind is called jivan mukti in the cricket field. Extend this throughout the life and that is the state of mind of the jnani. Therefore he may do \or may not do any karma. Kamakarena kama means will and by the force of one's own volition. It is voluntary giving and it is enforced renunciation. It is like fruit falling out of ripening. It is our of purnatvam and not out of force.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 312

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.15 {440}**

#### ***Kamakarena chaikē***

And some according to their own liking [have abandoned all works].

The argument in refutation of Jaimini's views is continued.

In this first adhikaranam known as Purushartha adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes that jnanam itself capable of liberation without the help of karm. Karma is required for siddha suddhi but we only negate the role of karma in moksa praptih. Karma is indirectly helpful but we cannot say karma directly give moksa. This is challenged by Purva Mimamsa. Purva Mimamsa wanted to establish that jnanam cannot give liberation independently and it can serve only as karma angam and wanted to establish karma alone is the cause of liberation. We said karma indirectly helps moksa. Purva Mimamsa says just opposite and he says karma directly liberates and jnanam indirectly helps moksa. Having negated Purva Mimamsa views Vyasacharya reinforces his conclusions in the last three sutras.

Of them sutra 15 we have completed. He said that jnani voluntarily renounce all the happiness. Rejection or renunciation of all the pursuits of happiness is naturally found in the jnani. Karma nivrutti is naturally found in wise person and it happens only because at the end of desires and desires end because of fulfillment. Karma nivrutti is because of kama nivrutti and kama nivrutti happens when we get purnatvam which we see only the wise people because of the Atma Jnanam. Wise are free from greed. The cause of freedom from greed, the cause can only be the wisdom, which is there in the wise people. Jnanam alone is capable of giving fulfillment independently which is indicated by renunciation of all other pursuit. Kamasya karaka means by the power of volition, which ultimately means voluntarily. Therefore jnanam swatantram. Up to this we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

#### **Sutra 3.4.16 {441}**

#### ***Upamardam cha***

And [scripture teaches that the] destruction [of all qualifications for work results from knowledge].

The previous argument is continued.

First we will see the general analysis of the sutra. In this sutra Vyasacharya says that not only karma need not be added to jnanam but he says karma cannot be added to jnanam to produce liberation. The argument is karma requires duality and karma can be generated with the help of plurality alone. Any action is produced with the help of various accessories and the accessories are defined as five in number. Subject, object, instrument, locus and beneficiary are the five factors. Thus, many karakams are required for any karma to be fulfilled. Every noun in grammatical sentence reveals a karakam and a verb reveals kriya. They are linked in some way or the other. The mimamsakas and naiyayikas have analysed. The verb goes always along with several nouns in a sentence. The accessories means dvidam. This is logically and experientially proved. The ego is dissolved in sushupti. The karta goes away. All other things also get dissolved. Yatra yatra dvidam tatra tatra kriya. That is why we have an equation karaka janya kriya. Vyasacharya argues Vedanta jnanam is a unique jnanam compared to apara vidya. All the other jnanams will only produce more desire and more karma just retaining Dvidam. Apara vidya produces karma karma and retains Dvidam. Whereas para vidya is a unique knowledge that destroys karma, and it removes Dvidam also. The sruti negates Dvidam which means falsified Dvidam and falsified Dvidam. This is called upamardham means nasah or negation or destruction. Dvidam nivritti means sarva karaka nivritti. All the karakams are negated. Therefore subject is gone the object is gone, the instrument is gone and sarvam Brahma mayam jagat. It is the destruction of duality. If the destruction of duality takes place how can there be a karma. Jnana anantaram eva sarva karmanah nasah. Jnana karma samucchayah katham sambavati. After waking up you want to add the dream money to the waker's account. How ridiculous it is that the dream earnings are destroyed the moment you wake up. Karaka and karma are negated the moment you wake up to Atma svarupam. The Upanishad itself reveals this truth 2.4.14 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad. Wherever the duality is caused by ignorance, there is activity caused by subject object instrument etc. Once a person has understood that Dvidam is mithya, who is going to do what who is to think what and who is going to take what when they have understood as mithya. I experience sunrise but I never take it as sathyam. I experience mirage water but I don't take the mirage water. Then it means he makes the statement verbally but he has not understood about the mirage water. The Brihadharaynaka upanisad talks about dvidam nasah therefore karma nasah and therefore samucchaya is not possible.

Now will go to the word for word analysis of the sutra. Upamardham means the destruction of duality cha means is also [said in the Vedas] this is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Upamardham means nasah or destruction. Anything reduced to power is called upamardhanam. Cha means conjunction to add to the reasoning list given before. Veda talks about duality that means destruction of karma and therefore after jnanam there will not be karma and how can it be combined with jnanam. That is the reason whatever karma is done after jnanam they are not enlisted as karma itself. Therefore if any jnani performs any karma after jnanam like Janaka performing nithya karma performing his nithya karma or sannyasi doing any karma of writing any book, they are called karam abasah like roasted seed they jnani's karma is karma abasah. Because it is karma abasah only, it is done by ahankara abasa it cannot produce agami punya papam. The roasted and ordinary seed will look alike and if you plant them unroasted one will germinate while the other will not. For look ajnani's karma and jnani's karma both look like. While ajnani's karma will produce, punya papam while jnani's karma will not produce any punya papam.

## **Topic 1. Purusharthadhikaranam [sutras 1 – 17]**

Knowledge of brahman is independent of sacrificial acts.

**Sutra 3.4.17 {442}**

***Urdhvaretassu cha sabde hi***

And [knowledge belongs] to those who observe perpetual celibacy, because in scripture [that stage of life is mentioned].

The previous argument is continued.

This is the final reinforcing argument that karma especially vaidhika karma need not join to karma for producing liberation. Vyasacharya says sruti talks about jnanam in sannyasis. Or sruti talks about sannyasi jnanis. It is very clear that in them jnanam exists without vaidhika karma addition. Jnanam in sannyasi is without vaidhika karma because according to sastra sannyasi cannot perform any vaidhika karmas. He has renounced all the fires and there is no question of performing any karma. Even the other smartha karmas are not possible because according to sastra all the karmas require various accessories. And in anganyasa karanyasa shikayai vasadu and utter some mantra and he has to touch the sika and sannyasi cannot do it because he is bald. Similar sacred thread etc., are required and since sannyasi does not have karma angani he cannot do any karma and he gets jnanam without karma samuccchaya. Therefore kevala jnanam as in sannyasi is capable of giving liberation. Sannyasi jnanis is talked about in the Brihadharaynaka upanisad [4.4.22] the wise people do not desire anything and since they do not have three desires and three sadhanas. He does not desire putra, wealth, lokas etc. According to Veda three asramas are desire based asramas Brahmacharya Grahasthasrama and Vanaprastha. These sannyasrama is not desire based and the sannyasis live on biksa. This is the essence of the sutra.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Cha means moreover [we hear about the wisdom of Self-Knowledge] urdhvaretassu in sannyasis; hi means because sabde [it is said] in the Vedas. This is the running meaning. Now we will come to significance of the words. Urdhvaretassu means sannyasi. One who follows brahmacharya vrutam; strictly speaking urdhvaretassu refers to three asramas. Brahmachari has to be a celibate and vanaprastha has to be celibate and only grahasthasrami need not be celibate. In sannyasa asrama alone karma is absent. Therefore, according to vedic concept among the four group in society three of the four has to adopt celibacy. Three asramas are gone and the society is based on three asramas who do not follow celibacy. Sabde means Veda vakyam [it is said in the veda vakyam] that sannyasi has jnanam without doing any karma. Veda vakyam kept in mind is 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad where sannyasis are glorified. Because of these reasons since jnanis voluntarily renounce and since jnanis renounce and therefore jnanam swatantram and it gives moksa without karma. Adhi Sankaracharya draws this adhikaranam throughout his bashyams. All his introductory bashyams are based on this adhikaranam only. With this the first adhikaranam is over. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

**Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

**Sutra 3.4.18 [443]**

***Paramarsam jaiminirachodana chapavadati hi***

Jaimini [considers that scriptural texts mentioning those stages of life in which celibacy is obligatory contain] a reference [only to those stages, they are not injunctions because other [scriptural texts] condemn [those stages].

An objection to sutra 17 is raised.

First, I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with 3 sutras. This is the second adhikaranam of this pada. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is that Purva Mimamsa raises a big question. This is an incidental topic because of the last sutra of the previous adhikaranam. The mention of the word sannyasi has irritated the Purva Mimamsakas. They even think that seeing a sannyasi is amangalam. There are other systems of philosophy, which are against sannyasa asrama. Purva Mimamsa says that there is no sannyasa asrama at all. Even in vishistadvaidam do not believe in removing the sacred thread on becoming a sannyasa. Removal of sacred thread is an unsacred thing. Many people are against sannyasa asrama. Then he goes one step further that really speaking there is only one asrama called Grahasthasrama. The other three asramas are non-existent. This is called eka asrama vadhah. He says so because that Veda insists a person should do vaidhika karmas for good Gathi. Not only Veda prescribed it as compulsory. One should do agnihotra as long as one is alive. Not only that the Veda criticizes the giving up of karmas in a special mantra and that mantra is virahaa esa devanam yaha agnim udvasayate Taittiriya Upanishad 1.11.1. The mantra means one who renounces the ritualistic fire becomes devanam virahaa he destroys the power of the devas and devas and they will not bless him. Fire represents ritual. Ritual represents worshipping the devatas. When I have fire and when I do ritual and when I worship devatas then alone devatas can bless me in return. Devas in the form of natural forces will bless you. Or else the natural forces will not bless. Life will become impossible. Devas bless the person depends upon worship which depends upon the fire. Therefore, Vedas say if you want devata's anugrah all the Purusharthas you get only by deva anugrah. Therefore you should be eternally a grahastha maintaining shroutha Agni. Veda negates all the three asramas in which there is no fire. Therefore, they are called anagraha asrama. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 313

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

#### **Sutra 3.4.18 [443]**

#### ***Paramarsam jaiminirachodana chapavadati hi***

Jaimini [considers that scriptural texts mentioning those stages of life in which celibacy is obligatory contain] a reference [only to those stages, they are not injunctions because other [scriptural texts] condemn [those stages]].

An objection to sutra 17 is raised.

We have entered into the second adhikaranam of the fourth pada of the third chapter. This is known as paramarsadhikaranam with three sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses how many asramas are prescribed by the Vedas. This issue has come now based on the last sutra of the previous adhikaranam. There Vyasacharya has indicated that sannyasa asrama by the word urdhvaretah. This is a controversy because the Purva Mimamsa does not accept the four asramas at all. He is eka asrama vadhi. This adhikaranam is a debate between ekasramavadhi Purva Mimamsaka and aneka asrama vadhi utara mimamsaka. Purva Mimamsaka says only one asrama is possible and it is grahasthasrama. Not all others are acceptable because only grahastha can perform all ritual, which is compulsory according to Vedas. One has to perform agnihotra as long as one is alive and this can be done only by a grahastha alone. Yaha agnim udvasayate if a vaidhika abandons the vedic ritualistic fire that person destroys the power of devas to bless him. Viraha should be written properly. Virahaa means the destroyer of devatas with which alone devas bless the manushyas. They can bless manushyas only through Agni based rituals. Only the oblations offered through fire reach devas. They in turn bless the manushyas. Ocne Agni is abandoned and if you do not give oblations devas will become incapable of blessing manushyas. Because of this reason only grahasthas alone can perform all vedic rituals in full measure. Only Grahasthasramavadis can maintain all the fires. Samidhadanam is only the fire the brahmachari can maintain the fire. He cannot do any other agnihotra rituals. He will not have money, he is not married, he has Agni, and still he is as good as anagni. He cannot perform vedic rituals. Similarly, vanaprastha also cannot perform vedic rituals because he will not have the resource to do the rituals. He lives in the forest and he lives on biksa and he will not have other accessories to perform any vedic rituals. He cannot give dakshina and he cannot do annadanam. Vanaprastha also is as good as anagnih. Of the four asramas three are anagniha asramas. Purva Mimamsaka argues anagniha asramas should be rejected. That is possible in grahasthasrama and that is why he calls that there is ekasrama alone which is grahasthasrama. There are some people who are handicapped people and they cannot perform the ritual and they unfit for grahasthasrama. Therefore Purva Mimamsa says other asramas I can permit as a concession for handicapped people. Healthy good people are grahasthasrama and all other unhealthy handicapped people are fit for other asramas. According to Purva Mimamsaka sannyasis are handicapped people. He does not accept other asramas. Vyasacharya in this



adhikaranam refute their argument and support the anekasrama vadha. We have got several sruti support of anekasrama vadha. Among those sruti vakyam there is one vakyam occurring in Chandogya upanisad and that is going to be taken in this adhikaranam to establish anekasrama. First we will see the Chandogya upanisad mantra II.23.1. The mantra begins with the statement that there is no word indicating that sannyasa is enjoined on man. There are three branches and each branches of vedic duty is associated with one asrama. Three dharma skandas refer to the three asramas. The mantra begins with anekasrama. More than one you have to accept. The secondary meaning is three asramas associated with three types of duty. Of those three asramas one skanta one asrama is grahasthasrama which is associated with three main duty viz. Performance of all yajnas in full measure; adhyayanam means Veda adhyayanam study and repetition of Vedas; third one is dhanam the charity which is possible only in grahasthasrama. Brahmachari, vanaprastha and sannyasi all live on biksa and they cannot give dhanam. The second one the mantra says that another asrama is vanaprastha asrama which is specifically designed for practicing austerity leading a simple life. Here possession is not allowed to lead a comfortable life. In fact other infrastructures are opposed to austerity. The third one is brahmachari acharya kula vasi. Here the order is not followed. It is an enumeration of the asramas. Brahmachari a vedic student who is a resident student in residential set up called gurukulam. Brahmachari is of two types one is upakurvana brahmachari a temporary brahmachari who qualifies himself to enter grahasthasrama. In fact Purva Mimamsa is willing to accept the brahmacharasrama as it is preparatory to grahasthasrama. There is another brahmacharyasrama that is naistika brahmacharyasrama. After completing the adhyayanam brahmachari is entitled to enter any of the three asramas. If he wants to study further, he will have to spend more time, such a brahmachari can take naistika brahmacharya vrutam, and he can choose to remain with guru and will study the scriptures. He will never perform agnihotram during his life time. This Purva Mimamsaka does not accept. This sruti refers to naistika brahmachari. The Veda says that he is totally dedicating his entire life to serve his guru and study scriptures. He does not come to grahasthasrama at all. He gives all energy in the service of his guru. Thus, three asramas are mentioned in this mantra. Then the mantra says that all the three groups of people who follow the asrama will reach higher lokas after death. Thus, three asramas are mentioned directly. Moreover, the one who abides in Brahman will attain moksa or immortality. The other three asramas will attain finite result but Brahma nishta gains immortality. This indirectly indicates sannyasasrama. Thus, three asramas are directly mentioned, sannyasasrama is indirectly mentioned, and this Chandogya upanisad vakyam is referred to skandha sruti. In Chandogya upanisad the first five chapter are fully confined to Upasanas.

The last three chapters alone talk of Vedanta jnana adhyaya. Adhi Sankaracharya shows his partiality for the first adhyaya and the commentary is brief. The last three adhyaya the commentary is brief. There is one exception you find where Adhi Sankaracharya writes very elaborate commentary and that is skanda sruti portion and establishes the four asramas and among the four he establishes the sannyasa asrama. It is this skandha sruti which is taken for debate in this adhikaranam. Here the Purva Paksi is Purva Mimamsa. He argues that skandha sruti does not support anekasrama vadha. The utara mimamsaka wants to establish that skandha sruti supports the anekasrama vadha. In this we will develop our arguments in two stages. First we will establish that the skandha sruti supports three asramas. In the second stage we will establish that this skandha sruti supports the fourth asrama sannyasa indirectly. Then we will conclude that anekasrama vadha. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now we will enter into general analysis of the present sutra. Jaimini is acting as purva paksa here. He cannot be purva paksa for Vyasacharya. For the sake of argument Jaimini takes the purva paksa stand. He says skanda sruti cannot take the anekasrama. Jaimini gives three arguments in support of his view. The first argument is that there is no commandment given in the above statement in the form of an imperative mood. This cannot be taken as commandment for three asramas. The second argument he gives is that three asramas is with reference to the popularly misconception and it is not the acceptance of the sruti. That popular misconception is due to parampara. It is pranti siddha anekasrama anuvakatam. It is not a sanction for the anekasrama. He says it is so because that there is no vidhi vakyam sanctioning anekasrama. The third argument is that not only the sruti does not support anekasrama but the sruti condemns sannyasasrama positively and how can you go against the sruti statement given that whoever does not do vedic rituals will not be blessed by devatas and in fact they will be condemned by devatas. Sannyasis abandon the ritualistic fire and therefore sruti condemns sannyasasrama. Because of these reasons there is only one asrama.

Now we will do the word for word analysis of the sutra. Jaimini means Jaimini Maharishi [takes the other asramas] paramarsam means as only references; cha achodana means and not as injunctions. Hi apavadati means because the sruti negates them. This is the running meaning. Now we will see the significance of the words. Jaimini interprets skanda sruti in this manner paramarsam means only, as references that the three asramas mentioned in the sruti are the references to the popular misconceptions of anekasrama. The aim of skanda sruti does not talk of number of asrama and its aim is Brahma nishtah. Its intention is not to talk about the number of asrama. Asrama number is not the subject matter here. It is like the maths teacher giving a sum saying one pen costs 15 rupees and what is the cost of 15 pens. Teacher is not interested in analyzing the present cost of the pen. He wants to find out whether the student wants to see that whether the student can multiply and find the answer. In the same way the number of asramas mentioned in the sruti cannot be taken seriously. It is given for glorification only. Anuvadha vakyam vidhi vakyam na bhavati. Achodana means this is not a sanction or commandment for or sanction for the prescription for the implementation of many asramas. The significance of this word is that any commandment will be indicated by the appropriate verb. When one says that there are 123 people here. There is no commandment at all. It has a verb of present tense. It is not a commandment. Commandment is to be indicated by verbal form in grammar. It should be in imperative mood. A tense cannot convey a mood. Skanda sruti does not convey any mood. Therefore this is not a sanction for anekasrama. Then he says that apavadati which means to criticize or to condemn or indirectly negate. The negation of other asramas is found in the Veda. Now the question where does the sruti negates anagrah asrama. The very statement that you should perform Agnihotra indicates that you should be a grahastha throughout your life which means you do not become a sannyasi. Because of these reasons there is only grahasthasrama. We can somehow accept other asramas except of course the sannyasasrama. This is the Jaimini's purva paksa. This view will be refuted by Vyasacharya in the next two sutras which we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 314

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

#### **Sutra 3.4.18 [443]**

#### ***Paramarsam jaiminirachodana chapavadati hi***

Jaimini [considers that scriptural texts mentioning those stages of life in which celibacy is obligatory contain] a reference [only to those stages, they are not injunctions because other [scriptural texts] condemn [those stages]].

An objection to sutra 17 is raised.

We have just completed the sutra 18 of the second adhikaranam known as paramarsadhikaranam. The first one is purva paksa sutra. Purva paksa being Jaimini. Here Vyasacharya analyses skanda sruti that occurs in 2.23.1 of Chandogya upanisad. Here Upanishad explicitly elaborates three asramas. The skanda talks about three asramas. The dispute here is Jaimini wants to establish that there is only one grahasthasramas. Many asramas are not sanctioned anywhere in the Vedas. Therefore, he explains skandah and triyah to establish his view. Jaimini gives his answer in this sutra. He says that the Veda only quotes popular notion that there are three asramas. It is only an anuvadha vakyam and not vidhi vakyam. It does not validate the three asramas. It only quotes a popular notion, which is wrong. Just as you say dvaidha vakyams are anuvada vakyam, in asrama we follow anuvadha vakyam. In support of this conclusion, he gives two reasons, achodana and apavadati. Hi indicates the reason. The two reasons are achodana hetu and apavadana hetu. There is no vedic support or vedic injunction for anekasrama. Achodana means absence of vidhi. The second reason is apavadah means the adverse report is also there with regard to the other asramas Vedas say that vaidhika karmas are to be compulsorily performed. All those asramas that do not prescribe compulsory vedic rituals are to be condemned and they are blacklisted asramas and they will not take a person to higher world because of these reasons. Therefore, other asramas are not there and Jaimini is particularly interested in negating sannyasa asrama. As a concession, he says that I am willing to accept the other asramas and they are available to handicapped people. The physically or mentally retarded people who cannot do the vedic rituals can go to the other asramas. Now siddhanta comes in two sutras.

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

#### **Sutra 3.4.19 [444]**

***Anusththeyam baadarayanah samyasarutehi***

Baadarayana [holds that sannyasa] also must be gone through because the scriptural texts [quoted] refers equally to all the four asramas or stages of life.

The objection raised in sutra 18 is refuted.

This is siddhanta sutra. siddhanta is Baadarayana who is none other than Vyasacharya. All asramas are not parasramas. If all the asramas are popular misconception then Grahasthasrama is also included in that. If you say triyah skandah it is only paramarsam and then grahasthasrama also will become misconception. Then you should treat all asramas on equal footing. The Veda clearly says triyah skanda. In the list Veda includes grahasthasrama. The valid Grahasthasrama and the other two are given in the same list and the very fact the other two are indicated with valid Grahasthasrama indicates the other two are equally valid. One of them you accept as valid and the others also should be valid and you have no reason to take one and dismiss the other two. Sruti vakyam gives equal validity to all the asrama by enumerating them together. 2.23.1 of Chandogya upanisad clearly mentions all the three asramas. How can you take the other three as invalid without any reason? You cannot do that. There are other Upanisadic statements also where four asramas are enumerated on equal footing. 4.4.22 of Brihadharaynaka upanisad enumerates the four asramas. Vedanu vachanena first one has to practice adhyayanam repetition of Veda under the guidance of a guru. This clearly indicates brahmacharya asrama. Then it says yagnena danena clearly indicates the Grahasthasrama and in brahmacharya the two are not possible because brahmachari is not supposed to have money. Tapasa anasanena one should practice tapasa naakasena that indicates vanaprasthasrama. Then the mantra says etam eva muntia munir bhavati etc., that indicates the sannyasa asrama. In the same mantra sannyasa is also mentioned and all the four are equally enumerated. Either say all the four are misconception or say all the four are acceptable. When we give this argument purva paksa is not convinced. Adhi Sankaracharya gives some more arguments. Purva paksa says even though four asramas are equally enumerated I cannot give equal validity. He argues there is no vidhi found in this skanda sruti and it does not say you should become brahmachari or you should become Grahasthasrama. Eventhough there is no vidhi for Grahasthasrama there is a vidhi support elsewhere. That is Chandogya upanisad 8.15.1 that the Veda talks about the student taking to Grahasthasrama and performing ritual as a compulsory duty. Grahasthasrama has vidhi support elsewhere but the other asramas do not have vidhi support anywhere. Other vidhi statement backs one asrama. Naturally Grahasthasrama is powerful. This is one reason to treat Grahasthasrama with partiality. There is another reason is that Grahasthasrama is glorified by the Veda that karma will take one to swarga loka etc. This Grahasthasrama sthuthi is there but other asramas are condemned by condemning the renunciation of the rituals. In the other asramas the rituals are not there. Therefore you cannot treat it on equal footing. This is the further argument given by Jaimini. Our answer to this question is that all these problem are you have not studied the Vedas properly. You have underscored the vidhi vakyams that prescribe Grahasthasrama as compulsory. But there are vidhi vakyam which prescribe other asramas also for pursuing moksa. There is famous Jabala Upanishad vakyam which you might not have noticed because it does not come under the ten Upanisads. In that Upanishad there is a very direct instruction to all spiritual teachers [4<sup>th</sup> mantra] that says one should complete brahmacharya asrama and become a grahastha. Once Grahasthasrama is fructified with production of vairagyam one should take to vanaprasthasrama where he can practice Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi. Having reduced them heavily one can practice Upasana. Once Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi is gained through Upasana Veda says one should take to

sannyasa. Thus, the first three asramas will help one to be qualified to enter sannyasa asrama. Then he will exclusively dedicate his life for Sravanam Mananam Nididyanam to gain moksa. Then the very same mantra says that if there is a brahmachari who has Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi because of the purva janma sadhana, and in the present janma in brahmacharya asrama itself he gets Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi then there is no necessity for him to go to Grahasthasrama and other asramas and straightaway enter sannyasa asrama. Otherwise instead of going through all the asrama in gradual form, from brahmacharya he can enter sannyasa or from Grahasthasrama he can become sannyasa or he can enter sannyasa from vanaprastha. There is clear vidhi in jabala Upanishad. Therefore even though there is no vidhi in this mantra there is vidhi support in the other Upanisads. Even after giving the argument Purva Mimamsa is not completely convinced. Still he says he cannot treat four asramas as equally valid because of the apavada sruti. It is powerful statement that you have to explain and the apavada sruti is if you give up karmas it is a papam. You block the blessings of the devas. Therefore, your next birth will not be elevating birth. That means you should not go to the other asramas. The other asramas are weakened by the apavada sruti. The other asramas are not acceptable. Then siddhanta argues when there is a vidhi sruti and apavada sruti both being sruti vakyams both are equally powerful and therefore one cannot cancel the other. Apavada sruti cannot negate the sannyasa sruti. If one is sruti and the other is smriti vakyam the former can cancel the latter. When there are two equally powerfully sruti how can one cancel the other. Then mimamsa says that you should interpret in such a way that both are validated. For example we say in Bhagavad Gita Krishna says for ksatriya yuddham and violence is a duty for ksatriya for protection of dharma if nonviolent method fails. Therefore 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita he says that ksatriya can fight for dharma. One sruti vakyam says violence is duty. There are other vakyams ahimsa is the duty. One should not harm or hurt other being. Both duties are given in Vedas. Now which statement is valid? Violence is valid or nonviolence is valid. One we call general duty and the other as specific duty. One is called samanya dharma and the other is visesha dharma. General rule one should not be violent and specific rule is that if violence is required you can fight. This method of interpretation is called sankocah. You reduce the area of operation of both the vidhi vakyams. Both srutis are valid in different area. Karma is compulsory and karma should never be given up. It operates in the field of people who are not Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambanna adhikari. Those who have not acquired qualification may continue the general vidhi of pursuing with karma etc. For him quote apavada sruti and not jabala sruti. Krishna did not quote sannyasa to Krishna and he quoted karma. Once one acquires qualification we can quote jabala sruti. Therefore apavada sruti is valid and this skanda sruti talks about Grahasthasrama for anadhikari. Therefore, all the four asramas equally valid for appropriate people. Therefore, anekasrama vadha is correct and ekasrama vadha is wrong.

Now we will do word for word analysis of the sutra. Anusteyam means other asramas are to be followed samyasarute because of equal reference to all the asramas. This is the running meaning. Now we will see significance of the words. Anusteyam means negation of the word paramasam. Vyasacharya says it is not casual reference but deliberate sanction to follow all the asramas. Samyasaruteh means equal reference to the sruti statement. Equality of all the asramas is meant here. You cannot have step motherly treatment. Now we will go to the next sutra where Vyasacharya gives another argument.

## **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

**Sutra 3.4.20 [445]**

***Vidhirva dharanavat***

Or rather [there is an] injunction [in this text] as in the case of carrying [of the sacrificial wood]

The argument commenced in sutra 19 to refute the objection raised in sutra 18 is continued.

Vyasacharya gives another argument. A suppositional argument it is. Purva Mimamsa said that for Grahasthasrama there is a vidhi and for other asrama there is no vidhi. We gave an answer stating that there is vidhi in Jabala Upanishad. Purva Mimamsa says that there is no vidhi. He has not read Jabala Upanishad or he is not willing to accept Jabala Upanishad as authentic Upanishad. Generally in tradition we do not write the name Upanishad. Sankara bashyams are valid but we do not call it Upanishad. Therefore there are many unauthenticated Upanishads and there is confusion as to which is authentic and which is unauthentic. Hence Purva Mimamsa may argue that Jabala Upanishad is written by some sannyasi to validate the sannyasa asrama. Adhi Sankaracharya says suppose the Jabala sruti is not accepted, we can take Skanda sruti as vidhi vakyam supporting the aneka asrama even though there is any verb indicating the imperative mood. Therefore he says vidhirva. If you do not accept Jabala sruti you can take Skanda sruti supporting the four asramas. He says that in Purva Mimamsa you yourself have quoted some non vidhi vakyam as vidhi vakyam. Vidhistu darane apurvatvad. You have occasion to prove the nonvidhi vakyam as vidhi vakyam. Skanda sruti also can be treated as vidhi vakyam taking the Purva Mimamsa argument to treat non-vidhi vakyam as vidhi vakyam. This we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 315

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

Sannyasa is prescribed by the scriptures

#### **Sutra 3.4.20 [445]**

#### ***Vidhirva dharanavat***

Or rather [there is an] injunction [in this text] as in the case of carrying [of the sacrificial wood]

The argument commenced in sutra 19 to refute the objection raised in sutra 18 is continued.

I have introduced sutra 20 which happens to be third and final sutra of the second adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes that there are more number of asramas. This Vyasacharya has to establish because the Purva Mimamsaka accepts only one asrama. He is ekasrama vadhi. Because Purva Mimamsakas give importance to vedic ritual which alone will liberate a person. For him vedic rituals are to be practiced until death for one to gain moksa. As an angam of ritual the Grahasthasrama will also become important for Grahasthasrama alone one maintains all the ritualistic fires. Therefore all rituals are possible only in Grahasthasrama. Therefore, since karma is important Grahasthasrama is also seen important. According to Purva Mimamsa, brahmacharya is a stepping stone to enter Grahasthasrama and it has no independent validity. Therefore only valid asrama he accepts eka Grahasthasrama. In this second adhikaranam Vyasacharya refutes ekasrama vadha and establishes anekasrama vadha. He concludes that anekasrama vadha includes sannyasa asrama also. Anekasrama sthapanam dvara sannyasa asrama sthapanam is the purpose of this adhikaranam. The reason is that in the previous important adhikaranam Vyasacharya has made a passing reference to sannyasasrama while establishing jnanam alone will give liberation. If sannyasi can get moksa it has to be only through kevala jnanam because sannyasi is fit for only following jnanam and he cannot follow any vaidhika karma and he does not wear sacred thread which is necessary for doing any ritual. Therefore, to establish jnana matrena moksa Vyasacharya had mentioned moksa of sannyasi in the previous adhikaranam. Incidentally, it was a big adhikaranam of Brahma Sutra with 17 sutras. Therefore, sannyasa asrama comes under scrutiny. Then Purva Mimamsa becomes a greatest challenger and he strongly refutes sannyasa. Vyasacharya establishes aneka asrama and through that sannyasa asrama sthapanam. To establish aneka asrama including sannyasa asrama Vyasacharya takes up wellknown Chandogya upanisad known as skanda sruti. In skanda sruti of Chandogya upanisad talks of aneka asrama clearly. Therefore, Vyasacharya took that statement and when that was taken Purva Mimamsa came with an objection. He said aneka asrama vidhi is not there in Chandogya upanisad. Therefore, Chandogya upanisad does not prescribe aneka asrama, it only makes a casual reference to those asrama, and casual reference cannot become a pramanam. Aneka asrama vidhi is not there is the argument of the Purva Mimamsa. It cannot be pramanam. Vidhi alone is pramana, such a vidhi vakyam is absent, and therefore I cannot accept anekasrama. When Purva Mimamsa said that anekasrama vidhi is not there, Vyasacharya said that if you say that anekasrama paramarsa is not a vidhi it is not a pramana

then you will have a problem. The problem is that in that skanda sruti Grahasthasrama paramarsamis there. If you take Chandogya upanisad sruti apramanam, and throw all asramas along with hot water baby also will go away and Grahasthasrama will also be treated invalid. You either accept all the three or reject all the three. For that Purva Mimamsaka said Grahasthasrama is included in skanda sruti and it cannot be a pramana for Grahasthasrama. Still I will say that Grahasthasrama vidhi is present in some other vakyam. The pramana for Grahasthasrama is elsewhere. That we saw in Chandogya upanisad 8.15.1 where there is a pramana vakyam that one has to follow Grahasthasrama. Skanda sruti is not a pramana for anekasrama also ekasrama also. Therefore Grahasthasrama is stronger. Then Vyasacharya said that if skanda sruti is not a pramana and you say that there is another sruti as pramana and he said that I have another sruti for proving and it is jabala Upanishad vakyam. I have vidhi vakyam, you have also a vidhi vakyam, and therefore aneka asrama vadha is to be accepted. Then Purva Mimamsa said that even though we have pramana for anekasrama I would not accept Grahasthasrama alone as pramanam and other asrama vidhi cannot be accepted. For that he gives a reason. The reason is that at one place Veda says that a vaidhika should not renounce the ritualistic fire and it is a papam to renounce the ritualistic fires. That is said in Chandogya upanisad. Therefore, in the other asramas Agni is not there. These fires are there only in Grahasthasrama. Brahmachari does not have any fire other than samidadanma. Sannyasi does not have any fire. So, other asramas are negated by the Vedas. Therefore, aneka asrama vidhi will be nullified by this vakyam Agni thyaga papa vakyam. Therefore, ultimately we come to one asrtama alone in which Agni thyaga is not there. For that Vyasacharya says that one sruti statement can never nullify another sruti statement. All sruti statements have equal validity. Anekasrama vakyam is also sruti Agni thyaga papa vakyam is also sruti. Both will have to be accommodated. This is contradiction. Sannyasa is giving up of fire. Aand sannyasi gains liberation as he gains Atma Jnanam. In another place giving up fire is papam. How do you reconcile sannyasa vidhi and Agni thyaga vidhi? This is the question posed by Purva Mimamsa. In three or four places Krishna says ahimsa is important but at the same time he advocates war to Arjuna. Fighting is himsa and yet Krishna advocated war. You cannot say one vakyam is stronger than the other. Both vakyam comes from the same guru. Then what do we do. We have to interpret in such a way to maintain the validity of both the vakyams. The general rule is one should not harm anyone. Then we say for removing adharma there is an exception that you may do himsa. The condition is maintenance of dharma. Even for dharma, samsthapanam himsa is not the first step, one should try all nonviolent method, and when that fails, violence should be employed to maintain dharma. You restrict the meaning of both the statements in two different fields. In the same way sannyasa is valid and giving up of Agni is also valid. In general rule panca maha yajna should not be given up`. Never give up your duty including rituals. You allow giving up of karma when a person has attained karma phalam of Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi all vaidhika karma meant for Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi and when it is achieved, sadhya prapti anantaram sadhanam is redundant and irrelevant. After removing hunger continues, eating is redundant and harmful. Therefore, Vyasacharya says sannyasa s all right when he has attained Sadhana Chadhustaya Sambatthi and that vakyam is not relevant adhikari and such a sannyasi will not incur papam. Purva Mimamsa may not accept jabala Upanishad and therefore Purva Mimamsaka may not accept the statement and therefore let us assume jabala Upanishad does not exist. Temporarily Vyasacharya is willing to give up jabala Upanishad. Vyasacharya says skanda sruti coming within the Upanishad you accept and he says that the very skanda sruti as anekasrama vidhi vakyam. When I say there is water it is not a vidhi vakyam. Commandment requires imperative mood. How can you take skanda sruti as vidhi vakyam. For this question the answer is given in the sutra 20. By using another method of interpretation you can convert a paramarsa vakyam into vidhi



vakyam. Vyasacharya says that this is not a unique interpretation I want to use and he says you have used this in your own Purva Mimamsa sutra. If you can change why cannot I also apply and take advantage of that provision. This is the approach of this sutra. Now I will enter into the general analysis of this sutra.

Here Vyasacharya takes an example occurring in Karma Kanda. Based on that Karma Kanda instant Purva Mimamsa Jaimini writes a special sutra. That Jaimini sutra we apply for skanda sruti also. Vidistu darane apurvadvad. 3.4.15 of Jaimini sutra. I will tell you the instance where Jaimini applies the sutra. The mantra is athastat samidam tarayan anugraved upari hi devopyo darayadi. It is a quotation from Veda purva bagha. Jaimini sutra is not a part of Veda. Veda vakyam gives a commandment to be followed. The commandment is that the priest must approach the homa kunda. That is the vidhi. This vidhi is given in a ritual called maha pitru yajna. It is a ritual dedicated to pitru or ancestors. He should take the ladle in which he carries the oblation material in the form of ghee and go near the homa kunda. When he takes the ladle in one hand and in the other hand he should take a fig called samith. In the mahapitru yajna he should approach the homa kunda with fig and ghee. How should hold it also is told in the mantra. The ladle should be in higher level and samit should be down below. This one is the vidhi vakyam. While offering the vidhi commandment Veda makes another reference which is not a vidhi but paramarsa. Paramarsa is when the ritual is for the devata but any ritual other than pitru yajna, the samit should be held above the ladle. That means pitru yajna samit should be below and in deva yajna samit should be above. The problem is for pitru yajna samit is given in the form of commandment and a vidhi in imperative mood. In deva yajna the vidhi is not there and it is not in the form of commandment. It is only a statement just saying that there is no water in the house. Now Purva Mimamsa problem is that with regard to pitru yajna we can take it as vidhi and can we take samita in deva yajna can we take it as vidhi. There is no imperative mood present there. He does not want to paramarsa vakyam as vidhi vakyam. Then he takes to another place where it is told how to hold the samit for deva yajna. He find that there is no vidhi elsewhere. We do require a vidhi where should I hold the samit. Then Purva Mimamsa comes to a compromise that even though it is a paramarsa vakyam is out of context, even though it relates to pitru yajna, this vakyam samit must be held above. The paramarsa vakyam should be taken as vidhi vakyam. According to Purva Mimamsa, a statement should have only one vidhi. Here one statement has got two vidhi. One is actual vidhi and the other one is compromise vidhi. Paramarsa vakyam is taken as vidhi vakyam. Purva Mimamsa says when there is no way out, compromise is possible and it is all right. Normally you take snanam but when you are not well, you can avoid snanam for doing a karma. Now Vyasacharya extends this conversion to skanda sruti also. We have to reinterpret the skanda sruti and see what are the vidhi involved in skanda sruti. In Purva Mimamsa, there are two vidhis as said above. Similar in skanda sruti also we have two vidhis one is primary vidhi and the other is paramarsa vakyam converted into vidhi. If you go back to skanda sruti there, the Upanishad refers to many asramas. All of them come under paramarsa vakyam. Having referred to aneka asrama at the end the Upanishad says Brahma nishtah or jnana nishtah means a jnani and such a jnani will attain moksa. Whereas the other people non-Brahma nishtas ajnanis will attain only finite result.. Therefore, the primary commandment theme of skanda sruti Brahma nishtah bhaved. May you all become jnana nishtas and attain moksa. As a part of the primary field, the Upanishad refers to asrama also. Aneka asrama paramarsa is there. Whether aneka asrama paramarsa [reference] can be converted into vidhi or not is our question. Our view is that it should be taken as vidhi as done by Purva Mimamsa statement mentioned above. We have vidhi elsewhere in jabala Upanishad vidhi vakyam. Purva paksa does not accept jabala Upanishad statement. Therefore, what we do is we convert anekasrama paramarsa into vidhi

vakyam. It is a very useful and informative teaching. Therefore anekasrama paramarsah is a vidhi. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 316

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

The scriptures prescribe Sannyasa

#### **Sutra 3.4.20 [445]**

#### ***Vidhirva dharanavat***

Or rather [there is an] injunction [in this text] as in the case of carrying [of the sacrificial wood]

The argument commenced in sutra 19 to refute the objection raised in sutra 18 is continued.

We are dealing with 20<sup>th</sup> sutra which is part of second adhikaranam called paramarsa adhikaranam where the discussion is whether veda accept aneka asrama or accept only one asrama. Purva Mimamsa claims there is only one Grahasthasrama alone. Vyasa establishes that aneka asramas are accepted by vedas and in support of this 2.23.1 of Chandogya upanisad is being analysed. The mantra reads as *traya dharma skandhah yajno dhyananam aanam iti, prathamas tapa eva, dvitiyo Brahmacharya kula vasi, tritiya'tyantam atmanam acharyakule vasadayan sarva ete punya loka bhavanit brahma samastho'mrtatvam eti.*

The mantra reads as there are three branches of duty, sacrifice, study and alms giving – austerity, indeed is the first. The second is the pursuit of sacred wisdom dwelling in the house of the teacher and is the third. All these attain to the worlds of the virtuous. He who stands firm in Brahman attains life eternal. Purva Mimamsa says that in skanda sruti three asramas are mentioned but are not presented as vidhi.

Even though there is no vidhi in this context but there is a vidhi in Jabala Upanisad. That anakasrama of Jabala Upanisad is mentioned in this skanda sruti. This was in the first two sutras and in third sutra Vyasa established that we could take this itself as a vidhi vakyam for aneka asrama. The conversion of avidhi vakyam into vidhi vakyam is accepted method in Purva Mimamsa itself with a condition if the teaching is new and useful teaching. That is called apurvavam.

In skanda sruti the main vidhi vakyam is brahma samstaka amritatvam eti that who ever is brahma nishta will attain liberation and whoever is interested in liberation must become brahma nishtaha. The other asramas also will become additional vidhi because it is a new information. Therefore brahma nishta vidhi is mukhya vidhi. He gave the example of holding a samit above and below the ladle. Holding above is mukhya vidhi and during deiva karma it is a vidhi although it is paramarsa vakyam. This we saw in the last class. Now we will come to word analysis.

First we will do the word analysis of the sutra. Va we will take first it means or; vidhi this Chandogya upanisad statement itself is the injunction for other the asramas. Dharanavat means like the dharana vidhi.

Now we will go to the significance of the words. Va means adhava alternatively to give the second interpretation. The first interpretation is based on acceptance of jabala sruti and if it is accepted anekasrama vidhi will be in jabala Upanisad. In Chandogya upanisad it will be taken as anuvadah. This is restatement in Chandogya upanisad. In the second interpretation anekaasrama is vidhi. Next is vidhih it is Chandogya upanisad vakyam. Aneka asrama means brahmacharya, vanaprastha, which are referred to dharma skanda. It should be taken as vidhi in the second interpretation. Dharanavat means like the dharana vakyam or vidhi occurring in karma kanda. Therefore the conclusion is that it is not ekasrama and it is anekasramas vedas have accepted. We have to extend the discussion a little bit more.

Now Purva Mimamsa comes and argues further. They say we are willing to accept skanda sruti is a pramana vakyam for aneka asramas. Even after accepting aneka asrama you cannot prove the existence of sannyasa asrama. It is so because skanda sruti talks about three asramas only for practice of vedic discipline. After mentioning three asramas veda itself enumerates the three as brahmacharya, Grahasthasrama and vanaprasta.

In fact you have introduced the adhikaranam for establishing sannyasa asrama. This adhikaranam ultimately prove a thing you want to prove. There is no pramanam for sannyasa asrama. With the Chandogya upanisad sruti how do you prove sannyasa asrama. Adhi Sankaracharya says it is there in the skanda sruti itself. He tries to establish sannyasa asrama through skanda sruti. This is our discussion now.

This is a struggle for us because in skanda sruti three asramas are mention with no mention of sannyasa asrama. It is implicitly mentioned in skanda sruti. It is said that read the sruti once again and there in the first part of mantra three asramas are mention and then it is mention *sarve ete* all the people belonging to the three asramas that Brahmacharya, Grahasthasrama and Vanaprastha asramas will attain punya lokam. It is not Moksa. Then it says brahma samasthah and the brahma samastha will attain Moksa.

Now Adhi Sankaracharya says three asramis will go to punya loka anithya palam and brahma samastha purursa will attain Moksa. Will brahma samastha be different from first three or not. This is our question. Brahma samastha is segregated from previous three. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya argues three fourth one must be other than the three asramas.

Therefore skanta sruti says sannyasi attains liberation. This is the pramanam for sannyasa asrama. Purva Paksi argues I am not satisfied with the argument. Upanisad does not say fourth asrama. It only says brahma nishta will gain liberation. Hence he says I will give you another interpretation. He does not accept the Adhi Sankaracharya interpretation. He argues we don't require fourth asrama at all. First three asramis who are not brahma nishta will not gain Moksa.

Ajnani Brahmacharya ajnani Grahasthasrama ajnani Vanaprastha will gain Moksa and brahma nishta Brahmacharya Grahasthasrama and Vanaprastha will gain Moksa. Vidhi is becoming brahma nishta. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives two answers. First is that the Upanisad does not say abraham nishta Grahasthasrama etc. Upanisad only says Brahmacharya, Grahasthasrama Vanaprastha punya loka. Fourth one is introduced after three

means it is the fourth asrama. If Upanisad wants to differentiate ajnani and jnani why should Upanisad talk of three asramas. It should have talked generally. The enumeration of three asramas indicates brahma nishtah means sannyasi alone.

The second argument is a bit disturbing arguments for all grahasthas. I will give you my comments later. Adhi Sankaracharya argues brahma nishtah can be a sannyasi only. He says because a sannyasi I only can become brahma nishtah. This Adhi Sankaracharya often argues in several places. He argues in support of this is that Vedanta Sravana Manana Nididyanam is committed pursuit of Brahman is primary duty of sannyasi alone. Sannyasi does not have any other duty. This is how designed in vedic teaching. But in other asramas pursuit of Brahman or pursuit of Sravana Manana Nididyanam is not a duty at all. It is not duty for Brahmacharya, Grahasthasrama or Vanaprastha and it is not prohibited but it is not enjoined as a duty. They may do or may not do it. If he does not do it he does not shirk any duty and he need not regret and he will not have pratyabhava papa also.

The next point for other asramis there are innumerable non-vedantic duties both secular as well as sacred. They have to do it compulsorily and non-performance will involve negative consequences both satriya papam and lokika negative consequences also will be there. In other three asramas when there is choice between a duty and nonduty which one is to be given priority. A conscious one will take to his duty only and not sannyasa duty. There are innumerable vedantic duties for them. Saturday brahma sutra class does not bind you. The other asramis has to compare between non-vedantic and other pursuits and they have to give priority to non-vedantic duties alone. Since it is to be given preference to avoid papam and he can do it only during spare time. Because it is taken as non-duty, non-vedantic duties are to be given prime time slot. Vedantic pursuit will have to occupy spare time slot. In that spare time when the mind is not pre-occupied with normal duties one may take to vedantic duties.

Vedanta in other asrama can occupy a time when there is spare time and unpreoccupied time. Hence it is argued Vedanta cannot be a commitment. It can be noncommitted pursuit. It is called anusthanam and committed pursuit is called nishta. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya heavily gives a loaded meaning for the word nishta. To get prime time slot one should become a sannyasi. This is Adhi Sankaracharya conclusion.

Hence Chandogya upanishad does talk about fourth asrama sannyasa through the word brahma samasthah. Sannyasa has not household, family or social duty. Even cooking is not his duty. Sravana Manana Nididyanam is his only duty. Any dress given and any food given should be taken. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says everyone should take to sannyasa.

Now I will come to my comment. When Adhi Sankaracharya talked of sannyasa his concept was based on social condition and lifestyle of people in those days. It meant every grahastha spends ninety percent of his time in performing vedic duties involving rituals. Three asramas and three varnas had vedic rituals. Now none of them does the vedic rituals in details according to norms. Formal sannyasa ritualistic sannyasa is for giving up the vedic rituals. In those days vedic rituals occupied prime time and therefore it was required. That is why sannyasa involved removal of sacred thread. Take kudumi means shed your status of kudumbi.

Now when no one performs vedic rituals where is the meaning of formal renunciation of rituals. Now sannyasa Adhi Sankaracharya says it has no relevance at all. What is to be done for giving up of worldly activities. For giving up this, formal sannyasa is not required. There

are many non-sannyasis who have given up or reduced worldly activities. In fact there are so many formal sannyasis have not left the wordly activities. Now they act for society. Formal sannyasa has not connection with loukika karma. We don't require formal sannyasa for giving up loukika sannyasa. we don't require formal sannyasa for giving up vaidhika karmas. Formal sannyasa has become irrelevant in these days. You understand the spirit behind the sannyasa. The spirit of sannyasa has got three factors. One is sannyasa represents sadhana cathustaya sambatti especially detachment from everyone especially the close people around.

The second pint is that with spirit of sannyasa I can give prime time and top priority to Vedanta. This is sannyasa in spirit. Third condition is can I enjoy unpreoccupied mind during Sravana Manana Nididyanam. As a grahastha I should ask this question. I assume that you enjoy an unpreoccupied mind or you ara as good as sannyasi during the classes. If you have unpreoccupied mind, you give top priority, and you have sadhana cathustaya sambatti you are as good as sannyasa. Previously it was in letter and spirit and now it is not in letter but in spirit only. It is so because vaidhka karmas have already have gone. If you do such vedic rituals etc., you cannot attend the brahma sutra class.

Adhi Sankaracharya said sannyasa is a must both in letter and in spirit and now we have modified that in spirit is enough and the letter is not compulsory.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 317

### **Topic 2. Paramarsadhikaranam [Sutras 18 – 20]**

The scriptures prescribe Sannyasa

#### **Sutra 3.4.20 [445]**

#### ***Vidhirva dharanavat***

Or rather [there is an] injunction [in this text] as in the case of carrying [of the sacrificial wood]

The argument commenced in sutra 19 to refute the objection raised in sutra 18 is continued.

We have completed 20<sup>th</sup> sutra which is the end of second adhikaranam known as paramarsa adhikaranam. In the first adhikaranam vyasa established Atma Jnanam as an independent means of liberation and in the second he established sannyasa as a means for liberation. In the second adhikaranam he refuted ekarsa vada of Purva Mimamsa and established anekasrama vada.

We have direct pramanam in the form of jabala Upanisad vakyam. The mantra 3 of jabala Upanisad reads as *brahmacaryam parisamapyta grhit bhavet, grhi bhutva vani bhavet, vani bhutva pravrajat yadi vetaratha brahmacaryaa eva snatako va sasnatako votannagniko va yad ahar eva virajet tad ahar eva pravrajat* here the commandment verb is used all four asramas are specifically used. The meaning of the mantra reads as after completing the life of a student, let one become a householder; after completing the life of a householder let one become a forest dweller; after completing the life of a forest dweller, let one renounce, even from the state of a student or from the state of a householder or from that of a forest dweller.

Not only that there is another vakyam also. The person need not necessarily go through all asramas compulsorily and he has other option also. He has also the qualification and one need not go through grahastha and Vanaprastha. From Brahmacharya to sannyasa is allowed. Thus we can all four or any two or three. Combining all four is called samucaya asrama and combining any two is vikalpaka asrama.

Thus there is direct support is there in jabala Upanisad. If he does not accept it we have tougher option of taking Chandogya upanisad sloka. Here we have to comment and extract the asrama through a special interpretation. The second problem is sannyasa is not explicitly mentioned. So we have to take brahma samasthah and take it as sannyasa asrama.

Purva Paksi had mentioned that sannyasa asrama is only for handicapped people who are unfit to do karma. For that also Adhi Sankaracharya wants to make a comment. He says such a sannyasa is also said in sastra. In the absence of wife, anagnih, in the case of widower who has lost his wife he becomes disqualified to perform vedic ritual and he is called vidurah.

Unmarried people also included in this category. For them sannyasa asrama is given as an option. There is another option apat sannyasa. If one want to go through all four asramas but he does not have courage to enter sannyasa asrama. For such people there is another option and you force to the fag end of the lfie when the doctor has said that he would not survive for long.

Only prisa mantra uccharanam in hospital bed is sufficient to take to sannyasa. Through this short cut prisa mantra sannyasa , he can take to sannyasa and that is called apat sannyasa taken in death bed. Suppose he survives after this sannyasa, then there will be problem. That is not our problem. In the next janma he can take sannyasa in Brahmacharya or he can attain krama Mukti. These are mentioned in the sastra and Adhi Sankaracharya says you should take it or conclude that all sannyasas are handicapped people.

These are mentioned in 4<sup>th</sup> mantra of jabala Upanisad. Scripturally unqualified people for rituals are sannyasa. The fifth mantra also give some more detail about the sannyasa asrama. The mantra reads as *athah parivrad vivarnavasa mundo'parigrahaah sucir adrohi bhaiksano brahma bhuyaya bhavatiti yady aturah syan manasa vaca samnyaset esa pantha brahmana hanuvittas stenaiti samnyasi brahmavid ity evam evaisa bhagavan yajnavalkyah*. The meaning of the mantra reads as the wandering ascetic who puts on orange robes, who is shaven, who has non-possession, purity, non-enmity, lives on alms, obtains the state of Brahman, if he is diseased he can renounce by mind and speech. This is not to be done by one who is healthy. Such a renouncer becomes the knower of Brahman. Also he should pursue Vedanta Sravana Manana Nididyanam. He attains Brahman aikyam in this janma itself.

Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya concludes that sannyasa asrama is there as jnana angam.

Now we will enter third adhikaranam.

### **Topic 3. Stutimatradhikaranam [Sutras 21-22]**

#### **Sutra 3.4.21 [446]**

#### ***Stutimatramupadanaditi chennapurvatvat***

If it be said that [texts such as the one about the Udgitha are] mere glorifications on account of their reference [to parts of sacrifice], [we say] not so, on account of the newness [of what they teach, if viewed as injunctions] ‘*Stutimatramupadanaditi chet*’ and reply portion is ‘*na apurvatvat*’

Saint thyagaraja took sannyasa at the end of his life. Even great upasaka Anandarama Dixitar also took sannyasa at the time of his death. They took apat sannyasa. First I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam. It has two sutras.

Here vyasacharya analyses Chandogya upanisad vakyam mantra 1.1.3 which reads as *sa esa rasanaam rasatamah paramah parardhyo'stamo yad udgithah*. The meaning of the mantra is that is the quintessence of the essences, the supreme, the highest, the eighth namely the udgitha.

This mantra talks about omkara occurring in Sama veda. It is musical version of omkara which is technically known as udgithah. Udgitha is ultimate essence of the creation. Seven



items are given and eighth and ultimate sara is called rasa tamah udgithah. Eighth and final sara is called udgithah which is said to be most sacred mantra and it is sacred abode of Brahman. That is why it is taken as symbol for invoking the Lord. The controversy here is whether we should take these virtues as simple glorification or should these virtues be put into any anustanam. Stuti artham means it is for simple glorification alone. We don't take the virtues for any type of anustanam. If it is anustanartham it will become a part of a karma or upasana vidhi.

Purva Pakshi says that all the gunas are for simple glorification and you need not use it in anything. To convey this idea Purva Pakshi quotes another example from karma kanda. Iyam eva juhoo and svarga logah ahavaniyah the significance of the mantra is and it says that juhoo is the name of the wooden ladle for offering oblations. Iyam means prithvi. The mantra says the wooden ladle is earth itself. In karma kanda they analyse this and the bhasyakara says it is meant to glorify the ladle. We look upon the earth very reverentially and so also the ladle. Thus the ladle is glorified. Then the mantra can be forgotten and you need not even chant the mantra. The reason why ladle is glorified is because before the mantra comes the ladle is introduced as part of the ritual in the previous vidhi as karma angam.

Therefore the Purva Mimamsakas have made a rule based on this observation. Wherever karmangam is there the virtues of karmangams mentioned should be taken as simple stotram. There is another karmanga guna vakyam ahavaniyah which means fire into which oblations are offered. That ahavaniyah is glorified as svarga lokah. Ahavaniyah is karmanga. Therefore in ritualistic portion it is taken as stuthi vakyam. In karma kanda since karmanga bodhaga vakyam as stuthi vakyam, we have to apply the same law in Chandogya upanisad 1.1.3 also because it also relates to karmanga guna bodhaga vakyam.

In Chandogya upanisad the karmanga is udgithah that refers to Omkara and every mantra is karma angam. The word rasa tamaha pararthiyah parama are the virtues of karmangam which is udgitha here. We have nothing to do with it. It is for glorification only. Here vyasa gives answer in this adhikaranam in two sutras.

Now we will go to general analysis of sutra 21. Here the first part of Purva Pakshi. The answer is na apurvavada. Now we will see how answer is given. Vyasa says your argument is incorrect. If you have to take stuthi as glorification of karmanga and then in the proximity there must be a karma vidhi vakyam. Then only karmanga will be relevant. In the Purva Mimamsa example [as quoted above] their contention is perfectly all right as it occurs near the karma vidhi, the performance of a ritual. I don't appreciate the glory of a mirudangist in the middle of a vedantic class. That is applicable to the example. But in Chandogya upanisad 1.1.3 there is no karma vidhi and therefore it cannot be taken as stuthi vakyam as it is not connected with any ritual. It is upasana anustana vakyam. In this upasana anustanam all these gunas have to be used. Therefore it is not stuthi vakyam and it is anustana vakyam. This is the general analysis.

Now I will give you the significance of the words of the sutra. Stutimatram Chandogya upanisad statement [1.1.3] is only a glorification. Upadanad means because of its reference to udgithah which is a karmangam. Iti chet if this is the contention, na it is not so; apurvavada because it is a new injunction or a new instruction or a new vidhi vakyam. Now we will take the significance of the word. Stuthi matram means mere glorification. Significance of matram or mere is the Purva Pakshi intention is that it is not used for any karma anustanam, it is artha vadha only.

The reason he gives is upadanat. It should be understood as karmanga upadanat. Karmanga uadanat means karmanga bodha udgitha uapdanat. When he takes this reasons he remembers a Purva Mimamsa nyaya. Yatra yatra karma guna bodhaha vakya varthate it is stuthi only. Then iti chet if this is the contention, na I cannot accept it because apurvatvat in this mantra there is no vidhi vakyam in the proximity and therefore it should be taken as new anustana vakyam and it is part of any other anustanam. [refer to arguments above]. One more reinforcing argument is given in the next sutra.

### **Topic 3. Stutimatradhikaranam [Sutras 21-22]**

#### **Sutra 3.4.22 [447]**

#### ***Bhavasabdaccha***

And there being words expressive of injunction.

The argument commenced in sutra 21 is concluded.

First we will see the general analysis. Here Vyasacharya says that there is clear indication in Chandogya upanisad to show that it is not a part of any vedic ritual but it refers to independent upasana. We have got in Chandogya upanisad 1.1.1 which reads as *aum ity etad aksaram udgitham upasita, aum iti hrd gayati tasyopavyakhyanam* the meaning of the mantra is aum one should meditate on this syllable, the udgitha for one sings the loud chant beginning with aum. Of this follow a big explanation. There is very clear instruction that udgitha upasana has to be practiced. From this it is clear that udgitha mantra is not used as part of ritual with no ritual at all. It is independently taken as upasana. It is not a karmangam at all.

We cannot accept anything outside the field of ritual. We can have swatantra upasana possible. I can practise omkara upasana without any ritual etc as is evident in the above mantra. Upadita is vidhi vakyam. Hence Vyasacharya there is direct vidhi vakyam. Omkara can be chanted independently as a mantra. Bhavah in the sutra means vidhih. Then another question may come which is answered here. I take it omkara is prescribed as part of vedic ritual. For this we say that if omkara is to be taken as part of vedic ritual then that ritual must be mentioned in the proximity. Otherwise where it is to be taken as an anga of a karma. Since there is no proximate karma vidhi, it is swatantra upasana only. Then there is one more argument if anything is part of a ritual then angam will not have a separate phalam. Angi alone will have phalam. Anga will not have phalam. Karma the ritual alone will have phalam. Here for omkara upasana separate phalam is mentioned. This being so it is not karmangam but swatantra upasanam. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 318

### **Topic 3. Stutimatradhikaranam [Sutras 21-22]**

**Sutra 3.4.22 [447]**

#### ***Bhavasabdaccha***

And there being words expressive of injunction.

The argument commenced in sutra 21 is concluded.

We see the 22<sup>nd</sup> sutra which is part of third adhikaranam and here Vyasacharya deals with omkara mentioned in Chandogya upanisad whether the mantra 1.1.3 is a swatantra omkara or it is karmana omkara is the question. Purva Mimamsa wants to point out that omkara is karmanga omkara because it is a mantra for every mantra is an angam of karma only. Once he establishes it, Chandogya upanisad will become karmangam. This is the overall picture you should have.

Purva Mimamsa does not want jnana kanda to exist independent having value its own. According to him jnana kanda is worthless and he want to prove it is dependent on karma kanda. Advaidin wishes to establish jnana kanda and later will negate karma kanda. Therefore Purva Mimamsa wants omkara as karmangam and Vyasacharya says it cannot be karmangam as no ritual is talked about in the proximity. No ritual is talked in the nearby sutras. There is karma vidhi in the first chapter of the Chandogya upanisad. Here he gives second argument that in Chandogya upanisad itself prescribes omkara in the form of upasana mantra.

The positive support an upasana vidhi and it exists as swatantra upasana. This is mentioned in the same mantra. The upaseeta is bhava sabdah and it is vidhi bodhaha vakya. It is not a karmangam is thus proved. Not only that there is a vidhi but also there is another reason also in the conjunction ca word occurring in the sutra. 'Ca' kara gives the implied reason. If omkara or omkara Upasana is karmangam, then angam will not have separate phalam for itself. Angam will always be a part of angam. If omkara or upasana is an angam of big ritual and omkara will not have separate benefit and the phalam will be mentioned in the karma it is no in the case of omkara upasana.

Where omkara upasana is talked about separate phalam is mentioned in 1.1.7 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *apayita ha vai kamanam bhavati ya etad evam vidvan aksaram udgitham upaste*. The meaning of the mantra is that he who knowing this, meditates on the syllable as the udgitha, becomes verily, a fulfiller of desires. Here it is very clear that omkara exists as separate sadhana. It need not be part of karma kanda. When swatantra saguna upasana exists what to talk of swatantra nirguna Jnanam. Therefore saguna upasana is independent of karma and nirguna Jnanam also independent of karma. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. I will give you running meaning. Bhava sabdad ca. Because of the usage of injunction or commandment of vidhi also Chandogya upanisad vakyam 1.1.3 is not mere glorification. Now we will see the significance of the word.

Bhavasabdah means vidhi and sabdah means bodhaga veda vakyam. The vidhi bodhaga veda vakyam kept in mind is 1.1.1 of Chandogya upanisad ibid. It is clearly there and why should it be connected with karma kanda vidhi when it is available here. Ca mans also. Also indicates another reasoning phala bodhagatvad ca. It present separate phalam for omkara upasana it exist independently and it need not join any karma kanda ritual. When we talk of this, the statement kept in mind is 1.1.7 of Chandogya upanisad. Because of this reason omkara is discussed here.

What is the conclusion regarding 1.1.3 of Chandogya upanisad statement. You look back to last class. Our main discussion was not Chandogya upanisad 1.1.7 but the main discussion was 1.1.3 of Chandogya upanisad. What happens to that controversy. There various virtues are mentioned. The virtues of udgitha omkara is mentioned in 1.1.3 is the controversy.

Purva Paksi says they are stuthi matram and they are not sued for any anustanam. In the light of our discussion we say that the virtues are not merely meant for glorification but they are to be intensely practised while doing swatantra omkara upasanam. It is omkara upasana independently and when you omkara how it hould be meditated. For which this glorification is given. When Chandogya upanisad 1.1.3 is employed that vakyam is called guna bodhaga vakyam by mimamsakas. Our view is guna bodhaga vakyam. If its is stuthi bodhaka vakyam it is not applied in any practice and if it is guna bodhaka vakyam it is applied in karmas. Here guna word is used as a part of anustanam by Purva Mimamsa . I do not want to enter this topic here. Before coming back to the grand picture is that omkara upasana is Saguna Vidya and our discussion is on Nirguna Vidya. What we want to add is when saguna Vidya stands independently why cannot it stand independent in the case of Nirguna Vidya. With this 22<sup>nd</sup> sutra is over. Third adhikaranam is also over.

#### **Topic 4. Pariplavadhikaranam [Sutras 23-24]**

**Sutra 3.4.23 [448]**

##### ***Pariplavartha iti chenna viseshitatvat***

If it be said [that the stories told in the Upanisads] are for the purpose of Pariplave [only we say] not so, because [certain stories above] are specified [by the sruti for this purpose].

The purpose of narration of stories in the Upanisad is started in this sutra and in the next sutra.

First I will give a general analysis of this adhikaranam. This is the fourth adhikaranam with two sutras. In this adhikaranam alos Purva Mimamsa is coming with some argument so that he can connect all Upanisad into karma kanda. Here he applies another method. He wants Upanisad should not exist independently but should be subservient to karma. Pariplavartha is a word commonly used in karma kanda. It is derived from the root plava means flooding.

In Purva Mimamsa pariplava has nothing to do with flood. It is the name of an action which is part of aswamedha karma or yaga. Aswamedha karma angam. This is done only by ksatriyas alone. While talking out it veda gives commandment pariplavam ritual as a part of aswamedha karma. What is that aswamedha pariplava ritual. But it is nothing but listening to stories. That katha sravanam is compulsorily to be done by those who do the aswamedha yaga. What stories should they listen?

The stories are the vaidhika katha sravanam. The various stories said in the vedas and Upanisads. The stories occurring in the Upanisad also are vaidhika kathas. Vaidhika kathas should be listened as part of aswamedha yagas. All vaidhika kathas are karmangam is their argument. He says once the Upanisad kathas becomes karmangam, as an extension of that following teachings also must be karmangam. Vidya is part of that katha and hence katha is karmangam so Vidya also is karmanagam. Therefore Upanisad does not exist independently. This is the controversy. We say Upanisadic storie are brahma vidyangam only. This is the adhikarana rasa.

Now we will see the meaning of the first sutra. Pariplavartha is purva paksha protion. They say all the vaidhika katha are aswamedha karmangam for pariplava ritual. In second part Vyasacharya gives the answer. Veda in the case of aswamedha instructs that the kings should listen to the stories occurring in karma kanda. Therefore vaidhika katha is meant for aswamedha ritual. Why the raja asks him to listen to the stories we do not know. It is for the purpose that the kings do not go out of the yagasala and for them not to engage themselves in other activities. This is meant for keeping the king engaged in gap hours between yaga procedure. This Vyasacharya accepts. In the prakaranam itself it is said what katha should be listened to. The kathas are first day some stories and second day you listen to this etc. First day you listen to manu story. Second day you listen to another king yama's story who is svarga loka athipathi or a raja. Thus stories are visheshitam. When we look at the list of the stories the Upanisadic stories are not included in the aswamedha prakaranam and therefore Upanisadic stories cannot be pariplavartham. Hence it is not aswamedha karmangam. Hence it is nirguna Brahma Vidya angam only. This is general analysis of the sutra.

Now we will do word analysis. Pariplavarthah means the Upanisadic stories are meant for pariplava ritual in the aswamedha ritual. Iti chet means if this is the contention, na it is not so. Visheshitatvat because of the stories for pariplava rituals have been specified [in the veda itself]. Now we will come to the significance of the words. Pariplavartha means meant for the ritual. Pariplava is defined aswamedha karma anga bhuta vaidhika katha sravanam. Listening to the vedic stories as a part of aswamedha ritual is called pariplava. Then our answer is we don't agree with you. Visheshitatvat means it is specified. You cannot listen to any story you like. You have to listen to specififc vaidhika katha where the Upanisadic stories are not included.

#### **Topic 4. Pariplavadhikaranam [Sutras 23-24]**

**Sutra 3.4.24 [449]**

***Tatha chaikavakyatopabandhat***

And so [they are meant to illustrate the nearest vidyas] being connected as one coherent whole.

The discussion commenced in sutra 23 is concluded here.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In the previous sutra we have established Upanisadic stories cannot be connected to aswamedha ritual. Now Upanisadic stories are not meant for karma kanda then what is the purpose of the story for it does not give any direct benefit to purushartha. They are arthavadha. How do you utilize the stories. All of them are meant for connection with Brahma Vidya. It is part of Brahma Vidya teaching itself. Either the story talks about the qualification of the student indirectly or talk about the teacher indirectly or it talks about the glory of Brahma Vidya itself indirectly.

Take the case of Nachiketus. Here Nachiketus is offered with both ika loka sukam or para loka sukam. Then he says I will give you worldly pleasures as also heavenly pleasures. All of the he refuses and he wanted only Atma Jnanam. This is a story but I directly, it says the state of mind of the vedantic student must be like that of Nachiketus. Then in other place in katha Upanisad it is said many people do not come to Vedanta classes at all and even if they come they don't understand at all and even if they go to many gurus and they don't choose me as Guru says yamadharma raja. Brahma Vidya is a rarest thing. In Gita Arjuna's mind is described. This also gives a view what study I should take and what type of teacher I should choose for pursuing the study. Never go to a teacher who separates sastra from teaching. Guru reminds that what he teaches is in consonance with the sastras. He should teach vedic contents alone. These are mentioned indirectly in stories in Upanisads. They are vidyangam not karmangam.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tatha ca means consequently eka vakyatopabandhat means since the Upanisadic story have connection with Upanisadic knowledge as one main teaching, the Upanisadic stories are not karmangam. They are not part of rituals. Tatha ca means consequently to the conclusion of the previous sutra. The Upanisadic stories are not part of rituals. Then ekavakyatha upapandhat means one main teaching or one main sentence. In election speeches many sentence will be there but the sole purpose of the speech is vote for me. This is eka vakyatvam. Don't take all the sentences literally. Similarly in the entire Upanisad, there is one sentence tat tvam asi. All the stories ultimately ends with the statement tat tvam asi. Sannyasa is prescribed as nididhasana angam in Yajnavalkya story in Brahdaranyaka Upanisad. Upabandhaka means connection. Connection between Upanisadic story and Upanisadic teaching. The connection is eka vakyata connection. Hence they are not karmangam. With this 24<sup>th</sup> sutra and fourth adhikaranam is over. We will see the next adhikaranam in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 319

### **Topic 4. Pariplavadhikaranam [Sutras 23-24]**

**Sutra 3.4.24 [449]**

#### ***Tatha chaikavakyatopabandhat***

And so [they are meant to illustrate the nearest vidyas] being connected as one coherent whole.

The discussion commenced in sutra 23 is concluded here.

We have completed 24<sup>th</sup> sutra and fourth adhikaranam of the fourth pada of the third chapter of Brahma Sutra. It talks of the various discipline to acquire Brahma Jnanam. When we say Brahma Vidya it is Nirguna Brahma Vidya. It is classified into two types and one is direct means and the other is indirect means. Direct means will be pointed out as Vedanta Sravana Manana Nididyanam and the knowledge has to be generated by operation of the appropriate means. The means is Vedanta and the operation is Sravana Manana Nididyanam. There are so many other things which are also useful indirectly like karma yoga is needed for purification of mind and ashtanga yoga for keeping the body fit. Even physical health is required indirectly. Even food indirectly contributes as stated in Gita. This indirect means is called parampara sahjana or bhagiranga sadhanam. Therefore the theme of fourth pada is nirguna Brahma Vidya and bhagiranga sadhana. First Vyasacharya establishes nirguna Brahma Vidya can produce liberation. It does not require any karma anustanam. We need kevala Jnanam. In karma kanda mere knowledge will not give any benefit. If I want to go to svarga loka I should know about the jyotistoma yaga and then I should do the yaga. However much I know the knowhow will not give me svarga. I have to perform the yaga. Yaga Jnanam and yaga anustanam will give the benefit. But in jnana kanda we don't require Brahma Jnanam to be followed by brahma anustanam. There is no anustanam involved and mere understanding can give liberation. Jnanam is able independently give the result. In karma kanda the knowledge should be followed by karma anustanam. It is not independent. I may know all about asanas but if I don't do it I cannot get any benefit. Knowing depends upon doing to produce result in karma kanda. In jnana kanda knowing does not depend upon doing. This principle Vyasacharya wants to establish with regard to saguna Vidya and nirguna Vidya. What do we mean by Sagunam Brahma Vidya which means upasana. It is Isvara upasana that exist independent of ritual. It need not always go with rituals. Some go with rituals and there are many they exist independently. Later Nirguna Brahma Vidya also independent. This is the essence of five adhikaranam. In the first adhikaranam Vyasacharya gave the pratigna the proposition that kevala Vidya is independent or not independent. This he gave in the first adhikaranam. The next three adhikaranam he established by answering the objections from Purva Mimamsakas. They objected that both should go with karma. The objections were negated in the following adhikaranam. Karma must be there for all the time was first negated. In grahashtasrama karma cannot be given up. He said sannyasa asrama exists and karma rahita Sagunam Brahma Vidya and karma rahita Nirguna Brahma Vidya also possible there in sannyasa. In third adhikaranam Purva Mimamsa talked of udgitha upasana. They said it is part of karma kanda. They said

Chandogya upanisad must be part of karma kanda. All Sagunam Brahma Vidya in Chandogya upanisad must go with karma kanda because omkara is karmangam. That also Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya successfully refuted by saying that in Chandogya upanisad no ritual is mentioned. So it is not part of karma kanda. In the fourth adhikaranam, Purva Mimamsa attempted the pariplava method of hearing Upanisadic stories. Stories are supposed to be part of karma kanda. All Upanisadic stories they said are pariplavam and they will be part of karma and entire Upanisad has to be used as part of karma kanda. Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya successfully refuted that even though they are meant as pariplava and not all the stories. Thus both saguna Vidya and nirguna Vidya can stand independently. Now we will enter the nigamanam and conclude Vidya swatantriayma topic. Proposition and conclusion should be the same. Now we will enter the next sutra 25

## **Topic 5. Agniadhanadhyadhikaranam [Sutras 25]**

### **Sutra 3.4.25 [450]**

#### ***Ata eva chagnidhanadyanapeksha***

And therefore there is no necessity of the fighting of the fire and so on.

The sutra states that the seeker of Brahman may dispense with sacrificial fire.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam and it has only one sutra. Mere understanding will liberate and mere cognitive transformation is required. Unbelievable but it is true. This is going to be said in this adhikaranam. Since mere knowledge can liberate and knowledge does not require any support of any adhistanam. You may do anustanam for other purpose. It is not for Moksa purpose. I want freedom from few extra kilos. For freedom no anustana is required. Asrama triya anustanam is not required for Jnanam to produce Moksa. Grahasthana and vanaprasthana karma anustanam is not required.

All types of anustanam is not required. Jnanam will do the job independently. The flame does not require the oil for removing the darkness. It require oil for continued existence. But removal of darkness oil is not required and oil cannot remove darkness. Oil is not effulgent to remove the darkness., it is not direct cause to remove the darkness. Similarly Jnanam does not require any thing to remove ajnanam. A person can take sannyasa if he wants for in it no other asrama karmas are there. Sannyasa is possible is the second corollory. The third corollory is that in sannyasa asrama one need not perform any karma. Jnanam is swatantram and therefore karma samucaya is not required.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In this sutra Vyasacharya says there is absolutely no dependence on karma. Here karma indicates all the asrama karmas are not require for Jnanam to produce phalam. The karma includes loukika and vaidhika karma and the latter includes kayika, vachika karmas. No parayanam is required for getting Moksa. None is compulsory.

The reason jnanasya swatantriyad. Jnanam is independently capable of producing Moksa. We should note another aside point. It is fundamental and therefore acharyas don't discuss this point. Kevalam Jnanam produces liberation because samsara is caused by mere ignorance. Therefore mere knowledge is sufficient. [or this refer to adhyasa bashyam in the beginning of Brahma sutra.]



Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Atah eva means therefore agnindhanadianapeksha ca there is no dependence on karma for knowledge to produce Moksa. Ataha eva means therefore only. You have to connect this to first sutra of this pada. The idea conveyed there is knowledge can independently give liberation.

Therefore you don't require to do any karma. You take walking stick only when you cannot stand on your own. In karma kanda Jnanam is weak and therefore you take Jnanam stick. In jnana kanda it is strong and hence you don't require any stick to support you. Agnindhanatianapeksha it means karma.

Agni means fire indhanam means oblation and adhi means etc. The priest and other. All are used in the context of karma. They indicate the rituals. The ritual in which fire oblations etc., are used. Anapeksha means non requirement. There is non-requirement of rituals in the Brahma Jnanam. For Adhi Sankaracharya it is very important and then alone the doors for sannyasa are open. For sannyasa this sutra is important. Ca means also. The non-requirement of karma is a corollary. With this, the adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 6. Sarvapekshadhikaranam [Sutras 26-27]**

**Sutra 3.4.26 [451]**

### ***Sarvapeksha cha yajnadi sruterasyavav***

And there is the necessity of all works because the scriptures, etc., [as means to the attainment of knowledge] even as the horse [is used to draw a chariot and not for ploughing]

The sutra says that sacrificial works and the like are necessary for origination of knowledge of Brahman.

First I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. It is very often quoted by Adhi Sankaracharya. Vyasacharya says Jnanam depends on all sadhanas. Sarva apeksha. When we listen to this if you remember the conclusion of previous adhikaranam it will give a big shock to us. Apparently Vyasacharya contradicts. Jnanam is dependent on everything all the sadhanas. Vyasacharya says Jnanam is both independent and dependent. This creates the confusion.

If it is independent it cannot be dependent and if it is dependent it cannot be independent. Nothing can be both independent and dependent. We say from one angle Jnanam is dependent and from another angle Jnanam is independent. As we say Brahman is both independent and dependent. In one context Brahman is dependent on maya. On another context we say Brahman is independent.

Without maya Brahman cannot do anything. It cannot sristi sthithi laya karanam. It has to depend on maya to do sristi sthithi laya. We even say maya is dependent on Brahman. There is confusion here. Which is correct? With regard to existence, Brahman is absolutely independent. It does not dependent on anything including maya. On the other hand everything including maya Brahman is independent. When it comes to functioning if Brahman is to do any function [the creation] even desire to do creation, visualization, preservation and any function Brahman is not independent. Brahman is dependent on maya.

From existence angle Brahman is independent and from functional angle Brahman is dependent. Maya is dependent on maya for existence also for functioning also. It has twofold dependence. Jnanam is both independent and dependent from two different angle. Jnanam for rising in the mind of the student for it is not there. Solid dark ignorance is there in place of Jnanam.

For rising Jnanam it depends upon many sadhanas directly and indirectly. Even tragedies we face in life are useful for Jnanam. This will create vairagya. Vairagya will create some interest on Gita. Arjuna required battle and possible death of Bhishma and drona for taking Gita lesson. Jnanam for its function of ajnana nivritti it is independent. It does not depend on anything. This is the introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya points out veda itself clearly says Jnanam depends upon so many factors for its rise. It needs karma, upasana, akara niyama and various disciplines etc. There is famous manta 4.4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. That is vividhisa stuthi.

The mantra reads as *sa eva mahan aja Atma yo'yam vijnanamayah pranesu, ya eso'ntar-hridaya akasah tasmin sete, sarvasya vasi, sarvasyesanah, sarvasyadhipatih; sa na sadhuna karmana bhuyan no evasadhuna kaniyan esa sarvesvarah, esa bhutadhipatih esa setur vedharana esam lokanam asamhedaya tam etam vedanuvacanena brahmana vividisanti, yajnena danena tapasanasakena, etam eva viditva munir bhavati, etam eva pravrajnino lokam icchantah pravrajanti etadd ha sma vai purve vidvamsah prajam na kamayante kim prajayaharismayamah* the seekers pursue Jnanam through all types of sadhanas like veda parayanam, all types of ritual, every charity you have done, the austerities etc., fasting etc., will edge you towards Moksa. From this we come to know Jnanam is sarvapeksha.

Even though Jnanam depends upon everything and dependence of some category and it is not uniform. Some have got direct connection and some indirect connection. Rama nama will give liberation means you should interpret properly. If I say Jnanam will give you Moksa means it directly produce Jnanam. Rama nama will prepare the mind to gain Jnanam. It produce interest in attending the classes. In certain classes it is paramparaya jnana sadhanam and in some cases saksat jnana sadhanam. It is like using animals for different functions Jnanam is not used for ploughing. Dog is used for different function. Karma function is different and sravanam function is different. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 320

### **Topic 6. Sarvapekshadhikaranam [Sutras 26-27]**

#### **Sutra 3.4.26 [451]**

#### ***Sarvapeksha cha yajnadi sruterasyavavat***

And there is the necessity of all works because the scriptures, etc., [as means to the attainment of knowledge] even as the horse [is used to draw a chariot and not for ploughing]

The sutra says that sacrificial works and the like are necessary for origination of knowledge of Brahman.

We are doing general analysis of sutra 25, which is the first sutra of this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya says that Jnanam is dependent on many factors and many disciplines. This appears to be a contradiction with the previous adhikaranam. There Vyasacharya said Jnanam does not depend upon any discipline or any factor.

Previously independent of Jnanam was talked about and here dependent is \talked about. The question is whether Jnanam is dependent or independent. It is dependent and independent also. From one point of view Jnanam is independent and another standpoint it is dependent. Brahman is independent and Brahman is dependent. From standpoint of existence and Consciousness Brahman does not depend upon anything. If Brahman is anugraha karta or srusti karta it has to depend upon the maya.

Similarly in Jnanam also Jnanam to remove ignorance does not depend upon any factor at all. This is a general rule and to any Jnanam it applies. It is independent capable of removing of ignorance just like flame removing darkness without dependent upon any factor. But the same Jnanam if it is to arrive in mind, for its utpatti, the Jnanam requires so many factors.

So we say utpattou anya apeksha. Flame depends upon many factors for its arrival. The dependent also has gradation. So many ways are there to produce flame. The direct factor is operation of matchbox. The operation of lighter is direct cause of generation of flame. Similarly the vedanta sravanam is direct factor to gain Jnanam. The oil does not generate flame. But it helps the lighter operation to get the light. The fuel becomes the supportive cause for lighter to generate the flame.

The supportive cause also is of two types. One is coexisting with the generating cause. Oil must exist when I light matchstick. There is other supportive cause, which is not coexisting which should exist before and not exist at the time of lighting the lamp. One who makes the oil, the container in which it is brought. The oil producer need not be there when I light the lamp. The oil container need not exist at the time of lighting the lamp. The direct generating cause etc., are required for the flame to arise. Preexisting, co existing and direct generating cause should be there for lighting the lamp. In gaining knowledge also all the three causes are there.

The preexisting supportive cause is like puja japa dhanam etc. Are required to prepare the mind that is sadhana cathustaya sambatti oil is needed. Therefore karma yoga and upasana yoga will bring the oil, they are the preexisting supportign cause, and once the oil is brought they all can go away. Then japa etc., are not compulsory and one can drop all karmas and take to sannyasa. They are preexisting supportive cause.

What is the coexisting supportive cause? Sadhana cathustaya sambatti have to exist even while Jnanam is acquired. During sravanam, mananam and nididyanam sadhana cathustaya sambatti is a must and after jnana nishta sadhana cathustaya sambatti is not a must. Then it will not go away. You can renounce but you cannot do that. Sadhana cathustaya sambatti comes under coexisting supportive cause.

What is generating cause? None of the above can produce knowledge. Any amount of karma or upasana or vairagya or anything can produce knowledge. The generative cause is Guru sastra upadesa. The only generating cause is one should systematically study Vedanta for a length of time under a guidance of competent acharya and that is the striking matchstick. All the three support one another, all the three are required for generating knowledge, and the generated knowledge does not depend upon anything to remove ignorance.

Hence Vyasacharya says that wherever dependence comes it should be used for production and not for phala dhanam. This explanation is to be done just as one employs horse appropriately for pulling vehicle and not for ploughing the land. Don't get confused in this regard. Use the causes appropriately. When you hear the japa, you should apply this adhikaranam, and you interpret it as that it indirectly produce Moksa as preexisting supportive cause for Moksa.

Then you use coexisting supportive cause and generating cause to get Jnanam. Don't literally take anything for any matter. Don't think japa will give moska and it gives mean japa serves as preexisting supportive cause. It gives mental purity only and nothing more. When the mind becomes pure Jnanam comes. This also leads to confusion. This should be interpreted that purity will serve as coexisting supportive cause to gain Jnanam. Vishnu sahasranama will work as preexisting supporgive cause only.

I call Vedanta an educational process and that process alone servces as generative cause. Like which animal should be employed for particular benefit should be kept in mind in the case of the above.

Ca means however; sarvapekshat knowledge has dependence on all disciplines. Aswavad means the disciplines are to be employed appropriately like a horse. Yajnadisrute means this is known from the sruti statement dealing with yajna etc.

Now we will see the significance of the words. Sarvepekshad dependence on all factors. Ca means however. While there is no dependent with regard to removal of ignorance but it is dependent for arrival of Jnanam. The sruti statement is 4.4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad given above [learning chanting and repetition of vedas is meant here] Brahmachari has no money etc., and he can do japa and parayanam alone.

Yajnena dhanena vedic ritual and charity can be done only by the grahasthasrama karmani. All types of austerities leading a simple life without possessing anything is primary discipline in Vanaprastha asrama. All are useful for knowledge. Hence veda says people work for

knowledge right from Brahmacharya asrama. All asrama karma serve as preexisting supportive cause that before vedantic study. Then take to sannyasa asrama and take the generative cause of vedantic sravanam. Like the horse they have to be employed properly.

1.2.15 of Kathopanisad and talks in the same manner. The mantra says that word which all the vedas record which all penances proclaim desiring which men live as religious students that word I tell thee briefly; it is Om. Likewise intimates that the wroks enjoined on th asramas are means of knowledge. The beauty is if veda says Moksa is purushartha many people have no value for Moksa. So Moksa is made a hidden agenda. The open agenda prescribed here is dharma artha kama. Get married and enjoy all pleasures. Artha kama provided by veda is open agenda and if you follow artha kama properly you indirectly pave way for moska like sugar coated tablet. That is indicated in Katha mantra also.

## **Topic 6. Sarvapekshadhikaranam [Sutras 26-27]**

### **Sutra 3.4.27 [452]**

***Samadamadyupetah syat tathapi tu tadvidhestadangataya tesham avasyanushtheyatvat***

But all the same [even though there is no injunction to do sacrificial acts to attain knowledge in the Brihadaranyaka upanisad text] one must possess serenity, Self control and the like, as these are enjoined as auxiliaries to knowledge and therefore have necessarily to be practised.

In this Vyasacharya is talking about another important discipline upon which knowledge is dependent for arrival. I said two types of supportive cause preexisting supportive cause, coexisting supportive cause and one is bhagiranga sadhana, and the other is andharanga sadhana. As the word shows while you study Vedanta the preexisting supportive cause you can drop it. But coexisting supportive cause will have to be there when Vedanta sravanam continues. This is puja, japa and social service etc., comes under this cause. A person should start with this, and once he gas got sadhana cathustaya sambatti he can continue or drop karma yoga. But satyam vadha etc., are coexisting supporting cause. You must follow this till you gain Jnanam.

Therefore they will come under andharanga sadhanani. In previous sutra bhagiranga sadhana is mentioned and here antharanga sadhana is mentioned. Here Vyasacharya says that the preexistent supportive causes, like karma yuga and upasana yoga it exists before coming to Vedanta and they may exist in this janma or in purva janma also. The preexisting material cause need not be in this janma and there can be in the previous janma also. If a person has gone through the same in purva janma, in this janma he need not go through sadhana cathustaya sambatti. He will not have interest in artha, kama etc. And he will have natural inclination for Vedanta pursuit.

This we have seen in the case of Nachiketetus. He rejected all the comforts offered by Yama Dharma raja. If we were in his position our action would be different. Many of us we will say after all Moksa can wait but water problem is immediate. So we will ask for water. Such people like Nachiketetus need not go through what they have gone through in the previous asrama and they will be ready to gain Jnanam. Their mind would well receive the Atma Jnanam instantly. They need not go through the three asramas, upasana karma yoga etc. They

require maintenance and continuation of sadhana cathustaya sambatti with which they are born. They will only have to maintain it. Spiritual prodigy has got sadhana cathustaya sambatti and they need further refinement and they can go to generative knowledge that is Vedanta sravanam.

The sutra has got three portions. First portion is tahapi tu tadvidhestadangataya, second portion is samadamadyupetah syat and the third portion is teshamavasyanushtheyatvat. Now I will do the general analysis. First portion points out the karma yoga etc., is not compulsory for all people if they have done that in purva janma and they find vairagya with them. Brahmacharya eva sannyasa is allowed for them. They need not study Purva Mimamsa for they need not do rituals etc. They do bhagiranga sadhana in this brith.

With regard to karma yoga there is option. But sadhana cathustaya sambatti is not an option and even spiritual prodigy has to maintain these disciplines. He should continue to practice. They are andharanga sadhana that is coexistent supportive cause.

Third part is sruti support for this conclusion. Sruti very clearly says that sadhana cathustaya sambatti is never optional and it is compulsory. The word dharma has three meaning one is vedic ritual and second is vedic values and vedic attitudes. When a person comes vedantic study he can give up vedic rituals by the rule sarva dharman parityaksa. Giving up of giving up vedic ritual is sannyasa asrama.

Vedic values he should continue even after becoming sannyasa for they are baghiranga sadhana. There also when he come to vedantic study it should be understood that only under one condition it is allowed only when you take to sannyasa asrama. Remaining in grahasthasrama you cannot give up the rituals even if you come to vedantic study. You can reduce vedantic rituals but you cannot give up and if you give up it is papam. The total giving up you can do only if you become a sannyasi. Giving up vedic rituals is possible only in sannyasa asrama.

Now I will give you vedic statement that support this conclusion. Brihadaranyaka upanisad 4.4.23 that reads as *santo danta uparatas titiksuh samahito bhutva, atmany evatmanam pasyati sarvam atmanam pasyati nainam papma tarati sarvam papmanam tarati, nainam apma tapati sarvam papmanam tapati; vipapo viraja 'vicihitso brahmano bhavati; esa brahma lokah samrat enam prapitosi iti hovaca yajnavalkyah, soham bhagavate videhan aadami, mam capi saha dasyayeti.* The essence of the mantra is there he who knows this having become calm, subdued, satisfied, patient and collected sees Self in Self.

One should be free from mental strain while doing Vedanta sravanam. Damah is sensory relaxation. All ten indriyas must be withdrawn. When ear is functioning to hear vedas, all other indriyas should stand withdrawn. Sravanam must be focused and intent. This is coexistent supportive cause. Withdraw from all other preoccupation. Uparama has several meaning. In sama and dama I withdraw mind and sense organs from all other preoccupation. Uparama is maintenance of the withdrawn condition at least until sravanam is over. This is very important or else the mind will go the same field once again. Titiksuh means putting up with obstacles that come on the way. This may be from health discomfort. Excuses will be many and innumerable. Any obstacle I should not give up. Don't give excuses in pursuing vedantic studies. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 321

### **Topic 6. Sarvapekshadhikaranam [Sutras 26-27]**

**Sutra 3.4.27 [452]**

***Samadamadyupetah syat tathapi tu tadvidhestadangataya tesham avasyanushtheyatvat***

But all the same [even though there is no injunction to do sacrificial acts to attain knowledge in the Brihadaranyaka upanisad text] one must possess serenity, Self-control and the like, as these are enjoined as auxiliaries to knowledge and therefore have necessarily to be practised.

I am doing the general analysis of sutra 27 of sixth adhikaranam. These two are two pillars of advaita tradition. Jnanam is totally independent to destroy avidya or Self ignorance. This was established in the previous adhikaranam. For arrival of Jnanam it deepens upon external factors. Guru and sastra alone kindle the Jnanam. And it is called saksat karanam or primary factor.

To support this primary factor we have two sets of supportive factors. One cause we call preexistent supportive cause bhagiranga sahakari sadhanam or yajnani sadhanani. They are religious activities, japa, danam etc. They need not exist simultaneously with study of Atma Jnanam. The second is andharanga sahakari sadhanam. This is coexistent supportive cause. It does not generate knowledge. If it generates knowledge it will be primary cause. They coexist simultaneously with vedantic study. The entire sadhana cathustaya sambatti maintenance become this category.

Viveka should be maintained all the time during the study. While maintaining them we should continue our study that is Vedanta sravanam. Here Vyasacharya talks about antaranga sadhana prescribed in 4.4.23 Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Samadanam means focus on Jnanam and Moksa. This is in addition to sama, dama, titiksa etc., already discussed in the last class. I should what is immediate and what is far ahead. Both of them are important for our concentration of our study. Puja etc., we should not forget long term focus. At the time of sravanam I should focus on immediate teaching. Ashtanga yoga is meant for purification of mind and prepares it for Atma Jnanam. Here we find five are mentioned in Brihadaranyaka upanisad.

We also talk about samadhi shatka sambatti. Brihadaranyaka upanisad has got two versions one in shukla yajur veda kanva saka which is commented upon by Adhi Sankaracharya . There is another one belonging to madhyantina saka which is commented by vidyaranya swamikal. Both are close to a great extent with slight modification here and there. Some slight modification here. Samadanam is mentioned in kanva saka. But in madhyantina saka there is another word shradda viddo bhutva. We take samadanam from kanva saka and shraddha from madhyantina saka and make the qualification as six. Jnanam can be purchased with money called shraddha. Shraddha we should have to gain Jnanam. Faith belief etc., are not real translation. Shraddha means shraddha. Then comes another question, this Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra talks about samadhi shatka sambatti sambatti.

While talking about sadhana cathustaya sambatti we talk about four disciplines. This is based on 1.2.12 of Mundaka Upanisad. The mantra reads as *pariksyā lokan karmacitan brahmano nirvedam ayan nasty akrtah krtena tad vijñānārtham sa urum evabhiḡacchet samit pañih srotriyam brahma-nishtham* the meaning of the mantra reads as having scrutinized the worlds won by works, let a brahmana arrive at non-attachemnt. The world that is not made is not won by what is done.

For the sake of this knowledge let him only approach with sacrificial fuel in had, a teacher who is learned in the scriptures and established in brahmana. From this it is clear eternal Moksa cannot be gained by karma. Only Jnanam can give Moksa. He does not want to depend upon karma and karma phalam is called vairagyam. Then the Upanisad says go to Guru for gaining Atma Jnanam. Going to Guru for nitya phalam is called mumuksutvam.

All four will come under antaranga sahakari sadhanam. This is general analysis of this sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tathapi tu means even if yajna is taken as optional samadamadyupetah syat one should be endowed with sama dama etc., tadvidheh means because they are prescribed tadangataya as part of that knowledge; tesham avasyanushtheyatvat means since they are to be necessarily followed. This is the running maning.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Sama dama means mind discipline and sense organs discipline. Adhi means etc., it refers to sadhana cathustaya sambatti. Upedah means endowed with. Syat means should be. One should regularly maintain them. Introspection is a very important sadhana for vedantic student. One should compulsorily follow until one get Sravana Manana Nididyanam.

Can we ignore jnana nishta. You can ignore them because it would have become the second nature. It is so because only when it becomes the second nature it is called jnana nishta. Tatapi means even though a person need not continue the vedic rituals, they have to be practised until antaranga sadhana is developed. Thereafter it is optional. Only after taking up sannyasa you can drop them forever. If one is born with sadhana cathustaya sambatti because of bahiranga sadhana practised in past janma and in his case yajnadi sadhanas are not compulsory and he can from Brahmacharya he can jump to sannyasa asrama.

He need not follow any one of the sadhanas, tad videh refers to the sruti support. Vidhi kept in mind is 4.4.23 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. There is another problem we face. Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam. How can a statement be called a vidhi is question posed by Purva Mimamsa. Mere statement is not a vidhi and in Brihadaranyaka upanisad there is a statement only. That is why Purva Mimamsa raises the question. Adhi Sankaracharya says even when there is no vidhi if there is unique teaching in veda which cannot be earned by any other pramanam then that statement can be called a vidhi. We have already established somewhere a statement can be called a vidhi if it is apurvadvad.

The second argument is that even though kanva saka there is no vidhi but in madhyantina saka there is a vidhi. Thus it is a vidhi and it is established. Tad angataya this qualification is prescribed as a part of Self Knowledge. For Self Knowledge they are compulsorily required. In your own mind Atma Jnanam should arise in a mind which has become sadhana cathustaya sambannah.



The next portion is tesan avasya anushttheyatvat. When veda gives injunction the prescription is applicable both primary and supportive sadhana. Both are compulsory. Atma darsanam and Atma darsana anga rupena, sadhana cathustaya sambatti also is compulsorily. We have to take more time for sadhana cathustaya sambatti only. For understanding Vedanta we need attend a few classes. If we take more time, it is not because the study is difficult but because we are not mentally prepared for that. We acquire sadhana cathustaya sambatti in many janmas and not we get in one year. Many janmas beginning from the past. They have to be compulsorily followed.

The bahiranga sadhanas contribute to Vedanta through adhista phalam or punyam. Sadhana cathustaya sambatti does not produce punyam but it produces drishta phalam. Drishta phalam is one we can experience it any time during sravanam particularly. Hundred percent concentration is required. Shanti and samatvam are not adhrishta. It is dhrista phalam only. The benefit of teaching we can continuously experience.

Adhi Sankaracharya say this is not only prescribed in Upanisad and lord Krishna in Gita emphasize this. 18.5 6 also emphasize this point. Antaranga sadhana is emphasised in 6<sup>th</sup> chapter. [third or fourth sloka] with this the adhikaranam is over.

Now we will go to 28<sup>th</sup> sutras.

## **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

### **Sutra 3.4.28 [453]**

#### ***Sarvannanumatischa pranatyaye taddarsanat***

Only when life is in danger [there is] permission to take all food [ i.e., take food indiscriminately] because the sruti declares that.

This and the subsequent three sutras indicate what kind of food is to be taken.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya analyses a mantra in 6.1.14 Brihadaranyaka upanisad. The relevant portion of the mantra is *navaha asyan annam jagdham bhavati*. There is a similar mantra occurring in 5.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad also. The context is samasti Prana upasana. Samasti Prana is Hiranyagarbha upasana emphasizing Prana aspect. Various glories are talked about here. Vishesha guna vishista Prana upasana.

The glory of Prana is that it is the greatest organ in the individual. To prove the greatness of Prana a story is also given. As per the story, it is said that one cannot survive without Prana but can survive with the missing of any of the organs. The moment Prana gets ready to go out, the organs become weak. Then they pray Prana. They glorify Prana. Then Prana asks the question what is my food. We discussed in 3.318 of Brahma sutra. Any food consumed by any organ is Prana's only it was concluded there. This applies to all worms and insects and jiva also.

After presenting Prana as eater of all annam, the Upanisad gives this statement that for a Prana upasaka no food becomes prohibited food. He can take all foods and he can take all unprohibited food. There is no vidhi nishedah. There is no rule about what can be taken and

what cannot be taken. This is called eating at will. This is the idea conveyed in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. We are going to have a controversy; this gives a vidhi Prana upasaka should eat everything. Is it a vidhi or a statement? This is the question. Should we take it as an arthavadha a glorificatory statement. Siddhanta sasy that this vakyam is arthavadha vakyam and don't follow it literally. The niyama of food discipline should be followed. This is our conclusion which we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 322

### **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

**Sutra 3.4.28 [453]**

#### ***Sarvannanumatischa pranatyaye taddarsanat***

Only when life is in danger [there is] permission to take all food [i.e., take food indiscriminately] because the sruti declares that.

This and the subsequent three sutras indicate what kind of food is to be taken.

Here we have four sutras beginning from sutra 28 to 31. It discusses a Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra. For the person there is no food that is prohibited and this statement is being analysed. Whether it is to be taken as vidhi vakyam or whether it should be taken as arthavadha vakyam. If it is vidhi one has to follow and if it is artha vadha it need not be observed.

One should eat all food without restriction or one can eat all is the question here. Sastra rule prescribed what to eat and what not to eat will be relaxed if it is taken as vidhi vakyam. These two are contradictory. If you accept the rule regarding sarvanna vidhi, then it will contradict the statement in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. If it is arthavadha we will interpret then we will call it a glorification of pranopasana. In glorification we can tell even if it is not a fact. It is not a pramanam or it is valid. Arthavada are two types. One is ninda in the form of criticism and arthavadha in the form of glorification.

Purva Pakshi claims it is a vidhi and we negate their view and say it is Prana upasana stuthi or glorification.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya gives one argument and Adhi Sankaracharya gives another argument. Adhi Sankaracharya says this vakyam cannot be a vidhi vakyam at all. To be a vidhi there should a commandment verb called imperative. Such verb is not there. The verb is simple present tense alone. Therefore how can you take it as vidhi vakyam.

Vyasacharya gives another argument. He says that sastra gives pakshya apakshya niyama. It is particular about discipline about eating how you eat how much you eat in what manner you eat etc. Since there is a niyama in sastra sarvanna pakshi vidhi is not there in sastram. There is only one rare exception given which is sarva anna paksana anumadhi. In exceptional cases on may give up the niyama. Here he differentiates vidhi from anumadhi. On occasion on may eat anything. That rare occasion is when there is threat to your very survival.

Without eating that if you face death, you can take anything. Only at that time the food niyama can be violated. Atyayam means leaving the body. Here only permission is given. Hence the sarvanna paksana vidhi cannot be permitted.

Where is the pramanam for this is our question. Vyasacharya says we have got an occasion in Chandogya upanisad which reveals this idea. He refers to mantra 1.10 of Chandogya upanisad. There Upanisad introduces a Prana upasana. The episode or anecdote regarding the Ushasti the great Prana upasaka. He meditate upon Prana as Isvara itself.

We discussed it 1.1.12 of Brahma sutra also. Here one lived in extreme famine. There all crops got destroyed and none had food to eat. This brahmana had no food. He goes out to seek food. He goes to neighboring village and there he found elephant owners. In that village he goes where they don't maintain any acharas etc. There he asked one person food which was beans of inferior quality. He asked for biksa. That person says I don't have any food left anywhere. All the food is what is on my plate.

Utchista annam he had. This should not be shared with others. But the brahmana asked for biksha. The other man gave food. Then that person gave utchista jalam also. This upasaka says I don't want utchista jalam. Then the other person asked why don't you take jalam also. Then he says for food there is no other source and it is choiseless situation but with regard to jalam I need not violate the rule for the water is available elsewhere. Then he wants to share the food with wife. But she says I have already eaten and this food I will keep it with me. Leftover of leftover is kept for the next day. Then the next day he takes the same food. Even my own utchistam you cannot eat the next day. There paksya paksya vidhi is totally violated. Here it is choiseless situation.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Ca however; sarvanna anumathih means permission to eat any food; pranatyaye only when there is threat to life; taddarsanat means so the sruti declares.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Sarvannanumatih means all types of food is permitted to eat; ca means to differentiate this from the previous adhikaranam. That I will talk about alter. Pranatyaye means the departure of Prana otherwise called death. Taddarsanat means it is found in the sruti. Sruti pramanam is Chandogya upanisad 1.10. Usashti upakyanam. It is not direct anumati. It is indicated here through the story. It is not direct permission.

## **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

### **Sutra 3.4.29 [454]**

#### ***Abadhaccha***

And because [thus] [the scriptural statements with respect to food] are not contradicted.

The topic commenced in Sutra 28 is continued.

In this Vyasacharya gives another meaning, which is almost an extension of previous sutra. If Purva Paksi takes Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam as vidhi then it will negate all apakshya apakshya vidhi given elsewhere. Then you will make two sruti statements contradict each other. You should observe akara suddhi. That vakyam is found in 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. A portion of the mantra reads as ahara suddhau sattva suddhah sattva suddhau dhruva smrtih, smrti lambhe sarva granthinam ... when nourishment is pure, nature is pure. When nature is pure, memory becomes firm etc.

When memory is pure there is release from all knots of the heart. The food not gets converted into body but also it gets converted into mind. Certain types of food by themselves impure tamasic etc. There are certain types of food they are not impure by themselves and if they are not offered to God it becomes tamasic.

First I should offer it to Isvara as naivedyam. A food cooked by someone who does not have achara anustanam and that food is considered impure. This is said in Chandogya upanisad. Our general advice avoid eating in hotel if you can avoid. Brahmacharya Vanaprastha and sannyasis cannot follow this rule. They have to take biksa from others only. Only grahastha can cook for himself. For them extra japa is given as duty. It is called prayachitta mantra. Receiving food from house achara is not followed, one receiving a prayachitta should be done. You cannot ask before taking biksha and it is insulting to the grahastha.

Therefore ahara suddhou sattva suddhih. Only when mind is pure knowledge will enter and entered knowledge will remain. Otherwise knowledge will not enter and entered knowledge will go out. Sarvanna paksana vidhi we should not take. If it is taken as arthavadha and it is not powerful to negate paksya paksa vidhi. Only when Jnanam comes all the bondage will go. For clear knowledge clear mind is required. For clear mind clear food is required. This is general analysis.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Abadadh cha means since the scriptural food restrictions are not contradicted our interpretation is valid. Now we will see the significance of the words abadhat means non-contradiction or non-negation. Because of non-contradiction. Only in our interpretation ahara niyama is not contradicted. Only if you take Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam as artha vadha it is contradicted. Now we get the rule of interpretation.

When you interpret the vedic statement we should see other vedic statement is not contradicted. If two vidhis are contradicting it should not be said. Hence Brihadaranyaka upanisad statement is not vidhi. Now Purva Paksi comes with another argument. They say that you don't understand my argument clearly. I am aware of consistency. Still I will say this vakyam as vidhi. I will convince you. He says you say this Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam is not vidhi vakyam because there is imperative mood. This is your argument.

For that he says you have forgotten Purva Mimamsa completely. We have seen there that in one sutra 20<sup>th</sup> sutra of this pada 3.4.20 and we have said even a statement where vidhi commandment is not there if certain conditions are fulfilled a noncommandment vakyam as vidhi. That is teaching something unique. You have applied this condition in skanda sruti. There there was not commandment and the we have taken it as a vidhi. Another noncommandment vakyam which we have taken as vidhi vakyam is in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Here also even though there is no vidhi applying Purva Mimamsa principle and also applying the above rule, I can take it as commandment because it is a unique rule found not anywhere.

His first argument is this vakyam can be taken as vidhi. Next argument we have given is that it is contradicting another vidhi vakyam in Chandogya upanisad. In one place there is sarvanna paksana vidhi and another place niyama is given and therefore you should not take it as vidhi vakyam. Purva Paksi says we do have contradictory vidhi vakyam existing in vedas. We do manage to reconcile them and in the same why cannot you accept these two vidhis also. When to contradictory vidhis are coexisting how do you reconcile. He says in the

sastra there is a vidhi one should not do himsa. Violence is prohibited. In another place for sake of performance of duty himsa is allowed.

In Gita Krishna says fight war. He himself gives ahimsa value in several places. He himself says you fight war. Follow ahimsa and therefore you fight. One vidhi you take it as general rule and the second rule you take it as exception under condition. Nonviolence is general rule, dharma is apavada, and it is exception. Pakshya paksa niyama is general rule and sarvanna paksana vidhi is a special rule for Prana upasaka. Where is contradiction. There is no problem.

This vidhi occurs in Prana upasana prakaranam and therefore it is a vidhi and it should be followed by Prana upasaka. For Ajuna fight is a rule. You cannot take it as a general rule and follow what is said to him. How to reconcile this? This we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 323

### **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

#### **Sutra 3.4.29 [454]**

#### ***Abadhaccha***

And because [thus] [the scriptural statements with respect to food] are not contradicted.

The topic commenced in Sutra 28 is continued.

We have completed this sutra. We now discuss some points discussed in Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam. No food is prohibited for Prana upasaka. Whether sarvanna paksanam is vidhi or artha vadha is being discussed. We have also concluded that it is arthavadha taking Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam. In this regard the vakyam from Chandogya upanisad was also taken for discussion. The best method to avoid debate is not to take Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam as glorification of Prana.

Now Purva Paksi has come with an objection saying that we can take it as vidhi vakyam. He says that even if vidhi commandment is absent we have power to assume the power in certain context as established in Purva Mimamsa and as also you have applied this principle in skanda sruti. If you can convert non-vidhi vakyam into vidhi vakyam I can also do it is the argument put forward by the Purva Mimamsa. Further there is contradiction between two statements in two places. So he says I will give you a solution to this problem. In one place veda says don't do any himsa but at another place you are asked to be violent and he quotes Gita. The same is case with animal practice where animal sacrifice is prescribed in one place and ahimsa at other places. Normally himsa is to be avoided and there are special circumstances where himsa is permitted. So also he say sarvanna paksanam also the exceptional cases ahara suddhi need not be followed.

To this we give three answers. When you take this as apavada a special case of violation eating anything and tell me what is the special case. Himsa of ksatriya. He can fight only in certain condition when the law and order is violated and not always as he likes. Again when sama dana fails then only he can use violence in order to uphold dharma. So we ask paksya paksa exception should have special condition. He says it occurs in Prana upasana prakaranam. Therefore the special condition is samasti Prana upasaka should take to sarvanna paksanam. It is not for all people. All should follow the rule but it is prescribed only for the limited Prana upasaka people prescribed in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. They can take anything. This is said by Purva Paksi.

Now that he has given the specific condition also. We say there is no vidhi in Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam. It is not a vidhi vakyam but a converted vidhi vakyam and it is called kalpita vidhi. A vidhi which directly occurs in the veda is called srudha vidhi an actual vidhi given by veda itself through an imperative mood. Kalpita vidhi is that you covert a statement into vidhi. After introducing a manipulated vidhi you find yourself in a corner because you introduced a manipulated vidhi that contradicts another vidhi. You take one vidhi as utsarga

and the other as apavada, which is also another manipulation, and for this interpretation you have to do another manipulation making weak your interpretation. This is twisting of sastras. The second dosha is you can use the utsarga apavada argument when there are two sruta vidhi contradicting each other both having commandments. You cannot drop any one of them for they are veda vidhis. But you should not try to apply the principle between sruta vidhi and kalpita vidhi which is not directly available in the sastra hence it is weaker one. It cannot even oppose the sruta vidhi. You should not introduce a kalpita vidhi if it contradicting sruta vidhi. That vidhi kalpana itself should not be done. You should not introduce a vidhi if it is contradicting a sruta vidhi. This is the second argument. If these are difficult to understand Adhi Sankaracharya give another one final argument. Adhi Sankaracharya asks I will agree your argument. Even if it is the case it is difficult to implement the vidhi. Then people will drop Prana upasana itself. He argues sarvanna paksanam is prescribed for Prana upasaka. We get the vidhi in 6.1.14. Prana upasaka should to sarvannam. Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question what do you mean by sarva annam. To arrive at the meaning you should study the Prana upasana prakaranam. There the topic is Prana is a glorious principle which resides in all jivarasis. The samasti Prana alone takes all the annam. Prana takes sarva annam the above mantra says. Prana is within the dog, cow etc. There sarvannam means dog food, insect food and pig food etc. And Prana upasaka is supposed to take sarva annam. Then it means Prana upasaka will have to eat dog food, pig food and insect food etc. Even excretion has to be eaten by Prana upasaka. It is impossible to take all the food as stated in the above mantra. Sarvanna paksana vidhi is incorrect because you cannot follow it. Sastra will not prescribe something that cannot be practised, because of the three reasons it is not a vidhi vakyam. Prana upasaka need not violate the niyama and he should follow. With this 29<sup>th</sup> sutra is over,

## **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

### **Sutra 3.4.30 [455]**

#### ***Api cha smaryate***

And moreover the smritis say so

The previous topic is continued.

First we will do a general analysis of the sutra. Sarvanna paksanam is permitted only in extremely rare cases which is whether a person is upasaka or not and if there is danger for life. For that pramanam was given from Chandogya upanisad. That pramanam given was not direct pramanam. From the story we derived the pramanam. It is sruti pramanam. It is implied rule and not direct rule. Why we should depend upon the implied rule. Hence Vyasacharya says that I will give you a smriti vakyam which gives direct rule that when there is threat to life sarvanna paksanam is allowed. Manusmriti sloka is there. Jivata atyayam apannah when there is threat to life [it may be disease also and no regular food is available like famine and other problem can be taken] souca annam is not available. Medhya annam is only available. If I don't consume that I will not survive. Yaha annamasti such person is dire circumstances. That time he will not bother whether anustanam is observed or not. He will take annam without bothering for anything for without food he will not survive. We should note that this should not be applied in regular cases as a matter of routine. Sastra says jivata atyaya apannah. Only in extreme cases you can take exception and not take it as a general rule.



Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Apicha means moreover; smaryate means smritis say so [also confirm this] now we will see the significance of the words apica means moreover this is an additional argument. This is in addition to Chandogya upanisad's indirect pramanam. The word smaryate means there is smiriti pramanam. Vyasacharya does not say what is the smiriti pramanam. Adhi Sankaracharya has quoted the manu smiriti sloka verse 10.104.

## **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

### **Sutra 3.4.31 [456]**

#### ***Sabdaschato'kamakare***

And hence the scripture prohibiting license.

The previous topic is discussed and concluded here.

We will do the general analysis of the sutra. We don't have a direct sruti pramanam for the rule that you can eat anything when life is in danger. We have another sruti pramanam, which is closer to what we mean. The sruti says that you cannot lead a licentious lifestyle. That is your living, as you like. Living as you like means take liberty to drink and eat anything as you like. Whatever word come out of mouth you utter. Behave any manner, as you like. It is called yateshtachara life. This has been negated directly by the sruti. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes tasmad brahmanah suram na pibed a brahmana one who wants to be guna brahmana one who wants to be sadhana cathustaya sambannah and if one wants to pursue spiritual life then you should not drink. Even if life is in danger you should not drink it is said. Sarvanna paksanam is not allowed. This is also an indirect support only

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha moreover; sabdascha there are sruti statements akamakare dealing with the prohibition of licentious life. That is doing anything at will. This is prohibited. Athah hence [the Brihadaranyaka upanisad statement is only an arthavadha]. The significance of the words is you should not be prahruta purusah and you should be samskrita purusah. Lead life according to various disciplines prescribed in the vedas. He may love to take liquor but he should avoid as prescribed by the vedas. Cha is conjunction and. In addition to arguments given before this is another. Akamakare means to prevent undue license prohibiting license as to non-proceeding according to liking. Take food etc., after doing all the nithya karmas. This is the discipline is prescribed in the vedas and this called akamakara. Athah mans therefore [sarvanna paksanam is not a vidhi] you must follow the vidhi. With this 31<sup>st</sup> sutra is over. 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 324

### **Topic 7. Sarvannanumatyadhikaranam [Sutras 28-31]**

**Sutra 3.4.31 [456]**

#### ***Sabdaschato'kamakare***

And hence the scripture prohibiting license.

The previous topic is discussed and concluded here.

We have completed 31<sup>st</sup> sutra and with that we have completed the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. Now I will make some general remark to this adhikaranam. While dealing with 28<sup>th</sup> sutra I talked about the significance of cha. I gave the meaning as however. While mentioning that I said the word however is to differentiate this with the previous adhikaranam. I did not tell you at that time. I said I would tell you latter. Now I will tell you that. The previous adhikaranam was an important adhikaranam where we analysed Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra 4.4.22. Here we analysed 6.1.14 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. In the previous adhikaranam the Brihadaranyaka upanisad was taken as a vidhi even though there was no verb indicating commandment. It was avidhi vakyam. Similarly in 6.1.14 also is a avidhi vakyam. In previous adhikaranam even though it was avidhi vakyam we said it is a vidhi vakyam. But in 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam we argued that avidhi vakyam should not be converted into vidhi vakyam and it should be retained as avidhi vakyam. Therefore there is a difference between the two.

Then there is third point also. I said that the entire fourth pada of third chapter deals with sadhanas of Nirguna Brahma Vidya. the direct and indirect nirguna brahma Vidya. here we have taken up the ahara niyama or not. We may get a doubt while dealing with Nirguna Brahma Vidya why should the sutra suddenly talk about sarvanna paksanam and the vidhi etc. this is pada sangathi discussion. Any topic should mix into total overall vision. Our answer pada is discussing what are the direct and indirect means of Self Knowledge. Direct means we know Vedanta Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Indirect means are countless like karma yoga, upasana etc. we want to add ahara niyama will indirectly influence the ultimate spiritual knowledge. Ahara influences the body speech, mind, emotion etc. this also comes under Brahma Vidya bahiranga sadhanam. It is contributory means for spritual knowledge. Therefore it is included in this pada. now we will enter the 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

### **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

**Sutra 3.4.32 [457]**

#### ***Vihitatvacchasramakarmapi***

And the duties of the asramas [are to be performed also by him who does not desire emancipation] because they are enjoined [on him by the scriptures]

This and the subsequent three sutras show who are required to perform sacrifices and do other prescribed duties.

First I will give you general introduction to this adhikaranam. The topic discussed here is dealing with asrama karmani. It means the compulsory duties prescribed for four asramas like Brahmacharya karmanai, Grahasthasrama karmani, Vanaprastha karmani and sannyasa asrama karmani. Brahmacharya asrama karma begins with wearing of the thread and Grahasthasrama after marriage.

Sannyasi also has not certain compulsory karmas, which is indicated by the thanda he has. Sannyasi removes the sacred thread and take to thanda. He has parayanam to be done. Instead of veda parayanam he will do Vedanta parayanam. He will do omkara japa. He will do thanda tarpanam. He has got various duties as part of his dharma. He has got jnana nishta and has freedom to give up even sannyasa dharma karmani initiative of thanta renunciation and such sannyasi is avadhuta sannyasi. He has duties until Jnanam is obtained. These are known as nithya naimityaka karmas. These duties are known as vihita karmani. They have to be done by all people. If these are not done they get papam caused by omission of duties. Commission based papa and omission related papams. Asrama karmas are compulsory duties.

In this sixth adhikaranam, we saw that veda says all compulsory duties can help in gaining spiritual knowledge. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad the duties are well prescribed. All contribute to spiritual knowledge by purifying the mind and also sufficient punyam for sravanam opportunities. It thus indirectly contribute to Jnanam. Whoever is interested in Moksa, he should perform nithya karma for gaining Moksa. 4.4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad gives this idea. Nithya karma is to be done by the seeker of Moksa and those karmas will be called kamyas. Here mimamsa ideas are given. Adhi Sankaracharya refers to it repeatedly. Once you say the daily nama japa has to be done by a person if he wants to gain Moksa. It means I present sandhya vandana as a means of gaining Moksa means it is kamyas. Once I say everyone should do sandhya vandanam it will come under nithya karma. If I say seeker should do it will become kamyas. Now the controversy is do the asrama karma come under nithya or kamyas. This includes panca maha yajna. This is because we say both. One sruti says one should compulsorily do asrama karma according to mantra 2 of Isavasya Upanisad. the mantra reads as 6'kuruvan *eveha karmani jijiviset satam samah evam tvayi nanyatheto'sti na karma lipyate nare* the meaning of the mantra is always performing deeds here one should wish to live a hundred years. If you live thus as a man there is no way other than this by which karman or action does not adhere to you. Another Upanisad mantra Brihadaranyaka upanisad 4.4.22 says *cenena brahmana vividisanti yajnena* which indicates those seeking Moksa should do the asrama karmas. Thus there is discrepancy. Moksa karma asrama karmani anudistet that is kamyas. Now the question is can you treat asrama karma as both nithya and kamyas. Nithya does not mean daily as per mimamsa language. Nithyam here means compulsory. Now the problem is Purva Pakshi says they cannot be treated as both nithya and kamyas both compulsory and conditional. It is so because once you name a karma kamyas means it is to be done a person who has that desire. The moment you name it a kamyas karma it is to be done by a person who has a desire. It means one who does not have a desire he need not perform. Putra kamesti need not do this by all people. Kuchela need not do it. Kamyas karma is anavasyakam non-compulsory. When it becomes compulsory it is nishkama karma whether you have desire or not you must do the karma. Therefore they can not go together nithyatvam and kamyatvam status. But veda gives a problem. It gives asrama karma nithya in isavasya and it says it is kamyas in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. which one I should take. Both are in vedas. What is our answer in the entire

adhikaranam? The answer is asrama karmas enjoy both nithya and kamyas status. It is possible for one karma to enjoy both these statuses. Then how can they enjoy both the statuses opposed to each other. For that we give the answer if we want an example tat tvam asi maha vakyam. One and the same Consciousness can have opposite attributes of sarvajnatvam and alpajnatvam. How do you explain contradiction in one Atma. How can one Atma enjoy jiva and Isvara status, created and creator status. We say opposite statuses are caused by aupathika bedas. Based on the context of ritual one and the same karma will occupy opposite status. Thus imagine a pouranika upanyasaka there he will tell you have to do daily sandhyavandanam. Not only that he will say if you don't do you will get papam. May do out of fear. Sandhyavandanam exists to avoid narakam. There the ritual enjoys nithyatvam status. Suppose he attends our classes. Here spiritual knowledge is presented. And it is said if you gain you gain Moksa and for that you do sadhana cathustaya sambatti. Tattva bodha says you have qualification and the author of tattva bodha does not say how to get the qualification. Here the guru says do sandhyavandanam. The same is presented in two different context. For nonmumukshi naraka bhaya nivruttyartham. For knowledge seeker it is to gain Jnanam and Moksa. The same karma is interpreted here as kamyas and nithyas karma. This has been analysed in Purva Mimamsa. In the Purva Mimamsa they face a similar problem. Whether a karma is nithyam or kamyam? Whether it is both? In Purva Mimamsa there are two vakyams. Yavat jivam agnihotram vihoti every person whether he is seeker or not should perform agnihotra ritual [asrama karma] as long as he lives and agnihotra enjoys nithya status. Also same veda says one who is desirous of svarga should do agni hotra. The very same agni hotra is prescribed for two different purposes in the vedas. If it is desire for heaven it is compulsory duty. It is in the context of nithya category. If he is desirous of svarga here agni hotra enjoys kamyas status according to the context. This is called samyoga pratatgvan nyaya. It is contextual connection. In svarga desiring person agnihotra exists as kamyas karma. But in svarga non-desiring person the very same agni hotra enjoys nithya status. In the same way asrama karma exists in nonseeker as compulsory duty and the same for seeker it is kamyas karma. It is done for siddha suddhi for Jnanam seeker. I will give you another example. Suppose a person is invited for a wedding reception of close relative where the attending is compulsory. He has decided to go. He sees the card. There it is written during reception there is a kutcheri and to attend the concert to attend the reception. The attending has become kamyas karma. Another person has come to attend the reception. Attendance is common in one it is kamyas status and in another it is nithya status. When you do prayer it is Moksa kama and for other it is duty. When one and the same karma enjoys two status it is called samyoga pratatgvan nyaya.

Now I will do the general analysis of the sutra. Asrama karma enjoys nithya status it is said. Because it is said so in vedas. But in next sutra it enjoys kamyas status also because the seeker of Moksa is asked to do those karmas. Both are because of the vedic injunction.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Asrama karma ca means the duties associated with the four asramas [should be performed]. Api means by others also. Vihitatvat means because they are enjoined compulsorily prescribed.

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Vihitatvat because it is enjoined for all. Ca is conjunction to be joined with next sutra. Asrama karma is the karmas the compulsory duties [fortyone samskaras] not optional. Asrama refers to associated with four status of life. Api should be taken by others also. Amumuksuna api. The significance of api is in the sixth adhikaranam it was said the duties will produce siddha suddhi and help knowledge. If it is said that these duties are meant for Moksa prapti and from this it is clear whoever wants

Moksa requires purity. Whoever wants purity has to do sandhya vandanam. This person says Moksa I don't need and I need not do sandhya vandanam. Many do not want Moksa. They are artha kamas, dharma kamas and desirers of Moksa are few and they don't want to do sandhya vandanam. When some argues like that we give different lecture. Then we say it is the duty you have to perform and if you don't do you will get papams and you will go to narakam. That is the significance of api. then it gets the name nithya karma. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 325

### **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

**Sutra 3.4.32 [457]**

#### ***Vihitatvacchasramakarmapi***

And the duties of the asramas [are to be performed also by him who does not desire emancipation] because they are enjoined [on him by the scriptures]

This and the subsequent three sutras show who are required to perform sacrifices and do other prescribed duties.

We have completed 32<sup>nd</sup> sutra belonging to 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. Vyasacharya discusses here the status of four asrama karmas. Every vaidhika is prescribed certain karmas which he has to do in whichever asrama he belongs to. The duties arise depending upon the asrama. Vyasacharya establishes that these karmas have twofold status based on twofold vidhis in vedas. This is accepted in Purva Mimamsa as in the case of agni hotra [discussed in the last class] thus we have established that the status of the karma is decided on contextual basis. Normally nithya and kamyas status cannot coexist because one is compulsory while kamyas is conditional. Still because of veda vidhi Purva Mimamsa accept that there are twofold agnihotras, a person right from beginning of grahashtasrama do agnihotra due to veda vidhi because of not doing it involves papam. Later if he does it for gaining Moksa, the same agnihotra becomes kamyas karma. Then he comes to know that it can give svarga prapti also. The very sankalpa changes when he does the agnihotra. The nithya agni hotra gets converted into kamyas karma. Same principle is taken for asrama karma. So also the duties of asrama also done for either of the two purposes is to avoid naraka and prefer Moksa. The nithya karma, which you do, can be used for Moksa prapti. It gives siddha suddhi and paves way for Jnanam. There is new bhavana or attitude towards nithya karma that is sandhyavandanam. Here kama is siddha suddhi or jnana praptyartham or Moksa praptyartham. This is called by special nyaya. The same karma is connected to two different people in two different ways. Nithya status of asrama karma was mentioned in 32<sup>st</sup> sutra. Now we will talk of the kamyas status we will discuss in 33<sup>rd</sup> sutra.

### **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

**Sutra 3.4.33 [458]**

#### ***Sahakaritvena cha***

And [the duties are to be performed also] as a means to knowledge.

The topic commenced in sutra 32 is continued.

First we will do the general analysis of the sutra. Here the very same asrama karma to avoid papam can be utilized for different mode the desire being to gain Jnanam. Siddha suddhi prapti as saha karitvam. It is contributory means to produce knowledge. Nithya karma will not directly produce Atma Jnanam. For this vedantic study is required. Regular sandhya vandanam and japa etc., will help to gain siddha suddhi which helps gain Jnanam. When I have the intention to get Moksa, and if do sandhya vandanam to get siddha suddhi and if you have that motive then sandhyavandanam is Moksa kamyasrama karma

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Sahakaritvena means Asrama karma should be performed as a contributory means of knowledge also. This is the running meaning. The significance of saha karitvena as a contributory means. It means for the jnana utpatti several means are there. we have talked about three of them one is systematic vedantic study; then second is proximate contributory means in the form of sadhana cathustaya sambatti; then we talked about remote contributory means. The third is karma yoga and upasana. All of them together responsible for jnana utpatti. Therefore every means is called a contributory means. Asrama karma is a contributory means. Cha means conjunction to add the previous sutra.

Before going further I want to add an aside point. Adhi Sankaracharya discusses this in Gita bhashyam. The point is the asrama karmas, which are compulsory, can be converted into kamyasrama karma to achieve a particular goal. What is the result you can accomplish through them. Adhi Sankaracharya says they can produce two types of results. One is the materialistic result of svarga prapti. All duties if you perform properly, then you get svarga prapti. Doing family duty ensures svarga. This we call it materialistic pleasure. The logic Adhi Sankaracharya gives is that whatever veda prescribes phalam must be there. svarga phala we should assume even if it is not mentioned there.

The second phalam is spiritual benefit of siddha Guru prapti sravana prapti jnana prapti dvara Moksa prapti. Every asrama karma has svarga or Moksa phalam. Then it will come under kamyasrama karma. Now you will be asked a question. Do you want svarga or Moksa. You cannot say both. You must choose one. You renounce svarga iccha it becomes nishkama karma. Then it will help in Moksa prapti. [refer also to 6.1 and 18.6 of Gita] krishna talks about yajna japa karmani are compulsory duties and he says that they will give you either svarga or Moksa. Therefore it is nishkama karma from the standpoint of svarga.

## **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

### **Sutra 3.4.34 [459]**

#### ***Sarvathapi ta evobhayalingat***

In all cases the same duties [have to be performed], because of the twofold indicatory marks.

The previous topic is continued.

Here Vyasacharya is answering a possible doubt that can come. The very same asrama karma we said has got both nithya and kamyasrama status because of two different vidhis. Asrama karmas have two statuses because of two different vidhis. The question is when asrama karmas have got two different status, will there be any change in the actual performance of karma. Somewhere when vidhi differs karma differs. That is why this question has risen.

Vyasacharya says we don't have any difference in karma performance. There is motive difference and not in action. There is no change in asrama karma whether you do it as kama or nithya karma. Should I perform the karma twice one for kama and another for nithya. This is the question. Then they say kama karmani nithyasya andhar bhavah. Nithya sandhyavandanam is included as avantaram. You need not separately perform it. One karma will fulfill both kama and nithya.

Vyasacharya quotes sruti and smriti pramanam. Refer to 4.4.22 Brihadaranyaka upanisad which says him the brahmanas seek to know through the study of vedas sacrifices etc. no separate yajna is prescribed for siddha suddhi. Nithya danam will serve both. Regular parayanam also like that. There is smriti indication also. Gita 6.1 that reads as *anasritah karmaphalam karyam karma karoti yah sa samnyasi ca yogi ca na niragnir na ca 'kriyah*. The emaning is he who does the work which he ought to do without seeking its fruit he is the sannyasin, he is the yogis not he who dos not light the sacred fire and performs no rites. Go on doing the regular duty and the change is in sankalpa or bhavana. In this context also refer to Gita 9.27 which reads as *yat karosi yad asnasi yaj juhosi dadasi yat yat tapasyasi kaunteya tat kurusva madarpanam* the emaning of the mantra is whatever thou does whatever thou eat; whatever you offer; whatever you give away whatever austerities you practise, do that as an offering to me [Krishna].

Now I will give the word analysis. Sarvatha api means in both cases te eva the same duties are to be performed; ubhayalingat means since this is indicated in both sruti and smriti. Now I will give you significance of the words. First is sarvatha api means literally by all means in either case. Whether asrama karma is used as nithya karma by an amumuksu for avoiding papa or whether asrama karmas are used by a seeker of Moksa for siddha suddhi. Either way. Te eva means the same duties [asrama dharma] only. Anusteyah to be performed ubhaya lingat the hint. Smriti and sruti lingat.

## **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

### **Sutra 3.4.35 [460]**

#### ***Anabhibhavam cha darsayati***

And the scripture also declares [that he who is endowed with Brahmacharya] is not overpowered [by passion, anger etc.]

The previous sutra concluded here.

Here another role of performance of duties is highlighted. Performing my duties has got several benefits. Avoidance of papam, it will lead me to svarga if I want; if I don't want svarga it will give me Moksa through siddha suddhi etc. the fourth benefit is controlling the anger, passion etc. study the mind of parents and you will find that they will not bother about their old age but worried about their children settling properly. This is the height of sacrifice. Parents are worried about the children more than their own future. Indian mind is engaged in completion of family duties and they don't bother about their own happiness. more in the next class.



## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 326

### **Topic 8. Asramakarmadhikaranam [Sutras 32-35]**

#### **Sutra 3.4.35 [460]**

#### ***Anabhibhavam cha darsayati***

And the scripture also declares [that he who is endowed with Brahmacharya] is not overpowered [by passion, anger etc.]

The previous sutra concluded here.

I have introduced 35<sup>th</sup> sutra which is the final sutra of 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. This is a very important adhikaranam because entire foundation of karma yoga is in this adhikaranam. Here, Vyasacharya is talking about unique status of compulsory duties prescribed in our sastras. Vihita karmani varnasrama karma swadharma etc. these karmas have got unique status because they give four types of benefits of which three I mentioned in the last class. In this adhikaranam and in this particular sutra fourth benefit is mentioned. Three benefits we talked about are pratyapa papa nivritti removal of papam; by way doing so it will remove naraka prapti; it is very much highlighted by Purva Mimamsa. Then threaten constantly if you don't do duties you will go to hell.

The second benefit is svarga prapti and through that svarga bogha prapti attainment of heaven and heavenly pleasures. It is materialistic punyam which will give material benefits. This Purva Mimamsa do not accept. But Adhi Sankaracharya emphasises this fact. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes sandhyavadana gives svarga and gives siddha suddhi to get Jnanam. If I want spiritual benefit through nithya karma I must positively say that I am not interested in material benefit.

But we have to note an aside point here. If you say swadharna anustanam, it will indirectly contribute to knowledge. It is not antaranga sadhanam. Swadharna anustana, one person gets more and more mumukshutvam desire for Moksa. It will produce intense yearning for vedantic study and it will give conditions for Vedanta sravanam and necessary will power to study. Thus swadharna siddha suddhi Guru prapti dvara jnana utpatakam is third benefit.

The fourth benefit is swadharna anustanam even after attainment of Jnanam and in fact it should continue after attainment of Jnanam. After jnana prapti will serve as a fencing protecting Jnanam. Otherwise Atma Jnanam may be disturbed by raga dvesha and kama krodha and temporarily Jnanam is clouded. He misbehaves in the situation and afterwards he feels guilty. Jnanam must be protected at all cost and jnana nishta should be attained. Asrama karma anustanam protects Jnanam and saves Jnanam from Raga dvesah abhi bhava. Every moment there is an attack of raga dvesha kama krodha etc. an angry person is in fits. Most of the emotion is caused by mental fits. When there is an emotional attack the intellect and Jnanam is overpowered. Emotional attack becomes an attack of Jnanam. That is why Krishna says in Gita even for jnani such protection is required. The attack of jnanam should be

protected. Some fencing is needed. That fencing is your nithya karma anustanam. This is the general analysis of the sutra

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Darsayati sruti reveals anabhbahavamca non-obstruction also; the significance of the words is anabhibhavam means non obstruction or non-attack cha means also. This is the fourth benefit and it is joined with other benefits mentioned in the previous sutras. Providing security to Jnanam is nithya puja and japa etc. whatever be the benefit there is no change in the way of performing the puja, japa etc. there is no difference in the steps of nithya karma. The next question is Vyasacharya says sruti reveals the benefits. Adhi Sankaracharya has already picked and shows the sruti portion Chandogya upanisad 8.5.3 *esahi Atma na nashyati yam brahmacharyena anuvindhyate*. The Atma Jnanam of the jnani will not perish. It is protected by the asrama karmas. Here the word brahmacharya refers to asrama dharma. Brahmacharya is compulsory vrutam for all the three asramas. Brahmacharya, Vanaprastha and sannyasa asrama. Brahmacharya preserves knowledge. With this 35<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over. Now we enter 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

## **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

### **Sutra 3.4.36[461]**

#### **Antara chapit taddrishteh**

And [persons standing] in between [two asramas] are also [qualified for knowledge], for that is seen [in scriptures]

Widowers who have not married again, persons who are too poor to marry and those who are forced by circumstances not to enter into wedlock and have not renounced the world come under the purview of sutra 36-39.

First I will give you the general analysis of this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya discusses a subject matter by way of answering a doubt that may arise in the mind after studying the previous adhikaranam. It was said there that asrama karmas duties prescribed for four asramas serve as sahakari karanam for Self Knowledge. Therefore they are important. Because of this there is a tradition that every vaidhika should become to one of the four asramas. What is the advantage of this division and the duties attached to it. One does not seem to know vaidhika duties. The varna sankrah is one of the problem and the problem that one does not know which asrama one belongs to the asrama. A person who belongs to a specific asrama is called an asrami. It is called lingam in sastra. It also gives the dress one should wear. From the dress one can know which asrama one belongs just as in military they give different dress to different cadre. So also the women. Now only it has become uniform dress. Previously it was not the case. Asrama karma helps generation of knowledge. The controversy here is this. due to some reason or other suppose there is an anasrami, that means a person who cannot be strictly classified to one asrama or the other. The various possibilities to become anasrami is if a Brahmachari who has studied and completed the study and after completion he should formally end the Brahmacharya asrama. Then he should enter another asrama. There is a ritual for that. That is called snataka vrutam. Special snanam is prescribed. Snatakah is graduated one. He has formally concluded his vedic study. The moment he

concludes his vrutam, he should get married. Otherwise he will not belong to Grahasthasrama and formally concluded his Brahmacharya. Then he will become anasrami. There should not be gap in between the two asrama. In the gap he becomes an anasrami. There is no Brahmacharya entry or the end. Since he does not do anything properly there is no question of conclusion. Now just before vivaha even without knowledge of the groom, the priest quickly complete the vrutam and continues with vivaha. Snakata vrutam and instantaneous marriage. One possibility of anasrami is when a Brahmacharya concludes vrutam and does not get married immediately and that gap is anasrami.

The second possibility is grahastha being handicapped in one way or other and therefore incapable of performing asrama karma.

Third possibility is most of the vedic karmas are possible only in Grahasthasrama. It is because wife is considered an integral part of the karma. Yagna requires five factors yejamana, patni, deiva vittam[knowledge of vedas], manusa vittam [money], and putra. If any anga is missing one is unfit for yajna. If grahastha loses his wife because of the death, then he becomes a vidhura. One who is free of bharam. He is a widower in English. This widower cannot do the asrama karma that is without patni. Or enter Vanaprastha or become sannyasi. If he is unable to do either, then that period of his life is called anasrami. Such anasrami is called vidhura. Every anasrami is not a vidhura but every vidhura is an anasrami.

What is the controversy here? Anasramis do not have asrama karmas. Because they are unqualified to do the asrama karmas. In the previous adhikaranam it was said asrama karma is required to gain Jnanam. Anasramis lose and cannot gain Jnanam. They deprived of jnanorpatti. These anasramis therefore cannot attain Jnanam. If they cannot gain Jnanam they cannot gain Moksa. It appears from previous adhikaranam anasramis cannot gain Moksa. Is true or not is the controversy. Whether anasramis will not or will get Moksa despite their angahinam. How do they manage to gain Moksa. One says cannot and another says it can. Siddhanti says anasramis also can get Moksa. Sastra is like mother and highly concerned about every person. No one should be left behind and one should be given an opportunity. It is another matter persons squander the opportunity. The sadhana is japa yajnah. This is the essence of this adhikaranam. The details we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 327

### **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

**Sutra 3.4.36[461]**

#### ***Antara chapit taddrishte***

And [persons standing] in between [two asramas] are also [qualified for knowledge], for that is seen [in scriptures]

Widowers who have not married again, persons who are too poor to marry and those who are forced by circumstances not to enter into wedlock and have not renounced the world come under the purview of sutra 36-39.

Now I am giving the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Purva Pakshi says anasramis cannot gain Brahma Jnanam. The reasons they give that they cannot purify their mind due to absence of asrama karma. [refer to sutra 33 ibid] they don't get jnana योग्यता due to absence of asrama karma and how can in the absence of jnana योग्यता get Jnanam. Vyasacharya says that sastra give opportunity to all to gain siddha suddhi. We have got certain general discipline that can be followed by all the people. It is applicable to all the asramas, males and females, married females and unmarried woman and applicable to widowed women also.

The most important is bhagavan nama japa. In kaliyuga all people will have impurity, earn livelihood through corrupt method. My salary is tainted with adharma. For all the papas earning sastra prescribed Vanaprastha as parihara. In kaliyuga all samskaras are absent. One side we accumulate papas and another side purifying karmas we give up. It is like working in dirty place and not taking bath. I accumulate impurity and say I have not time to take bath. For such people there is only one way out. In kaliyuga all are anasramis. Previously namasangirthanam was suggested for minority anasramis. But today anasramis are in majority. Do nama japa. My spiritual life is sustained only by nama sangirthanam. This is the essence of this adhikaranam. The main idea we should note is this and in kaliyuga namasangirthanam is important sadhana. It is only for siddha suddhi. It will not directly give you Jnanam as such. Therefore namasangirthanam cannot directly give Moksa also. After siddha suddhi one should strive for gaining Jnanam through Sravana Manana Nididyanam. gaining Moksa through namasangirthanam is only an artha vadha and it should not be taken seriously

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. This says even without asrama karma anasrami can gain purity, knowledge and Moksa by alternative method. That is why we say even other religious people can follow the method to gain Moksa. Vyasacharya says we have got pramanam in scriptures. Adhi Sankaracharya gives an example of Raikvah a Brahmacharya who has completed Brahmacharya and who had not married got Jnanam. This

occurs in Chandogya upanisad 4.1-3 . this has been discussed in abssutradhikaranam of Brahma sutra. Another example is Gargi. Gargi is not yajnavalkya's wife. Gargi is a brahma vadhini. An unmarried woman who became a great jnani capable of challenging yajnavalkya. It is also said widow remarriage also approved by veda. In smriti it is not allowed and sruti the permission is there.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu however; cha api knowledge is possible even [for those people] antara who are without an asrama. taddrishteh means because that is seen in the case of Raikva, Gargi and others, now we will see the significance of the words. Even those people without an asrama. Cha api means even. In spite of. In previous adhikaranam we have dealt with asrama people. Now we talk about anasramis. The previous one talked of majority and now it is for minority. But today it is otherwise. Majority have become minority. Tu refers the negation of Purva Paksi. Taddrishteh means adhikarasya dristih.

There are some sub-commentators who give some other meaning. Gargi comes in the context of nirguna Vidya and Raikva refers to Saguna Vidya.

### **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

#### **Sutra 3.4.37 [462]**

#### ***Api cha smaryate***

This is stated in smriti also

The previous topic is continued.

Here Vyasacharya says that there are smriti grandhas which talk about anasrami jnanis. The greatest advantage is even varnasrama dharma go haywire sadhana can survive. Veda has envisaged varnasrama becoming unpopular it means. Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary refers to such a jnani by name Samvartah, an anasrami jnani. We have heard about such jnanis. He followed avadhuta life without following any varna or asrama. They also talk about a Rishi Samvartah son of Rishi Angiras.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Api cha moreover. Smaryate such references are found in smritis. The significance of the word is api cha means moreover. Adhi Sankaracharya refers to the name of person and not sloka. The great Bhishma is also an instance in point.

### **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

#### **Sutra 3.4.38[463]**

#### ***Viseshanugrahascha***

And the promotion [of knowledge is bestowed on them] through special acts.

The previous topic is continued.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In the previous sutras Vyasacharya said there are sruti and smriti pramanams are there for anasramis to become jnani. Vyasacharya has not answered the question of Purva Paksi. It was said asrama karmas purify the mind. Anasramis do not have asrama karma. Therefore their mind cannot be purified and hence they cannot gain Jnanam. For this Vyasacharya gives his reasoning. There are certain general disciplines. They are available universally for asramis and anasramis. In keeping with Vyasacharya teaching everybody can get siddha suddhi and also gain Jnanam through nama samkritanam. Hare rama hare Krishna occurs in Kali Sankarana Upanisad. with that support and purifying power it is possible for any to gain Jnanam.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha and vishesha anugragah through special discipline is mentioned in the scriptures. The significance of word is visheshanugragah means special universal asramis or anasramis ]regardless of caste creed and religion] discipline; anugragah means support; Adhi Sankaracharya quotes Manusmriti II.87 perfected by many births be finally goes to the highest state. By japa one can get sadhana cathustaya sambatti. Manu says brahmanah and he himself redefines brahmanah as one who is compassionate and considerate person. Let him be friendly to everyone. Let him follow japa. This sufficient for one to get siddha suddhi and gain Jnanam.

### **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

**Sutra 3.4.39[464]**

*Atastvitarajjyayo lingaccha*

Better than this is the other [state of belonging to an asrama] on account of the indicatory marks [in the sruti and the smriti]

The previous topic is concluded here.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya gets disturbed a bit after writing the previous sutra. There it was said japa itself can purify the mind of all the people whether he does asrama karmas or not. This sutra the provision can be exploited by the people. Acharyas are afraid of exploiting the concessions given in the sastras. The excuse must be due to genuine reason. Hence Vyasacharya asrama karmas are superior to the general provisionary sadhanas given here. The provision given to anasramis should not be exploited by asramis. If there is a choice between the two asrama karmas should be done. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 328

### **Topic 9 Vidhuradhikaranam {Sutras 36-39}**

Those who stand midway between two asrama also are qualified for knowledge

**Sutra 3.4.39[464]**

#### ***Atastvitarajjyayo lingaccha***

Better than this is the other [state of belonging to an asrama] on account of the indicatory marks [in the sruti and the smriti]

The previous topic is concluded here.

In the last class I gave the general analysis of this sutra. Here japa parayanam, nama sangirthanam etc., are prescribed for the anasramis who are otherwise unable to observe the asrama dharma and get siddha suddhi and get Jnanam. Japa parayanam, nama sankirthanam etc., also will purify the mind alone and afterwards one has to gain Jnanam to get Moksa. Here it is confirmed that one should normally observe asrama karmas and the nama sankirthanam etc. Should be taken up by anasramis alone. The asramis may do samkirtanams etc., in addition to their duties and their duties is not to be replaced by japas etc. In support this Vyasacharya gives proof. He quotes IV4.49 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad let not a brahmana stay for day outside the asrama having stayed outside for a year he goes to utter ruin. There is a smriti pramana also. It is a dvija should not remain without asrama even for a few days. He must always belong to one of four asramas. The moment upanayana is done, he formally belongs to Brahmacharya. If he closes it with snataka vruta before he enters Grahasthasrama there is anasrami status. This formality is done at the time of vivaha. If asrami karmas and anasrami karmas are equally efficacious, sruti need not insist to be asrami. From this it is clear our first aim is to be an asrami for asrami karma alone is efficacious. The compromise formula of japa is meant for anasrami alone and it is not meant for asramis.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu means but; itarat the other one jyayah is better; atah than this one; cha and; lingat this is known from the statements of sruti and smriti. Now we will see the significance of words. Jyayah means superior; itarat means the other karma; it means asrami karmas or regular karmas prescribed for four asramas; atah means better than this one; this refers to anasrami karmas mentioned in 38<sup>th</sup> sutra. Between japa and sandhyavandanam for Brahmachari with sacred thread the latter is the best. If he does not have sacred thread, he can do japa samkirtanams etc. Lingat means Vyasacharya says it is known from twofold pramanams. It is indirect pramanam. Here twofold indirect pramanams are kept in mind 4.49 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. With this 39<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. The 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over. This adhikaranam name is not based on sutra padam but is based on the topic. Now we will enter into the 10<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam

### **Topic 10 Tadbhutadhikaranam [Sutras 36-39]**

He who has taken sannyasa cannot revert back to his former stages of life

**Sutra 3.4.40[465]**

***Tadbhutasya tu antadbhavo jaiminerapi niyamtadрупabhavebhyah***

But for one who has become that [i.e, entered the highest asrama i.e., sannyasa] is no reverting [to the preceding ones] on account of restrictions prohibiting such [reversion or descending to a lower order; jaimini also [is of this opinion]

The question whether one who has taken sannyasa can go back to the previous asrama is now being considered. The present sutra declares that he cannot go back to the previous asrama. This is the opinion of Jaimini also.

It is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter is that veda has got four asramas. One should take the four asramas in serial order. Brahmacharya is route map for spiritual journey. The route map consists of three phases karma yoga, upasana yoga and jnana yoga to go through to gain Jnanam. The spiritual is a long journey and not a crash course. It is a long term plan. Grahasthasrama for following karma yoga and Vanaprastha for upasana yoga and sannyasa asrama for jnana yoga. Each asrama is one for a particular purpose. Asrama remember is an infrastructure.

Then sastra says according to the level of yogyatha certain options are given. In certain cases Brahmacharya can go to Vanaprastha and sannyasa. Or he can go direct to sannyasa. Naturally the question comes as what about one reverting from sannyasa to Brahmacharya or Grahasthasrama. Can sannyasi marry and become grahastha. Many people take to sannyasa because of some problem.

After becoming sannyasi he is not able to continue due to some problem. If he desires to get married what is our view. Is it allowed? Purva Pakshi says logically it must be possible. Sadhana is possible only in Grahasthasrama. Siddhanti says no. It is not permitted. Sannyasi cannot become a grahastha and similarly grahastha cannot become a Brahmachari. Once a person enters one asrama he cannot go back.

Why do we say that there is no avarohanam or coming back. Vyasacharya says there is no sastra pramanam in support of this. Arohana krama is there but avarohana krama nasti.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says a sannyasi cannot become nonsannyasi; Vanaprastha cannot become non-Vanaprastha. Similarly Brahmacharya is also of two types. One is called upakurvana Brahmacharya and another is naishtika Brahmacharya. Upakurvana Brahmacharya is preparatory to Grahasthasrama. He is planning to enter Grahasthasrama. One knows that it is temporary. Thereafter he will enter Grahasthasrama. But suppose an upakurvana Brahmachari if he wants to continue as Brahmachari remain in asrama with Guru for the rest of the life, then it is called naishtika brahmacharya. Naishtikam means as a lifestyle and not a temporary discipline. Sastra says upakurvana brahmachari can become grahastha. Naishtika brahmachari cannot become a grahastha.

Abhavah means there is no conjunction. In tradition sannyasa cannot become grahastha. There is no sastra vakyam for avarohanam. For arohanam it is in jabala Upanisad. Third reason is niyama. Sruti positively prohibits such reverting back to lesser order of asramas. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes sruti vakyam. Aranyam iyat iti padam tado na punareyat. It



means every body should leave the society and go to forest finally. Either you should enter Vanaprastha or sannyasa asrama. Sruti adds from the asrama one should not come back to pravrutti marga or Grahasthasrama. It is irreversible journey.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tadbhutasyatu for a person who has become a sannyasi; na atadbhavah there is no further change of that asrama status; niyamatadрупabhavebhyah this is so because of the absence of scriptural pramana for reversal of status and the absence of conjunction; jainineh api means this is the view of jaimini also; the significance of the words is tadbhutasya sannyasi bhutah one who has become a sannyasi or Vanaprastha; for such a person na atadbhavah sannyasi cannot become a nonsannyasi; tu indicates the negation of Purva Paksi. Niyama atadрупabhavebhyah scriptural rule that prohibits reversal. [refer to above] atadрупam means pramanam or sastra pramanam tad रुपam means avarohana रुपah sastra pramanam; sastric sanction for reversal. Abhavah it means sishtachara abhavah; the absence of conjunction; because of these reasons reversal is not possible. Such reversal is strongly condemned in Bhagavatam. Jaimine abhi this is view of Jaimini. Previously in the beginning Jaimini was a vehemently arguing there is only Grahasthasrama and sannyasa asrama is not there. [18-20 ibid] now here he says Jaimini cannot return. From this it is clear that Jaimini is also a Vedanta. He takes Purva Paksi stand for the purpose of clarification. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 329

### **Topic 11 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

#### **Sutra 3.4.41 [466]**

#### ***Na chadhikaraimapi patananumanattadayogat***

And there is no fitness for expiation in the case of a naishtika brahmacharin [who is immoral], because a fall [in his case] is inferred from the smriti and because of the inefficacy [in his case] of the expiatory ceremony.

The previous discussion is continued.

Now I will give you the introduction to this adhikarnam. This is a small adhikaranam with two sutra. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya deals with a discipline called brahmacharyam. The word brahmacharyam has got several meaning depending on the context. Here it means celibacy. The significance can be grasped only when you look at it from vedantic or spiritual angle. Vedantic student has got primary goal of Moksa. As a means of Moksa he pursues jnana nishta. Jnana nishta is only means of liberation. Jnana nishta has got two important components. The first component is abiding in the knowledge that I am the Atma. Aham deha vyatirikta brahma asmi. This can be called Atma avasthana prapti. Abiding in Atma swarupam. The second component is dis-identification from anatma or deha. Deha abhimana nivritti. Withdrawal from bodily identification. Both the components are complementary to each other. One will not be established without the other. Deha abhimana is an obstruction to realize the Self. Both components are important. Only when both are there you can get the benefit of jivan Mukti. Deha abhimana nivritti is a tougher part. Withdrawal from dehabhimana is a tough discipline. For it is natural and habitual. The habit formed in countless janmas. It is not only universal and therefore transcending dehabhimana is tougher proposal and to accomplish the transcendence of dehabhimana, sastra prescribes several subsidiary disciplines. Cumulatively all subsidiary disciplines will help the prime discipline of dehabhimana nivritti. Even ahara nivritti is part of this. For tongue forms part of deha. Brahmacharyam is a secondary discipline. This is a component of jnana nishta and gaining Moksa. This anga discipline called Brahmacharya asrama transcend the gender identity. I am male and I am female and this is transcended as a part of deha abhimana nivritti. The gender identity belongs to body alone and not to Atma. I am Atma neither a male nor a female and I get gender identity through deha. That too sthoola deha. This is called lingam. This gender identity is called linga abhimana and transcendence is Brahmacharyam. I should extend minimum invocation of gender identity is called brahmacharyam. This is the topic of this adhikaranam. Brahmacharyam is basis of three asramas namely Brahmacharya asrama, Vanaprastha and sannyasa asrama. When I say Brahmacharya asrama it includes two types of brahmacharyam. Upakurvana Brahmacharyam and naishtika brahmacharyam. Whoever enters into anyone of the four asramas must clearly know that brahmacharyam is compulsory discipline enjoined on them and therefore they have to take it as compulsory commitment or vow. As even I am entering anyone of these four [does not include Grahasthasrama] I write to

God I take brahmacharyam as a vow. Any discipline taken as vow is called vrutam in sastra. Thus brahmacharyam is a vrutam for all the non-grahastha asramis. Once a person has taken a vruta or a vow one has to implicitly follow that and violation of a vow certainly will involve papam. It is a pratyavata papam. Omission of vow undertaken is pratyavata papam. It is otherwise called a pathakam. A papam is called a pathakam because it brings the jiva down spiritually. All the pathakams mentioned in the sastra are broadly classified into two. Classification is based on whether there is any parihara for this pathakam or not. If there is a parihara or prayachitta or expiatory action then that pathakam is called pariharya pathakam a remediable sin. And an unremediable sin is called apariharya pathakam. Apariharya pathakam is called maha pathakam. Adhi Sankaracharya uses an expression aprapathi samaharyam. Pariharya pathakam is called upa pathakam. The other one is maha pathakam. Now the question is whether brahmacharya banga is upa pathakam or maha pathakam. This is the topic of this adhikaranam. Siddanti view is that brahmacharyam is upa pathakam only and it does not come under maha pathakam. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

This sutra is Purva Pakshi sutra. Purva Pakshi argues that brahmacharya vruta banga is a maha pathakam. Vyasacharya will refute this. They argue that brahmacharya pathakam has no prayachittam at all. Therefore the four asramis do not have any remedy for the vruta banga. There is smriti pramanam for this. Atri smriti is there. In this atri smriti there is a vakyam and that is the pramanam. It is indicated in the sutra as anumanam. Pratyaksam means veda pramanam. From this we come to know there is no prayachittam. Suppose a person has entered naishtika brahmacharya asrama, or as a vow or commitment and if transgresses his commitment, there is no prayachittam and there is no parihara for that person by which he can purify himself. Saha Atmah that he is destroying his spiritual personality. It is a spiritual suicide. Taking this verse as a upa laksanam he extends this rule to other three asramas as Vanaprastha and sannyasi and upa kurvana brahmachari also. This is conclusion of Purva Pakshi.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Adhikarikam means prayachittam remediable measure; cha api na means is also not available [for a naishtika brahmachari. Tad ayogat this is so because prayachitta is not possible; patananumanat as it is known from the smriti which talks about his spiritual fall. His meaning naishtika brahmachari. Now we will go to significance of the words. Adhikarikam according to vedic scheme every vaidhika should belong to a particular varna or asrama. This designation is important for his lifestyle is based on the designation. This designation has got two parts one is rights and another is duties. The right is the vedic sadhanas prescribed for particular designation is available for me. It is like sandhyavandanam. A designation makes certain set of sadhanas available to me and from this I can get artha, kama and dharma etc. The rituals and disciplines are the rights. To maintain this designation, I have to follow certain duties and only as long as I do the duty I can have the designation. The compulsory duty is called vihita karma nithya naimityaka karmani. This is to retain the designation. Only when I retain the designation I have adhikara access to those sadhanas. The moment I violate those duties I lose my designation. I am a fake brahmachari or fake sannyasi etc. Adhikara nasah. After adhikara nasa whatever sadhana prescribed in veda I follow and it would be futile. It is like pedaling a stationary cycle. I don't progress. Therefore my first aim is to retain the designation. This can be done by nithya karma anustanam. All other things become functional only if I retain this adhikara. If I lose the adhikara how to get back the adhikara is the question here. I do the prayachitta to get back the adhikaram. Whatever prayachittam I do is called aadhikarikam karma. This karma will depend upon the type of violation. Since violations are innumerable the prayachittam is also innumerable. This is discussed in detail in 6<sup>th</sup> chapter of Purva Mimamsa. Adhikara lakshana

grandha is name of the chapter that gives various prayachitta karmas. Therefore Vyasacharya na adhikarikam for a naidhtika brahmachari. Also for all the other three. Na cha api means to connect this with the previous adhikaranam. Pathana anumanat means spiritual fall; getting distanced from Moksa. Anumanam means smriti vakyam. Tadayogat prayachittam is impossible. Therefore is maha pathakam. All such people will have spiritual fall. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 330

### **Topic 11 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

**Sutra 3.4.41 [466]**

#### ***Na chadhikaraimapi patananumanattadayogat***

And there is no fitness for expiation in the case of a naishtika brahmacharin [who is immoral], because a fall [in his case] is inferred from the smriti and because of the inefficacy [in his case] of the expiatory ceremony.

The previous discussion is continued.

We have completed the 41<sup>st</sup> sutra belonging to 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. We saw in the last class that it dealt with brahmacharya vrutam to be followed by three asramas except Grahasthasrama. It comes under vihita karma which should be followed and violation would come under pratya vadha. Any violation would result in papams. It causes spiritual downfall. Whether this pathakam born out of violation of vrutam will come under maha pathakam or upa pathakam. First one is irremediable while the other is remediable. Vyasacharya establishes here that it comes under upapathakam. Siddhanta comes in 42<sup>nd</sup> sutra. Purva Pakshi has claimed it is a maha pathakam. He says that there is no parihara for that and he quoted a smriti vakyam of Atri maharishi. Up to this we saw in the last class.

### **Topic 12 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

**Sutra 3.4.42 [467]**

#### ***Upapurvamapi tveke bhavamasanavattaduktam***

But some [consider the sin] a minor one [and therefore claim] the existence [of expiation for the Naishtika brahmacharin also]; as in the case of eating [of unlawful food]. This has been explained [in the Purva Mimamsa]

The previous discussion is continued.

Here siddhanta comes. This sutra can be divided into four parts. In first part he says it is upapadhakam only and not maha pathakam. Since it is upapathakam only, it has got prayachittam. Third part gives an example of transgression with regard eating discipline. Eating meat etc. Considered as papa karma. When he transgresses it, it is called eating transgression and it is small sin and it has parihara. Vyasacharya says brahmacharya also is

subject to prayachittam. Then the fourth part is support from Purva Mimamsa sastam. Adhi Sankaracharya gives a commentary on each part.

First part he says it is upapathakam only. Sastra does not categorize in mahapathakam list which is very small panca maha pathakani. This panca maha pathakam is enumerated in 5.10.9 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *steno hiranyasya suram pibams ca guros talpam dvasan brahma ha ca-ete patanti catvarah pancamas cacarams taih* the meaning reads as he who steals gold, he who drinks wine, he who dishonour the teacher's bed, he who kills a brahmana, these four do fall as also the fifth who consorts with them. Adhi Sankaracharya says in that list this one is not given. Since it does not come under panca maha pathaka list indirectly we know it comes under upa pathaka list only.

The second in list is there is parihara for this pathakam. Sastra gives variety of parihara for brahmacharya pathakam. Papams are graded in the sastra. For all the papas pariharas are mentioned. Sastra does talk about brahmacharya vratapanga parihara. For each asrama the parihara is separately mentioned. Varieties are there depending upon the ability of the person. Kayika pariharas are given like upavasa, pranayama, pilgrimage etc. Vachika pariharas are given like gayatri japa, omkara japa etc. Manasa parihara is also given in the form of Isvara dhyanam. Asrama wise pariharas are given and hence Vyasacharya says it comes under pariharyam.

The third part is the example. Just as sastra gives parihara for violating ahara niyama. If we are vaidhikas we have to follow vaidhika niyama with regard to food. Certain things are not allowed physically and some thing not allowed under some condition. One example is mamsa paksanam. For brahmachari, Vanaprastha and sannyasi if he violates he has to do prayachitta. The violation may be intentional and also may be unintentional. In tradition they ask don't eat outside if you can to avoid transgression of the niyama. Papams is two fold inadvertently done and deliberately done.

Another variety is do it and do prayachittam simultaneously. Here also there is gradation in intensity of papam. Panca maha yajna is important for that regularly cleanse me of the known and unknown papa, every moment we gather impurity. In asanam also there is papam. For this sastra prescribes prayachittam. Purva Mimamsa support is also given.

The categorization of papa punyam can be done by sastra alone. We are not judges to weigh or measure the categorization. We cannot do that. Punyam and papam come under apouruseya vishaya. With regard to health damage we can study and categorise between liquor and smoking. We can study medically and we can talk about the gradation of the damage.

This is drishta phala gradation. Here we don't talk about the religious or spiritual damage. Punya and papa are not available for biochemical research. Therefore follow what sastra says in this regard.

This is the essence of the sutra. Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu means but; eke some other acharyas [consider this transgression] upapurvam api as upa pathakam only that is remediable sin; bhavam and claims the existence of [parihara or prayachitta] asanavat as in the case of transgression in eating. Ahara niyama pangah. Tad uktam this has been clarified in Purva Mimamsa [sutra 1.3.9 of Jaimini sutra]

Now I will give you the significance of the words. Upa purvam means upa pathakam. Upa purvam yasya pathahasya tad upapurvakam or upapurvam that pathakam for which there is prefix upa. That is upapathakam. Api means eva means only. It is only a upa pathakam that excludes maha pathakam. Those acharya siddhanti is eke acharya. Therefore they claim bhavam which means existence. They claim the existence of pariharam for upa papam. This is crucial because wherever prayachitta exists the papam becomes upa papam. Asanavat like eating violation. The example given is mamsa asanam or eating meat. Asanam means aharah. Tatuktam means tasmin vishaye uktam this has been clarified in Jaimini sutra. This is the word analysis.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 331

### **Topic 12 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

#### **Sutra 3.4.42 [467]**

#### ***Upapurvamapi tveke bhavamasanavattaduktam***

Now I will discuss the point from bashyam. You talk only parihara given in the sastra. But you are not dealing with the mantra or sloka I quoted. Purva Paksi quotation is Atri Maharishi. Atri has said prayachittam na pasyami. An acharya beauty is reconciliation of entire sastra. Acharya has responsible post of harmonise all the veda, sastras and puranas. How can you ignore the Atri sruti. Atri vakyam is smriti vakyam whereas prayachitta bhava vakyam is sruti. When there is contradiction between smriti and sruti, we have to go by sruti vakyam only. We have to do some kind of reconciliation and we cannot reject smriti statement. It is like capital punishment. He suggests atri vakyam says arudo naishtikam dharma and it talks about naishtika Brahmacharyi and prayachitta is there in the case of all others like upakurvana brahmachari, Vanaprastha and sannyasa. When sruti talks about brahmachari we will interpret differently. Brahmachari has prayachittam only if he is upakurvana brahmachari and not for naishtika brahmachari. This is being done to validate Atri vakyam. Therefore Purva Paksi suggests you restrict the meaning to brahmachari in prayachitta sastra. This is called sankojakatvam. When sruti brahmachari has prayachittam you say upakurvana brahmachari has prayachittam and not naishtika brahmachari. This is the suggestion by Purva Paksi.

For that siddhanti says no and we cannot accept that also because first reason is in the smriti vakyam Atri says prayachittam na pasyami. He does not openly say prayachittam nasti. It is only an expression we interpret as abhava. This is weakness number one. This artha is extracted by implication and it is not lakshyartha. Second weakness is it is a smriti vakyam. The meaning derived is lakshyartha is weakness two. Because of two powerful weakness it approach veda as weak concept. The brahmachari occurring in veda is sruti vakyam. It is not implied. The argument is the strong word brahmachari used in veda can never be restrained or restricted by the weak smriti lakshita arthah. Therefore our conclusion is there is parihara for both upakurvana brahmachari and naishtika brahmachari. Then Purva Paksi says if you are so rigid and not accept any kind of reconciliation that you give capital punishment to Atri maharishi vakyam. Then siddhant says I also accept Atri but I want to give another meaning to this smriti vakyam. He says first I will say it is upapathakam only. But in keeping with atri smriti among upapathakams it is very serious upa pathakam. Therefore prayachittam is not that easy and it is a very tough prayachittam. Therefore prayachittam na pasyami means it is not easily available. Hence you find appropriate prayachitta and do that prayachitta. It is an upa pathakam bordering maha pathakam. Therefore Atri vakyam also is reconciled. With this 42<sup>nd</sup> sutra and 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over. It is upapathakam and prayachittam is available. It should be diligently followed.



We should also find out as to in what way this is included in our topic of discussion. Asrama karmas also contribute to jnana utpatti. It was said in 8<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. Entire karma yoga is based on that adhikaranam only. Pradhana asrama we keep in mind is Grahasthasrama. In Grahasthasrama alone one has qualification, resources and infrastructure for all vaidhika karmas. In all other three available karmas are minimal. Brahmacharya asrama is adhyayana pradhanam. Vanaprastha upasana pradhanam and sannyasa vedantic enquiry pradhanam. That is why all the three have secluded life. Asrama karma means it is Grahasthasrama karma only. Everyone loves to enter Grahasthasrama. Only one can enter Grahasthasrama who is upakurvana brahmachari. All others cannot enter Grahasthasrama. From this adhikaranam naishtika brahmachari is also excluded.

## **Topic 12 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

### **Sutra 3.4.43 [468]**

#### ***Bahistubhayathapi smriteracharaccha***

But [they are to be kept] outside the society in either case on account of smriti and custom

The previous discussion is concluded here.

Now I will give you the introduction to this adhikarnam. It is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. How should a spiritual seeker treat a person who has committed this upapathakam called Brahmacharya vruta banga. He is a sinner. What type of Vyavaharya he will fit is the discussion here. In this context they produce two types of malam or asuddhi. We don't talk of physical impurity but talk of certain adrishta asuddhi. An impurity which will contaminate in this janma as long as this body is alive. Another one is which will affect after the fall of the body when it travels after death. Generally a prayachitta is given for destroying both the asuddhis. Prayachittas are given remedial measures are given for destroying both the asuddhi. But in the case of powerful papm the prayachitta is not capable of destroying both the asuddhi. It is capable of destroying one of the two. The question is how do you which can destroy both and which will destroy one only. Since the whole field is adrishta it is difficult to know. Sastram alone talks about prayachitta and it alone tells whether it destroys one or both. Coming to our specific case when Brahmacharya banga done by Brahmacharyai or anyone what will happen. We said it is upapathakam only. Now our question will be the prayachittam destroy both the aishika or amusthika of this person. Vyasacharya says no. It is serious upapathakam and therefore it is capable of destroying the asuddhi of this life alone. He continues to be an asuddha purusah. Whether the person is tainted or not, the Vyasacharya says such persons are tainted for lifelong and such persons are not fit for transaction. They should be kept outside the society. Association with them will affect the one psychologically it is said. Vedic society talks of contagious though also. The very thought of untouchability is misunderstood now. If you are in one direction of life, better you choose one. Every vaidhika is asked to have companionship with nasthika. Such person will not included in our list of companions. Intimate companion ship with them may be avoided with those people who have committed such a upapathakam. Suppose they have committed an upapathakam and they have done prayachittam, then you can mix with them. In some cases you may forgive and include and in some other cases you may forgive but should not mix with them. Vedic society had the norm of who is samskrita and who is asamskrita and who should be interacted and

who should not be interacted. It was based on this and no caste or creed it is said. Keep safe distance with such people who have done upa pathakam. This is the essence of the sutra. The pramanam for this is smriti. Naishtikanam vanasthanam or yathinancha or a sannyasi avakirninaam one who has violated Brahmacharya vrutam or one who has formally married sudhhanam api he has committed upa pathakam even if he has become suddha his prayachitta will save him after death only and not during his lifetime. Because he has used the physical body to violate so the papam cannot be forgiven. This person is bahiskaryaka. Even after purification, he cannot come back to the normal regular society or regular vyavahara with other people. That is how the concept of excommunication came. In the village for all social function they won't invite him. Therefore Brahmacharya vrutam is very important for all the three asramis.

Now we will do the general analysis of the sutra. This person is unfit for regular companionship. He is unfit for social convention. This vedic constitution is not practicable in the modern democratic society where we are governed by the democratic constitution which varies from the vedic one.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu however; ubhatyatha api means either way; bahih means they are to be kept outside; smriteh means this is known from smriti; cha acharat means and convention that is by regular social practice. The significance of the word is tu means however; even though this is upapatham only it is not ordinary upapathakam bordering maha pathakam unlike others. The word upayatha api means either way. It is based on the previous adhikaranam. There it was said that the vruta banga was said to be maha pathakam. Then it was said upapathakam. Here whether it is taken either way, bahih one should avoid the companionship of such person. Under mahapathakam one should avoid such person. Even if you treat it as upapathakam you have to avoid contact with such persons. Acharat cha means also because of the regular practice. A person who has committed a sin, I do not know whether he is eligible for interaction or not. All these are approved if you follow the vedic constitution. If you don't follow the rules, then nothing can be said. Be alert not to be spiritually violated by such person who have committed pathakams. Achara is also pramanam. Cha is to join the two. With this 43<sup>rd</sup> sutra is over. 12<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 332

### **Topic 12 Adhikaradhikaranam [41-42]**

Expiation for one who has broken the vow of sannyasa

**Sutra 3.4.43 [468]**

#### ***Bahistubhayathapi smriteracharaccha***

But [they are to be kept] outside the society in either case on account of smriti and custom

The previous discussion is concluded here.

With the 43<sup>rd</sup> sutra we have completed 12<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. With this adhikaranam Vyasacharya concludes the discussion regarding the four asramas. Vyasacharya also establishes all four asramas are important and all produces two fold result one is svarga loka and siddha suddhi result. All should follow the asrama karma and attain the purushartha in the end. This is the basis for karmayoga in Gita and in other scriptures.

### **Topic 13 Svamyadhikaranam [44-45]**

The meditation connected with the subordinate member so sacrificial acts [yajnangas] should be observed by the priest and not by other sacrificer.

**Sutra 3.4.44 [469]**

#### ***Svaminah phalasaruterityatreyah***

To the sacrificer [belongs the agentship in meditations] because the sruti declares a fruit [for it]; thus atreya [holds]

This the view of the Purva Paksin or the opponents.

Now I will give you the introduction to this adhikarnam. It is an adhikaranam with three sutras. Here Vyasacharya deals with an academic subject matter of karmanga upasanani. One is swatantry upasana and another is karmanga upasana. Karmanga upasana is one which forms part of a vedic ritual. Therefore they can be performed only when the ritual is performed. It does not exist independently. They are paratantra upasanas. Some factor used in the ritual itself is meditation. Anyone factor used in ritual is alambanam upon which the meditation has to be done. Karmanga virat upasanam we studied in Kathopanisad. Among three boons the second was the ritual. After hearing Yama dharma raja prescribed Virat upasanam. For that samasti virat upasana you need a symbol and alambanam prescribed was the very fire itself upon which oblations were offered. In karmanga upasana you should not

that it is a part of ritual and it is factor of the ritual. Any factor used in ritual it can be a material like fire and even a priest himself may be an alampanam for the ritual. It may be person associated with the ritual or even the mantra may be the alampanam. In siksavalli of taiottriya Upanisad the vyahriti mantra or omkara mantra can serve as alampanam. Udgitha mantram served as alampanam as stated in Chandogya upanisad. All such upasanas are called karmanga upasanas. Swatantry upasanas are different and you can do that upasana independently. The pankta brahma upasana and Hiranyagarbha upasanas can be practised independently. Here we talk about the karmanga upasanas. The question is who should perform karmanga upasana. Who is the upasana karta of the karmanga upasana. Should this be done by anyone of the priest who performs the ritual or should this be done by yejamana the master who is engaging the priest. A karma which is done by yejamana is called yajamanam and karma done by priest is called artvityam karma. We will establish that the karmanga upasana should be done by the priest alone. This is topic of this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here the entire sutra is Purva Paksi sutra. Here Purva Paksi is Atreya Rishi. He presents his opinion in this sutra. He says swaminah eva karmanga upasana karma. The ritual based meditation should be done by the master only. He gives two reasons for this wrong conclusion. You cannot afford to blurt out something without reason. One reason is logical reason. The logic is that karmanga upasana phalam is expected by the yejamana. If he wants to be bogta of upasana phalam, naturally he must be the karta. Kartrutvam and bokritvam should be one and the same person.

He gives sruti pramanam also and it is taken from 2.3.2 of Chandogya upanisad. It talks about a karmanga upasana. An upasana in which various parts of sama veda mantras are to be taken. A part of sama veda mantra is bhakti. Some has got seven part some have five parts. The name of the bhakti is udgeetha etc. Each of the bhakti can be taken as alampanam for varieties of upasanas. Several such karmanga upasanas are talked about in Chandogya upanisad in second, third and fourth chapters etc. Upon the bhakti we invoke something or the other and one such upasana quoted is by Atreya Maharishi. Yaha evam vidvan suppose a person practices panca vidha sama he should take panca bhaktika sama mantra and he has to invoke various aspects of rain is taken in the rain upasana. Upanisad talks about easterly meditations and westerly meditations etc. Then the dark cloud, thunder and lightning and rain are taken for upasana. Five factors of sama mantras are taken. That is here referred to as panca vidha sama upasanam. The benefit he will get is for his sake the rain will pour. In fact by his karmanga upasana he makes the rain pour that will benefit the society even. He makes the rain pour down heavily. Whoever practices the Upasana he will get the benefit. If yejamana wants the benefit of the rain then the yejamana alone should do the karma. If the rtvik does the upasana, and goes back to his place the rain will fall in his place. Yaha vidvan means upasana karta. Therefore if the yejamana is in one place and if he wants the rain is needed in his place he should perform the upasana. This is the argument of the Purva Paksi.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Svaminah means svaminah karmanga upasana is an act of the yejamana. Phalasrute this is known from the sruti statement about the result. Atreyah iti means it is said by Atreya Maharishi. The significance of the word is svaminah means yejamana the organizer of the ritual who spends the money and who is the patron. He is differentiated from the priest. It is an act of the yejamana that is karmanga upasanam. It should not be handed over to the priest. Phalasrute the sruti pramana itself. The vakyam kept here is 2.3.2 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *udgrhanati tan nidhanam, varsati hasmai varsayati ha ya etad evam vidvan vrstau panca vidham samopaste* the meaning of the mantra is the cessation as the nidhana. It rains for him and he causes it to

rain, he, who knowing this thus, meditates on the fivefold saman in rain. Iti Atreya this is the opinion of Maharishi Atreya.

### **Topic 13 Svamyadhikaranam [44-45]**

The meditation connected with the subordinate member so sacrificial acts [yajnangas] should be observed by the priest and not by other sacrificer.

#### **Sutra 3.4.45 [470]**

#### ***Artvijyamityaudulomistasmai hi parikriyate***

[they are] the duty of the ritvik [priest] this is the view of Audulomi, because he is paid for that [i.e., the performance of the entire sacrifice.

The previous topic is continued.

First we will see the general analysis of the sutra. The answer is given by the Rishi Audulomi. He refutes Atreya Rishi. Ritvik mans priest and artityam means duty of the priest. The karmanga upasana should be done by ritvik only depending upon which upasana. If it is samaveda karma then it will be done samaveda ritvik udgata. If it is rk veda priest it will be ritvik priest. He gives the reason. I will give two reasons. First he asks if you say the logic for upasana the same logic will come for the rituals also. The priests perform the ritual only. Then the karma phalam also will go to the priest only. How it is possible. What is your answer for your karma. One is general rule and another is exceptional rule. Performance is the recipient of the karma phalam. I can always engage employee to do my karma and once the job is done eventhough actual performer is employee the karta is supposed to be employer only. If some one says he manufactures the product. He does not actually produce; it is only his employees do. In the case of ritual also the actual performer is priest and yejamana is taken as the karta. He has employed the priest by paying dakshina. When ritvik performs a yaga for performance ritvik gets the dakshina as the phalam. The phalam of yaga goes to the master who has given dakshina and that is why he is called yajna karta. Svarga phalam goes to yejamana only. The general rule is applicable even though the priest performs the yaga, the phalam goes to the master who engaged the priest. The performance by the proxi goes to the master alone. This applies to karmanga upasana also. One, who performs the main act, has to perform auxiliary acts also. If ritvik does the karma, he alone should do the anga upasana also. He can increase dakshina and the phalam will go to the yejamana alone.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Artvijyam means karmanga upasanam is an act or a duty of the priest; hi because; parikriyate he is employed or engaged; tasmai for that purpose; audulomih iti means so says the Rishi Audulomi. The significance of the words is artvijyam means ritvik karma; audulomih is the name of the saint; he gives the reason. Parikriyate means he has been bought; the employer buys every working person by paying salary. Here the priest is paid for the performance of the ritual or karma as the case may be.

### **Topic 13 Svamyadhikaranam [44-45]**

The meditation connected with the subordinate member so sacrificial acts [yajnangas] should be observed by the priest and not by other sacrificer.

**Sutra 3.4.46 [471]**

**Srutescha**

And because the sruti [so] declares

The previous topic is concluded here.

Audulomi says sruti also supports us. One is 1.2.13 of Chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as tena tam ha bako dalbhyo vidamcakara, saha naimistyanam udgata babhuva, sa ha smaibhyah Kaman agayati the meaning of the mantra is baka dalbhya is mentioned in the Maha Bharata as having performed a sacrifice punishing Dhrtta Rastra for his rude behaviour; salya parva 42. While introducing the ritvik baka who is the official priest of Naimishaah. For those rulers the ritvik Baka is performer both yaga and upasana. Then another quotation from Chandogya upanisad 1.7.-8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> mantra. The rk veda and yajur veda priest perform the ritual and during the ritual they can add any karmanga upasanas. Depending upon the wish of the yejamana the karmanga upasanas can be added in the middle of the priests. Then the priests ask what benefit you require for the upasana. The udgata asks the yejamana which karmanga upasana I can practise on behalf of you. This is additional phalam. The result is enhanced by adding upasanas at the desire of the yejamana. It is very clearly said that the priest asks the yejamana what he should do. So karmanga upasana will be done by the priest at the request of the yejamana is the essence here.



## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 333

### **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5. meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

**Sutra 3.4.47 [472]**

#### ***Sahakaryantaravidhih pakshena fritiyam tadvado vidhyadivat***

There is the injunction of something else i.e., meditation cooperation [towards knowledge] [which is] a third thing [with regard to Balya or state of a child and Pandithya or scholarship, [which injunction a given] for the case [of perfect knowledge not yet having arisen] to him who is such [i.e., the sannyasin possessing knowledge] as in the case of injunctions, and the like.

This sutra examines a passage in Brihadaranyaka upanisad and concludes that continuous meditation is also to be considered as enjoined by sruti fro the realisation of Brahman. This and the following two sutras show that the scripture enjoins the four orders of life.

Now I will give you the introduction to this adhikarnam. This has got three sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya deals with the various injunctions given by the Upanisads for Moksa or Atma Jnanam. For gaining Moksa the sadhana prescribed by the Upanisad is Jnanam. The same thing is said elsewhere also. Jnanam is prescribed by the sastras to gain moksa. When you want to pursue Moksa, then the question comes as to how to get Jnanam. For this one should practise Sravana Manana Nididyanam of the Vedanta. The pursuit of Jnanam is the primary sadhana and as a support of the primary sadhana Sravana Manana Nididyanam are supporting sadhana. Therefore in mimamsa language jnana vidhi is called pradhana, mukhya or angi vidhi. It is primary injunction prescribed for Moksa. For this we have to take the assistance of Sravana Manana Nididyanam. They are not independent pursuit and they are the part of primary pursuit of Jnanam. Moksartham Jnanam and for Jnanam you should pursue Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Sravana Manana Nididyanam are called anga vidhi or secondary vidhi. Thus we have two vidhis angi and anga vidhi. Angi vidhi is one and anga vidhi is another. Of the three anga vidhi what is the status of nididyanam which is going to be discussed here. Nididyanam is third anga vidhi supporting the anga vidhi to gain Atma Jnanam. Nididyanam is third anga vidhi is going to be established. Vidhis also subdivided into four parts. They talk about three types of vidhis apurva vidhi, niyama vidhi and parisamkya vidhi. Vyasacharya points out here that this nididyanam anga vidhi is a niyama vidhi. I will briefly tell you about the word niyama vidhi. Niyama vidhi is one injunction which will come into operation only under certain condition. The apurva vidhi always operate and it is a compulsory vidhi. Niyama vidhi comes to operation only the conditions are there for its operation. Nididyanam is such a conditional vidhi. What are the conditions under which nididyanam comes to operation. Sravanam and mananam themselves are capable of giving convincing Atma Jnanam. Because Vedanta sarsrtam is a pramanam and if I systematically study Vedanta sravanam is capable of producing Jnanam. Mananam is to remove the doubts which obstructs conviction. All the



doubts will be thoroughly removed by mananam. Through sravanam and mananam Atma Jnanam is gained. Then why the nididyanam is prescribed and it is said that it is not compulsory for all and it is required for those whose knowledge is obstructed by certain mental problems. Generally the problems are there for a person comes to Vedanta without gaining sadhana cathustaya sambatti. Vedanta Jnanam comes but Vedanta prayojanam does not come. It is because of obstacles in the mind called viparita bhavana. It will be minimum in the case of sadhana cathustaya sambanna adhikarai. Then you are free from nididyanam. The student does not feel the necessity of nididyanam. I don't need nididyanam that I am a human being. It is an evident fact for you and in such cases you need not think or repeat continuously. If I do that I will be sent to mental hospital/. For one adhikari sravana manana themselves is sufficient. In that case who have viparita bhavana the intensity of bhavana is not the same and it differs and there is gradation. It is called pramtra dosha pratibandha. This is there in the minds of the listener. It changes from mind to mind. Various prarapbda anubhava also contributes for the seeker. Some people it may need very long time and for some they cannot claim that I am free. They may say I understand Vedanta but I cannot claim I am mukta. Therefore depending upon the sickness of viparita bhavana the vidhi will operate. Once the sickness is gone then the injunction will not operate. In one of the rituals one has to take paddy and take the rice grain. The extracted grain is to be used for the ritual. The sruti says remove the grain. It can be extracted from paddy in several ways. Pounding, or with hand it can be removed. Husking operation can be done in several days. Is it left to our choice or Veda is particular about the method. Veda does not want us to any method we want. It can be said that it be removed by pounding. This pounding vidhi and extracting grain is a vidhi given by vedas. Is it apurva or niyama or parisankya vidhi is our question. They have concluded that it is niyama vidhi. If five do in different ways, one person uses the method of pounding. The niyama vidhi will apply to other four people. There is one person who is by himself correctly. By his own will he has used the pounding method. In this case the veda says for him it is niyama vidhi under certain condition. Nididyanam also is not injunction for all people. Suppose if there are some people with viparita bhavana, Vedanta says don't leave this and a vidhi has been prescribed for nididyanam until you become an adhikari. The essence of this adhikaranam is nididyanam is anga vidhi and second point and it is an anga vidhi or niyama vidhi. It is neither apurva vidhi nor parisankya vidhi but a niyama vidhi. Here we have to establish it is an anga vidhi and then it is conditional anga vidhi. When we read Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam in Maitreyi Brahmanam, there the vidhi is very clear. Atma has to be known. It is an anga vidhi is very clear. It has commandment. For the Atma darsanam three supporting sadhanas are prescribed. Sroutavyah manana and nididyanam and all these are vidhis only because tavyah is attached to each one. Anga vidhi is clear and three anga vidhis also are clear in the above vakyam. There is another Brahmanam in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. 3.5 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad [Kahola Brahmanam] there also vidhis are mentioned. One anga vidhi and three anga vidhis are mentioned. In the kahola Brahmanam very same vidhis are given but in different language. Everyone by listening to Vedanta first to gain knowledge that I am already free and I am Brahman. They should gain general Jnanam. A causal study will give you the general or samanya Jnanam. This Jnanam is called casual knowledge. If this knowledge should become a jnana nishta then he has to go through three exercises Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Since it requires a dedicated life the Upanisad says one should renounce the world. We can say in this context you should be a dedicated person to pursue the Jnanam. The casual knowledge aham brahma asmi has to gain pandityam. It is thorough knowledge of the central teaching done through systematic study called sravanam. It is a systematic study continuously for a length of time under a competent Guru. This alone will convert casual knowledge to a thorough knowledge. Otherwise a doubt will come whether I am Brahman or am part of Brahman or am different from Brahman

which is the main teaching. A thorough study is required to understand that I am Brahman. Thorough study is called pandityam or scholarship and some basic scholarship is needed. He need not be an expert scholar. Pandityam is taken as sravana vidhi. Then the Upanisad says after pandityam gaining abse knowledge through thorough study of prasthan triyam you use your intellect to remove the possible doubt. This is called reinforcement of the knowledge and this reinforcement is called bhalyam. May you lead such a sadhana which will convert sruti teaching to your conviction. You should say that I know I am Brahman. You should not say sruti says I am Brahman. It is a fact only when you realise it all the three periods of time. It is a fact of training now. It is realisation. Realisation means for me aham brahma asmi is a fact obtaining now. Seeing Brahman as fact is called realisation. This is accomplished by removal of the obstacles posed by the intellect. Then intellect gives funny argument. You think clearly and then the fact becomes a fact. And this is called mananam. Pandityam is sravanam and bhalyam is mananam. After the two, may you become a munih. That munih refers to a sasanam called mouna sasanam and mounam is nothing but nididyanam. Silencing the anatma buddhi and involving Atma vrutti is called nididyanam. Anusantanam is mounal. Dwelling upon the teaching is nididyanam. It is not to remove intellectual obstacle which has gone by mananam itself. I have the conviction and the problem is that there can be emotional obstacles because of some strong emotion it has been acquired by some people in the form of guilt etc. It may be due to kama krodha, depression etc. These obstruct jnana phalam of ananda. The santi I am not able to derive. This is not the case with all the people. It is the case with some people who carry the vasanas of the present and the past vasanas. It is vasanas pratipanda. It is there with some people. For some they are serious and for some they are mild. In Maitreyi Brahman the word used nididyanam tavyaha and in Kahola Brahmanam the word used is atamunih. After practicing all the three sadhanas [anga sadhanas] Sravana Manana Nididyanam, the Upanisad refers to in a peculiar language amounanca and mounanca mouna sadhana and non mouna sadhana. Mouna sadhana is nididyanam and amounam means sravana mananam. After that alone one becoems a jnana nishtah. Then only one becomes a real Brahmana. Those who clear they are Brahmanas are fake one. Even guna, jathi Brahmanas are fake one. The real one is ganadeeta jnani Brahmana is a Brahmana. The word Brahmana is the phalam. Now alone we enter into this adhikaranam. Purva Pakshi says that in this Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam [Kahola Brahmanam] I have a problem. In this there is a clear vidhi. One should resort to that it is said. Therefore Purva Pakshi claims I am able to accept there is vidhi for sravanam and mananam. After sravanam, and mananam there is a word munih and this you interpret as nididyanam vidhi and how can I follow a far fetched interpretation like this. Minih cannot be nididyanam. Muni can be a Vanaprastha or sannyasi. Even if I accept munih is nididyanam I cannot accept it as vidhi because there is no injunction or imperative mood verb. Here there is no verb. Hence I cannot accept there is vidhi for nididyanam. This Purva Pakshi contention. Then we ask if it is not a vidhi and then what do you take it as. He says munih is a glorification word of the panditah who has followed the first two vidhis. A jnani who has practised sravanam and mananam is a muni it is said is their argument. After the word muni atha Brahmana comes. The Brahmana is glorification of real Brahmana. As Atha Brahmana is not a vidhi so also muni is not a vidhi at all. Therefore nididyanam vidhi is not there. We are going to refute that person and establish that atha muni is a vidhi. It is nididyanam vidhi. We will also say it is anga vidhi and niyama anga vidhi. Adhi Sankaracharya will say it is a vidhi given to sannyasi. Sravana Manana Nididyanam vidhi is meant for sanyasa only. In short nididyanam niyama vidhi is going to be established.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 334

### **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5. meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

**Sutra 3.4.47 [472]**

#### ***Sahakaryantaravidhih pakshena fritiyam tadvado vidhyadivat***

Here Vyasacharya analyses 3.5 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad where Sravana Manana Nididyanam are described. Upanisad uses the word atha munih without giving any imperative verb to qualify it as a vidhi. Therefore there is a controversy. We will establish that there is mouna vidhi. Atha muni is only glorification of the first two vidhis sravana mananam. Prasasti here is glorification of one who has completed sravanam and mananam. He gave the example also. Just as atha Brahmana is glorification so also muni should be taken as glorification. We are going to establish that it as nididyanam. Mouna vidhi and nididyanam vidhi is synonymous. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya mentions four features with regard to mounam. First it is a vidhi and not a glorification. It is a discipline to be followed is intended here. Second point is that it is an anga vidhi which is meant to support a primary vidhi. That is sahakarya vidhi. Then what is the primary vidhi is the question that comes to our mind. The primary vidhi is gain Atma Jnanam if you are interested in Moksa. Just as jyotistoma yaga is prescribed in gaining svarga, those interested in Moksa should take to Atma Jnanam. If I am to gain knowledge what I should do. If you want Jnanam then practise Sravana Manana Nididyanam. These three becomes angam for jnana vidhi. Angi vidhi is otherwise called pradhana vidhi. Then comes the third feature. It is the third anga vidhi. Eventhough angi vidhi will always be one angams may be many. It is like doing puja is the primary work, but taking flowers buying other things are secondary vidhis. Mouna vidhi is the third one then what are the other two. They are panditya and bhalya vidhi. Fourth feature is that is a conditional anga vidhi. Technically it is called niyama vidhi. Once you say it is conditional vidhi, it is not compulsory for all the people. Nididyanam is not compulsory and it is into meant for all. Under what condition the nididyanam should be practised or not to be practised are given by the commentators. As long as obstacles are there in the mind which do not allow me to say boldly from my innermost heart that I am free, then nididyanam is required to make the mind to give such a statement. It is not because situations are unfavourable but I am free in spite of unfavaouable circumstances. Prarapta based family problems, prarapta physical condition and even mental conditions are mtihya. If Brahman is always sathyam, then jagat is always mithya. Until you come to this state, you have to follow the nididyanam. This is not to improve the pramanam but removing obstacles from the mind and as they are removed Jnanam seems to become clearer and clearer. It is called jnana adhisayah. It is refinement of knowledge or clarity of knowledge or freedom from obstacles which obstruct me from saying that I am Brahman. When point blank question is asked are you able to give the answer. This is the question. They are due to pramtru doshah. Therefore if after sravanam and mananam I am able to say I am Brahman

and free then I don't require nididyanam at all. If I am not able to say this, I need nididyanam. It is called niyama vidhi or paksita anga vidhi. He gives an example from Purva Paksa sastra to show that there also anga vidhis and anga vidhis are very much there. For one rituals many vidhis are possible. When there are many vidhis with regard to many rituals then one will be pradhana vidhi with regard to rituals and all others will talk about secondary things that contribute to the pradhana vidhi of conducting the puja. There can be many anga vidhis. Anga vidhi will be always one. May you do sandhyavandanam but it has so many other anga vidhis. In Purva mimamsa they take a sample yaga. They take darsa purna masa yaga which is pradhana vidhi. For that prayaja yaga is a secondary rituals which involve several oblations. They are called anga vidhi. For this pradhana vidhi and anga vidhi, Adhi Sankaracharya uses another word also. It is called pradhana vidhi as vid yadhih. Anga vidhi he calls vidhi angah. It comes later. It is like veda purva and veda anta. This is the essence of the sutra.

Vyasacharya only says mouna vidhi is a vidhi an anga vidhi, and he asserts his conclusion. He does not give any reason at all. Here the reasons are not given although he asserts his views. Commentators think that the reasoning is so simple that they can do it as homework. Adhi Sankaracharya rises to the occasion gives the reasons. The reasons are implied. One is simple. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad elsewhere in Maitreyi Brahmanam three vidhis are clearly stated. All the three vidhis are given there. Mounam here represents nididyanam. Here meditation is involved as a muni meditates. This is argument number one.

The second argument is an argument which we used long before in Sutra 20 of this pada. There the argument we borrowed from Purva Mimamsa. The same argument we borrow here. If a new teaching is involved, there you can assume a vidhi. Apurvatve vidhih kalpyate. The argument is nididyanam is a new thing we learn in this context. Apurvatvad mounam should be a vidhi. Even though explicit commandment is not there, because it is a new teaching we can take it as a vidhi on the basis of apurvatvat.

The third is the arguments based on the words and significance of the mantra. The mantra says pandityam nirvidya balyenam having completed the discipline or after completing the scholarship of Vedanta; after becoming scholarship in Atma Vidya which we call as Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Nirvidya means after completing Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Nirvidya indicates it is a vidhi. This refers to sravana vidhi. May you lead a life in which you strengthen the knowledge by removing all the intellectual doubts. I use the word intellectual doubt but because removing doubt is intellectual operations. In japa you don't use your reasoning power. Doubt removal is intellectual operation. Any idea of Vedanta you ask your intellect to remove the debt. First accept Brahman is there and then accept Brahman sathyam and last of all you accept Brahman sathyam jagan mithya. Can you swallow jagat mithya. I don't accept aham brahma asmi. Nobody waits for a fact to happen. You can ask a question whether it is a fact or not. Use your intellect to know whether it is a fact or intellect. If you wait for fact to happen you have not understood the circumstances under which fact is revealed. I have clearly understood the Vedanta. If he criticize the student he may not come to the class. Therefore mananam is intellectual process by which the factness of the Brahman sathyam, jagan mithya you understand. If the intellect is not understanding I ask it why intellect does not understand it. This intellectual process takes lot of time. Then Upanisad says balyanca pandityancha nirvidyancha atham muni vidhi after sravanam and mananam. We get doubt whether there is vidhi or not. Here the word nirvidya is repeated, i.e., after practicing, some thing you are to follow that is amounancha and mounancha and here the crucial point that is to be focused is mounam nirvidya means after following the

discipline of mounam it means something to be done by you. If it is not to be done by you why should they say nirvidya. Mounam there is anustanam and wherever anustanam is involved, a vidhi is understood. Therefore, mounam nirvidya iti vacanat mouna vidhi kalpyate. Therefore mounam is a vidhi. What about the amounam that is said there? The meaning of the word amounam means the other two non-mounam disciplines, which is here sravanam and mananam that is pandityam and bhalyam. Having followed Sravana Manana Nididyanam then alone you become a brahmana. Therefore this is the third argument to establish that mounam is vidhi. Nirvidya is the crucial word in this context. Now Purva Paksi argues I am willing to accept mouna vidhi. That is munitvam as vidhi I am willing to accept. How do you interpret mounam as nididyanam. Mounam is status of muni. How can you interpret as vidhi. The word muni has not connection with nididyanam. Muni means a sannyasi in the normal circumstances. Mouna vidhi will have to be taken as sannyasa vidhi only. This also I cannot accept because sannyasa vidhi is already there before. A thing already enjoined you couldn't say it again. Sannyasa anuvada is possible. Sannyasa vidhi is not possible. The word muni need not be used for sannyasi. The etymological meaning of word muni is one who pursues Jnanam. Jnana anustanam also can be taken as muni's function. Purva Paksi says that also I cannot accept. Jnana abhyasa vidhi I cannot accept. Says Purva Paksi. Sravanam itself is the pursuit of knowledge because it is pramana vichara. Why do you require jnana abhyasa vidhi? Therefore also I cannot accept mounam as nididyanam says Purva Paksi. Then Adhi Sankaracharya answers finally all the three Sravana Manana Nididyanam are really jnana abhyasa only. Even though all three are jnana abhyasa only, through all three we function differently for the pursuit of jnanam. Activities are distinct and in all of them our goal is one only that is gaining Jnanam of aham brahma asmi. We work for clarity of knowledge and therefore we need three separate vidhi for different operations but all operations culminate in one clarity. That culmination is clarity. The last question is if only one clarity is our goal why should we have three different operation for one clarity. Different operations are required the obstacles to clarity are different. We have three different obstacles for one and the same clear knowledge aham brahma asmi. Three obstacles exist in our mind. That tat tvam asi is not allowed to function. Pramana asambavana prameya asambavana and viparita asambavana are three obstacles that occupy the mind. Therefore we have to grill the student and make them get up to the Jnanam. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 335

### **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5. meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

#### **Sutra 3.4.47 [472]**

#### ***Sahakaryantaravidhih pakshena fritiyam tadvado vidhyadivat***

We discuss the general analysis of sutra 47. Here Vyasacharya establishes the mouna vidhi in 3.5.1 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Mouna vidhi in this context is nididyasana vidhi. It is an anga vidhi and he says it is the third anga vidhi which in other means nididyasanam. Finally he points out that it is a conditional anga vidhi otherwise called niyama vidhi in Purva Mimamsa. He supported his conclusion by referring to Purva Mimamsa. There every ritual is followed by secondary ritual. One is pradhana vidhi prescribing whole ritual and many secondary vidhis. They are anga vidhi. They are secondary ritual forming part of the pradhana ritual. Purva Paksi accepted the mouna vidhi. He asks how to conclude mounam is nididyasanam. He says mouna vidhi should be taken as sannyasa vidhi. We don't take mouna vidhi as sannyasa vidhi because sannyasa has already been prescribed in the previous portion. Since sannyasa vidhi is already given it need not re-prescribed through mouna vidhi hence it should be taken as nididyasana vidhi and it should be followed by sannyasi. Jnana abhyasa is called nididyasanam. It means dwelling in knowledge in one way or the other. Purva Paksi asks the question if you say nididyasanam is jnana abhyasa then in what way it is different from pandithyam prescribed as sravanam. Since both are to gain Jnanam why nididyasanam is needed. Is it not repetition is their argument. If you say both are one and the same nididyasanam should not be separate vidhi. It should be added in sravanam or mananam. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says one is gaining the knowledge and another is polishing the knowledge. Jnana adhisaya abhyasa is to make it clearer and clearer. Sravana Manana Nididyasanam is three disciplines and three make if practised it makes it clear. Why three different discipline? This is the question. For that we give the answer for one clarity there are three different obstacles. Since obstacles are different we need three different discipline and each one will remove the obstacles that obstructs the shine of knowledge. One way of presentation is ajnana pratibandah, samsaya pratibandah and viparita bhavana pratibandah or viparyayah. All the three remove all the three doubts. Another way of presentation is technical. One is pramana asambavaha, second is prameya asambavana, and third is viparida bhavana. There is third way, which is not that, popular. All the three are sruti virodhaha and yukti virodhah and anubhava virodhah. Sruti virodhah is seeming textual contradiction, yukti virodhah refers logical contradiction and anubhava virodhah is experiential contradiction. Sravanam results in sruti virodha and manana removes the yukti virodha. The very same Upanisad is interpreted by different acharyas differently. Since there are textual differences which one I should take is our question. I should respect the acharya. I may respect the acharya but I may not agree with his views or philosophy. Every acharya is a great person but does not force us we should therefore accept their views. Adhi Sankaracharya has got respect for Patanjali but he may not agree with their views. Jivatma Paramatma beda he will not agree. Student thinks accepting the acharya implies agree with their views. Hence the

contradiction appears in the mind. You respect all and you cannot agree with all. As long as clarity in study is not there, you will not have conviction. Basic scholarship should be there to come to one siddhanta. Doing namaskaras to all but stick to one siddhanta. Mananam is for removal of logical contradiction buddhi knows the language of reasoning. Vedanta says I don't want to sacrifice the reasoning therefore use your intellect thoroughly. Reasonings function in vyavahara plane. Sruti talks about in paramarthika plane. How can you cross over confusion in the field of superlogic topics [apourusheya vishaya]. The confusion comes because of mixing up of vyavahara and paramarthika simultaneously. It is neither logical nor illogical for it is super logical.

Third is anubhava virodhah. This is the last and most powerful obstacle. You always feel my life if full of sorrow. How can I say I am ananda swarupi when I am full of sorrow all through the life. I will become ananda when all problems are solved. How can this be possible. Prarabda based problems cannot be saved at all. Vedanta talks about atam ananda swarupa and we are used to we are wallowing in ahankara problem all the time. Sannyasi has no relation no possession and not much transaction and no responsibility. If the four are not there, then ahankara is not dominant. If ahankara is prominent, Saksi is subdued for I am ahankara pradhana Jivatma and he always feels uncomfortable to say I am anandah. Therefore I reject sastra or I will postpone Moksa. The only solution is we have to differentiate the vyavahara and paramarthika plane. Mithya ahankara will always have mithya problem. After the cessation of mithya problem, you will have no ananda problem. What we should have is have ananda despite mithya problem, family condition, worldly condition. Overshadowing ahankara problem will remove the anubhava virodha. Meditating upon this fact is nididyanam. It is not for mystic experience but it is to remove anubhava virodha pratibandha. Then I will be bold to say aham ananda swarupa. Thus Sravana Manana Nididyanam are required for removal of three obstacles. Once the obstacles are removed, I am real Brahmana.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Sahakarayantara vidhih mounam is [an injunction or commandment] prescribing another auxiliary discipline. Tritiyam it si the third one. Paksena prescribed as a conditional discipline. Tadvatah for a wise person vidyativat this is similar to a primary vidhi followed by a secondary vidhi. The significance of the word is sahakaryantaravidhih means another angam vidhih means commandment; tritiyam this is third secondary discipline. That is mounam which here is nididyanam. Panditya rupa sravanam and bhalya rupa mananam. Paksena means it is not a compulsory discipline but a conditional discipline. If sravanam and mananam itself if you will comfortable, it is o.k. Physical problem will be there to everybody including a sage. But he does not bother about it. Let the mind be in a reasonably healthy condition. Knowing body a mithya does not means health should be neglected. It should be a non-binding desire to maintain the body. Never connect the mental health to your freedom. How you handle the situation depends upon your discretion. Tatvatah means this is prescribed for the possessor of that. Jnanavatah. Nididyanam is prescribed for the possessor of sravana manana Jnanam and for that person nididyanam is prescribed for refinement. It is jnana nishta vidhih. Adhi Sankaracharya says jnana vadhah sannyasinah nididyanam vidhih. Since previous sentence has prescribed sannyasa this injunction is for a sannyasi. He will also give a supporting logic and nididyanam means constant dwelling on the subject and he should not have other responsibility and other occupation for they may obstruct nididyanam and hence he suggests nididyanam. vidyativat means pradhana vidhih. Anga vidhi is called vidhi antah. Vidhyadhah is primary injunction. Vat means like. Like the pradhana vidhi. it means just pradhana vidhi in Purva Mimamsa or karma kanda is followed by anga vidhi here also

Sravana Manana Nididyanam are anga vidhi which follow the pradhana vidhi which is gaining Jnanam. Just as pradhana karma vidhi is anga vidhi the Sravana Manana nididyanam is followed by Jnanam. With this the sutra is over.

### **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5. meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

#### **Sutra 3.4.48 [473]**

### **Kristnabhavattu grihinopasamharah**

On account of his being all, however, there is winding up with the householder

The following two sutras deal with some aside points. Here some possible doubts are clarified. The doubt is in Kahola Brahmana it is said sravana and manana should be followed by nididyanam. The mantra talks about spiritual journey of jiva. He should go through all four asramas and practise Sravana Manana Nididyanam and become real Brahmana that is jivan mukta. The culmination seems to be sannyasa asrama. The end of the journey seems to be to become sannyasi. The doubt is in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter Chandogya upanisad where chatuśpad Brahman is described and after talking about the whole thing, acharya kulad kulad ekam adithya. This mantra talks about entire journey of jiva. Follow all the discipline as long as you live and then you will get Mukti and according to this mantra the culmination is grahashta. But according to Kahola Brahmana it is sannyasa asrama is the culminating point to Mukti. Why Chandogya upanisad omitted sannyasa asrama. Vyasacharya says grahashtasrama is highlighted in that mantra for it has got not only Grahashtasrama discipline and also many of the disciplines belonging to that asrama. They are included in that asrama. Even Vedanta adhyayanam which is prescribed to sannyasi he can do. What grahashtas do sannyasi cannot do. Therefore he says Vedanta sravanadi sadhanas are included in Grahashtasrama. It is holistic asrama it is said. It is a complete asrama. Because of other activities he may not find time to study Vedanta. He can study Vedanta and he can even be liberated on gaining Jnanam. Janaka is the best example in this context. Grahashtasrama seems to be a great asrama. Because of superiority of availability of all sadhanas Chandogya upanisad concludes that is the best. In that mantra Chandogya upanisad is talking about krama Mukti. Brahma lokam abi samvartate. There Sravana Manana Nididyanam do not come to picture. There it is the practice of saguna upasana and getting krama Mukti. Hence don't mix up that mantra with kahola brahmana mantra which aims at jivan Mukti. More in the next class.



## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 336

### **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5 meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

#### **Sutra 3.4.48 [473]**

#### ***Kristsnabhavattu grihinopasamharah***

On account of his being all, however, there is winding up with the householder

We are in the general analysis of sutra 48 that answers an incidental question that may arise in the study of the previous sutra. There mounam was said to be a supported discipline. This as a supporting sadhana nididyanam named mounam was prescribed. Adhi Sankaracharya interpreted as a prescription meant for someone who has got knowledge through sravanam. Sravana mananam for Jnanam and nididyanam is for adhisayah. Jnana adhisaya is relevant only after gaining Jnanam. It is a vidhi for a person who has Jnanam and added that one more adjective who has got Jnanam and who is a sannyasi. This aspect is derived from Kahola Brahmanam. After sannyasa vidhi in the form bikshcharyam charanti and here charanti is taken as vidhi. Though it appears in present tense, it should be taken as vidhi. Nididyanam vidhi for sannyasi he says. This information we have to note because in the next sutra we will apply this meaning. Therefore nididyanam presupposes sannyasa. Because of this a doubt comes in the mind of the seeker for gaining Moksa we need jnana adhisayam; for jnana adhisayam one needs nididyanam and for nididyanam one requires sannyasa and it means spiritual of a person should culminate in sannyasa. This is what we derive from sutra 47. It need not begin in sannyasa but it appears it culminates in sannyasa. How do you explain the mantra occurring in mantra 8.15.1 Chandogya upanisad. That is the question which I mentioned in the last class. The confusion in the mantra and it talks about the detail of the procedure to gain Jnanam. Then the mantra says living in this manner a person gets Moksa. Remaining grahastha until death it says and sannyasa asrama is not mentioned there. How do you account for that? This is the question. The mantra reads as *tadd haitad brahma prajapataya uvaca, praja patir manave, manuh prajaphyah, acarya kulad vedam adhitya yatha vidhanam, guroh karma [krtva] atisesena abhisamavartya, kudumbe sthitva, sucou dese svadhyayam adhiyanah, dharmikan vidadhat, almani survendriyani sampratisthapyah, ahimsan sarva bhutany anyatra tirthebhyah sa khalv evam vartayan yavad dyusam brahma lokam abhisampadyate na ca punar avartate na ca punar avartate*. If nididyanam is to be done and sannyasa is suggested and here in the above mantra sannyasa is not mentioned.

For such a grahastha who practices karma and upasana direct Moksa is mentioned and only Krama Mukti is mentioned and therefore you should not equate this with Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra, which deals with jivan Mukti. Second reason, which Vyasacharya gives, is that Chandogya upanisad highlights Grahasthasrama because most of the spiritual are in Grahasthasrama and it accommodates of the discipline of all other asramas but others cannot accommodate Grahasthasrama functions. Vaidhika karmas cannot be practised by other three asramas while Grahasthasrama can follow other discipline. Because of versatile nature of

asrama it is highlighted and it is not meant to negate sannyasa asrama. A person can get krama Mukti also in Grahasthasrama even if he does not follow nididyanam and jnana nishta and we have seen in Gita even jivan Mukti is also possible in Grahasthasrama.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu means however; upasamharah means instruction on spiritual discipline are concluded in Chandogya upanisad grihina with the discipline of Grahasthasrama; kritsnabhavat because of completeness of spiritual disciplines in that asrama; that refers to Grahasthasrama;

The significance of the words is kristna bhavat means purnatvam; her purnatvam means totality of the sadhanas there is no deficiency in the Grahasthasrama including ashtanga yoga a grahastha can practice. Purna and pushkala purna is purnatvam and pushkalatvam means no deficiency. That is here indicated as kristna bhavat. Because disciplines are complete in Grahasthasrama Chandogya upanisad concludes its teaching with Grahasthasrama. With grahastha, one gains Mukti it is said here. Because of the completeness of sadhan Chandogya upanisad completes its instruction with Grahasthasrama and excludes sannyasa. Tu means however. Even though Brihadaranyaka upanisad highlights sannyasa asrama by prescribing mouna vidhi, Chandogya upanisad chooses to highlight Grahasthasrama not because Chandogya upanisad disrespect sannyasa but wants to highlight Grahasthasrama. It is clear from sakanda sruti where Chandogya upanisad also admits sannyasa asrama. Therefore there is no contradiction between Brihadaranyaka upanisad and Chandogya upanisad. Thus the seeming contradiction is set right by the sutra 48.

## **Topic 14 Sahakaryantaravidhyadhikaranam [47-49]**

In Brihadaranyaka upanisad III.5 meditation is enjoined besides the child-like state and scholarship.

### **Sutra 3.4.49 [474]**

#### ***Maunavaditareshamapyupadesat***

Because the scripture enjoins the other [stages of life viz. Brahmacharya and Vanaprastha], just as it enjoins the state of muni [sannyasi]

The sutra states that the scripture enjoins the observance of the duties of all the orders of life.

In this another possible small doubt is answered if the person thinks himself as Purva Mimamsaka. Purva Mimamsa's problem is ekasrama vadhi and he accepts only Grahasthasrama. Now and then Vyasacharya has to establish four asrama. In the 47<sup>th</sup> sutra he established sannyasa asrama through mouna vidhi in the preceding mantra. Therefore 47 establishes sannyasa. 48<sup>th</sup> sutra talked about Grahasthasrama. Therefore somehow we have established two asramas. Now Vyasacharya confirms here there are two other asramas also in addition to sannyasa asrama mentioned in 47 and Grahasthasrama in 48<sup>th</sup> sutra and now he says other two asramas also should be accepted. Here he says Brahmacharya and Vanaprastha also should be accepted. Therefore the doubt is whether there is one or two asrama, siddhanta says there are four asramas. Here Vyasacharya we have to accept four asramas because they are directly prescribed in the veda itself. Sastra vidhi prescribed is skanta sruti we studied before in Chandogya upanisad 2.23.1 and this elaborately studied in the second adhikaranam of this pada [sutra 18-20] and showed that four asramas are

prescribed. While analyzing the skanta sruti Adhi Sankaracharya talked of one more sruti which is direct and explicit. It is analysed in brahma sutra means it is not explicit. The other one is mantra 4 of Jabala Upanisad. Therefore we have to accept four asramas.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Itaresham api means the validity of the other asramas also [should be accepted. mounavat as in the case of sannyasa and Grahasthasrama; upadesat means because they are also prescribed the other asramas are also prescribed by the vedas. Now we will see the significance. Mounavat means sannyasa asrama; it is like sannyasa asrama means just as sannyasa asrama a valid asrama prescribed by the vedas. In the same manner itaresham api other asramas i.e. Brahmacharya and Vanaprastha also; the validity should be accepted. Upadesat means veda vidhih. Veda vakyam kept in mind is 2.23.1 of Chandogya upanisad and mantra 4 of Jabala sruti. Grahasthasrama need not be establish for Purva Paksi has already accepted it. What is left is only two asramas. Here the question is why Vyasacharya used plural number. This is the question answered by Adhi Sankaracharya. Adhi Sankaracharya says there are internal divisions within the asramas like upakurvana and naishthika Brahmacharya etc. Each asrama has got four varieties. The plural number includes the internal division also and therefore it is not wrong grammatically also. With this sutra 49 is over. Now we enter 15<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

## Topic 15 Anavishkaradhikaranam [50]

Child-like state means the state of innocence, being free from egoism, lust, anger etc.

### Sutra 3.4.50 [475]

The child like state means without manifesting himself according to the context.

The sutra says that the perversity of a child is not emant by the word ‘balyena] [by the child like state] in the passage of the Brihadaranyaka upanisad quoted under sutra 47.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam is a small one with only one sutra. Here Vyasacharya analyses the mantra from Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra 3.5.1, which is the same mantra as we did in the previous adhikaranam. Bandityam in the form sravanam and bhavanam in the form of balyam and nididyanam is mentioned in the form of sannyasam is mentioned. In the previous adhikaranam we analysed mouna vidhi. Finally we said it implied sannyasa asrama etc. In this adhikaranam we focus on the word balyam, which comes before mounam. We had already given one interpretation for the word balyam. Balyam means bhala bhavah that means strength reinforcement. We give the answer the reinforcement of knowledge received through sravanam. This means any knowledge, which is shaky because of doubt, and doubt shakes the knowledge and reinforcement the removal of doubts that always makes the knowledge shaky. Therefore freedom from doubt is bhala bhavah. Samsaya rahitvatvam or clarity of knowledge is reinforcement of knowledge. I have understood the fact. I am free is the clarity of knowledge. This was the meaning given for the word balyam. Purva Paksi takes the popular meaning for the word balyam. Here he takes the state of childhood or the lifestyle of childhood. Here Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya accept the second meaning also that is childhood. Having accepted the meaning they say it should be interpreted properly. After sravanam you should undergo balya avastha. Purva Paksi says that balya avastha means not the childhood

state for you cannot go back to childhood state age wise. Balya avastha cannot be taken here. It should be balasya karma the lifestyle of child. Both Purva Paksi and siddhantis accept this. There are two things in a child. First is its purity of mind or character. Innocence, integrity freedom deceptiveness together we call bhala suddhi. Second is indiscipline. Doing whatever it likes. Which one should be taken here is the question. Purva Paksi says after knowledge you become balyam means you can do anything. You give up puja, etc. This is Purva Paksi opinion. We ask the question is it not unethical. Sastra prescribes ethechachara because of sastra vidhi it will not be papam for him and therefore he can act like himsa prescribed in sastra does not come under ahimsa. After sravanam you can start it is stated. Another reason is that to show that jnani is beyond vidhi nisheda and it is glorification of a jnani or Jnanam. So sastra gives this instruction. This is Purva Paksi view. Siddhanta says balyam means innocence, raga dvesha vargitatvam etc. Papa sudhhi is highlighted in balyam as said by siddhanta. This we will see in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 337

### **Topic 15 Anavishkaradhikaranam [50]**

Child-like state means the state of innocence, being free from egoism, lust, anger etc.

#### **Sutra 3.4.50 [475]**

The child like state means without manifesting himself according to the context.

The sutra says that the perversity of a child is not emant by the word ‘balyena] [by the child like state] in the passage of the Brihadaranyaka upanisad quoted under sutra 47.

We discuss the sutra 50 of Anavishkaradhikaranam. I have given the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam analyses Brihadaranyaka upanisad 3.5.1 in which three forld sadhana vidhi as sravana vidhi, manana vidhi and nididyanam vidhi stated in the form of banditya vidhi, balya vidhi and mouna vidhi. The word balyam is discussed differently in Brihadaranyaka upanisad by Adhi Sankaracharya . This is reinforcement of knowledge by removing doubt. Both acpt the interpretation of bala bhava. If balyam of bala bhava it is a state in which one is like a bala or child. What do you mean bala bhava. Three meanings are possible bala avastha, bala karma and bala swabhavah. Bala avastha refers to stage, bala karma is the activities of child and bala swabhavah is child-likeness. Of the three possible meaning which one is vidhi here. First meaning is ruled out because bala avastha indicates the stage of life cannot be vidhi for we do not have a choice to follow that. If I am child, I need not become a child. I cannot become a child agewise. Bala avastha is obtaining fact and it is not subject to vidhi nishedah. Age being beyond the scope of vidhi for age is a fact. Therefore bala avastha is ruled out by both siddhanta and Purva Paksi. Bala karma that means do as he likes and it is governed by raga dvesah. This is bala karma. Next is bala swabhava meaning the innocent nature of a child. It is translated as childlike character in the form of simplicity, innocence, freedom ostentation etc. It is translated as bhava suddhi. Thus balyam can means either yetheshtachara or bhava suddhi which bala swabhava. Which meaning we should take is the question here. After completing vedantic study the lifestyle should be balyam. Purva Paksi unfortunately takes balyam as yathestachara which means after study of Vedanta jnani can live in any way he likes. Such free life is prescribed in sastra. He gives two reasons for that. That this is to show the greatness of Jnanam. In Jnanam he transcends all activities. This shows the greatness of knowledge and also he argues that such a lifestyle of jnani cannot produce papam because it is prescribed by veda itself. Jnani violating dharma will not give him papam as it is prescribed by veda. He gives the example of himsa for it is into papam when it is scarified in a yajna. Himsa in dharma yuddham is not only not a papam but also it gives him punyam and he goes to heaven. Dharma yuddhe himsavat. Adhi Sankaracharya establishes no following dharma should be continued even after the study of Vedanta even during and after study swadharma anustanam is important. Balyam should be translated as balya swabhavah. This is the general introduction. In this sutra Vyasacharya highlights one value by the word anavishkurvan means ostentation Self publicity, Self proclamation etc. What oneself one’s glory one’s knowledge etc., and any form of Self

publicity is called anavishkurvan the opposite is vinayatvah. Child does not have manitvam. Child is simple. How do you come to such a meaning why can't you take to yetheshtarah. For which Vyasacharya says the context reveals that meaning. Why balya vidhi is prescribed? We have already seen before all the three are anga vidhi contributory sadhanas. If this is an anga vidhi it is always meant for the primary purpose anga vidhi pradhana vidhi. Pradhana vidhi is Atma Jnanam. Pandityam is to gain knowledge. Scriptural scholarship is to become Self Knowledge. Similarly balyam is for Self Knowledge. The context is Jnanam. 1.2.24 Kathopanisad it is said that jnanam can arise in the mind, can stay in the mind and Jnanam can produce the result only in a mind that follows dharma. Therefore veda makes it very clear that dharma vidhi nisheda following anusaranam is compulsory to gain knowledge. If yetheshtacharam is obstacle to Jnanam how can the very same veda prescribed yethestara as a means to Jnanam. Therefore such a meaning cannot be given. If such a meaning cannot be given what to do with the word balyam. Adhi Sankaracharya says if other meanings are absent we will be forced to give this meaning. Fortunately balyam has got other meaning, which is favourable to the context. It is not contradict Katha mantra also. Why take unfavourable contradictory meaning. Therefore balyam means pure mind. Therefore the word balyam can be taken as purity of mind. Why veda prescribes purity of mind now when it has done so even before coming to Vedanta. Even if you are not interested in Moksa you have to follow veda. Then we say previously we prescribe for the same of jnana utpatti and later it is suggested for jnana phalam and jnana nishta. Then another question may come if this vidhi is required for gaining Jnanam before and jnana nishta later, do you say dharma is not required after gaining jnana nishta. Here dharma vidhi is not required. Jnana nishta is that state when adharma is not possible. It is spontaneous value. Jnana nishta paryantam values have to be followed deliberately and after gaining Jnanam, jnana nishta will come spontaneously. Whatever it is dharma should prevail according to veda. Then comes the last question. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad Adhi Sankaracharya has translated balyam as bhala bhavah mananam. Here we translate balyam as bhava suddhi purity. Now the question is which one I should take. Should I follow mananam or purity. Brihadaranyaka upanisad it says mananam and when I see Brahma sutra it calls it purity. Both should be taken and they are not optional. This is the general analysis.

Now I will give you the word analysis of the sutra. Anavishkurvan means wise person should remain pure without Self publicity; anvayat this is known from the context. The significance of the words I will give you now. Anavishkurvan as I said avishkaranam means Self projection; it means dumbhah all rajasic tamasa gunas; it is upalaksanam of all asura rajasa sambatti of Gita; anavishkarah means without rajasa tamasic guna and it means dominance of sattva guna. Gunas are always subject to fluctuation. You cannot clamp sattva guna. The three gunas are fluid and highly subject to fluctuation and it depends upon innumerable factors including prarapta. For both of them two sruti quotations are given. One should control rajo tamasa guna and one should promote sattva guna. 1.2.24 of Kathopanisad one should have sattva guna predominance; the next is avayata acharat the source of the mantra is not clear but it is in the veda. It means without any show it should be there. Lingam means accessories. Right from dress onwards he is simple. Acharah means language and conduct also show his simplicity. The body language reveals humility. Many puranas shows how one should stand and conduct before elders, Guru etc, are given. Now the modern development talks about the body language confirms the necessity. For your body also conveys some language. The very posture sends message. Therefore veda says the body language reveals your mind. Achara also should show humility or vinayah. Kathopanisad shows humility. He should live following humility. Anvaya means context. Lieterally anvaya means jelling of the meaning. This meaning will fit into the context of knowledge. Therefore anvaya means

context. Because of this context this is the meaning. Balyam means purity of mind. With this 50<sup>th</sup> sutra and 15<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. Now we go to the next adhikaranam.

## **Topic 16 Aihikadhikaranam [51]**

The time of the origination of knowledge when Brahma Vidya is practised.

### **Sutra 3.4.51 [476]**

#### ***Aihikamapyaprastutapratibandhe taddarsanat***

In this life [the origination of knowledge takes place] if there be no obstruction to it [the means adopted] because it is so seen from the scriptures.

The sutra states whether the consequence of Brahma Vidya which is the realisation of Brahman is possible in this life or will wait till death.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the 16<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with one sutra. It is called aihikadhikaranam. Here we see Sravana Manana Nididyanam is a long process and further doubts crop up which have to be cleared. Further viparita bhavana will also trouble us. This sadhana is prescribed for the purpose of gaining Jnanam and ultimate Moksa. Jnana abhyasa is meant for jnana utpatti. The jnanam is aham brahma asmi. Aparoksa brahma aikya Jnanam. Now the controversy is whether the sadhana will produce Jnanam in this janma or in future janma. Such doubts come because in karma kanda two types of karmas are talked about as some karma gives phalam in this life and some others give phalam in the next janma. Putra kameshti yaga will have to give putra in this janma alone. Similarly kareere is another yaga and this yaga is for the rains to come when the crops are dried up. The rain should come immediately and not in the next janma. Some other yagas are there to give indriya sakti. Similarly jyotistiyoma yaga is svarga loka and this phalam is gained only after death. Jnana janma phalam is in this life or next life is the question. There are argument in both ways. Purva Pakshi argues that jnana utpatti must be in this janma for jnanam comes under drishta phalam. I expect result that can be experienced by me in this life. Jnanam is drishtam or adrishtam. Mathematics Jnanam is drishtam only. Sishya will not know whether he has got Jnanam or not. If Jnanam is adrishtam sishya cannot go to a Guru and Guru also cannot teach also. So no teaching is possible no school is possible if Jnanam is adrishtam. Brahma Jnanam is also drishtam and jnanatvat physics jnavat. Brahma Jnanam is also like any other Jnanam only. It is brought out of pramanam. The type of pramanam is different and also prameyam is different like sabda Jnanam and sparsa Jnanam. What is ajnanam the type of pramanam varies. Similarly prameyam also differs. Prameyam of sabda Jnanam is sabda and object of sparsa Jnanam is sparsa. They are pramana janyam,. Brahma Jnanam is also samanam, pramana janyam, Vedanta vakya pramana janyam. Vedanta doest not say it is different Jnanam. Therefore the question is since Jnanam is drishtam and pramanam is to produce Jnanam and when one operates pramanam in this janma and Jnanam should operate in this janma alone. Therefore some say Jnanam is aihikam and some say it is amustikam. Siddhanta says it can be either. There is no rule or definiteness in this regard. More in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 338

### **Topic 16 Aihikadhikaranam [51]**

The time of the origination of knowledge when Brahma Vidya is practised.

#### **Sutra 3.4.51 [476]**

#### ***Aihikamapyaprastutapratibandhe taddarsanat***

In this life [the origination of knowledge takes place] if there be no obstruction to it [the means adopted] because it is so seen from the scriptures.

The sutra states whether the consequence of Brahma Vidya, which is the realisation of Brahman, is possible in this life or will wait till death.

In the last class I gave you an introduction to this 16<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is whether jnana sadhanam produces jnana phalam in this janma itself or in the future janam. Jnana sadhanam here is Sravana Manana Nididyanam. Jnana phalam is aparoksa Jnanam. Whether it will produce jnana phalam in this janma or in the next janma is our question. There is no clear cut rule whether it will produce phalam in this or in future janma. The siddhanta is indefinite and he says it depends on the status of the student. Vedanta is same; Brahman is the same; aparoksa Jnanam is the same but the students are not the same. So the result cannot be guaranteed. Here Vyasacharya says result is indefinite because Vedanta pramanam can produce Jnanam only if it is not obstructed by impurity in the minds of the student. Best seed cannot germinate if the ground is not prepared. The obstacle may be a emotional, prappta obstacle. Varieties of obstacles are there which do not allow the knowledge to take place out of the study. The obstacle removal becomes as important as Sravana Manana Nididyanam. These obstacles are there known and unknown. Even if the knowledge arises we don't have the courage to accept it as our knowledge. To convey this in the tradition they tell a nice story. The story of samshepa sariragam and it is dealt with in vichara sagaram. There was a minister by the name Birchu. This minister was very efficient and favourite of the king. Sometime he goes to forest and never returns. The king and the people were disturbed. There were few other ministers envious of Birchu and they were happy of his disappearance. They said that Birchu has died and he roams in the forests as a ghost. This information were well directed and the whole kingdom believed. After several years the king goes for hunting and in the forest he saw Birchu under a tree and was doing tapas. He was meditating. And the king went near him. The sight of Birchu Jnanam generated in the mind did not give him happiness. He should have been happy but instead of giving happiness he runs away from Birchu thinking that I am near a ghost. This is the story part. He says Birchu the minister prameyam is in front alive. Prameyam is there. Pramanam is there and gave direct knowledge that Birchu is there. The pramata king is there. Actual pramata and prameyam are there. Indriyam produces pratyaksa virtue vrutti and it is paroksa Jnanam. Birchu is right in front and has produced aparoksa Jnanam. King clearly attained aparoksa Jnanam but he is not willing to accept it as Jnanam and did not accept it as a fact. That vrutti does not produce any ananda also. In the actual knowledge there is no jnana vrutti and he does not get ananda of finding the minister and he



is afraid of the ghost. He runs away. Here it is not the lack of knowledge but the hesitation in accepting the knowledge as knowledge. In his vision he does not have Birchu Jnanam and in fact he has Birchu preda Jnanam. Brahman prameyam is there. Guru reveals the fact. Either the knowledge does not arise or the knowledge arises and the student hesitates in accepting the jnana vrutti as Jnanam. This is called pratipandah. The mind is with the impurity because of which Jnanam is not accepted as Jnanam. If the Jnanam does not arise because of the aparada or dosham and is the student does not have the courage to accept it as Jnanam what to do. You cannot change Brahman; you have to remove the pratibanda. Now continue Sravana Manana Nididyanam and keep on removing the pratibanda and then the time comes where the pramanam works and intellect is ready to accept Jnanam as Jnanam and it is able to derive the phalam also. This obstacle can be removed by continuing the Sravana Manana Nididyanam. One thing is the increase and improvement of sadhana cathustaya sambatti will help him to realise the phalam. This spiritual wealth of devi sampath mentioned in Gita will help realise Brahman. Two fold spiritual wealth of sadhana cathustaya sambatti and Sravana Manana Nididyanam will help the seeker to gain Jnanam. The adrishta pratipanda in the form of papam can be removed only by the adhrishta method of Isvara aradhana and Isvara puja and japa etc. Surrender to the lord in the form of ishta devata and swadharma anustanam according to the asrama must continue. Bhakti must continue. Alone with that Sravana Manana Nididyanam must continue and then only the impact of Sravana Manana Nididyanam will be felt. In this context I will make an aside point. While talking about removal of obstacles some acharyas mention yogic meditation as a remedy. They talk about patanjali yoga sutras very heavily. They say it is supportive means for Vedanta. Sometimes they say it is independent and even say it is superior means to gain Jnanam and Moksha. These acharya even within advaidic tradition heavily borrow the idea from yoga vashistam. This book is yoga pradhana vashitam. Here the Guru is Vashista and sishya is Rama. Uniqueness of this book is that it heavily leans on yaga, thought removal existence and they talk about siddha vrutti and mano nasa etc. This introduction of yoga in Vedanta is discussed by Madusudana Saraswati. He says in his Gita Bashyam this yogic method is not acceptable to Adhi Sankaracharya. Adhi Sankaracharya is not in favour of clubbing this chidda vrutti niroda method as a part of Vedanta sadhana reason being entire yogic sadhana is based on prapanca sathyatva vada, the philosophical approach the world is real mind is real and thoughts are real. This foundation Adhi Sankaracharya does not accept and therefore yoga mixing up with Vedanta sadhana is not acceptable. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya and those who strictly follow Adhi Sankaracharya don't recommend thought elimination in their teaching. Adhi Sankaracharya also in his teaching tradition does not stress on yoga, yoga sutra or yaga vashistam. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya followers who want to keep Adhi Sankaracharya teaching alone and who don't borrow yoga vashistam and prasthanam triyam don't take to yoga and yoga vashistam. Like Adhi Sankaracharya they avoid emphasizing thought eliminating sadhana. Even nididyanam does not involve thought elimination. We don't recommend thought elimination. Entertaining thought is nididyanam. This thought must get entrenched in the mind. We accept increase of devi sampat and we accept continuation swadharma and Sravana Manana Nididyanam and in his list we don't accept samadhi nirvruttika samadhi etc. We don't quote much of yoga sutra. He does not quote yoga sutra. Under yoga pradhana you close the eyes and in our system we keep our eyes open. One Jagadeeswara sastry, he says yoga pradhana means we are going away from Adhi Sankaracharya. Study pradhana means we go towards Adhi Sankaracharya. Continue Sravana Manana Nididyanam and increase sadhana cathustaya sambatti and then clarity will nicely happen in due course. If the obstacles are too much it can happen in the next janma and then it will not start from scratch. Whatever you study now will be carried forward. Vyasacharya in this sutra quotes Vama Deva rishi in this regard. Even in the Garpha

vasa itself he got knowledge without going to a Guru without doing Sravana Manana Nididyanam. In the purva janma he has done Sravana Manana Nididyanam and because some obstacle there was some jnana pratipanda and in the garbha he got the knowledge and the Guru was in previous janma and Jnanam comes in this janma. Those are called spiritual prodigy and they had Guru in the past though it appears they have no Guru.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Apratibandhe means in the absence of active obstacle; ahihikam api the rise of knowledge in the present birth itself is possible. Tat darsanat this is known from such scriptural references. The significance of the word is apratistuta pratibande means in the absence of active obstacles; active obstacles means to show the obstacles existing due to prarapta. Samchita obstacle is called passive obstacles. I have immunity if it is in samchita. Only if it becomes prarapta then it will give problem. The king goes to forest without any misinformation or hearing all the story about the disappearance of Birchu. The moment he sees Birchu he will run and embrace him. He will get instantaneous ananda and knowledge that Birchu is there. Sravanam itself will put an end to samsara. When there are no obstacles, the current knowledge you will gain in this janma itself. From this we derive a corollary that in the presence of active obstacles any amount of vedantic study knowledge does not arise or knowledge phalam does not arise. That means it arises in the next janma. In this case knowledge is postponed. Tat darsanat means this idea is found in the scriptures. The sruti pramanam is 1.2.7 of Kathopanisad says that some people don't understand Vedanta even though they study Vedanta seriously. They neither get knowledge nor any benefit from knowledge. Another pramana is Aitareya Upanisad Vama Deva. Vama deva has done sravanam in his previous janma. Jnana comes in the present janma. Then there is 6.43-44 of Gita also endorses this view. If you don't get Jnanam in the present life don't think that the knowledge is waste. Everything will be registered in the mind and in the next janma it will be carried. A casual sravana will give knowledge. With this that topic is also over.

## **Topic 17 Aihikadharmuktiphaladhikaranam [52]**

Liberation is a state without difference it is only one.

**Sutra 3.4.52 [477]**

***Evam muktiphalaniyamastadavasthavadhritestadavasthavadhriteh***

No such definite rule exists with respect to emancipation the fruit of knowledge because the sruti asserts that state [to be immutable]. We enter the last adhikaranam with one sutra.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya talks about the relationship between Jnanam and Mukti. In the previous adhikaranam he talked of jnana sadhanam and Jnanam. Jnana sadhana produces Jnanam and Jnanam produces Moksa. Jnana sadhanam is cause and Jnanam is effect and Jnanam is cause and Moksa is the effect. In the previous adhikaranam Jnanam is effect and jnana sadhanam is cause and here Jnanam is the cause and Moksa is the effect. In the previous adhikaranam we asked the question whether Jnana sadhanam produces Jnanam in the current janma and next janma. Here we ask whether Jnanam produces Moksa in the current janma or the future janma. The answer is here the previous rule should not be extended. With regard to Moksa phalam from Jnanam, the previous niyama cannot be applied and Jnanam gives Moksa instantaneously and it is said Jnanam itself is Moksa. The general analysis of this sutra is

Vyasacharya says Mukti phala aniyamah. Niyamah means rules mentioned in the previous adhikaranam that is indefiniteness. Jnanam may come or may not come in this janma. This rule cannot be applied here. Jnanam gives Moksa in the present janma itself. He says the reason for this is the definition of Moksa proves this. The definition of Moksa is brahma bhava. Being Brahman itself is Moksa. The Upanisad clearly says Jnanam produces brahma bhava instantaneously. The knowledge is of the nature that I was I am and I ever will Brahman is the knowledge. And this brahma bhava does not happen gradually also. More so in the next class.

## **BRAHMA SUTRA**

Class: 339

### **Topic 17 Aihikadh Muktiphaladhikaranam [52]**

Liberation is a state without difference it is only one.

**Sutra 3.4.52 [477]**

***Evam muktiphalaniyamastadavasthavadhritestadavasthavadhriteh***

No such definite rule exists with respect to emancipation the fruit of knowledge because the sruti asserts that state [to be immutable]. We enter the last adhikaranam with one sutra.

We see the last sutra of the fourth pada of the third chapter. We see the general analysis of the sutra. There are two interpretation of this sutra. Some interpretations are different from the other. Here we talk about relation between the Jnanam and Mukti. In the previous adhikaranam we saw the difference between vichara and Jnanam, the cause and effect the Jnanam is the cause and moksha we said is the effect. Vichara gives Jnanam and Jnanam gives the Moksha. Just we have two pairs of cause effect relationship. The first pair we saw in the previous adhikaranam. We see the second pair in the final adhikaranam. In the previous adhikaranam we saw vichara produces Jnanam and how long we take for vichara produce Jnanam we cannot predict. The process is unpredictable timewise. Eventhough vichara is cause and has to produce knowledge there is unpredictability because of the minds of the student for mind is not same because of the various obstacles called adhrista pratibandhas. Because the pratibanda varies we cannot say when the vichara will produce Jnanam. In some cases it may take years and in some cases it may not happen in this janma itself and it can be in the next janma. Kala niyama nasti it means we are not sure whether we get jnana phalam now or in future. Now we take the next pair in this adhikaranam.

Jnanena Moksa utpatitih. When it comes to that what about the niyama. Is it also indefinite like the previous case or not. If it is indefinite what will be the condition. I may get Jnanam and Moksa I will get now or in future and wait for the lord's clearance. In fact there are some philosophers the time of Moksa bhagavan alone decides and we cannot question bhagavan. For some devotee he takes less time and for some it will take more time. We cannot also question God in this regard. For that we say it is not so. The indefiniteness mentioned in the previous case is not applicable in this case. It means Moksa comes immediately on gaining Jnanam. The word aniyamah in this sutra you must understand carefully. Aniyamah means that there is no rule mentioned in the previous adhikaranam. The rule mentioned in the previous adhikaranam is aniyama. Niyama of aniyama is not applicable in this case and it means there is definiteness. It is niyama bhavah. There is definiteness with regard to kala connecting Jnanam and Moksa utpatti. What is the kalam we can definitely say. Now the next question is what is the definite time gap between Jnanam and moksha in the case of all jnanis in all four yugas. Adhi Sankaracharya clearly says there no time between Jnanam and Moksa. It is instantaneous. With regard to this rule there is indefiniteness all people to attain Jnanam will attain Moksa. Why there is no progression requiring time. Jnanam and Moksa re eka rupam which does not have any gradation or progression. This Adhi Sankaracharya points out first of all in Jnanam there is no gradation at all for everyone must gain knowledge

aham brahma asmi. In the case of saguna upasana there is gradation possible. In upasana taratamyam is possible so also in phalam also. In saguna Isvara gradation is there. in aham brahma asmi Jnanam there is no eka rupam. In Moksa also there is no gradation. We define Moksa as brahma bhavah. Brahma bhavah means Brahman swarupa aikya prapti. Attainment of nature of Brahman. Brahma bhava itself is Moksa because Brahman by nature happens to be nithya mukta swarupam samsara rahitam. Brahman is free from ajnana, karamani janma marana chakram. All are not there in Brahman. Brahma bhava is Moksa bhava, since in nature of Brahman there is no gradation in the nature of Moksa also there is no gradation. Either you are Brahman or you are not. Either you have understood you are Brahman or you have not understood Brahman. Therefore there is no gradation in all these three. If there is no gradation no progression is possible. Gradation abhavat progression abhavah. Hence you cannot talk about time gap. Time gap can be increased or decreased. How do you know all these things is the next question. Where is pramanam for this. Adhi Sankaracharya says study Upanisad properly. In Brahman there is no gradation is clear from the definition of Brahman. 11.6 of Mundaka upanisad; Brahman is attributeless and therefore gradation is not possible. 1.3.15 of Kathopanisad; 7 of Mandukya Upanisad; all these mantras indicate in Brahman there is no gradation, in Moksa also there is no gradation. What about Jnanam? For that also there is clear sruti vakyam 3.2.9 of Mundaka Upanisad; the knower of Brahman is Brahman. The most important thing is the verb used by the sruti. One who knows Brahman is Brahman., it does not say he will become Brahman; the present tense is used. This Adhi Sankaracharya very elaborately analysed in samanvaya sutra [4] and establishes that between Jnanam and Moksa there is no time gap being knower of Brahman is Brahman. The logic behind this is the knowledge of Brahman happens to be unique knowledge different from other type of knowledge. Brahman knowledge is considered to be Brahman knowledge only when you are able to say aham brahma asmi. All other knowledge is in the form of second or third person singular but Brahman knowledge is in first person. So Brahma Jnanam is brahma bhavah. So says that Brahman I am. Brahma bhavah is Moksa and therefore Brahma Jnanam is Moksa and there is no taratamyam and there is no kala beda or gradation. It is said in Mundaka Upanisad. then the mantra says the knower of Brahman is Brahman and sruti does not say he will cross over samsara. There is no future tense. All are in present tense. Time of knowledge is time of brahma bhava and time of brahma bhava is time of freedom. If a person says I have Jnanam but I have not crossed sorrow then Vedanta says you don't have Jnanam. Knowledge brahma bhava and samsara abhava happens simultaneously. The present tense does not even refer to an event. When you say fire is hot. This is a present tense not referring to an event of time but it reveals the fact that is not time bound. When I say fire is hot it is a present tense which reveals a fact which fact is not a present fact but an eternal fact. Therefore there is no gap between gaining Jnanam and Moksa. First we say jnanena Moksa and later we say jnanam eva Moksa. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will come to word analysis. Muktiphalaniyamah means there is no such rule with regard to the result of liberation; evam means as in the case of Jnanam or the result of knowledge; tadavasthavadhriteh means this is known from the scriptural definition of the state of liberation. tadavasthavadhriteh repeated to indicate the end of third chapter; the significance of the words is muktiphala aniyamah means the result or the effect of liberation due to gaining knowledge; aniyama means absence of the rule applied in the previous sutra; we said before vichara and Jnanam we said it is definite. This rule is absent here; the instantaneous is the result of Jnanam and moksa. Tat avastha avadhriteh means scriptural definition; the definition of the state of liberation; from that we come to the conclusion. Vyasacharya says that the definition of Moksa the brahma bhava alone is Moksa; we never define Moksa as a condition of the mind. Once you define Moksa as condition of mind

progression, time gap etc. will come. It is not a condition of mind. Mind condition may change after knowledge. Refinement of mind is a by-product and not the aim of the seeker. I am Brahman and not refined mind. Refining the mind is not the aim of the seeker. Going to temple and getting prasada is not the aim. Darsan is the primary aim. I am not the mind but I am Brahman myself. The sruti says Jnanam gives instantaneous brahma bhava because knowledge happens to be I am Brahman. It is not an even of time but it is a statement of fact. Therefore the definition of Moksa and the nature of knowledge makes clear that there is no difference between Jnanam and moksa. Adhi Sankaracharya says in this adhikaranam also the study is cause effect relationship is between vichara and Moksa. In this adhikaranam it also relates to relationship between vichara and Moksa. Between vichara and Moksa the relationship there is no time. If Jnanam is indefinite naturally Moksa also will be indefinite. Once Jnanam is indefinite Moksa is also indefinite. If Jnanam comes in this janma Moksa will come in this janma and if Jnanam come in the next janma the Moksa also will come in the next janma. This is a simpler interpretation. With this 52<sup>nd</sup> sutra is over. Fourth pada is over. Third chapter is over.

### **Bird's eye view of the third chapter.**

Here sadhana adhyaya we talked about all spiritual sadhana in all the four sections. In the **first pada** the emphasis is on vairagyam and through that sadhana cathustaya sambatti is sadhana highlighted. This was done in a peculiar manner or by talking about the travel of jiva after death. Panca agni Vidya etc., was talked about. Jiva gathi varnana dvara samsara varnanam was done. It is not for enjoying but to get freedom from that.

In the **second pada** jnana yoga sadhana was highlighted by analysis of tvam pada and tat pada and aikyam also was shown. This was done from sutra 25-30. tat pada tvam pada vichara dvara jnana was discussed.

In the **third pada** upasanas were discussed. This is to attain subtle intellect. Guna upasamhara nyaya was also highlighted. The different attributes are to combined or not were discussed.

Then in the **fourth pada** karma yoga is the central theme. General karma yoga is diluted karma yoga. Panca maha yajna you can do in any manner you like. Do that with Isvara arpana prasada buddhi. Classical karma yoga is asrama karma yoga anustanam as prescribed in the vedas. In that context four asramas were established. Purva Mimamsa does not accept them. Asrama karmas were discussed as the prime component of karma yoga. As a part of sannyasa asrama duty Sravana Manana Nididyanam were also highlighted. Duties of sannyasa, Brahmacharya etc., were discussed in detail. For all these people there is a religious duty as an offering to lord is karma yoga. Thus sadhana cathustaya sambatti jnana yoga plus karma yoga is sadhana adhyaya. With this we complete the third chapter. Now we will enter fourth chapter in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4, Pada: 1

Class 340

### **General Introduction**

In the last class we completed the third chapter of brahma sutra. Before going further, I thought of taking stock of the situation. We have completed three chapters. We have completed 75 percent of the course. Totally 16 sections are there and we have completed 12 sections. Of 191 adhikaranams we have completed 153 topics and adhikaranam we have covered 80 percent of Brahma Sutra and lastly there are 555 sutras and we have covered 477 sutras. We have covered 85 percent. We have one more chapter to cover which I hope to complete with the grace of Guru and parampara. Like other chapter fourth one also has four padas and 38 adhikaranams with 78 sutras. It will take a minimum of one year to take the balance sutras.

### **General introduction to fourth chapter.**

It is phala adhyayah. It is a natural consequence of sadhana adhyaya. Any sadhana should produce phalam and this phalam is topic of the fourth chapter especially saguna nirguna Vidya. Vidya is taken in two meaning one is saguna and nirguna. Saguna Vidya is upasanam and nirguna Vidya is taken as Jnanam. This saguna upasana and nirguna Jnanam together we call saguna nirguna Vidya and here we talk of their phalam. The phalam is Mukti. Three types of moksas will be discussed in the entire fourth chapter and they are jivan Mukti, liberation while living in this body; second is vidheha Mukti that is liberation after the fall of the body and third one is krama Mukti in which jiva does not get liberated here travels to svarga loka and gain nirguna Jnanam and get ultimate Moksa. Of the three types of muktis first two are meant for those gaining nirguna Jnanam or nirguna Vidya and saguna Vidya or upasanam will give krama Mukti. All the three are talked about in the fourth chapter. All are mixed together. This chapter has got four padas. All the four padas talk of the three fold muktis. Topics are intermixed. They talk about topic division based on predominance. The first pada is bandha nivritti pradhana pada. that is freedom from bondage or freedom from karma. The second one focuses on departure of Prana at the time of death; uktranti it is called. This is the topic of second chapter. Jivan mukta will have uktranti or krama mukta will have uktranti will be discussed. The third pada is shukla gathi pradhana pada and it talks of shukla gathi and details of jiva's travel regarding the devatas etc. the fourth pada is brahma prapti pradhana pada in which brahma prapti is highlighted which include saguna brahma prapti of upasaka and nirguna brahma prapti of jnani. We should be alert to find out which talks of saguna upasaka and what discusses nirguna jnani. Mukti is attained by both saguna upasaka and nirguna jnani. Because of the common word Mukti, this may confuse of course Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam make it clear. This is the general introduction to the fourth chapter.

### **First adhyaya/pada of this chapter.**

It deals with how Vidya removes papam. When we use the word Vidya it well refers to saguna and nirguna Vidya. first pada highlights banda nirvrutti so it is called jivan Mukti pradhana pada. this is the topic of pradhana pada. it has fourteen adhikaranam and 19 sutras. Interestingly 8 adhikaranam are part of the previous chapter only. It is so because these 8



adhikaranam with 12 sutras deal with sadhana only. They should legitimately belong to the third chapter only. only 6 adhikaranam with 7 sutras alone relate to first pada of the fourth chapter. This is the outline of the first pada. now we will enter first sutra of first adhikaranam of first adhyaya / pada.

## **Topic 1 [Sutra 1-2]**

Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

### **Sutra 4.1.1. [478]**

#### *Avrittirasakridupadesat*

The repetition [of hearing, reflection and meditation on Brahman is necessary] on account of the repeated instruction by the scriptures.

The sutra states that constant practice of meditation is necessary.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. As I had said the first eight adhikaranam deal with sadhana only, it is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. The sadhana dealt with here is the primary sadhana for Jnanam and Moksa that is sravanam and mananam. It is suggested in the very beginning of the Brahma Sutra. This jijnasa alone defined variously in different context. Another name for jijnansa is vichara. Vicharah is another name for enquiry. Also it is said as jnana abhyasah. Another word used is jnana yoga used by the latter people. In kathopanisad Yama Dharma Raja uses the word adhyatma yogah. The last expression is Sravana Manana Nididyanam. this is the vedantic prescription for jnanam and Moksa. All the words are synonymous.

Any action or pursuit for that matter one question arises in the mind is how long should I go and how much I should do and how often I should do. The moment doctor gives prescription you ask him how long the medicine should be taken. Vidhi means duration question comes. Vidhi means how often and how much and how long comes. In karma kanda we are used to vidhi. in karma kanda veda prescribes the duration and frequency etc. in veda purva бага veda prescribes the duration, the number etc. for we do the thing to get the phalam and the phalam offered by the veda is in the form of adhristam. Adhristam means invisible result. That is called punyam. If the veda prescribes a japa a varuna japa for rain and how is varuna japa is going to produce rain. The sound of mantra is to produce an adhristam and that will produce the rain. So also other benefits. now the question is how many time I am to chant for getting the adhristam. The number of avritti required is indicated in the veda itself. The whole thing is suprasensuous. In karma kanda they have prescribed a rule. When sastra prescribes the number of times, you have to follow it blindly. When sastra does not specify the number and ask you to do you have to only once. This is presented in the form of rule. Wherever veda vidhi is there, you should follow to get the adhrista phalam. This is sastra vidhi. in sutra 3.4.47 of the Brahma Sutra we have studied this aspect. We have said there it is a niyama vidhi. Sravana Manana Nididyanam is a niyama vidhi and if it is so how many times I should do sravanam. Vidhi produces adhrista phalam. This is the debate in this adhikaranam. Purva Pakshi here says you apply Purva Mimamsa rule and if it does not mention the number it should be taken as one. His logic sastra mentions only once and it does not give number of times. Siddhanta says no. this has to be done during the whole time. What is the logic that is going to be given. The logic is when the benefit is adhrista phalam invisible result, you depend

upon sastra. All sadharas are ment for Jnanam and Jnanam does not come under adhrista whether I have got gone Jnanam etc., I should know myself the fact. None can know about yourself other than yourself. My own Saksi Chaitanyam reveals my mental condition with regard to Jnanam and ajnanam. This with regard to any knowledge. This is also a type of Jnanam only. whether you have doubt or not, you alone know. Since it is dhrista phalam you decide not Guru not even sastram. And for this in Purva Mimamsa an example is given. Drishta phala vishaye in the case of a pahalam visible it is to decided by the person not sastra. There is vidhi. before performing yaga they have prepare several material for yaga and they have to take variety of grains. One of them is paddy. Then sastra says you remove the husk and dehusking is to be done. It is also vidhi to remove the husk. How should I do the dehusking the job. Sastra says the method also I prescribe. You should remove by pounding. Now how many times I should pound. Vidhi means the number comes. Here sastra does not mention. How do you decide. Purva Paksi argues you apply Purva Mimamsa rule. When the number is not mentioned you do it only once. Purva Mimamsa says no. if pounding is an action prescribed for producing punyam then you have to do only once that punyam is generated. But here pounding is prescribed for adhrista punyam but dhrista phalam of removing husk and the paddy. Whether the rice is separated from husk or not that phalam is drishtam. The phalam can be seen. Sastra need not and will not say how many times and our decision is until the dehusking is complete. This is decided by looking at the dehusking process. The sadhaka is to decide. Similarly Sravana Manana Nididyanam is not producing a punya which is to give result after death. It is not the phalam intended by Vedanta. Jnanam or wisdom or knowledge is intended whether I know or not or revealed teaching is a fact for me or not. Whether the know subject matter is fact or not or when I say I am free for my own innermost heart is statement of fact or 'statement of fact quoted by Guru'. Until it is a fact for me I have to continue Sravana Manana Nididyanam. you keep on doing until you say I am free here and now. Not because the set up is conducive in spite of the set up. If the statement comes from within, then Sravana Manana Nididyanam need not be there.

Now I will do the general analysis. Avrutti means repetition of Sravana Manana Nididyanam. we don't look upon Sravana Manana Nididyanam as three totally different existences. Three different names are there but they are different existences. They are the same existence. In the three the common factor is brahma pratyaya avrutti. There is repeated thought centered in the mind. Therefore in sravanam by studying veda etc., even though we do variety of things the central idea is brahma Atma aikyam. I am whole and I am whole should be the conclusion. I am free and I am free. In mananam even though the existence appears to be different by negating all systems of philosophy and negation is to remove the obstacle to entertain the thought I am free. Any system that entertain the thought of that I will be free later then I will negate the thought. Whatever obstruct the statement you weed out. All times you think that I am free I am free. Nididyanam also Brahman pratyaya avrutti unlike yoga sastra. In Vedanta vrutti avrutti is the aim. Vrutti nirodha your remove the thought and in Vedanta you maintain the thought I am free in spite of the set up. Brahmatma avrutti pratyayah and even if you don't do it, it is a fact. Vyasacharya says sruti itself if the pramanam. You do this either in the form of sravanam or mananam or nididyanam. we insist on brahma pratyaya avrutti. In sitting do brahma pratyaya avrutti until it is not required.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 341

### **Topic 1 [Sutra 1-2]**

Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

#### **Sutra 4.1.1. [478]**

#### *Avrittirasakridupadesat*

The repetition [of hearing, reflection and meditation on Brahman is necessary] on account of the repeated instruction by the scriptures.

The sutra states that constant practice of meditation is necessary.

We have entered into the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter of Brahma Sutra which deals with the phalam of Brahma Vidya dealing with jivan mukti, videha Mukti and krama Mukti as the case may be. He talks of banda nivrutti here. Moksa is freedom from something and gaining some other thing. Here we talk of dukha nivrutti in the first pada. fourth pada deals with prapti pradhana. By the word banda we means papam. Karma ksaya pradhana pada. we saw that even though it deals with banda nivrutti the first eight adhikaranam deals with sadhanas only. of this first adhikaranam deals with sravana manana nididyasanam. we discuss we should do sravana manana nididyasanam must be repeated until you get Jnanam. It is cyclic process. Not that you start with sravana and culminate in nididyasanam. On the other hand it should cyclically go on. Even though we have been listening to same thing, we see great dimension as we go on repeating it. Even though prama, prameyam and pramanam are the same, still we insist on repetition there is difference in pramata. Pramata by repetition gets refined through more Sravana Manana Nididyasanam. the same Vedanta vakyam becomes more powerful. We have powerful antakarana medium through which it mediates, it is of different quality and Sravana Manana Nididyasanam is for pratipanda nivrutti. Tat tvam asi gets more impact as my mind gets refined. We have completed the general analysis of the first sutra in which the avrutti is required. Brahmatmaka pratyaya is to be repeated. The pramanam for this is sruti itself emphasizes the avrutti by using three separate sravana rupena pratyaya avrutti, manana rupena pratyaya avrutti and we should never get away from aham brahma asmi pratyaya. In each existence we remove different obstacle for pratyaya. First one also pratyaya is same obstacle handled is different. It is like a person going to three different doctors. If one health is aim why do you go to different special doctors. Even though health is one obstacles for health is threefold. The goal is same in all the three cases. So also in the case of Sravana Manana Nididyasanam. the main aim is aham brahma asmi. The difference between first aham brahma asmi and third aham brahma asmi is the Jnanam is same. The various sruti pramanams are 2.4.5 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad; 4.4.21 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad; the qualified student should gather knowledge and thereafter he should not leave Vedanta may you get soaked in Vedanta and if possible gradually reduce your other activities and increase your nivrutti so that you get more and more soaked in Vedanta. Anya vacho vimunchata the Mundaka says don't talk any other subject matter and save time and save it for the teaching; next one is Brihadaranyaka upanisad 3.5 of Kahola Brahmanam. All insist upon remaining in this knowledge which is called nishta. Allowing the knowledge to perpestrate into every

thought of yours and every response of life situation should be soaked in Vedanta. It should be there in every action I do. It does not happen by mere understanding but by soaking in Vedanta. That is why Adhi Sankaracharya invariably translate nishta into sannyasa and his idea is in hour mind being in vedantic atmosphere as much time as possible. Sannyasa gives the conducive opportunity for that. Through sannyasa mind can always be in the teaching. With this general analysis is over.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Three words are there. avrutti means repetition of brahma vrutti or brahma pratyaya avrutti; it is to be done; asakridupadesat means this is known from the repeated scriptural injunctions or prescriptions. Now we will see the significance of the words. avrutti means repetition of thoughts; this word differentiates vedantic meditation from yogic meditation. In yogic meditation thought elimination is the aim and vedantic meditation thought repetition is the aim. Vrutti means aham brahma asmi aikya vrutti avarti. Sravanam has thought mananam has thought and nididyanam has thought. We don't question the possibility of thoughtless thought but it is not part of Vedanta Sravana Manana Nididyanam. then kartavya is understood. Avrutti includes Sravana Manana Nididyanam. asakrid upadesat means repeated upadesat means the injunction or vedic commandments. Here some acharyas have different opinion. Asakrid means many times. Whether it should be connected with avrutti or upadesat. Should you say asakrid avrutti or should we say because of many times injunctions. Majority of acharyas they take it as many times injunctions taken by Adhi Sankaracharya is better because many times avrutti need not be said for the word avrutti means doing repeatedly. Avrutti has got inbuilt many times. So asakrid you take for many times. With this first sutra is over.

## **Topic 1 [Sutra 1-2]**

Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

### **Sutra 4.1.2. [479]**

#### ***Lingaccha***

And on account of the indicatory mark

The same topic is continued.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this sutra. Now some more supportive arguments are given. Linga pramanam means an indirect indication as the support. Indirect clue that indicates repetition. Adhi Sankaracharya where tat tvam asi maha vakya is repeated nine times. 1.5.2 of Chandogya upanisad. reflect upon the rays and you will have many sons. In this section treating of meditation on the udgita the text repeats the meditation on the udgitha viewed as the sun because its result is one son only and the clause reflect upon his rays. Enjoins a meditation on his manifold rays as leading to the possession of many sons. This indicates that the repetition of meditation is something well known. What holds good in this case holds good for other meditation also. Tatvam asi is repeated eight times. Repetition would indeed be useless for him who is able to realise the true nature of Brahman even if the mahavakya tat tvam asi is enounced once only. but such advanced souls are very rare. Ordinary people who are deeply attached to the body and objects cannot attain realisation of truth by a single enunciation of it. For such persons repetition is of use. The erroneous notion ' I am the body' can be destroyed only through constant meditation or repeated practice.

Knowledge can dawn only when there is incessant and frequent meditation. Repetition has the power of annihilating the erroneous idea gradually. Meditation should be continued till the last trace of body idea is destroyed. When the body Consciousness is totally annihilated Brahman shines itself in all its pristine glory and purity. The meditator and the meditated become one. Individuality vanishes in toto.

In Taittiriya Upanisad III.2 we find that Bhrigu goes several times to his father Varuna and asks him again and again to be taught the nature of Brahman. The injunction about repetition is meant for those only who lack in purity and subtle understanding and in whom a single enunciation is not sufficient to give them the direct cognition of Brahman. The individual soul is taught step by step to be subtler than the body etc., till it is realised as pure Chaitanyam. We observe that men by repeating again and again a sentence which they on the first hearing had understood imperfectly only, gradually rid themselves of all misconceptions and arrive at a full understanding of the true sense. All this establishes the conclusion that in the case of cognition of the supreme Brahman the instructions leading to such realisation may be repaired.

Lingat means this is known from the scriptural clues or marks or pointer; cha means also. This is known means Brahman pratyaya avrutti is to be done is known. The significance of the words ligat means scriptural clues. Chandogya upanisad tattvam asi abhyasah. Repetition is known by another word abhyasah. The next word cha also. It means it is another supportive pramanam. First it was upadesa pramanam and now it is linga pramanam.

Now I will give you some points discussed by Adhi Sankaracharya. One point Adhi Sankaracharya raises a Purva Paksi. Purva Paksi says what is the benefit of repeating a vrutti when it deals with Jnanam. Because when you repeat the thought the object is not going to change or improve. Again if Brahman cannot improve Brahma Jnanam also cannot improve. For knowledge is always true to object. If the object does not change or improve there cannot be any improvement in the Moksa slo. Why should we repeat aham brahma asmi. If you say it is for generation of knowledge and if one time pramana vrutti does not produce knowledge how can repetition will produce knowledge. Tattvam asi is same. pramana should produce knowledge or should not produce knowledge. If it does not produce knowledge first time any number of repetition it cannot produce knowledge. In the case of karma repetition will improve the efficacy of karma. It is so in the case of meditation also. More repetition of rudram will give more phalam for it comes under karma. When it is the case of what is the use of avrutti. This is the argument of Purva Paksi. Here it is not karma and it is ajnana nirvrttiartham. So it is illogical is the question.

Adhi Sankaracharya says it is necessary because of sruti yukti anubhava pramanam. The sruti pramanam is given by Vyasacharya. Sruti pramanam supports avrutti even in the case of Jnanam. The next support is yukti and anubhava. The anubhava pramanam is even in worldly knowledge when we try to get knowledge from a book or article we find that when we read it repeatedly we are able to gather complete knowledge. You get more clarity by repetition. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says repeated reading gives clarity is a fact proved by our experience both in material knowledge and spiritual knowledge. Once it is experienced as fact don't try to logically negate the fact. You use logic to support a fact and not to negate the fact. It is an experienced fact how can you negate.

Then we come to the logic. Purva Paksi says in the case of worldly knowledge perhaps repetition may be useful. Because in the world we talk about the thing which have got several

aspects. First time I see one thing and second time I see some other aspect of the same thing. So it goes on. In worldly teaching the object of teaching has more parts and each time particular aspect will be clear. Third time you see some other aspect. In the case of Brahman why do you talk of avrutti for Brahman does not have parts.

For that Adhi Sankaracharya answers do you think I don't think. Even though Brahman does not have parts the misconceptions regarding Brahman are many. There are so many false features superimposed on Brahman. One is jivatva, isvaratva, worldly superimposition and with regard to body also so many superimpositions. So many misconceptions are there. Each time sravana each misconception is removed. So repetition is needed to get pure knowledge. As even misconceptions go away the clarity is more and more. There is change in knowledge but there is clarity born out of repetition. Thus sruti yukti and anubhava pramanams have proved the repetition improves our thinking.

The avrutti is presented as a commandment or a vidhi as in karma kanda. Once a vidhi comes in veda there is always a karta towards whom the vidhi is directed. Otherwise it cannot survive. I cannot say you fly not through aeroplane. This will not exist because you cannot fly. The vidhi does not exist. When jnana kanda gives avrutti vidhi, this vidhi can be exploited by Purva Paksi. The moment vidhi comes karta is kept in mind. With him kartrutvam comes into picture and then it will appear Vedanta accepts kartrutvam as a fact. Without promoting kartrutvam and karta, veda cannot give any injunction. I have to do vrutti avarti. Therefore I am a doer. The doership may get indirectly confirmed. Vedanta itself promotes doership. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya gives a warning here. Vedanta has got two teaching. One is kartrutva nivrutti individuality nivrutti and there is secondary seeming teaching which supports kartrutvam and individuality. Similarly even jivan Mukti and vidheha Mukti indirectly supports the individuality. It supports individuality. Similarly vidheha Mukti seemingly supports individuality. There are certain portions of Vedanta that supports individuality. We should not get attached to secondary and ignore primary. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 342

### **Topic 1 [Sutra 1-2]**

Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

#### **Sutra 4.1.2. [479]**

#### ***Lingaccha***

And on account of the indicatory mark

The same topic is continued.

We have completed second sutra of this adhikaranam. Aham brahma asmi pratyaya should be repeated in the form either sravanam, or mananam or nididyanam. in support of this conclusion, Vyasacharya or Adhi Sankaracharya gave three pramanams sruti, yukti and anbhava which we discussed in the last class. As the subject matter is deep, there is need to dwell on the subject deeper that needs repetition of reading, meditating. More so what I don't see, smell and touch what I cannot objectify in any manner is seen to be identity. The world is victimizing me or which I experience every day is seen to be unreal and mithya. This is second hurdle. Vedanta says every free absolute Brahman is you are. Third one we are unable to accept for it appears to be unreal though Vedanta asserts it to be correct. This has been our view in all our janmas and the new knowledge is difficult to penetrate the thick skull of our head. Even though Brahma Jnanam is one, there is possibility of knowing Brahman progressively and hence repeated sravanam is needed to remove the many misconceptions about Brahman thought in us. Hence avrutti is require. Sruti pramanam is there in first sutra and linga pramanam is there in the second sutra. Yukti and anubhava pramanam is supplied by Adhi Sankaracharya. Then Adhi Sankaracharya adds an incidental note that I discussed in the last class. The journey of the seeker is first a samsari and then he becomes an adhikari and then by sastirk study he becomes a jnani and then he becomes brahma nishtah and finally he becomes videha mukta and he is then sarva karma rahitah and therefore punar janma rahitah. It is this spiritual journey that attracts every seeker because he knows by knowing this journey that I will become jivan mukta and vidheha mukta is the incentive to start the very journey. Interestingly this journey belongs to ahankara. Because at every stage there is description of ahankara status. When you say I am a samsara it is from the standpoint of sthoola sookshma sarira. Dehabimana makes a samsari. Atma does not have sadhana cathustaya sambatti or mumuksutvam. Adhikari is also a stutus of ahankara. Later when he becomes a jnani and jnani is also a status of knower pramata. Jnani means one who has got prama the knowledge. It is not the Atma. Atma is not samsari Atma is not adhikari and Atma is not a jnani and all belongs to ahankara. The fourth status of jivan mukta the living liberated. The living belongs to Atma or ahankara. Atma is ever alive and cannot become dead. The word living is used for someone who will be dead later. Jivan ahankara rupena muktah. Jivan muktah is status of ahankara. Videha mukta is one who has given up body and who is free from sarva karma and one who does not have punar janma. All these three definition belongs to ahankara alone and not Atma. Atma you cannot say because Atma is ever free from body. When you refer to videha Mukti of Jnani you refer to ahankara which

associated with the body and which left the connection with the body due to prarapta. Atma does not have prarapta. Their association with body is not there and where is the question of vivehatva status. This can be linked to ahankara alone and freedom from all the karma is for ahankara alone and not for Atma. Similarly freedom from punar janma is also for ahankara and not for Atma. Videha Mukti is also for ahankara alone. The entire spiritual journey starting from samsari, adhikari, jnani, jivan mukta and videha mukta is for ahankara and every layperson is interested in this ahankara journey. Sastra clearly says that a jnani alone will become a jivan mukta and jnani alone will become a videha mukta and be free from rebirth and be liberated once for all. This is the urge of a seeker. But what happens is when he comes to Jnanam and understands Vedanta and what is the Jnanam. It is that I have two nature one is lower and the other is higher nature Atma. Part of this knowledge is that I the Atma am ever free and ahankara is mithya. When I come to the state of jnani ahankara is reduced to mithya. Sastra asks me to do the avrutti of this Jnanam. And jnana avrutti means ahankara mithyatva avruttih. Therefore jnana avrutti means ahankara mithyatva avrutti. Once ahankara mithyatvam I focus on naturally mithyatva avrutti means ahankara importance is reduced and Atma satyatvam is focused. Once I come to the state of jnani my focus is on Atma tattvam and there defocusing from ahankara. Once this defocusing of ahankara the next stage of jivan Mukti and the last stage of videha Mukti also will have to be defocused from if have to do jnana avrutti. All lead to focusing on Atma. Ahankara jivan Mukti and ahankara jivan Mukta all become mithya and Vyavahara. When a jnani does jnana avrutti should he focus on Atma, which is paramarthika sathyam or jivan Mukti or videha Mukti which are vyavahara sathyam. Sastra asks us to do jnana avrutti. By revealing the mithyatvam of ahankara sastra indirectly telling me not to focus on jivan mukti and videha Mukti which mean focusing on ahankara or focusing on mithya is losing sight of sathyam which means giving up of brahma avrutti. It means dropping the focus from sathyam and this means brahma avrutti dropping. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says a jnani does not focus on jivan and videha Mukti and they are the focus only before coming to Jnanam. After becoming a jnani focus cannot be jivan Mukti and videha Mukti but on Brahman. Jivan and videha Mukti happens as a by product of Brahman focusing. It is avantara bhalam. They are spin of ahankara for my focusing upon Brahman pratyaya avrutti. Hence Adhi Sankaracharya says when you do brahma pratyaya avrutti don't ask whether I the ahankara doing the avrutti. Don't focus on ahankara which is doing avrutti but focus on Brahman which is the focus of avrutti. Don't focus on subject of avrutti but object of avrutti which is Brahman here. The moment you focus on videha Mukti you do wrong. Always concentrate on Brahman and not on anything else. Even after studying Vedanta we tend to judge the status of ahankara and then complain this and that and sastra says focus on teaching that I am not ahankara and own up with Brahman. Always focus on I am not ahankara and then ahankara will get Mukti. Do sadhana and you will get Mukti. This is the phalam promised by Isvara. This injunction also you should not misinterpret. Vedanta says you should do avrutti. That means Vedanta is commanding me. Command must be given to karta someone who can fulfill the commandment. The Purva Pakshi says the very fact Vedanta commands me to do and say in the vision of Vedanta I am karta. Aham brahma asmi is not the teaching and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says from the commandment if you take I am the karta, it is an implied meaning you take. Whereas I am akarta is the direct teaching of Vedanta. The direct teaching is more powerful than the other one. Therefore aham brahma asmi should be focused. This is the technical aspect. This can be extended to all the others also. With this second sutra is over. First adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 2 [Sutra 3] Atmatvopasanadhikaranam.**



Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

**Sutra 4.1.3. [480]**

***Atmeti tupagacchanti grahayaati cha***

But [the sruti texts] acknowledge [Brahman] as the Self [of the meditator] and also teach other [to realise] it as such]

The sutra prescribes the process of meditation.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam.. this is the second adhikaranam with one sutra only.

In the previous adhikaranam it was said that one should repeat brahma pratyayam [thought]. Now a question may come whether Brahman should be visualized as an object or Brahman should be visualized as subject nondifferent from me. For both are there in sastra. Brahman is first introduced as jagat karanam. Here Brahman is taught an object different from and it is even said it is within you indirectly saying that Brahman is different from me. It is known to be realized etc. of course there are portion where the Upanisad says tat tvam asi ayam Atma Brahman etc. here Brahman is revealed as Atma myself. Here Sravana Manana Nididyanam vidhi is there, I meditate on Brahman and question is should I do abeda dhyanam or beda dhyanam. Vyasacharya says now we are in jnana kanda and jnana kanda wants to give us liberation. for Moksa what we require is bedah or dvidam and what we need is aikya dhyanam or nididyanam. in jnana kanda brahma Jnanam is abeda dhyanam alone and it is called nididyanam. one should repeat the thought Brahman I am. If sometime the thought crops up in the mind will I get jivan Mukti ask the mind which you talk about. Control it and ask the mind to concentrate on atman and not I the ahankara. I the ahankara comes into picture till you get Jnanam and after gaining Jnanam the ahankara thought should go and you should think yourself as Brahman alone. In order not to waver the mind in other thoughts, the mind is asked to repeat the thought I am Brahman all the time. Brahma Atma aikya dhyanam is suggested here. The word upasana here is used in the meaning of nididyanam. Vyasacharya says that the general introduction is beda upasana or abeda upasana. Purva Pakshi says beda upasana and we say it is abeda nididyanam. Vyasacharya gives the reason that sruti primary teaching is aikyam Atma brahma aikyam/ it is the sara of Vedanta not only it is the vision of Vedanta and it wants to transfer this vision to you. not only veda enjoys the vision but also try to transfer the vision on to you. therefore it should be abeda dhyanam. This sutra is considered to be one of the most important sutra. It reveals Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Even though mahavakyam have been discussed also, [3.25 to 3.30 Jivatma Paramatma aikyam was revealed] even there the maha vakyam interpretation was not clear and explicit maha vakyam is very clear in Brahma Sutra. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya writes an elaborate commentary on this sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Iti atam means Brahman should be seen as Atma tu because upagacchanti means the scriptures accept cha grahayanti and teach so. The significance of the words is Atma means I myself the subject; that Atma is sthoola sookshma sariram. It is aham pada lakshyartham the implied meaning of the word I. It is Sakshi Chaitanyam. Ahankara should be subdued although it is ahankara does all the sadhana cathustaya sambatti. We should focus only Atma and not ahankara. Iti means in this manner one should meditate or visualize; avrutti kartavya means in this manner you should see

Brahman. You see Brahman as myself. the word tu in this context is taken as reason. The reason is given. Upagacchanti the scriptures see in this manner. It is scripture's vision that Brahman is Atma Jivatma is Paramatma Jivatma Paramatma aikyam is vision of the scriptures. Upanisad is not satisfied in that but also wants us to see in the manner. It wants us to rise at its level. You give up ahankara factor. Eternally you look down upon and postpone to reach Brahman level and seeking jivan Mukti and viveha Mukti. This is not right. When will you say I don't care jivan Mukti and vidheha Mukti and look to Brahman. This level jumping is to take place some time during sadhana. The more I see myself as Brahman and joke will be one ahankara will get jivan Mukti or videh Mukti when millions of ahankara floating in me as sathyam.

Therefore sruti wants to change the channel itself. It should happen sometime in sadhana from ahankara focus to I am Brahman focus. This guru cannot do for the disciple. Mother cannot run for the child. Guru can say change the focus to Atma. First I invite you showing ahankara game and in the end I show you Brahman and ask you to forget ahankara and transcend the ahankara obsession. This is the significance of the words. more in the next class. In tattusamanvayad [4<sup>th</sup> sutra] we have discussed the matter. Those idea we have to briefly remember here which we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 343

### **Topic 2 [Sutra 3] Atmatvopasanadhikaranam.**

Meditation on Brahman should be continued till knowledge is attained

**Sutra 4.1.3. [480]**

*Atmeti tupagacchanti grahayaati cha*

But [the sruti texts] acknowledge [Brahman] as the Self [of the meditator] and also teach other [to realise] it as such]

The sutra prescribes the process of meditation.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya gives more specification about brahma pratyaya avritti. Brahman pratyaya should not be beda pratyaya and Brahman should be seen as I the meditator. Nididyanam meditation on the meditator. But upasana is meditation on non-meditator. When you meditate on yourself it is called nididyanam. so Vyasacharya says brahma aham asi should be pratyaya. Why should we repeat this. it is so because that is the unique vision of Vedanta. Vedanta does not look upon student as limited individual and it looks student as Paramatma and it is the conviction of the sastra. Ayam Atma Brahma this Jivatma who is listening to teaching and who is teaching liberation this Jivatma is one other than Brahman and this is the vision of the scriptures but Vyasacharya says scriptures are very eager to transfer this vision to the students. They want us to enjoy the same vision. They communicate this to the student. Grahayati means to make the student receive means it teaches the student. The aim of Vedanta teaching is brahmaiva aham asmi. Until such time, veda consider that they have failed to do its job. Veda is happy only if we realise this truth. Therefore previous adhikaranam brahma pratyaya vritti kartavya. This adhikaranam says we should realise this fact explicitly. Nowhere else this explicit maha vakya is available in Brahma Sutra. I said this being an important topic Adhi Sankaracharya spent some time in writing bigger commentary on the sutra. I will share some of the point. First question arises in the mind that veda's vision is Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Naturally we will say the scriptures talk about Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Purva Pakshi raises the question that the scriptures talk about beda also and how can you conclude Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Not only beda vakyams and abeda vakyam and there are beda abeda vakyams also. Otherwise amsa amsi vakyams are there and Jivatma being part of Paramatma and part not totally identical nor totally different also. Amsa different also and also identical. Tamil nadu is part of India and tamil nadu is not totally India also. For this Adhi Sankaracharya says this topic has been discussed and completed. In the fourth sutra we asked the question Tattusamanyadhikaranam. This is vision of the sastra. This we call it tatparyam. Which one scriptures focus upon and which one scriptures don't want to focus upon. By using six indicators we have arrived at upakamrama upasamhara that the tatparyam is abeda not beda in the fourth sutra. Aikye eva tatparyam na tu bedeva beda abeda na eva. Another interesting Purva Pakshi which we have not discussed there I will discuss here. If you talk about jiva and Isvara there will be serious problem. The problem he says if Isvara is equated with jiva , isvara abhava prasangah and there will be no God at all.

Do you want to degrade yourself. If you equate jiva to Isvara, Isvara is Isvara jiva is also Isvara then there will be only Isvara and jiva abhava prasangah. All the jivas will be Isvara and Isvara is Isvara and if there is no jiva at all sastra anartakya prasangah and no sastra is required for Isvara. There is no need for Isvara to read sastra. Sastra will become redundant. Therefore you should not talk about jiva Isvara aikyam. There is no need of class if all are Isvaras. Generally they raise the question and they don't listen to the answer. But for our satisfaction we have to answer. We will ask whether you ask from vyavahara dristi or from paramarthika dristi like asking is drama world is there or not. Are you talking from dreamer's angle or from waker's angle. From dreamer's angle it is there and from waker's angle it is not there. if Purva Paksi says I talk from vyavahara dristi jiva Isvara beda is there jiva is jiva and Isvara is Isvara jiva does namaskara and Isvara has to receive namaskara and Isvara is samsari and therefore jiva requires sastra and jiva has to gain Jnanam and jiva has to gain Moksa etc. we give vyavahara sastram to get vyavahara Mukti. Then why do you talk about aikyam. Aikyam is from paramarthika dristya. Like waker looking at dream the vision changes. Therefore aikyam is presented from absolute angle and paramarthika dristya abeda darsanam is prescribed. Where is the problem. Now the question comes after the paramarthika darsanam will vyavahara darsanam will continue or not. After gaining the knowledge of oneness of Jivatma and Paramatma with absolute angle, will vyavahara beda continues or not. Vyavahara beda will have to continue even after paramarthika darsanam and from vyavahara dristya he will continue to be jiva and after paramarthika darsanam if he continues to be vyavahara beda is there what is the benefit for the jiva. This is the question posed by the Purva Paksi. Including Guru's body the difference continues. Adhi Sankaracharya says even though vyavahara will continue its impact and its significance will come down from a higher plane just as value of dream comes down once you wake up. From paramarthika dristi, the vyavahara problems will become insignificant the situation remaining same its impact will come down. That means overpowering. Just like a candle light on the road, its impact will be very less. From the distance you will see the power of the candle. Suppose the sun arises and in the afternoon if the candle is there on the road, you will not see the existence of the candle. Therefore vyavahara beda is there and vyavahara avastha only we get the Jnanam of paramarthika plane. Jnanam belongs to the mind and Jnanam is vyavaharam and it deals with paramarthikam. It will reduce the vyavahara beda caused problem. Therefore remaining vyavahara avastha perceiving vyavahara beda lifts the two I lifts one to the third eye of paramarthika abeda darsanam and remove the samsara of vyavahara. The removal is mithyatva darsanam. Falsification is the aim. Paramarthika dristya Atma brahma aikyam.

### **Topic 3 [Sutra 4] Pratikadhikaranam**

The symbols of Brahman should not be meditated upon as identical with the meditator.

#### **Sutra 4.1.4. [481]**

#### ***Na pratike na hi sah***

[The meditator] is not [to see the Self] in the symbol because he is not that.

This and the following two sutras examine the value of a pratika or symbol to worship

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the third adhikaranam with one sutra. It is based on the prominent word in the sutra. The topic is

pratika upasanam. It is an incidental topic that comes out of the previous adhikaranam. Upanisad is meditation on various devatgas. And for the sake of devata Jnanam sastra prescribes certain symbols to help for they are not visible and they are just abstract principle. So you need a symbol to symbolize the devata and it is called alampanam. Alampanam is symbol to worship invisible devata. One is pratima alampanam the symbol like a statue where a clear cut human form or features are available. We have clear description also. When the alampanam has got clear features we call paratima alampanam. The second is pratika alampanam where we don't have clear avayavam or features like saligrama or a mount of turmeric powder etc. then you do puja on the lamp and the flame. All come under pratika. Some are sound principle also. Sometimes various veda mantras are taken as symbol. It is like vyahriti upasana. The mantras are pratikam. Sabda can be pratikam and rupa can be pratikam. Various pratika upasanas are said in the vedas. Various devatas are also taken as the pratikam like agni, adhitya, varuna etc. in the vedas we find in some of the pratika upasana, we talk about brahma upasanam wherein the upasya devata is Brahman. Adhi Sankaracharya gives some examples mano brahma iti upasita 3.18.1 of Chandogya upanisad; 3.19.1 of Chandogya upanisad and then in Bhuma Vidya 7<sup>th</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad there are 13 brahma pratika upasanas are given. Even panca bhutas are taken as pratikams. We will take one particular example. May you meditate adithya as Brahman. Here also since brahma upasanam upon adithya pratikam is prescribed. Such does not have hands and other features. I have not come to the controversy. Once the sruti talks of adithya upasana, it means upasanam is also pratyaya avrutti repetition of thought. here we come to the controversy when the Upanisad says may you do brahma pratyaya avrutti in such instance should we come to Atma. We are asked to equate brahma to Atma as per the previous sutra. If in nididyanam brahma pratyaya avrutti is in the form of I am, should we extend principle brahma pratyaya upasana should I look upon adithya as Brahman or should I look adithya as myself. Therefore the controversy is adithye brahma darsanam is adithye brahma Atma darsanam. Should I look adithya as myself or different from myself. Adithya is Brahman and I am Brahman and should I meditate upon adhithya as myself or not. Whether adithya pratika upasana is beda upasanam or abeda upasanam. This is the question. The answer here is Purva Pakshi is going to say it is abeda dristi. We will say it is beda dristi. There should be dvaitam. It looks as though Vedanta is interested in negating others. What is the secret behind it. The secret is from paramarthika we should talk of abeda only and from vyavahara dristi we should talk of beda only. in vyavahara dristi everyone talks of abeda. In paramarthika if everyone talks of beda we will condemn. Paramarthika we are pro advaitam and from vyavahara drsistya we are pro dvaitam. Purva Pakshi says abeda and siddhanta says abeda.

Now we will come to general analysis of the sutra. In pratika darsanam it should be beda darsanam only. and there are three factors and all the three should be seen distinctly. Three factors are upasaka the meditator is different the Jivatma; the upasya devata brahma is different the sagunam brahma Isvara; we should use our discretion. Brahma is saguam brahma who is upasya devata. Karma phala dada and I the upasaka is different the karma karta. The third factor is the symbol is very much different. It may be saligrama etc. therefore upasaka is different from upasya and both are different from pratikam. Division is there at the time of upasana. This upasaka is ajnani alone. He is preparing for Jnanam and therefore he is ajnani. Therefore in karma kanda we are ajnani and the divisions are there. therefore brahma pratyaya avrutti and I visualize upon any symbol. I have to do that. The conclusion is all pratika upasanas are beda upasanas except an exceptional upasana in which the symbol for invoking the lord is I myself the body mind complex. I invoke bhavani as myself. In sandhyavandanam I invoke myself. This thought is abeda pratyaya. There are certain

pratyaya upasanas which we call ahangraha upasana and pratika upasanas are veda pratyaya avrutti only.

When I am doing abeda pratyaya avrutti in ahangraha upasana will it come under upasana or nididyanam. here also abeda pratyaya is here. We say they are different. Even though ahangraha upasana has abeda thought nididyanam also has abeda thought the thought will be the same but they cannot be treated as the same. this is called upasana and that is called nididyanam. which is upasana and which is nididyanam? before vedantic study when I visualize I am God it is an imagination and it is not a fact for me. That imagination thought is called ahangraha upasana. Imagination is not a thought. after thorough vedantic study when I do pratyaya avrutti, I am the infinite and it is not an imagination for me it is a fact for me. When the vrutti is repeated as fact it is nididyanam when vrutti is repeated as imagination it is ahangraha upasana. In pratika upasana there is no abeda dhyanam also and there is beda dhyanam. Pratika upasana and ahangraha upasana and nididyanam the three words you should understand properly. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 344

### **Topic 3 [Sutra 4] Pratikadhikaranam**

The symbols of Brahman should not be meditated upon as identical with the meditator.

**Sutra 4.1.4. [481]**

***Na pratike na hi sah***

[The meditator] is not [to see the Self] in the symbol because he is not that.

This and the following two sutras examine the value of a pratika or symbol to worship

We are in the four sutra which belongs to the third adhikaranam. This adhikaranam has only one sutra. Here topic of discussion is pratika adhikaranam. I have given the general introduction to this adhikaranam. Here pratika upasanam said in Chandogya upanisad are taken up for discussion. I was talking about three type of meditations. Three types of meditation is known as pratika upasanam ahangraha upasanam and nididyanam. We want to establish in pratika upasana brahma pratika avrutti is there and there is object difference and therefore it is beda upasanam. But in ahangraha upasana there is also brahma pratyaya avrutti is there and here Brahman is on one's self and therefore it is abeda dhyanam. In nididyanam also brahma pratyaya avrutti is there and here also I see Brahman on myself and therefore nididyanam also happens to be abeda dhyanam. One beda dhyanam and two abeda dhyanam. Now the question comes why you call one as ahangraha upasana and the other as nididyanam. What is the basis of difference? In ahangraha upasana the upasaka does not know that I am Brahman. Upasaka here is ignorant, he has not studied Vedanta, and he has not done maha vakya vichara and therefore does not know I am Brahman. Still he repeats the thought I am Brahman without knowing I am Brahman and therefore for him I am Brahman is not a fact but it is an imagination. And therefore it will be called ahangraha upasana. In this upasanam aikyam is an imagination and not a fact. But aham brahma asmi is nididyanam and the person here who does the nididyanam, has done maha vakya sravanam and maha vakya mananam and it is a crystal clear fact and therefore he reminds himself of obtaining the fact. It is Self reminder. Nididyanam is Self-reminder of already obtained fact which fact I am convinced. Therefore, it comes under Jnanam. In ahangraha upasana abeda dhyanam is there but one is on imagination and in the other it is reminder of the fact. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya establishes pratika upasana is different from both ahangraha upasana and nididyanam. Pratika upasanam is neither ahangraha upasana nor nididyanam and therefore it does not come under abeda dhyanam. Therefore it comes under beda dhyanam. Adhithyah brahma upasita comes under beda dhyanam. May you look upon sun as Brahman. If adithya pratika Brahmanam will not come under ahangraha upasanam or nididyanam. We have to give reason for that. Why it is nididyanam? It is so because firstly it comes under upasana kandam and therefore Brahman mentioned here is Sagunam Brahman. Upasya devata is Sagunam Brahman and upasaka is saguna Jivatma and therefore upasya and upasaka are different because upasya devata has different gunas and upasaka has different gunas and therefore they cannot have aikyam. Therefore it cannot be nididyanam. Aikya asambavat nididyanam na bhavati. The second reason is the upasaka is a sadhaka

and through upasana he is working for jnana yogyatha and after that he has to do Vedanta vichara and thereafter he has to become a jnani and therefore he comes under ajnani category only. It is said every upasaka is an unfortunate samsari being an ajnani. Since he is an ajnani he cannot practise nididyanam for the latter is for the jnani. Pratika upasanam nididyanam na bhavati. This is the argument to establish pratika upasanam is not nididyanam. Why do you say pratika upasanam is different from ahangraha upasanam in which case it will become abeda Jnanam. Why do you say pratika upasana is different from ahangrah upasanam. In pratika upasana Brahman is invoked on external symbol and Upanisad gives external symbol called pratikam. Here adhithya is symbol. From that it is clear that it is not ahangrah upasana. If veda wants us to practice the symbol should have been myself alone. Upon me Brahman is invoked and in ahangrah upasana the symbol is available and veda need not give external symbol. From this it is clear that symbol is external and therefore I am not symbol and therefore it is not ahangrah upasana. Since it is different from both of them it is different from abeda dhyanam and since it is different from abeda dhyanam it comes under beda dhyanam only.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Na one should not visualize oneself. Pratike upon a symbol hi because saha the upasaka na does not know. The significance of the words is na pratike means one should not visualize oneself upon the symbol Jivatma upon the symbol because he should visualize Paramatma alone upon the symbol. And suppose a vedantic student asks why do you make such a difference, for Jivatma and Paramatma are one and the same. For them we answer upasaka being ignorant he does not know the aikyam. Therefore Isvara cannot be replaced by jiva. After becoming jnani, it can be replaced by Paramatma. He gives the reason nahi saha. Hi indicates the reason saha na means saha na jnani bhavati. He is not an aikya jnani and once he becomes aikya jnani both are replaceable. Jnani knows that he is Brahman. We do the same puja to jnani as we do to Isvara. Saha na aikya jnani bhavati. With this the sutra is over. It is an aside topic. The whole discussion is nididyanam. Since both dhyanam and nididyanam are similar this topic is introduced here. Now we go to 4<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam and 5<sup>th</sup> sutra.

#### **Topic 4 [Sutra 5] Brahmadrishtyadhikaranam**

When meditating on a symbol, the symbol should be considered as Brahman and not Brahman as the symbol.

**Sutra 4.1.5. [482]**

#### ***Brahmadrishytirutkarshat***

[the symbol] is to be viewed as Brahman [ant not in the reverse way] on account of the exaltation [of the symbol thereby]

The same discussion is continued.

This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The topic is same topic. It is pratika upasanam. Symbol is there. Deity is there in the upasanam. It is pratika upasanam. The topic of discussion is slightly different. Previously we discussed beda or abeda upasanam. Now the discussion is when we say manah upasita one should meditate sun as Brahman or one should meditate Brahman as the sun. is it adhithya upasanam as Brahman or is it brahma upasanam as adhithya. When I say visulaise sun as Brahman, the object is sun and the prominence is sun



alone and the object is mukyam. Therefore when I say sun as God the sun becomes upasana vishayah. You can visualize in different way as you like. The choice is there. as Isvara the as Isvara represents in the manner of which we call in Sanskrit as prakarah. According to Sanskrit grammar vishaya will appear in second case. Imagine surya as symbol. The object is surya and take surya as Isvara. The second possibility visualize God as the sun. in this upasana God is vishaya and therefore it will appear in second case and as the sun is upasana prakarah. When this distinction is not clearly made in veda we will have doubt which is vishaya. When you say adhithya Brahman upasita which is vishaya and which is prakarah. This is controversy.

If you commit the mistake of thinking then the doubt will arise. So Vyasacharya has taken the trouble to write this adhikaranam. Here Purva Paksi says that the object of upasana is Isvara; Isvara is vishayah and adithyah is prakarah. According to Purva Paksi it should one should visualize God as the sun. once you say visualize God the God becomes the object. Siddhanti says the opposite. We say that one should visualize the sun as God. Sun alone is vishayah and sun alone is the object of upasana and Isvara is prakarah. The Purva Paksi conclusion he should a logic. His logic is you should meditate on God only. the sun should only take the secondary status. All other things are unimportant. Purva Paksi says God must be object and it alone is important and one who gives phalam and the Isvara alone has to give the result. Therefore Isvara alone is the object of meditation.

Siddhanti says nothing doing. This is adhikaranam introduction. Now I will give you the general introduction to the sutra. Vyasacharya gives one reason and Adhi Sankaracharya gives three reasons. Vyasacharya says in upasana always a superior thing should be visualized upon the inferior thing. This is the principle of upasana. Upon inferior locus you visualize a superior thing. Adhi Sankaracharya explains it further and says even from worldly angle when you want to glorify someone, you say you are Indra, you are Sun God etc. he is glorified as superior person. If you want to be a sycophant you have to consider the other man as superior one. Then only he will be happy. I cannot compare Indra as a human being. Then Indra will not be happy. Rather he will be angry. When indra and manushya are involved manusya can take Indra as symbol. Always the rule the object of upasana is inferior quality and visualized as superior one. Here adhithya is inferior to Isvara. Even if you take adhithya as Hiranyagarbha then also Hiranyagarbha is superior. Isvara is samasti karana sariram. Then the question comes if you say it is adhithya upasanam, because Isvara is phalam, how can an inferior give the phalam. If object of meditation is inferior one how can inferior one can give phalam. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer. Remember always Isvara alone gives the phalam. Even when inferior one is object of meditation through the inferior one the sadhana or worship goes to Isvara only. sarva deva namaskarah kesavam pratikacchati. Samaskara is directed to inferior one but through the inferior channal it goes to Isvara only. direct object is adhithya and ultimately it goes to Isvara only. whichever finite devata you worship and it does not have the phalam but the phalam is given to you by the Isvara alone. I do adhithya upasana but the phalam is given by the Isvara. Adhithya is object of meditation and Isvara is only prakarah. Because Isvara is superior. This is Vyasacharya's argument.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. There are two words. brahmadrishtih means the visualization of Brahman should be practised on the symbol. Utkashat means since Brahman is superior. The significance of the words is brahmadrishtih means Brahman visualization and remember we use the word loosely nirgunam Brahman does not come to the picture at all. Here we mean only Sagunam Brahman. Upon the adhithya. By saying upon

adhithya means adhithya is the object that you keep in mind. Flowers are offered in temple to the idol. But Isvara comes in the form of prakara. Prakara is technical word used in nyaya sastra. Here clip is supposed to be clip. Suppose clip adhara vruitti takes place and the clip form belonging to the thought is called prakara. Clippe clip prakara darsanam Jnanam. If I see vinayaka in clip there is change not in the object but there is change in the prakara. The prakara I have is left to my choice. Prakara is associated with internal thought. it is conveyed to the mood of thought that is entertained. If you see the stone as stone it is dhyanam and if you see stone as God it is upasanam. Difference is not in the stone but difference is in the thought mode alone. Utkarshat means superiority. With this the word analysis is over. Now we will see three more reasons given by Adhi Sankaracharya which we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 345

### **Topic 4 [Sutra 5] Brahmadrishtyadhikarnanam**

When meditating on a symbol, the symbol should be considered as Brahman and not Brahman as the symbol.

**Sutra 4.1.5. [482]**

#### ***Brahmadrishitirutkarshat***

[the symbol] is to be viewed as Brahman [ant not in the reverse way] on account of the exaltation [of the symbol thereby]

The same discussion is continued.

We see the fourth adhikaranam of the first pada of the fourth chapter. we have competed this adhikaranam and I wanted to discuss some points occurring in Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam. Mano brahma iti upasita adhithyah brahma upasita adhesah, the symbol for meditation is adhithya and manah. The upasya devata is Brahman. Since it is upasana prakaranam the Brahman referred to Sagunam Brahman or Isvara. Adhithya and mana are pratikam. The doubt that was referred to was whether one should meditate adhithya as Brahman or Brahman as adhithya. When we say adhithya is to be meditated as Brahman adhithya is object of meditation and when you as Brahman and Brahman is said to be prakara of meditation. Devata is not seen as object of meditation for devata is not in front and it not taken as object but taken as prakara as mode. Devata is prakara and patikam is vishayah. If Brahman is to be meditated as adhithya when you say Brahman becomes vishya and adhithya becomes prakarah. Which one is the vishayah and which one is prakarah. Purva Paksi says Brahman is to be meditated as the sun and we said it is not correct. Adhithya should be meditated as Isvara. In upasana always the lower object is object of meditation and it is always visualized as higher thing and prakara should be higher and vishaya should be lower. When smaller is seen as higher thing it is glorification. When I look upon bigger one as smaller person it will become avamana. It is not glorification of Isvara it is avamana of Isvara. On the other hand finite adhithya is seen as infinite Isvara and then adhithya devata will be flattered and one will get the phalam. Purva Paksi asked the question is not the Isvara is to give the phalam. Isvara is to give the result. For that Adhi Sankaracharya answered that phala dada is Isvara only. therefore devata themselves are getting phalam from Isvara only and therefore even when object of meditation is finite devata the phalam comes from Isvara only. object of worship directly in front is tone and it cannot even listen to your prayers. Through inert stone it goes to Isvara. Therefore what is the rule visayah is nikrista vastu and prakarah is utkrista vastu. Object is inferior variety and devata is superior variety. If Devata can be object of meditation we would not have brought in the symbol itself. The very fact we introduce the symbol is that devata we cannot see. Devatgas are paroksa. The pratyaksa pratikam is object and devata will become prakara on the pratikam. This is the answer given by Vyasacharya. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Adhi Sankaracharya says manah brahma adhithya brahma iti upasita in that first word is manah and adhithyah. Since these two words occur first we understand them as they are. Because they occur in the beginning we are able to take the direct meaning of the word. The second word is brahma or Isvara when you take the primary meaning of the word Isvara it does not logically fit in. achetana adhithya cannot be sarvajna chetana Isvara. Therefore the second word we are not able to take the primary meaning for it contradicts the first word. There is no contradiction in my mind for there is no other idea in my mind. Now I accept. Suppose another one comes and says I come at the same time. Here second one contradicts the first one. Whenever you get first information intellect will not have any difficulty in accepting that information. Only when the second information comes there is a possibility of contradiction. Then you have to resolve the contradiction. The question is which one should be modified to suit. If the second information contradicts how do you resolve the contradiction. Second one is to be adjusting to suit the first for it came without any objection for it occupied the mind. The second one is weaker for the first one has occupied without objection. Objectionless occupation is stronger. When manah and adhithya came we are able to take the primary meaning. When the word Isvara comes it does not fit in with first one and inert adhithya cannot be sarvajna Isvara. You adjust by the second one taking the first for second one is not factual and it is an imagination or visualization. Sun is inert principle is a fact and upon the inert sun I have to visualize sarvajna Isvara and second one is prakarah. first one has to be fact and therefore the conclusion is visualization is Isvara and not adhitya. Therefore adhityam upaseeta and Isvara is not an object and it is only a mode which is visualized. This is the first argument of Adhi Sankaracharya .

The next argument is adhithya brahma iti upadeeta. After the word Brahman that is Isvara sruti uses the word iti which means in this manner. May you see sun as God. Why sastra gives you such a commandment. See sun as sun does not require any commandment. It is because pratyaksa pramanam will reveal sun as the sun. commandment is required when something does not happen in natural force. Seeing the sun as sun does not require commandment seeing the sun as Isvara needs injunction. Isvara is an imagination to be done. Iti indicates imagination prakarah. adhithyah is not followed by it and adhithya is actual object. See someone as father means he is not father. But Guru is object fatherhood is a prakara and it is a visualization. Brahman is followed by the word iti. The third argument is vakya seshat means the following statements support our conclusion. 3.19.4 of Chandogya upanisada adhithyam Brahman iti upaste. The word adhithya and Brahman is in nominative case. Therefore we had confusion. In latter statement adhithya occurs in dvidiya vipakti. Adhithyam upaste is the sentence and therefore the object of meditation is sun alone. Object here is prakarah. may you meditate upon sun as Isvara. This is the third argument. In all our pujas and rituals pratikam is object and Isvara is prakarah. with this brahmadrishi adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 5 [Sutra 6] Adithyadimatyadhikaranam**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

**Sutra 4.1.6. [483]**

*Adityadimatayaschanaga upapattteh*

And the ideas of the sun, etc., are to be superimposed] on the subordinate members [sacrificial acts] because [in that way alone the statement of the scriptures would be] consistent.

A particular instance is cited to confirm the preceding sutra.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. This is also an involved and complex topic where we have to grammar etc. the topic is pratika upasana where there will be symbol and devata will be there. pratikam is object and upasyam is prakara. This discussion is what is the object and what is prakara. Which is to be meditated on which is our discussion here? May you meditate upon as adhithya isvarena upaseeta. Here the mantra taken is 1.3.1 of Chandogya upanisad and also 2.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad. the first mantra says he who burns up these [sun] let a man meditate upon that which shines yonder as the udgitha; and the second one reads as one ought to meditate upon the saman as fivefold, let man meditate on the sevenfold saman in speech Chandogya upanisad 2.9.1 and this earth is the rik, fire is saman Chandogya upanisad 1.6.1 of Chandogya upanisad.

Adhithyam udgitham upaseeta. Here there are two things one is sun and the other is udgitha. The controversy both of them are occurring in dvidiya vipakti. Which one is the object and which one is prakara because both of them are clearly different. Is the sun to be viewed as the udgitha or the udgitha as the sun? between the udgitha and the sun there is nothing to indicate which is superior as in the previous sutra where Brahman being preeminent the symbol was viewed as Brahman. We have no clue or indication. If Isvara is involved we can easily solve for Isvara is superior to all. Utkrishta vastu ia always prakara.

Here is Isvara is not involved. How to find out which is to be meditated on what. Similar problem occurs in the next mantra also. May you meditate on five fold components of sama. For example one component is himkara. Bhaktih is one component of sama mantra. Why does Chandogya upanisad talks about sama bhakti. We have got two things. Lokas are there and sama bhaktis are there. the Upanisad says prithvi himkarah the mantra him that occurs in the sama veda. Both occur in the same nominative case here. Therefore I have no way of knowing which one is vishaya and which one is prakara. Should I meditate upon the earth as himkara or should I meditate himkara as earth. this is the question. Now we will have to Purva Pakshi argument. Purva Pakshi says that these are all karmanga upasanas which siddhantis also agree. Karmanga upasanas means meditations practised as part of a ritual or karma. Himkara is a karmangam. Any mantra is a karmangam for mantras are used as part of a ritual. Purva Pakshi argues that devatas are not part of ritual. The lokas are not part of rituals. Lokah akarmangam. Let us apply the law nikrishta vastu ni utkrishta darsanam. Superior one should be imagination. Between lokas and sama bhakti which is superior and which one is inferior. Purva Pakshi argues karmangam should be superior for they are capable of producing phalam. From the standpoint of utility all mantras are superior and lokas are inferior and therefore the object of meditation and sama mantras should be the mode of imagination that means may you meditate upon lokas as karmanga bhakti. May you meditate upon prithvi as himkarah. This is the first argument of Purva Pakshi. Karmanga is superior to loka for karmanga gives phalam.

Second argument of Purva Pakshi is saptami nirdeshat. In the second mantra 2.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad lokeshu is in saptami vipakti. Upon lokas may you meditate on sama. Nikrishta vastu ni utkrishta darsanam. May you see on earth the sama.

Third argument is linga. Linga means there are some other mantras which serve as clues for Purva Pakshi conclusion. Refer to 1.6.1 of Chandogya upanishad yiyam eva ritu agnih sama. Yem refers to prithvi and prithvi alone is rik and agni is sama. By saying the prithvi alone is rik which indicates that you should see prithvi as rik and agni as sama. Veda mantras are presented as prakara. Sama is presented as prakara. From this it is clear that mantras are prakara.

Fourth argument he says the asangata virodha which siddhanti gave in the previous adhikaranam. Manah Brahman where it was said that Isvara is second one and manah is first one. Isvara is not the fact Isvara should be imagination. This argument we offered in the previous sutra. Now Purva Pakshi says you apply the same principle here. Prithvi is first one and that is the fact obtaining in front. Prithvi cannot be imagination for it is given the first and since himkara cannot be prithvi and therefore himkaratvam is not factual property of prithvi. Therefore also you should meditate upon the prithvi as himkara. Prithvi is object and himkara should be the mode of visualization. Because of these four reasons lokas are objects and sama mantras are imagination. Now what is going to be siddhanta. You can understand that siddhanta will negate and say it is not true. The loka is not the object of meditation and bhakti is pratikam and object of meditation. Lokas are not object but the imagination upon the sama. According to Purva Pakshi the same is opposite. What is the conclusion see himkara as prithvi. This is going to be siddhanta.

Now we will enter into general analysis of the sutra. There are three arguments of which first and foremost is given by Vyasacharya. Adhi Sankaracharya gives several arguments in his commentary. Now I will deal with Vyasacharya argument and then go to Adhi Sankaracharya bhashyam.

His argument is 'that is proper'. He says always our glory is that we have totality of vision. Holistic vision is more important than logic. Holistic vision is important more than logic and reason. Totality gives the motive. Always go behind logic and language. Vedanta strength is in samanvaya. We have holistic approach. What is that? We will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 346

### **Topic 5 [Sutra 6] Adithyadimatyadhikaranam**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

**Sutra 4.1.6. [483]**

#### *Adityadimatayaschanaga upapattteh*

And the ideas of the sun, etc., are to be superimposed] on the subordinate members [sacrificial acts] because [in that way alone the statement of the scriptures would be] consistent.

A particular instance is cited to confirm the preceding sutra.

Now we are in the general analysis of the sutra 6 which is the fifth adhikaranam of this pada. here Vyasacharya is analyzing a type of karmanga upasanam mentioned in Chandogya upanisad 1.3.1 and 2.3.1 of Chandogya upanisad. the controversy here is whether we should take omkara as adhithya or adhithya as omkara. What is vishaya and what is prakara. This is the question discussed here. The same confusion comes 2.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad also. Here two factors are there one is prithvi and himkara is sama bhakti and sama mantra. Here one is loka and the other is mantra. Loka should be seen as mantra and mantra should be taken as loka. This is the controversy here. Purva Paksi as usual comes with wrong suggestion and says loka should be seen as mantra and loka is object and mantra is prakara. Surya should be seen as omkara and prithvi as himkara mantra. In short loka should be seen as mantra. For this Purva Paksi has given four reasons.

First reason he gave was mantra is superior to loka for mantra is karma angam capable of giving phalam. Therefore mantra is superior and loka is inferior. Therefore nikrishta loka is vishaya and utkrishta mantra is prakarah. this is argument number one and the second argument he gave was in Chandogya upanisad 2.2.1 it is said lokeshu is in saptami vipakti. The nikishta vastu is given in saptami vipakti. Saptami vipakti refers to nikrishta vastu and therefore loka must be nikrishta vastu and therefore this is vishayah and utkrishta mantra should be prakarah. the third argument he gave was a mantra as a support 1.6.1 of Chandogya upanisad as a clue or indication of support of him which he calls as lingam. The clue mantra iyam eva rk agni sama. Prithvi eva rk the earth alone is rk` mantra and agni is sama mantra is the statement from here it is clear that prithvi lika must be visualized as rk mantra. Therefore loka is vishaya and mantra is prakara. The fourth argument is adhyatvat in 2.2.1 of Chandogya upanisad the upasana mentioned is prithvi himkarah. Prithvi is presented first and therefore it should be taken as fact and the next one is mantra and since prithvi does not have mantra status. We said before mano brahma upasanam we gave the argument the manah occurs first and therefore it should be taken as vishaya and Brahman should be taken for prakarah. therefore we only inititated the argument the first one is vishaya and second one is prakarah. hence this argument is forwarded by Purva Paksi. Prithvi is first word and therefore

it must be vishaya and himkara is second word and therefore it is prakarah. this we saw in the last class

Vyasacharya answers here for this elaborate Purva Pakshi is simple and he says the mantra must be seen as lokas. Sama mantra or sama bhaktis should be seen as various lokas and therefore mantras is object and lokas is the mode of meditation. He says upapakteh and says that is proper. From that answer we have to extract what is the intention of Vyasacharya. Adhi Sankaracharya explains this in his commentary. Then he adds two more further arguments.

First we will study the three arguments. I will discuss Vyasacharya argument and complete the sutra and thereafter enter into Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam and also refutation of Purva Pakshi arguments.

Vyasacharya argument is never forget the context. Always context must be remembered for the context is more powerful than language for words get different meaning according to the context. Never study any sentence out of the context. In the previous adhikaranam we studied swatantra pratika upasanam wherein a symbol is used as some other devata are all swatantra upasanam and not connected to any ritual. It is not part of ritual. But here we are discussing karmanga upasanam. That is the upasanas as part of the ritual. This context is very important for our attitude to upasana will depend upon the context. In swatantra upasanam upasana exists independently what gives the phalam is upasanam. Upasana is powerful here. In karmanga upasanam, upasana does not have independent status and it depends upon a karma. It is an anga of karma. According to mimamsa rule an anga does not exist independently and therefore it cannot give result by itself. Angam does not produce the result. Angam is always aphalam or nishphalam. Any anga is meant to strengthen the anga the primary one. A subsidiary does not produce any independent result and it has the power to strengthen the primary one. Karmanga upasanam is not for producing phalam and it is to strengthen the karma. Ordinary karma is raised to a higher status and it acquires an exalted status. This is called samskara or refinement or elevation or face-lifting or boosting the power of karma. What produces the result is not upasanam and karma alone produces the result. All these things Vyasacharya keeps in mind while writing upapakteh. Once you know upasanam is not meant for producing the result but for improving the status of karma the question comes how can it improve the status of karma. Karmanga upasanam improves the status of karma by improving the status of the various accessories used in karma. When the status of accessories are increased karaka janya kriya is also boosted and when it is boosted the kriya phalam also increases. How does this happen. The methodology is you look upon ordinary factor used in the ritual like ghee, priests, fire etc., what you want to do is you want to elevate the status of accessories used in the ritual. You cannot convert the object but you use imaginary conversion you bring about. In puja swarna pushpam samarpayami. You give ordinary vilva leaf but you call it swarna pushpam. It is visualized as a superior svarana and because of this darsanam ordinary karmanga is elevated to higher status. Karma is inferior and you want to elevate the status of karmanga and you visualize the karmanga as utkrishta vastu. In this visualization which is vishaya and which is prakara. Vilva flower is vishaya and I visualize as prakara. The actual object in front is vishaya and visualization is prakara. Karma anga is always is vishaya and something else is karma anga and utkrishta vastu is prakara. Karmangam is vishaya only and it is the object of meditation. Because the five fingers are karma angam. These five fingers become object of meditation and when I meditate I don't visualize as fingers but I see as various devata rupa. Finger is vishaya and devata rupa is imagination. Therefore Vyasacharya asks the question when Chandogya upanisad says



prithvi himkara tell me what is karmanga of these two. Whose status we want to elevate is our question. Vyasacharya argues himkara is karmangam. It is because, every mantra is an accessory used in karma. Prithvi etc., you don't offer as oblation. You take himkara as prithivi and status of himkara is elevated due to visualization. When karmanga is elevated karma gets elevated and when karma gets elevated phalams get elevated. In all karmanga upasanas the object of meditation can never become prakara is the logic. Because of that accessories become superior, you worship devata as devata. You invoke devata on yourself so that puja karta gets elevated and the puja becomes greater. If I do puja as devata I get superior result and therefore you convert yourself into a devata.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha means and Adhithyati matayah means visualization of deities like the sun [should be practised] ange means upon the accessories of karma; upapatteh means because that is logical. Now we will see the significance of the words. cha is literally and in this context differentiation unlike the previous adhikaranam. In previous adhikaranam it was independent upasana and here it is karmanga upasanam. Here always karmanga is object of meditation only and there is no compromise in that. Adityadi katayah. Matayah means visualization like adithya adhi. It refers to Chandogya upanisad 2.2.1 prithvi etc. ange means upon the karmanga which is the object. In this Chandogya upanisad context the object in mantra 1.3.1 omkara udgitha is object and in 2.2.1 himkara is the object. The sama mantra should be object and lokas must be imagination. Mantras are not imagination. The reason is upapatte that is proper. With this sutra and adhikaranam is over

Adhi Sankaracharya gives second argument. Second argument is upakrama. He says you look at the very beginning of the Chandogya upanisad, which is the foundation of all upasanas, considered in the first and other chapters. The first mantra is foundation. Never forget the heading. Adhi Sankaracharya when you read second and third chapters, etc. the foundation is laid in the first mantra. It is very clear that udgitha the sama mantra is object of upasana. From then onwards all topics have been sama mantra upasanam only and in all the portions the mantra is an object and never mantra is prakara. Here also like udgitha mantra himkara is object of upasanam and it is only imagination. Then the third argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives is a latter mantra occurring in Chandogya upanisad 2.7.2. and 2.8.1 of Chandogya upanisad. in 2.7.2 there is conclusion and 2.8.1 there is initiation of another upasana. Panca vidha upasyam samapti now ends the upasanam panca vidha sama and hereafter starts sapta vidha sama. This indicates that it is sama upasanam. Both relate to sama and therefore sama is object of upasanam and not prakara. Because of the sruti support we have to conclude that mantra is object. Because of the three argument our conclusion is that. Our next job is refutation of argument of Purva Paksi.

The first argument of Purva Paksi is prithvi himkara. Prithvi refers to loka and mantra is there. our confusion is Purva Paksi said loka is inferior and mantra is superior and therefore inferior one is vishaya and superior one is prakarah. loka must be seen as mantra. The reason why mantra is superior is loka does not give us karma phalam. It is not capable of producing the result but mantra is karma angatvat and it is capable of producing the result. Adhi Sankaracharya turns the table and argues that loka is superior to mantra. It is so because mantra is only a karma angam whereas loka is karma phalam itself. Karma angam is sadhanam and loka is karma phalam. Of the two end alone is superior and therefore phala rupa loka is utkrishtah. Sadhana rupa mantra nikrishtah. Therefore karmangatvat it is superior. We say karma phalatvat loka is superior.

Second argument is purely a grammar argument. Lokeshu panca vidham sama upaseeta. Here he focused on the word lokeshu which is saptami vipakti seventh case. According to upasana rule seventh case indicates nikrishta vastu. On inferior object you imagine a superior vastu. Nikrishta vastu is always an object and utkrishta vastu is prakarah or visualization. Therefore he has powerful argument. For that Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question don't tell me what is saptami etc. lokeshu panca vidham sama upaseeta. Translate in such a way and you will tell me what is what. Purva Paksi translates the sentence means visualize the world as sama. Here when you say visualize world as sama and the world is in seventh case and you translate it as object. Then you say visualize world as sama. In the sentence sama, the word is in second case. Sama is occurring in second case. As sama means it is second case. You convert seventh case into second and second case sama into third case. Visualize the world as sama; lokaththai samamaga dhyanam sei. Lokam samna upaseeta. Adhi Sankaracharya argument is in your translation you compromise with two cases. But our translation is visualize sama as the world. In our translation we compromise one vipakti. Therefore we win. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 347

### **Topic 5 [Sutra 6] Adithyadimatyadhikaranam**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

**Sutra 4.1.6. [483]**

#### *Adityadimatayaschanaga upapattteh*

And the ideas of the sun, etc., are to be superimposed] on the subordinate members [sacrificial acts] because [in that way alone the statement of the scriptures would be] consistent.

A particular instance is cited to confirm the preceding sutra.

We see the sixth sutra of the first pada of fourth chapter. this happens to be the fifth adhikaranam of the pada. here Vyasacharya analyses a pratika upasana from Chandogya upanisad. in the two upasanas adhithya and udgitha are given as upasana topic in the first manta and in the second mantra loka and sama mantra are taken up for discussion. If you adhithya is to be taken as omkara then adhithya becomes vishayah and omkara prakarah. similarly in second instance various lokas and sama mantras are mentioned whether loka should be meditate as sama mantras or sama mantras should be meditated as loka. Udgitha and sama mantras are prakara says Purva Paksi. We say it is not so and we say sama mantras are objects of meditation. Visualize omkara as adhithya and similarly visualize himkara as prithvi and not vice versa. Mantra is vishaya and loka is prakara. After establishing Vyasacharya view we came to Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam and now the position where we are is that Adhi Sankaracharya refutes the four arguments of the Purva Paksi. Purva Paksi gave four arguments to show that the lokas are vishaya and mantras are the prakara. The first argument we refuted in the last class. The second one we are in the process of refuting. See the mantra after 2.2.1 where the upasana is prescribed after two mantras phalam is given in 2.2.3 of Chandogya upanisad. we find the very same lokas are mentioned as the karma phalani. Therefore the lokas are karma phalam and mantras are karma angam. From this we come to know karma angam is part of ritual and it will come under the means. Lokas are mentioned as sadhyam the karma phalam. Sadhanam is superior and sadhyam is inferior. End is superior to the means. A person like the means for the ends alone. Therefore the meditation must be mantresu loka darsanam and mantra is vishaya and loka must be prakara. Visualize mantra as lokas. Therefore prithvi himkara means udgitam mantram adithyena upaseeta. This is the refutation of first argument of Purva Paksi.

Purva Paksi asked us to observe the mantra 2.2.1of Chandogya upanisad. Purva Paksi argument was word lokeshu is in seventh case revealing nikrishta vastu and that is why we defined meditation as nikrishta vastuni utkrishta vastu. Nikrishta vastu is always vishayah. Nikrishta vastu is always object and the other one is prakarah and utkrishta vastu. If loka is vishaya then sama must be praharah only. therefore also you have to accept my argument. This was Purva Paksi contention. Here Adhi Sankaracharya argues. We asked Purva Paksi

tell me what should be visualized as what. You present your views properly and then we will see whether your views is in agreement with Upanisad vakyam. Purva Paksi said visualize the lokas as the sama mantras. To be precise sama bhakti. This is Purva Paksi statement. Our statement is visualize the mantras as lokas. Taking the Purva Paksi statement visualize lokas as mantras in Sanskrit language lokan sama mantra rupena upaseeta. Vishaya is dvidiya vipakti and sama is tridiya vipakti. Sama should be in tridiya vipakti according to Purva Paksi. Now Adhi Sankaracharya asks read the Upanisad vakyam. Lokeshu is in saptami vipakti and you have to convert it into dvidiya vipakti. You take seventh case into second case. The next sama occurs in second case in the mantra. Purva Paksi will have to convert into tridiya because sama is prakara of meditation. You have to compromise two vipaktis. Two grammatical adjustment. We say visualize sama as the lokas. Here sama must be the vishaya and it must come in dvidiya vipakti and loka must appear in tridiya vipakti in siddhanta. Here what do we find the sama mantra must be in dvidiya vipakti we find the mantra in dvidiya vipakti only. therefore we don't have to compromise with regard to the sama. Take it as vishaya. The word lokeshu we want it into tridiya vipakti for loka is prakara for us and it is utkrishta vastu and karma phalatvad. Therefore we convert the saptami vipakti into tridiya. Therefore our interpretation is closer to veda vakyam due to less number of compromise. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Now the third argument we have to refute. The third argument was lingat. We have seen that in the previous class. There is an indication in support of my clarification. As a clue or linga Purva Paksi quoted a mantra from Chandogya upanisad 1.6.1 that says iyam eva rk` agni sama. The word iyam literally means this. in that Chandogya upanisad context this refers to prithvi. Iyam eva rk means this prithvi is rk mantra. Agni sama means agni alone is sama mantra. Purva Paksi argues look at the very construction of the sentence and from that it is clear that prithvi and agni must be vishayah and rk and sama mantra must be prakarah. from this it is clear mantra is prakarah and lokas are vishayah. Therefore my interpretation is correct. Adhi Sankaracharya says no. he says lingam you quote is supporting me only. he says the word eva is used after iyam. Eva is emphasis and Adhi Sankaracharya argues emphasis is required not for the object of meditation and emphasis is required for prakara of meditation. Prakara is important and that is the new teaching. See Ganga as goddess. The emphasis is on goddess only. vidheya is always prakara vishaye. Prakara is new teaching and therefore emphasis is required on prakara not upon vishaya. That is the new teaching. Here the word eva comes after iyam and therefore iyam prithvi must be prakara and not vishaya. Lingam is not supporting you and it is supporting me. Your clue is not supporting you but me because of the position eva that is the clinching argument. With this third argument is also refuted.

Now the fourth and final argument is here. This a difficult situation for us. We have made a statement in the previous adhikaranam. It was favourable in our previous argument but the same statement is adverse in our adhikaranam. There the topic mano brahma iti upaseeta. There we said mind is vishaya and Brahman is prakara. Visualize mind as Brahman and not vice versa. Visualize sun as Brahman. One of the argument we gave was whatever occurs first is powerful and therefore it should be taken as vishayah. The word Brahman is occurring in second therefore it is weaker and it must be imagination. First is fact and second is imagination. Now Purva Paksi takes that argument and applies here and when that is applied we are in trouble. In both the mantras loka is mentioned first and mantra second. If you apply the above argument in both mantra adhithya occurs first and in the next one prithvi occurs first and sama mantra occurs second in both. We are trying to present the mantra as vishayah. How do you account for your argument. For that we say that rule is general rule. Because

whatever we listen to enters into our mind without any contradiction. The first information is stronger because it has the advantage like a person entering first he can take any seat. But the second one is in disadvantageous seat not occupied by the first. Therefore the general rule is the first is stronger than the second one. But there are exceptions to that. The second one is proved stronger by other methods. If second is proved stronger by other method then the second one will push the first. Second has stronger power that neutralizes the disadvantage of coming second. Erroneous perception and right perception is exception quoted for this nyaya. You take erroneous perception and right perception. Seeing the rope as the rope is right perception. In the two which one takes first and we see rope as snake. Erroneous perception takes place first. Every erroneous perception does have an advantage and even though it has the advantage when it is proved by pramanam the latter perception even though it has the disadvantage of second one because it has prama it can negate the first one. Almost everyone thought like that and some has to say the sun does not go round the world and sun is at the centre and earth goes round. The latter knowledge dismissed the former one. The rule applicable in the previous sutra is not applicable in this adhikaranam for we have powerful reason to dislodge the nyaya. The reasons are the three previous arguments are powerful to dislodge the fourth one. This is a case of exception. The general rule is negated here. With this adhikaranam is over. You should see loka as mantra or mantra as loka. We say the mantra as the loka and not vice versa. Now we enter the next sutra and next mantra.

## Topic 6 [Sutra 7-10]

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

### Sutra 4.1.7. [484]

#### *Asinah sambhavat*

Sitting [a man is to meditate] on account of the possibility

The posture of the meditator while engaged in meditation is now being discussed

This is fairly a long adhikaranam with four sutras. In the case of upasana whether there are posture restrictions or not is the question discussed here. Upasana is a mental work. Upa and asanam. Asanam means dwelling to stay or to be or to remain. upa means in the proximity or close. Near what? Near various object of meditation. Upasya vishaya and be near to it. Who should be near the upasya vishaya. Whether it should be body or mouth or mind should be near. We say mind being in contact with upasya vishaya. It can stand close to any object in a particular way. It is by way of entertaining dealing with that object. Staying close means remaining closely attached to it. Vas means to stay. Upavasah means mentally staying close to God by entertaining the thought on God. Sanga brahma vishaya manasa vyaparaha is upasana. It cannot be Nirgunam Brahman and then it is not called upasana and it is called nididyanam. the controversy comes because upasana is an activity of the mind and what should be condition of the body. When two people are there and they visit a particular place and one is entertaining a person. What should be done to the body. Whether restriction should be there or it can do anything it likes. After all the job is done by the mind only. during upasana body postures should be there or not. Purva Pakshi says since body has no role to play since it is only job of the mind, postural restrictions are not there. what is going to be siddhanta is no. postural restrictions are there. this is the general introduction.

In the first sutra Vyasacharya says restrictions are there, and the ideal posture is seated posture is ideal. The physical posture may be standing, sitting and reclining. Vyasacharya says of the three sitting is the best of the three for upasana. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 348

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 7-10]**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

#### **Sutra 4.1.7. [484]**

#### ***Asinah sambhavat***

Sitting [a man is to meditate] on account of the possibility

The posture of the meditator while engaged in meditation is now being discussed

Asinah sambhavat

Sitting [a man is to meditate] on account of the possibility

The posture of the meditator while engaged in meditation is now being discussed

Here Vyasacharya discusses whether specific posture is required or not for the upasanam. Adhi Sankaracharya in his introduction points out before answering the question asks what type of meditation it is. Meditation can be classified into three types. one is karmanga dhyanam, second svatantra dhyanam or Vedanta dhyanam or nididyanam. karmanga dhyanam is that meditation which is part of a ritual and it has to be practised while the ritual is being performed. Before offering particular oblation, one should meditate upon a devata before offering the oblation. It is done at the time of performance of the oblation. Such a meditation will become karmanga dhyanam. Svatantra dhyanam is not part of a ritual and it is independent meditation. We have many such meditation in sikshavalli. There are innumerable svatantra meditation. Third is vedantic meditation of jnana vrutti which is already received from sastram. Adhi Sankaracharya points out in the introduction to this adhikaranam the first and third variety are not under discussion here. Karmanga upasanam there cannot be any controversy because for performance of karma whatever posture prescribed for karma will apply to the karmanga upasana also. Even sandhyavandanam there are special rules. At the time arkyam pradhanam if you are asked to do dhyanam whatever posture for arkyam pradhanam he has to meditate for a few minutes. Similarly direction of karma and if you are to do it facing the east the upasana also to be done facing the east. Veda prescribed the posture direction for karmas which is to be followed for upasana also. Facing the east and eastern part of the ground should be lower than where he is seated. A place which goes downward in the eastern direction. Therefore karmanga upasana is not the topic of this adhikaranam.

Vedanta dhyanam. Here vedantic meditation is not under consideration because it is not done for adhrishta phalam. The rules are compulsory when the phalam is in the form of punyam, the invisible result. It is for avoiding forgetfulness or for assimilation. Nididyanam does not

require any posture and it becomes our choice. For nididyanam vedantic meditation posture is left to the choice of the individual. If they choose posture like any karma there is no harm.

The middle one svatantra upasana whether there is posture or not is our controversy. Purva Pakshi says there is no restriction. Siddhanti will say there is posture restriction and he should meditate in sitting posture. Use the best posture that is practical for in that alone mind can focus on upasaya devata. In standing posture one may lose balance. Eyes contribute in balance. If you try to stand with closed eye or walk with closed eye you lose the balance. In meditation you close your eyes, you will lose balance, and you cannot concentrate on meditation. The reclining posture there is no physical balancing problem and when the eyes are closed the sooner or later you get sound sleep. therefore reclining posture is also not ideal. Therefore sitting posture is ideal. Vyasacharya does not say whether one should sit on the ground or on chair. Ideal should be sitting on the floor. If a person cannot sit on the floor, if he sits the meditation will be directed towards knee joints. If you cannot sit on floor, it is perfectly all right if you sit on raised platform or chair. Because of practicability sitting is the best of three posture. This is general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Asinah means remaining seated [one should practise upasana or meditation] samhavat means because that is practical and conducive and favourable. Significance of the words is asinah remaining seated sambavat means practical or conducive.

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 7-10]**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

#### **Sutra 4.1.8. [485]**

#### ***Dhyanaccha***

And on account of meditation

An argument in support of sutra 7 is adduced.

Upasana is another word for dhyana. Both of them are synonymous. In the sastra dhyana is defined as mental existence, which involves twofold efforts. One is withdraw mind or thought from the external objects. This is a tough proposition. Even though we go to meditation room the body comes yet the mind is in any place other than the room. The mind gets stuck on something or somebody. Plucking the mind from the object is difficult. Withdrawal of mind from the object is called vijadiya pratyaya nivritti. The second part is directing towards upasaya viahsya which existence is called sajadiya pratyaya pravah. Therefore together we say vijadiya pratyaya anantarita sajadiya pratyaya nivruttyaya pravahah. Mind has to be plucked and directed. It is plucking and directing process. Seated posture is conducive for withdrawal of mind. Therefore do meditation. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Ca and dhyana since upasana is identical with dhyana [the above condition is to be accepted] the above condition is seated posture. Vyasacharya uses the word dhyana only. the significance of the words is dhyana



pacami vipakti withdrawal of mind is needed. This is possible in seated posture. Ca is to combine.

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 7-10]**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

#### **Sutra 4.1.9. [486]**

#### ***Achiatvam chapekshya***

And with reference to immobility [the scriptures ascribe meditateness to the earth]

The argument In support of sutra 7 is continued.

With reference to the immobility of the earth in ordinary eye, the scripture fancies the earth as being engaged in concentration as if it remains fixed in space in the act of pious meditation. It suggests that such a steady application of the mind can be attained by meditating only in a sitting position. If the body is at rest, there is rest for the mind also, if the body is in motion, i.e., restless the mind too becomes restless. Steadiness accompanies meditation. Steadiness of body and mind is possible only while sitting and not while standing or walking.

A particular expression in language in sastra and loukika vyavahara. In Chandogya upanisad 7.6.1 says the mountains which stand still appear to be meditating. This is sastriya vyavahara. The loukika vyavahara is the crane that stands still until it gets its fish. Fish pratyaya. The moment the fish goes nearby, it is on meditation as it were seeing the stillness of the bird. Meditation and inactivity go together. Because of sastra vyavahara and loukika vyavahara meditation is practised with stillness. If you want to practise meditation, you have to stand still. How many minutes you can stand still. Therefore seated posture is suggested.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Ca means moreover [there is an expression] the mountain meditates as it were] the crane meditates as it were apekshya based on achalatvam there stillness or motionlessness; now we will see the significance of the words ca' there are loukika and sastriya expressions. There is series of jayatis. The mountain is still. Achalatvam means motionlessness or stillness. There is no other reasons for comparison. It is inert. Without some sadhrishya no comparison is possible for meditation is the job of living being. There can be only one basis. Meditator is still and mountain is still; therefore seated posture is suggested.

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 7-10]**

In meditation on the members of sacrificial acts the idea of divinity is to be superimposed on the members and not in the reverse way.

#### **Sutra 4.1.10. [487]**

#### ***Smaranti cha***

The smriti passages also say [the same thing]

The argument in support of sutra 7 is concluded.

This is the last sutra in which Vyasacharya gives sruti support. The posture is mentioned in so many places. He says VI.11 and 12 of Gita is referred to here. A particular confusion can come for 6<sup>th</sup> chapter refers to nididyanam subject. He takes only asana niyama. Otherwise there are some other slokas also. Because of smriti support one should meditate in seated posture.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Smaranti cha smritis also say so or declare so. The significance of the word is smaranti means smritis declare and cha is again the conjunction to reinforce with another pramanam. If we don't want to take the 6<sup>th</sup> chapter of Gita where is the pramanam. In the Bhagavatam there are several examples. It is there in Uddhava Gita. Chapter 9 verse 32. it talks about upasanam and posture is prescribed. With this the fourth sutra is over and 6<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over.

## **Topic 7 [Sutra 11] Ekagratadhikaranam**

There is no restriction of place with regard to meditation

**Sutra 4.1.11. [488]**

### ***Yatraikagrata intravisheshat***

Wherever concentration of mind [is attained] there [it is to be practised] there being no specification [as to place]

We enter into the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter is the same. we are not listening karmanga upasanam or Vedanta Jnanam. Those who read Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam, he uses nididyanam for upasanam also. Upasanam means saguna dhyanam and nididyanam means nirguna dhyanam. But Adhi Sankaracharya does not observe this rule. If you happen to read Adhi Sankaracharya, he uses this word for both. Similarly the word Brahman and Isvara and Brahman means nirgunam and Isvara refers to sagunam. Here the discussion is neither karmanga upasanam or Vedanta upasanam but svatantra upasanam. Svatantra upasanam requires sitting posture. Do we have any other rules to observe like dik desha and kala for doing svatantra upasanam. This is the question. Dik means direction; should we sit in a particular direction avoiding south; desha means in particular place only like puja room etc. third one is kala niyama do we have any rule or not. Purva Paksi says those rules are to be observed like asana rules. Siddhanta is going to be negating Purva Paksi. Vyasacharya and Adhi Sankaracharya say there are no such rules. Desa kala and dik rules are not there for svatantra upasanam. For sandhyavandana karma the niyamas are there. for karmanga upasanam it is decided by karmas. For svatantra upasanam, doing siva dhyanam or Vishnu dhyanam seated posture are compulsory desa kala niyamas are not there. since svatantra upasanam requires focusing the thought without retraction with regard to dik desha and kala, wherever you are able to focus without retraction that desa is permitted; that kala is permitted and that direction is permitted. No rule as such is there for the purpose. We don't ban even south direction. This is the general analysis.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tatra a person can meditate in any place; at any time; facing any direction; yatra where ekagrata concentration is possible; avisheshat means since there is no scriptural specification with regard to place time and direction; this is the running meaning. The significance of the words wherever ekagraha is possible; ekagraha means concentration; ekam one vishya in front of the mind; yatra ekagrah tatra upasanam puryat, one can practise svatantra upasanam. It is so because avisheshat in the absence of any scriptural specification unlike karma. When a person wants to perform brahma yajna ritual he should face dik rule; when he wants to perform vaishva deva yajna he should sit where is east is down and west is up; the last one is for kala; when pinda pitru yajna is a ritual and it should be done in the afternoon only. this is kala niyama. All these are karma. For svatantra upasana there is no such specification. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 349

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 11] Ekagratadhikaranam**

There is no restriction of place with regard to meditation

**Sutra 4.1.11. [488]**

#### ***Yatraikagrata intravisheshat***

Wherever concentration of mind [is attained] there [it is to be practised] there being no specification [as to place]

I want to discuss a point which is dealt with by Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam in sutra 11. Purva Pakshi raises an objection. Vyasacharya said that scriptural specification is not there for pratika upasanam. Purva Pakshi questions that statement. How do you say such specification is not there. this shows that you have not read the scriptures properly. In Svetasvatara Upanisad prescribes desha in minute detail. How do you say desa niyama nasti. The mantra II.10 of Svetasvatara Upanisad reads as same *suchau sarkara vahni valuka vivarjite sabda jalasraya dibhih mano nukule na tu caksu pidane guha nivatasrayane prayo jatet* the meaning of the mantra is in a level clean place free from pebbles fire and gravel, favourable to thought by the sound of water and other features, not offensive to the eye, in a hidden retreat protected from the wind, let him perform his exercises [let him practise yoga]. The place stagnant water is there such place you should avoid. If there is a huge reservoir cold wind may affect the body hence such place may be avoided. The place should not affect the eyes too much. One commentator says there should not be too much glaring light that may disturb the eyes. Caksu also refers to some flies. There should not be insects, flies etc. the place should be similar to cave, and where too much wind is not there. Therefore Purva Pakshi claims that svetasvatara Upanisad specifically states the place of meditation. How Vyasacharya says the place is not prescribed. Adhi Sankaracharya defends Vyasacharya. He says that there is another crucial word in that mantra. Mano nukule and this word which is conducive for your concentration means we are not talking about adhrista phalam but dhrista phalam the place favourable for meditator and therefore the importance is to be given to mano nukule and all other suggestions are not compulsory rule. They are secondary only. because is a manasa karma therefore manokulatva niyama is important. Since mano nukula is important, all other conditions become secondary. The conditions are not vidhi and they are only suggestions. Desa vishesha is compulsorily presented. Suggestions are given by the Upanisad and you need not follow. If you make such things compulsory, then you cannot practise meditation all the rules are secondary. Sit and concentrate the mind is compulsory vidhi. with this 11<sup>th</sup> sutra is over. 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is also over.

### **Topic 8 [Sutra 12] Aprayanadhikaranam.**

Meditations should be continued till death

**Sutra 4.1.12 [489]**

***Aa prayanat tatrapi hi drishtam***

Till death [till one attains Moksa] meditations have to be repeated for tehn also it is thjus seen in scripture.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter here is upasanam only. an important rule regarding upasanam is being discussed here. We have seen three types of upasanam before other than nididyanam. one is karmanga upasanam, a meditation which is part of vedic ritual and this cannot independently exist; second is independent upasanam and here we have external symbol called pratikam; third one which we will deal with one is ahamgrah upasanam. This we discussed III.3.59. the uniqueness of this upasanam is like svatantra upasanam and it can exist independently without any ritual. Here the upasya devata is invoked upon myself. Aham is taken as the locus of devata. For all the ahamgrah upasana the phalam is upasya devata aikyam. If it is virat upasana virat aikyam. If it Hiranyagarbha upasanam Hiranyagarbha aikyam. The phalam is supposed to be the aikyam with God and it is nothing but krama Mukti. Those who do saguna brahma upasanam they will become one with Isvara. Isvara aikyam or krama Mukti is the phalam in these cases. The point to be noted is that the upasana is that I should invoke God on myself. This is the topic. the controversy here is how long one should practice this upasana for its success. Because with regard to karma the restriction is there. with regard to Vedanta vichara is also how long question is there. there we asked the question how long one should attend the class. Avrutti means repetition. We said vicharasya phalam is clear knowledge. Whether I gained knowledge decides the duration of the upasana. If one says with today's class things are clear means he is free. Therefore nididyanam is dhrista phalam and we don't do for punyam and it is for clear understanding. If the understanding is there you can stop upasanam. It is optional. In the case of ahamgrah upasana is for limited time only. parichchinna kalam. Vyasacharya says no. ahamgrah upasana can be fruitful only if he does it until death unlike nididyanam. for nididyanam such a rule is not there. this is the topic of this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya clearly prescribes the rule. Prayanam means leaving and it means dying. Ahamgraha upasana should be done until death. What is the pramanam for that. The pramanam is that sastra prescribes that upasanam should be prescribed even at the moment of death. We saw this in Gita the upasaka should be an expert yogi and must have practised so thoroughly and he should sit in padmasana even at the time of death. Then several questions come. First we will complete sutra part.

One is satapata Brahmanam 10.6.3.1 that says whichever thought a person at the time of death whatever he utters that he becomes. This is one pramanam. The we have smriti pramanam also 8.6, 8.7, and 8.10 of Gita whatever he thinks at the time of death he becomes after. Therefore if you want to become one with God at prayana kala you remember Isvara only. once question that comes to our mind is that if one is to remember God at the time of death, there is no need of remembering God all the time.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Aaprayanat means upasana has to be practised [ahamgrah is understood] until death hi because tatra api means the practice of upasana even at the time of death dhristam is prescribed in the scriptures. This is the running meaning. The significance of the words is aaprayanam means until death; even at the moment

of death; ahamgrah upasana has to be practiced. Even at the moment of death practice of meditation is prescribed. Dhristam it is seen in the scriptures. Here you have to note a subtle difference. Until death you do Isvara upasanam. You note difference between at the moment of death is prescribed and the conclusion is until death. You have to do throughout the life until death. Dhristam means such an injunction found in the sruti. That is one sruti is satapata Brahmana and smriti is Gita.

Purva Paksi prescribes Isvara dhyanam at the time of death. Why you insist dhyanam until death. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer. If a person has to remember Isvara at the time of death his subconscious mind should be saturated with Isvara vasanas. Our thoughts are influenced by will and vasana. In fact there is constant fight between the two. I think good. But I don't practice. I am convinced of positive thought. will is there. often I fail. thoughts happen in spite of the will. Our thoughts are determined by will and vasana. As we get older, the vasanas are stronger and will is weak. How many experiences we have gone through? Each experience registers a vasana. Towards death will power is practically absent and the will is almost zero at the time of death. If Isvara smaranam is to happen, our free will is not there at the time of death. We should saturate the mind with Isvara vritti. How to do it? Control subconscious mind with vritti avrutti. This is otherwise called abhyasah. This word is used by Krishna in Gita. Sheer repetition of ahangraha upasana. Invoke upasaka deva repeatedly in me. I should deliberately remove the distance between I and the devata. This is destruction of beda. It is not through advaita Jnanam. This requires Self-knowledge. We are not talking about that. We visualize I am Vishnu and this repetition leads to abeda ksatsatkarah. I visualize God in this life. It means his mind is saturated with upasya devata. He has become one with devata. Veda says in Brihadaranyaka upanisad it is said the upasaka gets several faculties of the devata, many powers are accomplished, and he gathers devata sakti. Saturation of the mind with I am God thought is called abeda ksatsatkara. Once this comes to the mind at the time of death he will get phalam.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 350

### **Topic 8 [Sutra 12] Aprayanadhikaranam.**

Meditations should be continued till death

#### **Sutra 4.1.12 [489]**

#### ***Aa prayanat tatrapi hi drishtam***

Till death [till one attains Moksa] meditations have to be repeated for teh also it is thjus seen in scripture.

If one meditates upon Isvara himself it is possible for him to become one with devata and such type of upasana is ahamgrah upasana. The rule is that ahangrah upasana will have to be continued throughout the life and even at the time of death. The pramanam for that was from satapata Brahmanam and also some from Gita. Brihadaranyaka upanisad IV.4.2 and Prasna Upanisad 3.10. there also it is said whatever one person thinks at the time of death that he will become after death. In addition smriti pramanam is also there. as a person thinks so he becomes 8.6 of gita . Then I entered into a discussion of few points in the bashyam. The first question that comes is the sastra clearly says what he thinks at the time of death he becomes. I have to make sure I think of God at the time of death. And why should I remember God now. We say that it will not work. First reason is that we don't know the time of death. Then you can plan in such a way at the time of death you can be there in the puja room and pray. Unfortunately we don't know the time of death. We don't know whether we will be conscious at the time of death. Still we can say that we cannot think what we want to think. As we grow old vasanas take over the will at the time of death. Therefore better start thinking right now. Up to this we saw in the last class.

Purva Paksi says that it is not required to think of God all the time. Only for ahamgraha upasana we have to think of lord. It will produce adhrista phalam and it will produce Isvara thought at the time of death. I need not generate Isvara vasana and I have to do the upasanam and through the upasana I will get the punyam to think of God at the time of death. Vasana route is taken by us and in the advantage is to generate vasana I have to remember God all the time. Ahamkara upasana if done intensely for sometime, the adhrista phalam of the upasana will enable you to think of God at the time of death the Purva Paksi contends. In support of this argument he quotes the agnihotra karma. Agni hotra and jyotisyoma done will generate the adhristam after that he does not do any ritual. This agnihotra punyam will influence anthakala smaranam and it will produce the appropriate andthakala smaranam and similarly the any loka prapti will be produced and anthakala smaranam will decide next janma and why cannot you apply this to ahamgraha upasana also. Adhi Sankaracharya says you should use adhrista method only when dhrista method fails. Adhristam is a kalpana and kalpana or presumption or assumption is needed only when dhrista method fails. For prayana kala Isvara smarana you cannot take adhrista produced when it can be explained through dhrista method, the direct we can ourselves know without sastra pramanam.

Through pourusheya pramanam we can explain anthakala smaranam the remembering God now itself produce anthakala smaranam. why do you infer an adhristam. In the case of other rituals, adhristam have to be inferred because veda talks about jyotistiyoma karma for a limited period and therefore I have to infer that the ritual produces punyam and that punyam will influence the marana kala smaranam and that marana kala smaranam will influence the life after death I have to go through. Here I dhrista method is sufficient and it is supported by sastra also. Sastra does not say adhristam will produce Isvara smarana and it has to be produced our remembrance of Isvara throughout the life. Don't depend on punyam for you to remember Isvara at the time of death. For this you should make it a habit of thinking God all the time right from now on and make it a habit and then only you can think of God at the time of death which will influence your life after death. What is the sastra pramanam. Gita VIII.6 in the beginning Krishna says marana kala smarana decides the life and in the end he says you should think of God all the time and then only you can remember God at the time of death and consequently you can get better life after death. Other references are Gita III.10 remembering whatever form of being be in the end leaves this body into that same form he even passes assimilated its being. and III.17.6 of Chandogya upanisad says let a man at the time of death take refuge with this triad and IV.2.10 of Prasnopanisad says the Prana united with light together with the individual Self leads on to the world as conceived at the moment of death and IV.4.3 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad this also follows from the comparison to the caterpillar example the leech takes hold of another object before it leaves an object.

Therefore, punyam does not determine your antha kala Isvara smaranam. Your practice alone determines. Therefore think of God all the time. In the case of agni hotra karam punyam will influence the smarana at the time of death. Only in the case of ahamgraha upasana it is only the vasana that influence the smarana. With this 12 th sutra is over. With this sadhana topic is over. Hereafter alone we really enter the fourth chapter.

One cannot entertain such a thought of Isvara at the time of departure of Prana from this body without practice for the whole life. Therefore meditations must be practised up to death.

## **Topic 9 [13] Tadadhigamadhikaranam**

Knowledge of Brahman frees one from all past and future sins.

**Sutra 4. 1. 13[490]**

***Tadadhigama uttarapurvaghayorasleshavainasau tadvyapadesat***

On the attainment of this [viz. Brahman] [there takes place] the non-clinging and the destruction of later and earlier sins; because it is so declared by the scriptures.

The eight adhikaranam that we studied until now and 12 sutras belong to sadhanas and that too types of meditations. Now we are left with 6 more adhikaranam with 7 sutras. These alone are essentially first pada of the fourth chapter. the rest of the first pada deal with jnana phalam. And jnana phalam is in the form of twofold Mukti jivan Mukti and krama Mukti.

In the first pada Vyasacharya concentrates on freedom from bondage. In the fourth pada Vyasacharya concentrates on Moksa prapti. The second and third pada deals with krama Mukti which is the result of karma and upasana. How does an upasaka leave the body for krama Mukti is also talked about. Second pada does not talk about jnani. Third pada also



concentrates on upasaka and talks about the shukla gathi the route upasaka takes after departure. This is the overall view.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. The topic of the sutra can Atma Jnanam destroy all the papams or not. as usual Purva Pakshi says that Jnanam that too one moment's dhyanam cannot destroy the papams accumulated over all the janmas. Jnanam cannot destroy sarva papams they say. Siddhanti says Jnanam can destroy all the papams. Jnanena papa nasah.

Now I will come to the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says Jnanam can destroy all papams which I means all sanchita and agami papams. How do you come to this conclusion. Vyasacharya asks the question that there are papams accumulated in so many janmas how do you know and what is the pramanam for past janma and what is the past infinite janma and what is the past infinite papams. There is no pratyaksa pramanam and no logic pramanam and no scientific pramanam also. Science has not proved past or future janma. Therefore this must be clear to us we don't have any scientific proof for past or future janma and past papams also. That is why we call adhrishta. The first point to be noted is regarding papa karma you cannot use your brain or logic. It is sastra based. Go by sastra pramanam only., there are infinite bundle of sanchita papam we know only through sastra only. whether Jnanam can destroy papams or not can be decided by sastra only. Let me not use my brain and try to understand what sastra says. If you accept sastram and come to know of infinite papam and you should accept sastra that papam destroy papams. Never take sastra pramanam partially. Don't talk of logic. If you don't accept papa nasa then don't think of existence of papam at all. Accept both or reject both regarding the existence of papams. Accept sanchita papa is there and also accept that sanchita papam gets destroyed. Either accept both or don't accept both. Don't accept the sastra partially that is accepting regarding the existence and not accepting the destruction of the papam on gaining Jnanam. Therefore Vyasacharya no doubt papams are infinite but sastra says through Jnanam you can destroy the papams.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tadadhigame means in the wake of Brahma Jnanam, uttarapurvaghayoh of all agami papams and sanchita papams respectively result or happens or occurs; asleshavinasau the absence and destruction of tadvyapadesat this is known from scriptural statements about them. The significance of the words tadadhigame tad means Brahman adhigama means Jnanam; it is the seventh case sati saptami; when Brahma Jnanam takes place or at the moment of Brahma Jnanam; uttarapurvaghavayoh utara means agami and agam means papam pruvagha sanchita asleshavinasou non-contact or non-arrival this should be connected with agami. Agami papams will not arrive after Brahma Jnanam. Agami water touch jnani lotus leaf. Vinasah means destruction and this should be connected with sanchitam. Agami papasya abhavah sanchita papasya nasah. Both agami and sanchita will go. How it will go? Don't use brain but accept sastra statement without questioning. This is apourusheya vishaya. Here sastra only is the pramanam. Vyapadesah means scriptural statement regarding the agami abhava and sanchita nasa. Now the question is what is the sruti vakyam. One is 3.2.9 of Mundaka upanisad. the important word is tarati papmanam. Similarly in the case of upasaka sarva papa nasa through Krama Mukti is talked about and that comes in IV.14.3 of Chandogya upanisad this is for agami abhava papam.V.24.3 of Chandogya upanisad talks of the destruction of sanchita papams. Just as dry grass put on fire will get totally burnt similarly all sanchita papa will burn in jnana agni. These two vakyams have to be carefully understood. These are given for upasaka. Upasaka will go to brahma loka and get Jnanam and through that he will destroy all the papams and

will get Mukti. This is the sruti pramanam. We have smriti pramanam also 4.36 of Gita also emphasizes this point. Just as ordinary rat can help a person float in an ocean, the jnana pravah can help crossing over all papams. Jnana will help destroying all the papams.

Now I will go to some points discussed in Adhi Sankaracharya bashyam. It is important because destruction of all papams through Jnanam is unbelievable. Here sastra is pramanam and Adhi Sankaracharya in his commentary says not only sastra is pramanam and there is supporting logic also. The logic is karana nase karya nasah. All karmas are because of karta. Karmas are possible only when karta is there. karta is possible because of superimposition. You should know from adhyasa bashyam. Here we have established karta is born because of adhyasah. Adhyasah is because of ajnanam. And since ajnanam produces karta, karma and when the route ajnanam is destroyed the entire tree is to fall. Thus all the karmas are destroyed. This is proved by swapna example. I have superimposition of doing papa punya karmas in swapna. There the court has given imprisonments and what happens to it when I wake up. When I wake up everything goes. There is no question of swapna papa sticking. How can vyavahara papam be there when I identify with Brahman on gaining Jnanam. Purva Paksi raises a question that you say sastra is pramanam and I have got a sastra pramanam that karma goes away through result only. Adhi Sankaracharya says come to the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 351

### **Topic 9 [13] Tadadhigamadhikaranam**

Knowledge of Brahman frees one from all past and future sins.

**Sutra 4. 1. 13[490]**

#### ***Tadadhigama uttarapurvaghayorasleshavinasau tadvyapadesat***

On the attainment of this [viz. Brahman] [there takes place] the non-clinging and the destruction of later and earlier sins; because it is so declared by the scriptures.

We see the 13<sup>th</sup> sutra, which happens to be 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam of this pada. here Vyasacharya talks of total destruction of sanchita and agami karma through Atma Jnanam. not only karmas done in the past karma and the present karmas up to the rise of Atma Jnanam are destroyed. After Jnanam whatever karmas are done by jnani will not produce any punyam or papam. Naturally a doubt can come how can Jnanam gained in this janma gained through a study conducted in few years destroy papams of countless janmas. Jnanam means realisation or mystic experience so that using extraordinary word elevates status of Jnanam. Otherwise the doubt will come how can understanding will destroy all the karmas. If you want to know anything about karma sastra alone is pramanam. Keep logic and intelligence aside. It is adhrista vishaya. Adhrista vishaye pouruseya na pramanani bhavanti and vedah eva pramanam. Veda clearly says sarva karma nasah. We have sruti and smriti pramanam in this regard. A person crosses over the ocean of sins with the boat of knowledge. Once sruti pramanam has given the clue then we can give the logic based on sruti. We don't stop with mere sruti and we say it is primary pramanam and we have supportive pramanam also. Karana nase karya nasa. When cause is removed effect is removed. By the removal of ignorance deha abhimana is removed. Jnana praptou ajnana nasa ajnana nase deha abhimana nasa; with that kartrutva nasah and akrtrutva nase sarva karma nasah. Again to assimilate the idea further we have swapna experience. Because the waker ignorance I have swapna deha abhimana. Because of my ignorance I have swapna deha abhimana. Swapna deha abhimana swapna kartrutvam and because of that I do swapna karma and because of this those phalams waiting. The moment I wake up ignorance is gone. Jnana praptou ajnana nasan; swapna kartrutva nasa and sarva karma nasah. It is perfectly all right sruti yukti pramanams are there. this is the essence of the adhikaranam.

Purva Paksi raises a question. The question is he says no doubt with regard to all karmas we cannot apply logic and we have to apply sastra pramanam only. now Purva Paksi says I have got sastra pramanam to show that karmas cannot be destroyed. One has to experience karma phalam. No escape is possible. He says when a person commits suicide all the karmas and the karma phalams including the papam of committing suicide attract him on his rebirth in the next birth. We have sastra pramanam for this. if this be the case how can a jnani escape the papams of the previous janmas on gaining Jnanam is the question of the Purva Paksi. And what is the vakyam. Avasya anuboktavayam kritam karm sudha sukam definitely one has to experience the karma whether it is punyam or papam. A karma which is not experienced or karma phalam which is not experienced will never get destroyed even during the pralya kala

the unexperienced karma phalam will remain as it is. This is sastra vakyam. When another sastra vakyam says cannot be exhausted how can you ignore that statement and quote that is convenient to you. you cannot say one sastram is pramanam and another is apramanam. Here you cannot both because they are mutually contradictory. Then we say when two sastra vakyams are contradictory and cannot be rejected and you have to interpret in such a way that it does not contradict the other vakyam. The next question is which should be adjusted to which. Purva Pakshi would say suit your vakyam to suit mine. Karma cannot be destroyed and will have to be exhausted. All other vakyams you quoted you have to take it as artha vadha or glorification of knowledge. He says my vakyam is pramanam vakyam and your vakyams are glorifications. Even a jnani has to exhaust all his karmas and only advantage as jnani and after exhaustion of all karmas he will get Moksa. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says no. only our statement is pramanam vakyam and your statement is weaker. Because your vakyam is smriti vakyam. Whereas we have given smriti and sruti and logic also. Because we have given three supports we have to take ours as pramanam and therefore Jnanam will destroy karmas. In the case of ajnani, karmas will have to be exhausted only through experience. It is ajnani vishaya vakyam. Sarva papa nasa is jnani vakyam. One vakyam deals with ajnani and another deals with jnani. Then Adhi Sankaracharya says even in the case of ajnani it is not totally applicable. Karmas will have to be experienced that statement is not totally applicable and sastra suggests prayachitta karmas for they can destroy papams. If a person chants rudra several papams will be destroyed. Prayachittam also destroys karmas. This applies to ajnani who has not prayachitta karma also. Without getting Jnanam and even without doing prayachitta karma, the karmas will not be destroyed. You have to experience the karma phalam. Then Adhi Sankaracharya gives third and final argument. Suppose we take the vakyam as pramana vakyam that prayachitta karma will not destroy papams and also we take Jnanam also will not destroy karma, nothing will remove karmas and all have to experienced and exhausted, then let us assume avasyam anuboktavayam is paramount statement and then for Moksa one will have to exhaust all karmas only through experience. That is take birth and birth without any end. now Adhi Sankaracharya asks the question will it happen at any time. Because sanchita karmas are acquired in many janmas. Infinite janmas we have gone through and gathered samchita karmas and it is impossible to physically exhaust all the karmas. Then exhaustion will require infinite janmas. There also situation is worse and even then it is not possible because as even exhausting I will replenish karma phalam. Then anirmoksa prasanga dosha will come. No moksa is possible and all sastras will become waste. We have to take the Purva Pakshi statement in a very limited sense and avasya vakyam is applicable to ajnani who has not done the prayachitta. This is called sancoshah. This method we often use. In Gita Krishna talks about ahimsa value in several chapters. Yet he gives final teaching you fight war to uphold dharma. It is himsa. We see contradiction like this and then we reduce the meaning of one statement in such a way that it will not contradict. Except for protection of dharma in other cases you follow ahimsa. Excluding dharma samrakshina context you have to follow ahimsa. Similarly here also the vakyam is to be given samkosa artha. So on gaining Jnanam you destroy all the papams sanchita and agami.

## **Topic 10 [14] Itarasamsleshadhikaranam**

Similarly good work do not affect the knower of Brahman

**Sutra 4.1.14[491]**

***Itarasyapyevamasamsleshah pate tu***

Thus in the same way there is nonclinging of the other [i.e., punya or virtue, good works] also; but at death [liberation i.e., vidheha Mukti is certain]

Discussion on the consequence of brahma jnana [the knowledge of Brahman] is continued.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The topic under discussion is karma nasa only. In the previous adhikaranam Vyasacharya talked about karma nasa but referred to papa karma. Therefore papa nasa was mentioned. Here he talks about punya. Whether Jnanam will destroy punya or not. Many people will be disturbed if we say Jnanam destroys punya. We always were under the impression that punya is favourable and it is ananda hetuh also. We were carefully accumulating the punya and are worried at the exhaustion of punya. When punya goes away one suffers as this is our orientation. Here Vyasacharya says Jnanam destroys punya also. What is the reason Vyasacharya does not give. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer. Here the adhikaranam talks about sarva samchita agami punya nasa also. This is the essence of the adhikaranam sara.

Now I will come to general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says the other one also goes away. The other one means punya. Then Vyasacharya says in this sutra since all punya or papams are destroyed at the end of life when the body falls Moksa is definite. At the time of fall he does not have punya or papam. So he is liberated. No higher janma or lower janma or manushya janma and therefore he is liberated.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Evam means similarly; asamsleshah means the destruction of itarasya api of the other karma also result to liberation is definite pate at the time of death or the fall of the body. The significance of the words is itarasya means other karma; in this context it refers to punya karma; api means also; not only papam even punya or punya also; evam means similarly and similarly means as in the case of papam; from this Vyasacharya indicates that the pramanams are also similar. Whatever pramanam we quoted in the previous adhikaranam applies here also. Asamsleshah literally it means non-contamination; that means freedom or finally destruction of punya karma. Pate means pata means fall; here Vyasacharya refers to fall of the body; at the time of the fall of the body; tu means emphasis. Definite. From the context we have to find out that Moksa is definite. Moksa means vidheha Mukti is definite.

Now we have to find out the pramanam. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the pramanam. First is 3.1.3 of Mundaka Upanisad. The mantra reads as *yada patyah pasyate rukma varnam kartaram isam purusam brahma yonim tada vidvan punyo pape vidhuya niranjanah paramam samyam upaiti*. The meaning of the mantra is when a seer sees the creator of golden hue, the lord the person, the source of brahma, then being a knower, shaking off good and evil and free from stain, he attains supreme equality with the lord. A vidvan destroys his punya or papam also. From this it is clear punya is also an obstacle to Moksa. The reason is that Moksa is defined as sarira abhava. Freedom from embodiment is called Moksa and punya is cause of embodiment and sarira karanam punya and sarira abhava Moksa and therefore punya and Moksa are enimical. As long as punya is there one will have higher janma and for transcending janma one has to destroy punya. Gita 4.37 reads as *yadai dhamsi samiddho gnir bhasmasat kurute 'rjuna jnanagnih sarvakarmani bhasmasat kurute tatha* the meaning of the mantra is as the fire which is kindled turns its fuel to ashes O Arjuna even so does the fire of wisdom turn to ashes all the work. There we have to underline the word **sarva** the adjective sarva includes both punya or papam. Therefore punya nasa also

is included. Now we will see the yukti pramanam also. The very same argument when Jnanam arrives ajnanam is destroyed and once ajnanam deha abhimana goes away kartrutvam will go away and when kartrutvam goes away both papa and punyam will go for they are based one and the same kartrutvam. The same can be extended to dream example also and once he wakes up not only papas go away but also the punyam. Karana nase karya nasah applies to the punyam also. With this sutra 14 is over.

### **Topic 11 [15] Anarabdhadhikaranam**

Works which have not begun to yield results are alone destroyed by knowledge and not those which have already begun to bear fruits.

#### **Sutra 4.1.15 [492]**

#### ***Anarabdhakarya eva tu purve tadavadheh***

But only those former [works] whose effects have not yet begun [are destroyed by the knowledge; because the scripture states] that [i.e., the death of the body] to be the term

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is another adhikaranam with only one sutra. Here Vyasacharya deals with prarapta karma. Previously he talked about sanchita and agami punyam or papam and all the four are destroyed. Now what is left out is prarapta punyam or papam. What will happen to prarapta Punyam or papam is the question discussed here. This is also sanchitam only. it is also acquired in the past. it is only a subdivision of sanchitam. When I say prarapta, the word prarapta does not negate the status of sanchita for it is also acquired in the past. it is a special sanchita or prarapta sanchita.that part of sanchita karma which has already started fructification. The birth of the body is starting point. A particular bunch of sanchita has started fructification. Will prarapta be destroyed by Jnanam or not is the question here. Purva Paksi says prarapatam also will logically be destroyed by Jnanam. it is so because by Jnanam ajnanam is destroyed and once kartrutvam is gone all karmas must go for it is kartrutvam is the plank where all the karmas are placed. How can you hold on to prarapta when all punyam or papams are destroyed on gaining Jnanam. in siddhanta we say no. how do you say so. This we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 352

### **Topic 11 [15] Anarabdhadhikaranam**

Works which have not begun to yield results are alone destroyed by knowledge and not those which have already begun to bear fruits.

#### **Sutra 4.1.15 [492]**

#### ***Anarabdhakarya eva tu purve tadavadheh***

But only those former [works] whose effects have not yet begun [are destroyed by the knowledge; because the scripture states] that [i.e., the death of the body] to be the term

Discussion on the consequence of Brahma Jnanam is continued

The Jnana phalam is discussed in the fourth adhyaya. All the four adhyayas talk about Jnana phalam. Both nirguna and saguna phalams are discussed. The karma nivrutti in these sutras beginning from 13<sup>th</sup> sutra. We have seen karma nivrutti in tattva bodha. Sanchita is destroyed again is avoided and prarapta is exhausted. We used sanchitam generally including punyam or papam. Here punya is separately dealt with and papa is separately dealt with. In the 13<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya exclusively dealt with papam. He divided punyam and papa separately. In 14<sup>th</sup> sutra punyam was talked about. Both sanchita and agami papa will be destroyed. In 14<sup>th</sup> sutra punyam was dealt with discussed both sanchita and agami punyam. Now here we talk of prarapta papa punyams. That happens to be the 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. I was giving a general introduction to this adhikaranam. Prarapta is destroyed or not is the question here. Purva Pakshi says prarapta also must be destroyed on the same logic we used for sanchita. All sanchita earned through trillions of janmas are destroyed by gaining Jnanam. this was our argument in the previous sutra. Karana nase karya nasa was our argument. When the cause is gone the effect is gone. Ajnana and karma has got karya karana sambanda. Between ajnanam and karma there is karya karana sambanda. The whole series will fall as one gains Brahma Jnanam. there is no question of sanchitam. Purva Pakshi says should not you apply the same logic for prarapta also. Because that is also karma and karma phalam. We cannot say it is not born of ajnanam. Therefore we should logically say jnanena prarapta nasah.

Siddhanta says prarapta is an exception. Now we will go to the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says you should remember that for all karma discussion logic is not primary pramanam. One of the blunders the vedantic student does is application of logic in Vedanta. Appropriate application of logic may be there. for logic is not independent pramanam and it is always secondary. It needs some other pramanam for its support. It is invariably dependent pramanam. It is called upajivya pramanam. The two independent powerful pramanam are one is pratyaksam and the other is sastra pramanam. Pratyaksa gives data for logical pramanam. Without data logic will be speculative. Another pramanam is veda pramanam. It is upajivya pramanam independent source of knowledge. Logic should depend upon sastram. The next question is when do you use logic based on pratyaksa and when do you use logic based on sastra. Svatantra yukti does not exist. Here the topic happens to be punyam or papam karma which adhristam. When the subject is adhristam, we have to believe in sastram alone. We

don't throw away logic but we apply logic based on sastram. You cannot leave sastra and study Vedanta. Based on science Vedanta cannot be taught and based on pratyaksa Vedanta cannot be taught. You must accept sastra to learn sastra. Sastram says prarapta nasah na bhavati and it comes under exception. Then the question is where it is said. VI.14.2 of Chandogya upanisad says *tasya tavad eva ciram yavan na vimoksye atha sampatsya iti* I shall remain here only so long as I shall not be released from ignorance. Then I shall reach perfection. For him there is delay only as long as he is not delivered from the body and then he is one with Brahman which fixes the death of the body as the term of the statement of the attainment of final release. A jnani continues to be jivanm Muktah alive until the body falls and after the fall of the body, he gains vidheha Mukti. He continues to hold the physical body for some more time even after Jnanam and the continuity of the physical body is continuity of prarapta. Body is linked to prarapta. To is for everyone that means Jnanam does not destroy prarapta. The pramanam for prarapta exception we don't say yukit but we say praraptam. It is like giving supportive logic for the experience of sunrise. We experience sunrise even though sun does not rise at all. What we do is we don't negate sunrise but we explain the experience of sunrise. Sastram has said and therefore I give yukti based on sastram. The argument we give is Jnanam does not praraptam because Jnanam does not look upon prarapta as enemy. For the very rise of the knowledge, prarapta has helped. It has cooperated with individual through and through for the rise of knowledge. The basic condition for rising knowledge is I should be guman being. No one can attain Jnanam except the human being. The basic condition for Jnanam is manushya janma and this is possible only due to praraptam. Isvara is not responsible for manushya janma and it is only prarapta gives manushya janma. We don't deny the role of purushartha or freewill. But here we are focusing on the role of prarapta. Without prarapta support mere freewill cannot lead to knowledge. It is cooperative endeavour. He will be out of vedic culture. And therefore prarapta vasad manushya prapti; prarapta vasad Guru prapti; prarapta vasad sravana prapti; prarapta vasad jnana utpatti. Thus we see it is only due to prarapta one gains Guru, and Jnanam ultimately. Vidheha mukta does not have deha. He does not have buddhi and he does not any sthoola and sookshma sariram. Vidheha mukta is not locus of any knowledge or Jnanam. continuity of Jnanam both the birth and continuity is because of the support of prarapta. Jnanam wants to show its gratitude to prarapta oh prarapta because of you I am born because of you I survive but I will not do any harm to you and you continue as long as you are there. that is one reason. Prarapta and Jnanam are not enimical. This is reason one.

If Jnanam destroys praraptam also, the moment Jnanam rises prarapta will go and the body dependent on prarapta and body will fall and the person will die. He will be alive so long as ajnani and the moment he becomes a jnani he will die. Every jnani is dead one every living one will be ajnani. There will be no Guru. We want teaching from guru and he should be alive. All live people are ajnanis all gurus will be ajnani and they cannot teach Jnanam. the very Guru parampara will not sustain. Once a student comes to know the Jnanam will kill and he will not take to the study of Jnanam. coming to Vedanta class will be to coming to suicide. then only those people who want to die will come to the class. This is the next argument.

Jnanam does not destroy prarapta is proved by pratyaksa pramanam and anubhava pramanam of every jnani. Every jnani knows I have Jnanam. whether one is jnani or ajnani with regard to any subject matter, whether I know or not, I am the pramanam. I should know that I know. I only serve as pramanam. I am able to go to master that I know I do not know. Teacher should know his knowledge. Jnanam is Saksi pratyaksam. Every one knows he knows or or not. jnani knows I know. Whether he tells others or not. yet he knows he knows.



Kandavar vindilar vindavar kandilar. Those who have seen Brahman do not say I have seen. Those who say I know have not seen. But for this statement Omkarananda gave different meaning. Vindavar means dividing. Advaita jnani divide the world into two. Vindavar those who divide kandilar they have not know Brahman, knowers do not divide and dividers do not see. My Jnanam is known to me. Jnani knows that I am still alive. Jnani knows I am alive and jnani knows I have Jnanam. he experiences the coexistence of jnanam and praraptam. He experiences the existence of body and knows with the existence of body he knows the prarapta exists. Both coexists. Therefore jnanam does not destroy praraptam. Experience of every jnani is pramanam. Because of these reasons the conclusion prarapta continues and then what about the logic. Karana nase karya nasah. We say for that also we have an answer. Even when karanam is withdrawn karyam does not get destroyed immediately and it continues for sometime like a released arrow. This will continue even after the motive of the archer is withdrawn. He has shot the arrow and it moves forward. Later he comes to know it is a human being. He does not want to kill the child. The desire is gone and even after kama nasah the arrow will continue to travel because of the momentum. This is classical sastric dhrstanta. When you switch on fan it rotates. When we switch off, even after you switch off the fan will continue for sometime. So also the karma. Remove the root and even after removal tree will continue for sometime. The momentum will continue. That is called praraptam. It is not against logic also.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Purvetu only those past karmas; anarabdha karye different from praraptam [get destroyed]; tadavadheh means because the fall of the body is known to be the limit [for the vidheha Mukti to take place] the significance of words is anarabdhakarye praraptam means praraptam karye means punyam or papam phalam; prarapta phalam and anarabhdha other than prarapta that means only sanchita punyam or papam will get destroyed; na arabdham karyam phalam yayoh te and it is dvi vachanam because it refers to sanchita punyam or papam. Then purve is adjective to that to exclude agami; that means samchitam to exclude agami. Therefore anarabdha kale purve. Eva for emphasis. Tu for differentiating from the previous adhikaranam. It is unlike previous adhikaranam. Then supply the verb nasyatah. Samchita alone will get destroyed. Agami will get destroyed has already been discussed. Samchitam and praraptam are past. purve is dvi vachanam. The pramanam for that is sastram alone. Avadhi means limit; tad means sarira pata avadheh; because the fall of the body is presented as the upper limit for vidheh Mukti. From that we have to arrive at our topic. if the fall of the body is upper limit for vidheh Mukti the body continues and if body continues the prarapta continues and it means prarapta is not destroyed and therefore we know Jnanam does not destroy prarapta. The fact that two muktis are there jnani survives and therefore praraptam is not destroyed. How do you know fall of the body is upper limit for the fall of praraptam. This is found in 5.14.9 of Chandogya upanisad tasya tavad eva cirum. Until the body falls jnani continues as jivan mukta and a jnani. With this 15<sup>th</sup> sutra and 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 353

### **Topic 12 [sutras 16-17] Agnihotradyadhikaranam**

Permanent obligatory works enjoined by the vedas for different asramas are not to be given up.

**Sutra 4.I.16 [495]**

*Agnibotradi tu tutkaryayaiva taddarsanat*

But the agnihotra and the like [tend] towards the same effect knowledge [liberation], because that is seen from the scriptures.

We enter the next adhikaranam with two sutras. The topic in this adhikaranam is very interesting that the prarapta vilakshana sarva papa nivrutti was mentioned. Here also Vyasacharya talks of an exception. Prarapta vilakshana punyam or papam we said. And Vyasacharya divides prarapta vilakshana punyam into two varieties. Sanchitam and agami is non prarapta punyam or papam. Of them prarapta vilakshana punyam is divided into two. One type of punyam is called vihita karma punyam and the other is called kama karma punyam. Vihita karma refers to nithya naimityaka karma which are compulsory and the punyam is generated by that and it is called vihita karma. punyam the other one is kama karma punyam that is punyam generated by rituals done for either money or position or svargathi lokas for any benefits other than Moksa. We can call kama karma punyam is material punyam. Spiritual punyam creates the conditions for knowledge like siddha suddhi prapti, sravana pratipandhi nivrutti and even creating a mindset which has an interest for the study. Otherwise study will not be interesting. This is the job of spiritual punyam. Material punyam will give all material conditions for worldly enjoyments etc. then this itself can become an obstacle for the Vedanta. What I want you to note is that two punyams are there. suppose a jnani before attaining Jnanam and he has done more nithya naimityama karmas before gaining Jnanam and that will come under praraptam or prarapta vilakshanam. Karmas done in this janma will not come under praraptam. Karmas done in this janma is prarapta vilakshanam. This also are of two kinds. All karmas done in this janma by an ajnani will come under agami karma. And this ajnani accumulates agami and some are exhausted in this karma and unexhausted will at the time of death join the sanchita. In the case of jnani you cannot say that. There is special rule. Whatever karma done in this janma by jnani before getting Jnanam, they all will come under sanchitam only. jnani's sanchitam will include all the past karmas and also the karmas done before becoming jnani. Vyasacharya wants to discuss prarapta vilaksana vihita karma punyam and kama karam punyam of the jnani. This is the general introduction of the adhistanam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Prarapta vihita karma punyam is not destroyed by Jnanam. nithya naimityaka karma punyam of jnani or agnihotra punyam of jnani acquired before becoming a jnani and even in the past manushya janmas all the vihita karma punyams they are not destroyed by Jnanam because they have all been utilized for arrival and perpetuation of Jnanam. if I have to follow the nididyanam for rest of life conditions should be conducive. Therefore prarapta vilaksana vikita karma punyam indirectly contributes to

Moksa by providing the conditions. Adyatmika, adibouthika and adhideivika conditions for jnanam jnana योग्याता ज्ञाना निश्चिता and ज्ञाना प्राप्ति. That is provided by prarapta vilakshana vihita karmas. Then the question will come if prarapta vilakshana punya is not destroyed and is used for functioning what will become for karmas vilakshana punya. This will be discussed in the next sutra. What is pramanam for this? this is the question. We discuss thing in the field of adhrishtam. How does Vyasacharya know all things. He says I also have got it with the external apourusheya pramanam of vedas. Vihita karma punya is Moksa anukulam. It is conducive to Moksa and therefore mumukshu should not reject that punya. You accumulate the sandhyavandana punya which alone is going to help you to get Moksa. That helps you to come to the class and have Brahma Jnanam. indirectly Vyasacharya says mumukshu may give up all karmas and he should not give up nithya naimityaka karmas. Not that it will directly give Moksa but it will contribute indirectly. With regard to vihita karma don't talk of vihita karmas and this indirectly gives Moksa. The sruti pramanam is IV.4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. the mantra reads *tam etam vedanuvacanena brahmana vividisanti, yajnena, danena, tapasanasakena etam eva viditva munir bhavati etam eva pravrajino lokam icchantah pravrajanti etadd ha sma vai tat purva vidvamsah prajam na kamayante* the meaning of the mantra is brahmanah means vaidhika practise three fundamental sadhanas yajnena jnanena tapasa daily Isvara aradhanam, daily charity and tapas means various austerities like upavasa etc. these three words alone quotes in Gita. These karmas never gets destroyed because these contributes to Moksa. It gives nithya phalam but indirectly takes to Moksa and thus it gives nithya phalam. Therefore karmas are important and that is why even when one takes vividha sannyasa sastra prescribes another set of nithya naimityaka karmas. Vihita karma punya is necessary for contributing to Moksa. So sastra prescribes sannyasa karmas with danda he keeps. Therefore he has to get up early in the morning. He should do sannyasa nithya karmas. Maha vakya japa etc., he should do. Vivisanti means he acquires spiritual knowledge through nithya naimithyaka karma

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu means however; agnihotrati means vihita karmas [nithya naimithyaka karmas like agni hotra] tatkaryaya eva means are meant only for liberation which is the result of knowledge. Tad darsanat we conclude thus because that is found in the sruti. Now I give you the significance of the words. agnihotra is name of the ritual. Agnihotra or similar karmas. Agni hotrati all panca maha yajnas. Tu refers to the exception to the previous rule. The previous rule is prarapta vilaksana punyams are gone; here the exception is when we say prarapta vilakshana punya means karmas punya goes and not vihita karma punyams. Tad karyaya eva means Jnana phalam or result; jnana karyam is Moksa. For the sake of Moksa only. agnihotrati also for the sake of Moksa. If agni hotrati also for the sake of Moksa why he writes jnana karyadi eva,. This is to indirectly reveal that agni hotra is also meant for Moksa and jnana karyam is also Moksa means both agni hotram and Jnanam are working for the same Moksa phalam only. once you say that we get an idea that Jnanam and agni hotra have common goal and hence they are friendly. Adhi Sankaracharya raises the question that everywhere else karma is enimical and how can enimical karma become friendly to Jnanam only now. For that Adhi Sankaracharya says that is possible. In the asmas of sadhus even enimical animals live together. He quotes ayurveda example. Normally curd is not good for cold fever etc. but when jaggery is added the same thing is good. Thus aupadhika vasa because of the condition enimical can become friendly like snake poison becomes medicine in certain conditions. Then comes the last question then does that means you talk about jnana karma samucchayavada. You seem to support karma. Jnanam and karma work for Moksa. So you combine karma and Jnanam. if that is so why do you criticize combination of jnanam and karma. For that Adhi Sankaracharya answers he says you have not noted a minute difference. The difference is samucchaya is vihita. One is

simultaneous combination and another is serial combination. Samana kale combination at the same time jnana and karma cannot be given pradhanyam. Therefore we negate sama samucchayaha. Here we are glorifying and supporting krama samuscchayah first karma pradhana life and then jnana pradhana life. There is percentage difference karma pradhana first and jnana pradhana life next. This krama pradhana we glorify here. Sama samucchaya we criticize elsewhere. Tad darsanat means this idea is found in the vedas. Vihita karma punyam is Jnanam friendly is our finding. Not only it is jnana avirodah but jnana sahaya tattvam and it is found in the vedas. IV4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad says so. That is why when we say karma yoga primarily refers to vihita karma only. Adhi Sankaracharya keeps in mind vihita karma is jnana sadhakam and kama karma is jnana bathakam. Panca maha yajna pradhani and he is not kama karma pradhani. Even his employment for the sake of salary or running business not as kama karma and it should be vihita karma and he should say he earns money for panca maha yajna. He should not say he earns for enjoyment. That is why we have got an expression I have got two more years of service. We don't we will earn for two years. What we earn are meant for panca maha yajna. That is why in Gita wherever karma comes he will translate it as agni hotradi. The word agni hotra is upalaksanam for panca maha yajna. Kama karma also can be part of karma yoga when kama karma is done even though you want phalam of that, it will give material benefit and if you do it as Isvara aradhanam and when you receive the material benefit don't take it as Isvara prasada and the as a bye product siddha suddhi is created. Take the putra as Isvara's prasada. Siddha suddhi born out of kama karma is bye product. Only a drop of siddha suddhi will come. But panca maha yajna rahita siddha suddhi will produce within a few years and in this janma itself Moksa will become possible. These sutras are very important sutras.

## **Topic 12 [sutras 16-17] Agnihotradyadhikaranam**

Permanent obligatory works enjoined by the vedas for different asramas are not to be given up.

### **Sutra 4.I.17 [496]**

#### ***Ato'nyapi hi ekeshamubhayoh***

For [there is] also [a class of good works] other than this according to some [There is agreement] of both [teachers, Jaimini and Baadarayana] [as to the fate of those works]

Vihita punya karma is Jnanam friendly. It is not destroyed by Jnanam. on the other hand vihita punya karma is utilized for Moksa. You don't call it destruction. What is utilized never termed as destroyed. The question comes if punyam is not destroyed by Jnanam and how do you say sarva punya nasah before in sutra 14 ibid. it is contradiction./ for that Vyasacharya says because I say punyam in two different meaning. One is vihita punya karma and kama karma punyam, which gets destroyed on gaining Jnanam. therefore in this sutra he says there is another punyam other than agnihotradi punyam. Other than agnihotradi punyam other than vihita karma punyam there is another punyam kama karma punyam which has been done in this janma as also in the previous punya also. That punyam is also there and it is that punyam which is destroyed by Jnanam. that is mentioned in sutra no. 14. some of them are distributed to jnani's devotees who are interested in material welfare. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 354

### **Topic 12 [sutras 16-17] Agnihotradyadhikaranam**

Permanent obligatory works enjoined by the vedas for different asramas are not to be given up.

**Sutra 4.I.17 [496]**

*Ato'nyapi hi ekeshamubhayoh*

For [there is] also [a class of good works] other than this according to some [There is agreement] of both [teachers, Jaimini and Baadarayana] [as to the fate of those works]

Prarapta Vyasacharya calls it as arabdha karyam. Sanchita agami mixture he uses the name anarabdha karyam. I have slightly changed arabdha karyam I call it praraptam and anarabdha karyam I call it prarapta vilaksanam. Therefore note the terminology. He want to introduce a new concept. With regard to papam we have prarapta papam and prarapta vilakshana papam. In the case of jnani prarapta papam is not destroyed. Prarapta vilakshana papams are destroyed. No problem and no controversy. Now what about punyam. Here we enter into new concept. Prarapta punyam is not destroyed for jnani. What about prarapta vilakshana punyam of jnani? Can we apply the law of papam. Prarapta vilakshana papam is destroyed. What about prarapta vilakshana punyam should be destroyed in the normal course. But Vyasacharya introduces a new concept regarding prarapta vilakshana punyam. He says that prarapta vilakshana punyam is of two types which division is not there in the case of papam. But prarapta vilakshana punyam we are dealing with one bunch and we divide into two. One is prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punyam and another prarapta vilakshana kama karma punyam. Vihita kama means compulsory duties like panca maha yajna jnani must have done in this as also in the previous janma. Prarapta vilakshana kama karma punyam before becoming a mumukshu jnani also must have been a man of desire. During those days as a ajnani would have desired position and other things before coming to Vedanta and there would have many such unfructified kama karma punyam. This means totally punyam, is of three groups. One prarapta punyam prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punyam and prarapta vilakshana kama karma punyam. We have said prarapta punyam is not destroyed by Jnanam. What about the other two. Vyasacharya says prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punyam is not destroyed by Jnanam [sutra 16] and naturally we will be worried any undestroyed karma will give punar janma. Vyasacharya says prarapta vilaksana vihita karma punyam is absorbed by Jnanam the very rise of Jnanam has happened only because of prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punyam alone. Therefore it is utilized not destroyed. This is the essence of 16<sup>th</sup> sutra. In the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra Vyasacharya says prarapta vilaksana kama karma punya alone will be destroyed by Jnanam. This is one point given in the sutra.

The second point is that some of the prarapta vilakshana kama karma punya are destroyed in a different way. One destruction is direct destruction itself and there is another type it is distributed or transferred to those kamis who worship a jnani. Those who are interested in worldly benefits and they do worship him. And for them worship should give punya phalam and prarapta vilakshana kama karma punya is transferred to the devotee. This is done by

bhagavan. Adhi Sankaracharya says this has been already said in sutra 3.3.26 of Brahma Sutra. Putras of Jnanam will take away the worldly properties. Adhah means takers. Putrah dhayam ubhayanti shrutah sadhu hrityam those who worship the jnani in his project all the good karmas they do, and they will get prarapta kamyam karma punya will go. What about the people will harm and for them the papa karma will go. This is the second point given in the sutra. The devotees share some of the prarapta vilakshana kamyam karma punya.

Third part of the sutra is that it is accepted by Jaimini and Baadarayana., the necessity of elimination of prarapta vilakshana kamyam karma is acceptable to both Jaimini and Baadarayana and kamyam karma is un-conducive to Moksa.

This is the general analysis of the sutra. Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Api means there is prarapta vilakshana kamyam karma punya also. Anya means which is different athah from this punyam; [that is prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punyam] which has been utilized as mentioned in the previous sutra. Ekesham statement of certain branches of veda mentioned about the distribution of some of them. Udhayoh this is the conclusion of both Vyasacharya and Jaimini. This is said by the Vyasacharya. The significance of the words. Atah means prarapta vilakshana vihita karma punya mentioned in the previous sutra. And anya api means another punyam is there. That is prarapta vilakshana kamyam karma punyam is there. Then we have to understand that alone is destroyed in two fold manner. One is directly and another is through distribution. Ekesham refers to some of the vedic branches talk about their distribution for the worshippers. Ubhayoh this is acceptable to both Vyasacharya and Jaimini.

One point I have to add regarding the karmas of a jnani. Adhi Sankaracharya adds a note that the distribution of karma to others should not be taken literally. It is only an artha vadha vakyam. Artha vadha is glorification for some purpose. It means it is not a fact. In fact that also destroyed by Jnanam only and there is no actual distribution. Why Upanisad talks about that. The purpose is so that people worship jnani for getting his punyam. It is more to encourage the people to worship a jnani. Then does that mean that if I worship a jnani punyam will be distributed to me and does that means worship of jnani will be futile and for that bhagavan will give punyam for jnani worshippers. Getting punyam is fact and getting transferred from him is not a fact. Because that is given by bhagavan. Why cannot we take transference of punyam as a fact. Why do you transference is figurative. Why cannot you talk about transference. Adhi Sankaracharya says somebody's karma cannot be transferred to somebody. This occurs in Bashyam of 3.3.26. The transference of punyam is for glorification and it is not a fact. How can someone's punyam or papam be taken somebody else and it is not possible. Therefore punyam or papam transfer is arthavadha. But the punyam is given by bhagava. Again those who hurt jnani bhagavan will give papam to those who harm a jnani. With this, the adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 13 [18] Vidyajnanasadhanadhikaranam**

Sacrificial works not combined with knowledge or meditation also helps in the origination of knowledge.

**Sutra 4.4.18 [495]**

***Yadeva vidyayeti hi***

Because the text ‘whatever he does with knowledge’ intimates this

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is answering a possible doubt which can come based on 16<sup>th</sup> sutra. In 16<sup>th</sup> sutra it was said that prappta vilakshana vihita karma punyam is utilized for Jnanam. In this janma whatever vihita karma we do will help in our vedantic study. It will help us to gain Jnanam and also Moksa. Here we give an exception to vihita karma and it is knowledge friendly. This means nithya naimityaka karma. He uses the word agnihotra karma. It comes under deva yajna. It is knowledge friendly. What is controversy? Somebody wants to know whether the word vihita karma upasana sahita vihita karma or upasana rahita kevala karma. Is it combined with meditation or it is simple karma. Karma here is vihita karma. Which karma punyam does Jnanam absorb. Purva Paksi says that upasana sahita karma alone is knowledge friendly and not kevala karma. Kevala karma does not help a person. Siddhanta says kevala karma is also knowledge friendly. Why should Purva Paksi argue like that? Purva Paksi in our traditions are informed people. Speculative wild objections are not there in our tradition. Here he quotes a wellknown vakyam. That is Chandogya upanisad 1.1.10 the mantra reads as *yadeva vidyaya karoti sraddhayopanisada tad eva viryavattaram bhavati khalv etasyaivaksara syopavyakhyanam bhavati* the meaning of the mantra is knowledge and ignorance however are different. What, indeed one performs with knowledge faith and meditation that indeed becomes more powerful. This verily is the explanation of this syllable. Yadeva refers to vihita karma vidyaya means upasana saha with meditation; whatever vihita karma is done along with meditation tadeva that combination virya vastram bhavati that alone becomes more powerful and more efficacious. From this it is clear that ritual meditation combination is glorified by the vedas. Because the combination is glorified we should conclude that combination is recommended and therefore combination is conducive to knowledge. The single one kevala karma without combination cannot be jnana upayogi and therefore according to Purva Paksi 16<sup>th</sup> sutra must be interpreted properly and the word agni hotradi according to him is upasana sahita agni hotra. That alone will give phalam. This is the Purva Paksi.

Siddhanta is given in this sutra. That kevala karma is also conducive to knowledge. This is the siddhanta given. What is the pramanam for us? Vyasacharya says I have got two pramanam one is your own vakyam. Yadeva vidyaya karoti Vyasacharya says read that mantra properly. The statement says karma done with meditation is more efficacious. Ritual with meditation is more efficacious means ritual without meditation is less efficacious. Adhi Sankaracharya asks less efficacious also is efficacious. The problem is in gradation only and there is no controversy regarding the efficacy. There is only a gradation in efficacy. Both give punyam and therefore both are conducive to knowledge. This is pramanam one.

The second pramanam is again 4.4.22 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. *Tametam vedanuvacana sakena brahmana vividisanti yajnena danena tapasa* in this vakyam Upanisad clearly says all the sadhanas will help in Moksa. Since yajna is separately and independently enumerated you have to accept that kevala karma is also conducive to knowledge. This is the general analysis.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Iti hi based on the statement yadeva vidyaya means this is in inverted commas referring to 1.1.10 of Chandogya upanisad ‘the karmas or rituals which is done with meditation is more efficacious’ [we conclude that karma without meditation is also efficacious. Based on the statement karma with meditation more efficacious karma without meditation is also efficacious. Therefore agnihotradi in 16<sup>th</sup> sutra

both kevala and upasana sahita agni hotra as conducive to knowledge. The significance of the words is yad eva vidyaya 'Vyasacharya himself uses the word iti that indicates Chandogya upanisad vakyam; yad eva vidyaya is incomplete and he expects us to put full vakyam. Hi means based on because of supported by; I have taken the meaning based on Chandogya upanisad vakyam; we have come to this conclusion. The conclusion kevala karma also is efficacious upasana sahita karma is also efficacious; first one is more and second one is less effective. The indirect idea conveyed to the sadhaka is you can get siddha suddhi through your duties whether you do upasana or not. But mere duties also will give siddha suddhi. More in the next class.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 355

### **Topic 14 [19] Itaakshapanadhikaranam**

After enjoining the fruits of Prarapta karma the knower becomes onw with Brahman.

**Sutra 4.4.19 [496]**

#### ***Bhogenatvitare kshapayitva sampadyate***

But having exhausted by enjoyment the other two works [viz. Good and evil works that have begun to yield fruits], he becomes one with Brahman.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. This is the final adhikaranam of this pada. the subject matter of this adhikaranam is based on the question that may arise after reading the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra. 19<sup>th</sup> sutra has connection with 15<sup>th</sup> sutra. In 15<sup>th</sup> sutra it was said that Jnanam destroys only the prarapta vilakshana karmani. Once the sutra says jnana destroys nonprarapta karma it means Jnanam does not destroy praraptam. This is implied in the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra. Naturally the question comes if Jnanam does not destroy prarapta what will happen to prarapta. This question is important for karma is an obstacle to Moksa and as long as karmas are not destroyed Moksa is an obstruction to Jnanam. for that the answer comes in this sutra. The next two adhikaranams are called incidental prasangita adhikaranam not required for the flow of the subject. What is the right flow after 11<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam we have to read the 14<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. What happens to prarapta. The answer given here is that prarapta is exhausted only by experiencing the pleasures and the pains. There is no way out at all. Now what about prayachittas meant for prarapta. We should know whether we talk about jnani or ajnani. In the context of jnani we don't talk about pariharam or prayachittam of karma. In the case of jnani we talk about prarapta exhaustion and we don't talk of the topic of parihara. We should not mix it with the prarapta of ajnani. Some of the prarapta we can exhaust by doing parihara. In the case of ajnani we allow the person to do parihara and best thing to do is to gradually reduce prayachitta karma. The aim is gradual reduction. Once one comes to Vedanta he should reduce the parihara. He exhaust the karma. Here the discussion is of a jnani. Therefore Vyasacharya says prarapta is exhausted. This is one point considered in this adhikaranam. Once the prarapta is exhausted the obstacle of merging with Brahman is gone. Sanchita is burnt and agami is avoided and the last obstacles of prarapta is gone and he can merge with Brahman. Even though we talk about Jivatma merging with Paramatma after exhaustion of prarapta and that is from the point of vidheha Mukti and that happens only after prarapta exhaustion. Freedom from sariram is possible only after the prarapta is exhausted. Jivan Mukti requires prarapta. Jivatma Mukti does not require prarapta going for it coexist with prarapta. Prarapta means sukha dukha anubhava. Jivanmn Mukti means freedom and how can jivan Mukti and sukha dukha anubhava can coexist. Their question is how can one with disease can claim I am jivanm mukta it can coexist if one understand sukha dukha anubhava as mithya or vyavahara sathyam and oneself as paramarthika sathyam. When jivan mukta says with diseases in the body it is because of two tier philosophy vyavahara disease and paramarthika ananda. Once prarapta is exhausted brahma aikyam is attained. This is the general analysis of the sutra. First part talks of the exhaustion of prarapta and it is exhausted

by sukha dukha anubhava. How can jnani have dukha anubhava? It is because of his papam. Then we are shocked how can jnani can have papam. Remember when we say jnani has papam it is not performed after becoming jnani and that which he did before becoming jnani or in his purva janma. In saying that we need not have any difficulty we talk of purva kala papam of jnani when he was ajnani. Fructifying papams can give unimaginable problems. We don't expect this. all this happens because of prarapta. This is said by Vyasacharya. When it gives trouble the whole world is disturbed but jnani is not disturbed for he is able to see the hand of prarapta. He knows this will go away. He is not worried for sanchita is destroyed and agami is avoided. He does not mind experiencing the current prarapta.

When prarapta is exhausted and all three karmas are gone, the death of jnani is death of three sarirams. When ajnani dies only his sthoola sariram dies. When jnani dies three sarirams die. Because karma is the bond which keeps the sookshma karana sariram as a unit just iceberg remain an iceberg remains with low temperature and gets dissolved when the temperature rises. The bonding temperature is gone and the bond goes jivan mukta goes and he becomes vidheh mukta. This is the general analysis of the sutra

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. tu means however; kshapayitva itare means after exhausting the other karmas [prarapta punya or papa karmas] bhogena by going through experiences sampadyate means jnani merges into Brahman. The significance of the words is itare means the other; the other means other than [go to 15<sup>th</sup> sutra where prarapta vilaksana karma was mentioned] anarabdha karya vilakshana other than non prarapta karma that means prarapta karma; anarabdhe punya pape itaratah; both punya or papam kshapayitva means exhaustion; ksee means exhaustion; therefore exhausting; tu indicates however and however is used to differentiate prarapta from others. While others are destroyed prarapta is not destroyed. Bhogena by becoming a bhogta and bhogta means mithya. Tena by means of bhoga; sampadyate means at the end of exhaustion jnani merges. It is Brahma aikyam. Sampadyate is Upanisadic expression. Sampadye is used in Chandogya upanisad. then finally there is one more aside point.

When we say jivan mukta merges with Brahman. We should know it is not actual merger and it is like gatakasa merging with mahakasa when the pot is broken. There is no movement or change in the pot space and if at all there is change there is change in our vision. Previously we called it potspace and now we call it total space. Jivan mukta is enclosed Consciousness and videh mukta is unenclosed Consciousness and the difference is in observers mind and it is not there for the jnani. Consciousness with body or without body is attaining liberation. with this first pada is over.

### **Bird's eye view of the first pada.**

In the first pada there are 14 adhikaranam of them 8 topics belonged to previous chapters namely sadhana adhyaya. The first eight adhikaranam talked about dhyanam and nididyanam. nididyanam as also upasanam comes under sadhana. Adhi Sankaracharya does not say why it has been done like that. Subcommentators justify the mistake of adding the sadhana adhyaya in the fourth chapter. one of them give this argument. They say when we talk about phalam we will talk about the superiority of phalam that is Moksa and also the gradation of liberation the krama Mukti, sadhyo Mukti etc. whenever we read the gradation in Moksa that it is caused by the gradation in sadhana. The qualitative differences in phalam are dependent on qualitative difference in the sadhana. To indicate this sadhana is included in phala adhyaya. First eight topic go with sadhana topic. Next six topic 9<sup>th</sup> to 14 deal with

Mukti phalam belonging to jnanis. Upasakas also will get Mukti kramamukti rupena. To differentiate this we say jnani's jivan Mukti. It is also of two types. one is karma nivrutti and samsara nivrutti and merger with Brahman. Dukha nivrutti is emphasized in pradhama pada and sukha prapti is talked in fourth pada. This is how fourth adhyaya is. Second and third pada deal with upasaka. This is the topic of pradhama pada.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4, Pada: 2

Class 355 contd.

### **Topic 1 [1] Vaghadhikaranam**

At the time of death the functions of the organs are merged in the mind

**Sutra 4.2.1[497]**

#### ***Vangamanasi darsanacchabdacca***

Speech is merged in mind because it is so sen, and there are scriptural statement [to that effect]

This sutra says that speech merges in the mind at death

Now we will enter into second pada. The second pada has got 11 adhikaranam spread over 21 sutras. This second and third pada both of them deal with upasaka's krama mukti. Krama mukti as the word shows talks of liberation in gradual stages. Various stages are involved in krama mukti. First is jiva of upasaka leave the physical body. Departure is the first stage, which is unique to upasaka and it, does not happen in the case of jnani. In the case of jnani it is the case of merger. In the case of upasaka it is the departure. The coming out of the body the jiva consisting of sookshma, sthoola sariram. That is called utkranti. The second stage is called gathih. Shukla marga. That is the special path. One road is there for special people. If you give special upasaka payment it is shukla marga. Third stage is brahma loka praptih. Reaching the destination of brahma loka. Departure travel and reaching. Fourth stage is gaining nirguna brahman aikya jnanam. Aham brahma asmi. The upasaka has to gain knowledge. Because they have not gained jnanam in this life, so he has to gain the same in brahma loka. Fourth stage is jnana prapti. The fifth stage is at the time of pralayam all the devatas including brahmaji merge into brahman and at that time this upasaka also merges. Along with brahmaji they will merge with brahman. Thus there are several stages. Of these stages the second pada concentrates on utkranti pada of the upasakas. The third pada deals with shukla gathi pradhana pada. The various devatas how do they travel where all they will stop etc., will be highlighted there before one reaches brahma loka.

Now i will introduce the first adhikaranam. The first adhikaranam is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. It analyses a mantra occurring in vi.8.6 of chandogya upanisad. The mantra deals with utkranti. The mantra reads as *asya soumya purusasya prayato van manasi sampadyate manah prane, pranas tejasi tejah parasyam devatayam* the essence of the mantra is when ajnani dies what happens to him. Ajnani includes upasaka also. You should not take it upasaka as a jnani. Whenever we say upasaka is ajnani, he is jivatma paramatma aikya ajnani. All other lay people also ajnani. The mantra talks about all ajnanis in general which includes the upasaka also. All sookshma sariram gradually withdraw from respective golakams and as an example one organ is mentioned. The vak indriyam gets withdrawn into the mind. Only mentally speech is possible. So many things i want to say but mouth does not cooperate. Therefore upanisad says vak withdrawn into the mind. This indicates all sense organs withdraw into the mind. The mind withdraws into tejas tattvam. Different meanings are given for tejas tattvam. The temperature is there in the body. Thought is also gone and

only life is there. Tejas merges into isvara. For us what is relevant is vak manasi sambatyate. Therefore the adhikaranam is called vak adhikaranam. What do you mean by vak merger into manas. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 356

### **Topic 1 [1] Vaghadhikaranam**

At the time of death the functions of the organs are merged in the mind

**Sutra 4.2.1[497]**

#### ***Vangamanasi darsanacchabdacca***

Speech is merged in mind because it is so sen, and there are scriptural statement [to that effect]

This sutra says that speech merges in the mind at death

We are in the fourth chapter of brahma sutra after completing the first pada in the last class we have entered into the second pada. In the first pada sarva karma nivrutti and jivan mukti were talked about. Here the krama mukti of saguna upasakas will be discussed. It is happen in several stages. All the organs of sookshma sarira will merge into the jiva. Upasaka is an ajnani. This first stage of withdrawal of all organs is called utkranti getting ready for quitting the body. The second stage is upasaka jivatma traveling through shukla gathi and it is called gathih. Third stage is brahma loka prapti and reaching the brahma loka and the fourth stage is nirgunam brahman jnanam which the upasaka had not attained in manushya sariram. The fifth and final stage at the time of pralaya when brahmaji attains vidheha mukti all the jnanis will gain vidheh mukti. These are the stages. The second pada of the brahma sutra of fourth chapter will focus on utkranti and gathi specially the utkranti of saguna upasaka. This is utkranti pradhana pada. This begins with an analysis of chandogya upanisad vakyam which clearly talks about utkranti. It is continued the latter adhikaranam also. The first few adhikaranams are analysis of chandogya upanisad dealing with utkranti part.

First i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam a small adhikaranam with two sutra. It talks about what happens to the vak of dying person. For analysis the chandogya upanisad vakyam is taken mantra 6.8.6 [given above] talks about the laya of parts or limbs of the dying person. The resolution of various constituents of the individual is discussed here. This resolution is talked about in four stages in the mantra. Hey soumya asya pratayah purusasya pratayah means dying. Priti means departing for good. The context is a dying ajnani for him organ resolution takes place is discussed here. Mind resolves into prana; prana resolves in tejasi and fourth stage tejasa parasyam devatanam. These are the four layams or resolution. Vak resolves in mind and mind resolves into prana and prana resolves into tejas and tejas resolves into para devata. We analyse the first stage in this adhikaranam. Vak resolving into the mind is discussed here. Why should this topic come in this brahma sutra. There must be some controversy otherwise it would not have occurred here. Here the controversy is what is the meaning of the vak. The word vak can have two meaning and one is vak indriyam the name of the organ of speech and second meaning of the word vak is function vrutti of the indriyam. One refers to substance itself and the second one refers to the

function itself. The fan is not there in last row means one is fan is not there and the second is fan is not functioning. One is dravya abhava and the other is dravya kriya abhava. When upanisad says vak resolves into the mind does it mean indriyam resolves or the only the functions stops. Speaking actions stops which one is meant by the upanisad is the controversy. Purva pakshi says that vak indriya laya is mentioned in this upanisad vakyam. the siddhanti will say sense organs do not resolve into the mind. The function resolve into the mind. This is the subject matter of this adhikaranam.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says vak indriya pravrutti the function of vak indriyam resolves into the mind. For arriving at this conclusion we have two reasons. Darsanat sabdadica darsanat means we see that happening in a dying person. When a person dies towards the time of death the mind function continues thoughts continue the speech gradually withdrawn. This is indicated by the tears rolling. Speech gradually becomes weaker and withdrawn. We cannot say it is vak indriyam for we don't perceive the indriyam resolving into the mind. Indriyam belongs to sookshma sariram and we cannot see where does it resolve. Speech resolve we have anubhava pramanam. This is reason one.

The second reason is sabdadi ca we have sruti pramanam and it says vak resolves into the mind and the word vak has got two meaning one is indriyam and another is indriya vrutti. The word vak has both meaning. If we take indriya vrutte layah we have sruti pramanam. Then purva pakshi says you are very smart. You say the second meaning is indriya vrutti for which sruti pramanam is there. Then purva pakshi can argue if i claim indriyam resolves into the mind and i have sruti pramanam. When the word vak has got both meaning one meaning supports the purva pakshi and another supports the siddhanti. When the sruti equally supports both how can siddhanti claims it supports them. One is called karana vitpatti and the second is bhava vitpatti. Bahva vitpatti means speech function. Adhi sankaracharya says even though both meanings are grammatically right our interpretation is correct. In this context the function alone should be taken into account. The rule is when different meanings are possible we have to choose that meaning which has the support of reasoning. Adhi sankaracharya says indriyam vak cannot resolve into the mind. It is logically untenable. According to reasoning and experience any thing will resolve into the material cause alone. Karyam karane liyate. If ornaments are melted it will dissolve into gold and not wood. If tree resolve it will go to mud only. If this fundamental law is remembered the indriyam cannot resolve into the mind. Mind is not material cause of the indriyam. That is why during pralayam also we say the pancha bootha will dissolve into fire etc., in the same order. Karya karana sambanda is there. Laya takes place in the reverse order. Indriyam does not dissolve remains in the ajnani. Indriya vrutti dissolve in the mind. If you apply the logic you will have the problem. You argue that indriyam does not dissolve into the mind for the mind is not material cause of indriyam. Indriya vrutti dissolve into the mind and they don't have karya karana sambanda. Indriyam alone is upadana karanam. Indriya vrutti cannot resolve into the mind because of the same logic. Just as you say indriyam cannot resolve into mind as it is not upadana karanam indriya vrutti also cannot resolve into the mind for the same reason. For that adhi sankaracharya argues that indriyam cannot dissolve into mind but indriya vrutti can dissolve into the mind. Substance can dissolve into the material cause and it cannot dissolve into the nonmaterial cause. With regard to the function that rule is not there. Function of a substance need not dissolve into the material cause. Pour water on fire. You don't experience the heat. The heat is gone. Now adhi sankaracharya asks the question do you say fire dissolve in the water or the heat dissolve into the water. Fire cannot dissolve into the water. Fire is not a product of water and on the other hand water is product of water. Still the heat is removed because the water has absorbed the burning pravrutti has dissolved into the water. The law we



learn from this adhikaranam is that a thing can dissolve only into the material cause and the function of the thing can dissolve elsewhere also. E.g fire cannot resolve into the water but burning function of fire can dissolve in water. Vak indriya pravritti can dissolve into the mind.

Our controversy is chandogya upanisad vakyam. It says vak dissolve into the mind. Our confusion is vak indriyam or vak vrutti. Vyasacharya writes the sutra to remove the confusion. Sutra is not clear. Question is how do you vyasacharya means vak indriaya vrutti or vak indriyam. He has used the same confusing word. Purva paksi asks adhi sankaracharya how do you know vyasacharya supports your meaning. Adhi sankaracharya says vyasacharya means only what i say. Adhi sankaracharya says vyasacharya meant vrutti and not indriyam. Later another sutra comes 4.2.16 abhivago vacanat. Here we discuss jnani's death. There vyasacharya and adhi sankaracharya make it very clear there the dissolution is indriyam. Therefore in this sutra for the upasaka it should be indriya vrutti only. If for both the same type of laya for jnani and ajnani that the word vak in this sutra vak vrutti only. This is the general analysis

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Vak means at the time of death the function of speech manasi resolves into the mind; darsanat means this is known by observation ca sabdat and scriptural statement. The significance of the words is vak and we have to take bhava vitpatti means we are not referring to organ but the function; the next word is manasi means in the mind or into the mind resolves into the mind darsanat this is experienced in others the mind function continues for long time even after the withdrawal of sensory functions. The mind feelings at the time of death cannot be shared. 4.4.2 of brihadaranyaka upanisad also talks of this. Sabdat means sruti pramanam. Sruti pramanam we mean that the word vak has got the meaning of function only. Really speaking purva paksi does not have logical support. Therefore vak even though it has both meaning our conclusion is it does not support the logical basis is not there. Ca means and it is joining the two supports.

## **Topic 1 [1] Vaghadhikaranam**

At the ime of death the functions of the organs are merged in the mind

### **Sutra 4.2.2[498]**

#### ***Ata eva cha sarvanyanu***

And for the same reason all [sense organs] follow [mind i.e., get their [functions merged in it].

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. The doubt is upanisad says vak manasi sambatyate. The question is upanisad is referring to one indriyam. Vak is one of the karmendriyam and five jnanendriyam. What about their indriya vrittis whether they also resolve or not. All the other sensory functions also resolve into the mind. The proof for that is atah eva and i don't want to give you separate proof. Two proof i have given in the previous sutra may be taken here also. As speech goes all other functions also goes away. Even as we grow old other organs become weaker and weaker. Our experience prove that. Sruti pramanams also are there. Chandogya upanisad vakyam does not support you because it talks of vak indriyam. Chandogya upanisad cannot be your vakyam purva paksi says. Adhi

sankaracharya says another sruti support is given 3.9 of prasna upanisad is quoted here. This says *tasmad upasantatejah punar bhavam indriyair manasi sampadyamanaih* fire verily is the upbreath. The meaning of the mantra is therefore he whose fire of life has ceased goes to rebirth with his senses sunk in mind. When jivatma goes to the next body the jivatma goes with the sense organs which have dissolved into the mind. From that we come to know that all the ten sense organs get resolved into the mind at the time of death. Sense organs means indriya vrutti dissolves into the mind.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Ata eva means due to the same reasons only sarvani ca the functions of all other organs also anu means resolve into the mind. The significance of the words is atah eva means because of the same reasons only; the reasons given in the previous sutra vak vrutti layah; darsanat sabdat ca only we have to make a note that there is nothing special and it is experience; when you say sabdat means chandogya upanisad sabdat. Here sabdat means prasopanisad pramanam. Ca means conjunction to include all organs. Anu means liyante to merge. With this the first adhikaranam is over. The essence of adhikaranam is in the case of dying ajnani the functions of all sense organs dissolve into the mind even after sense organs stops functioning the mind continues emotions come and feelings come and thereafter mind merges into the tejas and tejas into the devata. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 357

### **Topic 1 [1] Vaghadhikaranam**

At the time of death the functions of the organs are merged in the mind

**Sutra 4.2.2[498]**

*Ata eva cha sarvanyanu*

And for the same reason all [sense organs] follow [mind i.e., get their [functions merged in it].

We have entered into the second pada of the fourth chapter. It has four padas and all deal with phalam and hence it is called phala adhyaya. First pada and fourth pada deals with nirguna vidya phalam whereas second and third pada deal with krama mukti phalam of saguna upasana phala rupa krama mukti. If the second and third pada deal with krama mukti then what is the difference between the two. In the second pada vyasacharya concentrates upon the topic of departure of jiva how the saguna upasaka leaves the body for attaining krama mukti. In the case of nirguna jnani jiva does not leave the body and the body dissolves here itself but in the case of saguna upasaka jiva leaves the body. It is called utkranti. Second pada deals with saguna upasakas departure. The third pada deals with the same but it deals with as to how the saguna upasaka travels after death. The route it takes is specially discussed. What are the devatas are there which all devatas assists and which takes from which point to which point etc., are discussed. It is called gathi. Regarding the departure there is an important mantra occurring in chandogya upanisad and therefore in first three adhikaranam vyasacharya analyses that particular mantra 6.8.6. The mantra reads as *asya soumya purusasya prayato van manasi sampadyate manah prane, pranas tejasi tejah parasyam devatayam* the essence of the mantra is when ajnani dies what happens to him. Ajnani includes upasaka also. Upasaka is not a jnani but he is an ajnani. He chooses to analyse in adhikaranam 1 to 3. Prayata mans leaving. Predham means because one who has left. All sense organs of the dying persons gradually withdraw and merge into the mind. Vak literally means organs of speech but it represents here all the ten organs here. Mind resolves into prana and prana resolves into tejas. Tejas resolves into para devata meaning paramatma isvara. Thus there are four stages before merging into paramatma. We have completed first adhikaranam. In that adhikaranam vyasacharya raised the question what do you mean by sense organs resolving into the mind. Is it the sense organs themselves resolve or only the functions resolve into the mind. Indriya laya or indriya vritti laya is the question. Instrument does not and its function is absolved. Vyasacharya establishes it is not sense organs dissolve but the function dissolve. He gave the logic. Anything an resolve only into the material cause. Pots can dissolve into clay only and not into the gold. The law is karya dravyam karana dravye pradiyate. Applying this principle, we analysed and the mind is not the material cause of the sense organs. On the other hand panca bhutas are the material cause. So the functions alone dissolved into the mind. Later vyasacharya extended this principle to other organs also quoting a prasonpanisad mantra as the support. With this adhikaranam is over. The first part of ukranti is over. Now vyasacharya enters into the next stage of ukranti of saguna upasaka.

## Topic 2 [3] Mano'dhikaranam

The function of mind is merged into prana

### Sutra 4.2.3 [499]

#### *Tanmanah prana uttarat*

That mind [is merged] in prana [as is seen] from the subsequent clause [of the sruti cited]

It has been shown that the passage 'speech is merged in mind' means a merging of the function only. A doubt here arises whether the subsequent clause 'mind is breath' also means to intimate a merging of the function only or that to which the function belongs.

Now i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter of this adhikaranam we have seen that all sensory functions resolve into the mind. It is sastrically true and experienced by the people who observe the process of death. As even one dies all sensory functions dissolves into the mind, expression is not possible but the mind functions. Tears are seen on the eyes. It shows violent thoughts are happening. The body language also indicate that vak is withdrawn and mind is functional. It is pratyaksa pramana siddham. Now vyaacharya asks the question what happens to the mind. Vyaacharya says mind \dissolves into the prana, the mukhya prana. Therefore vyaacharya says the second stage of departure is mind dissolving into prana and thoughts also gradually recede. The capacity to thinking and emotion also is withdrawn. The same chandogya upanisad mantra is pramanam. In the previous adhikaranam we saw the sensory organs dissolving and now we see the mind dissolving into the mind. Here also the same doubt is raised whether the mind dissolves or the mental function dissolves. The upanisad is not clear. Here also vyaacharya says by the same logic you should conclude the mind does not dissolve into the prana and it is function of the mind that dissolves into the mind. Vachyartha should not be taken for it is illogical. Mind is not a product of prana. Both do not have the karana karya sambanda. The word manah should through implication mind should reveal the mental function alone. Function can dissolve into prana and for this karana karya sambanda is not required. The heat of the fire resolves into water eventhough karana karya sambanda is not there. This is the essence of the adhikaranam.

Adhi sankaracharya discusses an additional point which we will see after discussing the meaning of the sutra. Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tad manah that mental function resolves; prane in prana; uttarat this is known from the subsequent portion [of the chandogya upanisad mantra 6.8.6]. The significance of the word is that mind [in the previous adhikaranam mind has been presented as locus of sensory functions resolving into that] here mind means we should take the mental function and not the mind as such. Then we have to supply the verb resolve. The dying person loses the capacity to identify the persons who come or gathered there. Chandogya upanisad says as long as mental function is not resolved he recognizes but when mind is resolved he is unable even to recognize the people. This indicates mind resolves into the prana. The next word is prana. They resolve into the prana. Uttarat means here the subsequent portion of the chandogya upanisad mantra 6.8.6 the mantra which we have used in the previous adhikaranam. Why do we quote sruti pramanam. What happens to the dying person cannot be known through the pratyaksha pramanam. The mind itself is apratyaksham. How can i know the dying person's mind resolves or not and where does it resolves also is apratyaksam.

Now i will go to the additional point discussed by adhi sankaracharya . He raises a purva paksi. He says that in the previous adhikaranam i am able to accept that vak does not dissolve into the mind but the vak vrutti dissolves there being no karana karya sambanda. But in the case of manah prane i have an argument to advance. He says mind and prana do have karana karya sambanda unlike vak and mind. Therefore the mind can dissolve into prana. Vachyartha can be applied and you need not take lakshyartha. Purva paksi shows that both has karana karya sambanda. He quotes 6.5.4 of chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *annamayam hi, soumya manah, apomayah prana*, it means mind is a product of the earth element; prithvi karyam manah; then the same mantra says apo mayah prana that is prana is jala karyam. Since mana is anna karyam [prithvi karyam] mind's essential nature must be prithvi because prithvi karyatvat; just as ornament is golden because it is made of gold; similarly prana is jalatmakam being product of jalam. It is sruti vakyam. Therefore manah prithvi rupam and pranah jala rupam jala karyatvat and once you accept manah is prithvi rupam and prana jala rupam, manah is product of jala rupa pranah. Both have got karana karya sambanda. The reason is you remember taittriya vakyam from jalam alone prithvi is born and in place of jalam you place prana and in the place of prithvi you place mind. Thus there is karana karya sambanda between the two. Why cannot karya manah directly dissolve into prana jalah. Adhi sankaracharya says i cannot accept because karana karya sambanda is of two types. One is direct karana karya sambanda and the other is indirect karana karya sambanda. Direct karana karya sambanda means directly something is born out of the other like jalam and prithvi. But when we discuss manah and pranah they do not have direct karana karya sambanda because prana does not directly produce the mind and therefore you have to establish their karana karya sambanda indirectly. Adhi sankaracharya calls pranatikam which means indirectly established. Between the two you cannot directly prove the karana karya sambanda. Jalam and prithvi has karana karya sambanda and therefore manah and prana has got karana karya sambanda. Therefore you have to know the difference between direct and indirect karana karya sambanda. Between prithvi and jalam there is direct karana karya sambanda and between mind and prana there is indirect karana karya sambanda. There is second law we have to notice only the first case only when the karana karya sambanda is direct karya can resolve into karanam. A karyam cannot dissolve into karanam if the karana karya sambanda is pranatikam [indirect]. Sub commentators gives an example. He gives the example of the snow in himalayas. It is jala karyam. Pot is prithvi karyam. Prithvi and jalam there is karana karya sambanda. Extending that principle you can say pot and snow have got karana karya sambanda. But what type of karana karya sambanda but it is indirect karana karya sambanda between pot and snow and therefore pot cannot resolve into the snow. They do not have that possibility. In the same way pranah and manah cannot resolve into prana. This is an additional argument given by adhi sankaracharya .

### **Topic 3 [4-6] Adhyakshadhikaranam**

The function of prana is merged in the jiva

**Sutra 4.2.4.[500]**

***So'dhyakshe tadupagamadibhyah***

That [prana] is merged in the ruler [individual soul or jiva] on account fo the [statements as to the pranas] coming to it and so on.

Now i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This adhikaranam has three sutras. The subject matter of the adhikaranam is what happens to the prana of a dying person. We have seen the sense organs and also the mind. Functionally sense organs dissolves into mind and the mind function into prana. With regard to prana there is a problem because two different vedic mantras give two different versions. First chandogya upanisad the current one which we analyse 6.8.6 according to that pranah tejasi. Prana dissolves into tejas which means agni tattvam which is one of the five elements. According to brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra prana dissolves into jiva or chidabasaah. First statement occurs in 4.3.38 which reads as *evam evaimam atmanam antakale sarve prana abhisamayanti, yatraitad urdhvocchvasi bhavati* even so do all the breaths [or senses] gather round the self at the end when one is breathing with difficulty [when he is about to die]. According to this mantra prana goes to jivatma. This adhi sankaracharya and vyasacharya refer to as upagamah. Prana approaches jiva. From various parts of the body panca pranas are supposed to withdraw from the body and joins the jivatma who is supposed to be located in the heart. Like the children wanting to join parents join the heart before departure of the soul. 4.4.2 of brihadaranyaka upanisad reads as *pranam anutkramantam sarve prana anutkramanti sa vijnano bhavati* it says the prana departs the body alongwith jivatma. This is called prana anutkramanam. Anutkramanam means accompaniment. The third statement is *ta vijnano bhavati*. Here it is said that jivatma knows its future at the time of departure. This called sa vijnanatvam. What is the significance of sa vijnanam. If jivatma is aware of its future, it is implied that mind should be there with jivatma. Without the mind jivatma cannot know the future. If mind is to be there prana has to there. For the mind has joined the prana at the time of death and if mind has to be there with jivatma prana also has to be there with jivatma. Sa vijnana reveals mind alongwith prana is with jivatma at the time of departure. All these three ideas reveal prana is with jivatma. But chandogya upanisad says prana is agni tattvam. Now the controversy is whether we should go by chandogya upanisad or brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam or whether prana go to agni tattvam or goes to jivatma tattvam. Vyasacharya will say both statements are true and in fact prana goes to jivatma which is with agni tattvam. Or it goes to agni tattva sahita jivatma. This will be the conclusion of the adhikaranam and vyasacharya establishes it in three sutras. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 358

### **Topic 3 [4-6] Adhyakshadhikaranam**

The function of prana is merged in the jiva

**Sutra 4.2.4.[500]**

#### ***So'dhyakshe tadupagamadibhyah***

That [prana] is merged in the ruler [individual soul or jiva] on account fo the [statements as to the pranas] coming to it and so on.

I was giving you the general introduction to fourth adhikaranam of second pada of oruth chapter. This adhikaranam consists of four sutras. Here the discussion is what happens to the prana of the dying person. There is a confusion regarding this because there are seemingly contradictory statements in the srutis. One says prana merges in to the atma tattvam while the other says the prana merges into the jiva tattvam. Chandogya upanisad says tejas tattvam and brihadaranyaka upanisad says atma tattvam and the question is which one is correct. Vyasacharya establishes that both statements are valid. Since some technical aspects are there i will give the overall picture.

Vyasacharya points out that brihadaranyaka upanisad should be taken as the main statements and the jiva travels along with prana. The aside point we have to remember is that the discussion centers round ajnanis ajnani karmis and ajnani upasakas. This is the primary thing. Here we have to remember the teaching given in panchagni vidya. This is elaborately studied before in 3.1 of brahma sutra. There also we saw what happens to jivatma at the time of death. At the time of death the agni devata witnesses the creation and agni devata takes the present body and gives the next physical body also. Next physical body is received at the time of cremation itself. It was said in panchagni vidya that it is not received in fullfledged form but in subtle version of gross elements. Subtle elements is the raw material for the next body and these are called subtle sthoola panca bhootani. These gross elements which would evolve in the next physical body and it is with jiva only. Stoola bhoota amass surround the body. Prana surround the jiva and jiva is surrounded by sthoola bhoota amsa. Prana sahita jiva is associated with sthoola panca bhootani. Since prana joins the jiva and jiva joins pancha boothani we can says prana joins pancha bhootani. Prana joins jiva and jiva joins pancha bhoota. There is nothing wrong in saying prana joins pancha bootas. Brihadaranyaka upanisad talks about prana joining jiva and chandogya upanisad talks that prana joins agni tattvam. Pancha bhoota is rudimentary body which will evolve into body under a process. Of this we are now in the first sutra of the adhikaranam. Prana joining the jiva is the subject here based on brihadaranyaka upanisad support. Vyasacharya justifies prana joining jiva.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here vyasacharya says prana joins jiva. Jiva is referred to as adhyaksah the head of the unit consisting of mind prana karma etc. In support of this prana joining jiva three statements of brihadaranyaka upanisad are taken. The first one talks about prana going to jiva. Jiva upagamana vakyam. 4.3.38 of brihadaranyaka upanisad. It talks about the prana accompanying the jiva. It is called anugamanam.

Upagamanam going near and anugamanam means going with it. The third vakyam is prana's coexistence with jiva, which is called avasthanam. Avasthanam is indicated in brihadaranyaka upanisad says jivatma is aware of its future. It is aware of the next bundle of prarapta. Jivatma senses the next birth. Adhi sankaracharya argues if jivatma should be aware of the future at the time of departure only if mind is with jivatma. If the mind should be there with jivatma prana also should also be there for prana is the container of the mind. Therefore mind and prana together alongwith jivatma we come to know from savijnana vakyam. All the three vakyams reveal that prana goes to jiva. This is the general analysis of sutra 4.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Sah that prana joins adhyakshe this jiva tadupagamadibhyah means this is known from the sruti statement which reveals the union of prana with the jiva and other similar statements. The significance of the words is sah refers to prana; here prana is loaded with sense organs and prana with mind and so sah refers to loaded prana at the time of death. In another brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra an example of bullock cart was given for shifting the residence of jiva to next birth or new body. Tadupagamadibhyah means tad refers to jiva; upagama means joining; prana joining jiva is tadupagama; adhi means etc., this is known from prana joining jiva etc. The vakyam kept in mind is brihadaranyaka upanisad 4.3.38. Adhi means etc. This refers to anugamanam and avasthanam. These two are revealed through 4.4.2 of brihadaranyaka upanisad. Therefore prana joins jiva at the time of death.

### **Topic 3 [4-6] Adhyakshadhikaranam**

The function of prana is merged in the jiva

#### **Sutra 4.2.5.[501]**

#### ***Buteshu tacchrutch***

In the [subtle] elements [is merged] [the jiva with the pranas] as it is seen from the sruti

Vyasacharya talks about the second phenomenon that takes place at the time of death. While prana is joining jiva, jiva is planning to take to new birth or new body. It prepares for the raw material for the next physical body. In the world, there is vast amount of raw material is available. Out of the total sthoola bhutas a small portion from the samasti is stuck to jivatma and from the raw material it has to evolve the next physical body. These pancha boothas only takes the form of new body as stated in the panchagni vidya. Therefore this sutra talks about jiva joining the pancha bhutas. Pancha sthoola boothas or it is pancha sthoola bootha amass which is raw material for the next physical body. When the jiva joins with the pancha boothas something else is also there. Prana has joined and jiva alone with prana joins the pancha boothas and it is this phenomenon that is talked about in the chandogya upanisad. We can also say prana joining pancha bootha or jiva joining pancha bootha. Therefore chandogya upanisad says pranah pancha bootha amse sambadhyate. But chandogya upanisad does not say prana joins the pancha bootha. It takes the agni tattvam part. The word agni is upalakshanam for pancha boothas. We should interpret prana joining agni tattvam is equal to prana joining pancha bootha tattvam.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Buteshu means the jiva with prana joins the five gross elements; tad sruteh this is known from the sruti statement which reveals that. I



will give you the significance of the words. Buteshu refers to pancha sthoola bhoota amsa the minute portions of five gross elements which is the raw material for the next physical body which takes place in the form gradual evolution which is discussed in panchagni vidya and discussed in 3.1.1 of brahma sutra. Tad shrurte all these are indicated by the sruti statements tad bodhaga srute the sruti statement conveys this idea. Chandogya upanisad 6.8.6 pranah tejasi is the portion of the mantra. Tesaji sthoola pancha bootha amse.

#### **Topic 4 [4-6] Adhyakshadhikaranam**

The function of prana is merged in the jiva

#### **Sutra 4.2.6.[502]**

#### ***Naitasmin darsayato hi***

[the soul with prana is merged] not in one element only for both [sruti and smriti declare this [or declare so]

In this sutra vyasacharya answers a possible question. Chandogya upanisad says that pranasahita jiva or jiva sahita prana joins agni tattvam. Purva paksi says upanisad mentions only agni tattvam and why do you interpret as panchaboothani. You take laksyarth and not vachyarth. We know that between vachyarth and lakshyarth, vachyarth is stronger we all know. How do you give up vachyarth and take lakshyarth. When one element is mentioned why do you take five elements. Vyasacharya gives sruti vakyam elsewhere. It says jiva joins not one elements but five elements it is said. There is a verb darsayata. There are two factors are pramanams revealing the truth. The subject should be two. Vyasacharya says what are the two. Adhi sankaracharya says two refers to question and answers occurring in panchagni vidya [chandogya upanisad] which 5.3 of the upanisad. In that vidya portion there is dialogue between svetagetu and pravaha jaivili what travels along with jiva is the discussion and there also there is reference of one element and through that discussion also we concluded that five elements go with the jiva. This was further discussed in brahma sutra 3.1. Already the issue has been settled. Another interpretation is instead of question and answer, we take it as sruti and smriti pramana we know five elements travel and not one element. What are they. Sruti pramanam is 4.4.5 of brihadaranyaka upanisad; this says prithvi mayah apo mayah etc. It is clearly said that jiva is surrounded by five gross elements travel after death. Second one smriti pramanam. There is manu smriti pramanam. 1.27 of manusmriti. Here it is said that pancha boothas are there along with jiva at the time of creation. Adhi sankaracharya gives the logic also. We know from our experience that our physical body is made up of five elements. Body is made up of refined clay only. We have jala tattvam, agni tattvam and vayu tattvam and akasa tattvam inside the stomach. Since we clearly say that karyam is pancha bootha and therefore karanam also there should be pancha bootha.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Na jiva is not ekasmin associated with one element hi means because darsayata sruti and smriti says so. Reveal otherwise. The significance of the words is na ekasmin means it is not associated with one element; on the other hand it is associated with five elements; darsayatah because sruti and smriti teach otherwise. Tejasi should be taken as upalakshanam for five elements. Chandogya upanisad vakyam refers to one element tejas; brihadaranyaka upanisad refers to five elements; when sruti support is there for both when both are equally powerful how can you take five elements then you have to apply the rule whichever has got logical support. Five element vakyam is

powerful due to logical support. Our body is made up of five elements we know and therefore the raw material is a mixture of five elements only. Now we focus on specific ajnani for we concentrate on krama mukti.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 359

### **Topic 4 Asrityapakramadhikaranam**

The mode of departure from the body up to the way is common to both the knower of the sagunam brahman and an ordinary man.

**Sutra 4.2.7 [503]**

#### ***Samana chasrityapakramadamritatvam chunuposhya***

And common [is the mode of departure at the time of death for both the knower of the sagunam brahman and the ignorant up to the beginning for their easy, and the immortality [of the knower of the sagunam brahman is only relative] without having burnt [ignorance]

There is no departure for the knower of nirgunam brahman. His pranas are absorbed in brahman.

Here one aside topic is analysed. Now i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. Here the subject is whether the upasaka has got gathi travel or not. We know upasaka also travels after death. The reason for analysis the sruti uses certain words which can create confusion. One word is vidvan which is used in the name of saguna upasaka and nirguna jnani.again the sruti uses the word vidya in two meaning. One is saguna upasanam and second is nirguna jnanam. Thirdly the upanisad uses the word amritatvam in two meaning. First is absolute immortality and second meaning is relative immortality which is in the form of brahma loka prapti. In brahma loka one can live for very very long time. The life in brahma loka prapti is called relative immortality. Absolute immortality is called adhyantika amritativam. Brahma loka immortality is abekshika immortality. Suppose i make a sentence vidvan vidyaya amritatvam prapnoti. Vidvan through vidya attains immortality. The sentence will have two meaning. One is saguna upasaka through sagan paramatma attains immortality. Nirguna jnani through nirguna jnanam attains immortality. Because two meanings are there we should know whether there is departure from the body is for both of them [sagan upasaka and nirguna jnani]the departure and travel is common or not. Siddhanta says nirguna jnani does not depart leave the body and travel. The journey mentioned in the chandogya upanisad is not applicable to nirguna jnani in his case the death procedure is different which will be taught later. In this context when we say vidvan vidyaya amritatvam asraye we should understand through saguna upasana attains abekshika amritatvam. The travel and departure involved in the case of saguna upasaka are very similar to other non upasakas also. Upasaka will have the same lot like ritualists.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that the departure for upasaka is exactly the same as the departure in the case of riutalist as well as other people. In the case of upasaka also the vak and indriyas will resolve inot mana and mind will resolve into prana and prana will join other two units. Upasaka has got sthoola sariram in brahma loka. Naturally the question will come if all the stages are same that is the nonupasaka also and then they come hridaya and what is the superiority of the upasakas who are going to

attain immortality. You say all are the same. For that vyasacharya says upto this stage withdrawal step is the same. The bifurcation takes place after reaching the hridayam. After coming to hridayam how they take the route, in the outer the difference comes. From the hridayam all ajnani jivas have to come out from various nadis and this is the internal journey of all the people. Having come to periphery of the body and then they take different route to take different places in their external journey. There we see the difference between the upasakas and non-upasakas. They take a special nadi or special route. The upasaka will have special internal journey to the sushumna nadi and go to the top of the head. The non-upasaka will go through any nadi other than sushumna nadi. Nonupasaka ajnani will have internal nadi through non-sushumna nadi. They will go through with different part of the body. Thereafter the non upasaka jiva will travel through other than shukla gathi. This is what is said in the sutra. A person raises the question why should upasaka travel through sushumna and travel through shukla gathi etc. Why travel through shukla gathi for immortality. Vyasacharya makes it clear jnani's death do not involve travel.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Samana is process of withdrawal is the same ca only for a meditator and other ignorant jivas; asrityaupakramat until they reach the path of travel; ca however amritatvam immortality promised for the meditator is only relative anuposya which obtains before the removal of ignorance. The significance of the words is samana the word samana means same; the beginning stage of withdrawal for upasaka and other ajnanis; in terms of chandogya upanisad upto the prana stage it is common to all; ca asrityupakramat sriti means path of travel consisting of two portion one is internal path indicated by nadi and the other travel after death two fold margas without; upakrama means marga prapti until jiva reach the path of journey up to that marga they travel together; the railway station is hridayam; thereafter in the case of upasaka he takes the special path of sushumna nadi and shukla gathi and amritatvam; amritatvam ca immortality obtained is apekshikam anuposya the ajnana nasam bina amritatvam it is an immortality it happens before the destruction of ignorance; therefore amritatvam that comes before the destruction of ignorance is anuposya upa plus ush means to burn down; her it means after burning down anuposya means before burning down the ignorance; the immortality that is promised for upasaka is that relative immortality which can be obtained before burning down the ignorance which is in the form of brahma loka prapti and this is different from moksa or liberation. Jnani obtains moksa while upasaka gets krama mukti. With this the aside topic is over. With this 4<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

## **Topic 5 [[8 – 11] Samsaravyapadesadhikaranam**

The dissolution of fire etc., at the time of death in the supreme deity is only relative

**Sutra 4.2.8[504]**

***Tadapitch samsaravyapadesat***

That [fine body lasts] up to the attainment of brahman [through knowledge] because [the scriptures] declare the state of relative existence [till then]

Now i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It has four sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is vyasacharya goes further into the main mantra chandogya upanisad 6.8.6. Now we have one more part tejah parasyam devatanam this we will analyse. Tejah means that all the sense organs resolve into the mind and the mind in the

prana and we have the loaded prana joins two units one is jiva the chidabasa and the other is adhi sariram the future physical body. The loaded prana means it is nothing but prana plus mind plus jiva and it is nothing but sookshma sariram and also the future sthoola sarira and chidabasa jiva are mixed together. All the three units put together is represented as tejah. It consist of sooksma sarira and future sthoola sarira and jiva and this chidabasa alone travel whether upasaka or non upasaka. What happens to that is the question here. Chandogya upanisad says tejah parasyam devatanam. The group of three components expect it to travel but chandogya upanisad says this group merges into brahman. Para devata here refers to brahman. The meaning chandogya upanisad mantra is that unit of three component merges into para devata which here is brahman. The confusion here is if the jiva unit merges into param brahman we call it moksa. After ultimately merging with brahman alone we call it liberation. This ajnani or karmi or upasaka or otherwise merge into para devata must be moksa. According to this mantra all the dying people attain moksa. The mantra begins with a general statement. The qualification for moksa is death. When this doubt comes we have to clarify. No doubt jiva merges into brahman and it is relative merger and not absolute merger. This apekshita brahma layah and not adhyantika brahma layah. Brahman is here itself. The permanent merger takes place in the case of jnani. In the case of ajnani brahma layam takes place and next fructifying prarapta will be there, sooksma sarira sariram will be there and it will after temporary merger will take appropriate marga again takes birth just like a person getting awake after deep sleep. In chandogya upanisad in the very same section in the beginning sushupti is analysed. In the sushupti analysis very clearly says every jiva merges into brahman in sushupti for we love our individuality and all our karmas are suspended and we are one with brahman. If maranam becomes moksa because of brahma layam sushupti also would have become moksa. If brahma laya is moksa sushupti is enough to get moksa but we know after sleep the person comes back again to life as he wakes up. In sushupti there is apekshika brahma laya is there. In only jnani's vidheh mukti there is adyantika liberation. Here vyasacharya clearly says that brahma laya takes place in sleep and maranam. It is our experience and also scripturally make clear. Jiva keeps its individuality in deep sleep and also in maranam even though jiva merges into brahman temporarily. Even in pralaya jiva merges into brahman retaining it individual. This will go only through jnanam. The second part vyasacharya says if it is not accepted twofold problem swill be there. All the travel after death will become invalid statements. Samsara vakyani will become redundant of the moksa takes place after death. Scriptures talks about after death will become invalid if all jivas gains moksa on death. All karma kanda vakyams will become apramanam for it talks of jiva going to higher lokas if maranam is going to take to brahma layah. The third problem is vedanta sastram becomes redundant. If you know that the death will give moksa where is the need for gaining jnanam and going to classes and reading sastras etc. Samsara vakyam etc., will become apramanam. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 360

### **Topic 5 [[8 – 11] Samsaravyapadesadhikaranam**

The dissolution of fire etc., at the time of death in the supreme deity is only relative

#### **Sutra 4.2.8 [504]**

#### ***Tadapitch samsaravyapadesat***

That [fine body lasts] up to the attainment of brahman [through knowledge] because [the scriptures] declare the state of relative existence [till then]

We do general analysis of sutra 8 of fifth adhikaranam. Here also Vyasacharya analyses the significant mantra 6.8.6 of Chandogya upanisad which talks about the departure of ajnani after or during death as to how various organs are withdrawn and how the chidabasa gets associated with raw materials of the next physical body and how it travels through the periphery of the nadi and how it goes to various lokas by taking appropriate margas. All the details are given and all these relate to the death of ajnani and that ajnani may be ignorant or a ritualist or any upasaka. Even the greatest upasaka comes under ajnani from vedantic angle, upasaka exists in the field of dvaitam and so long as he is in the field of dvaitam he is an ajnani. With regard to withdrawal there is no difference at all. It is similar. These stages are same. The difference happens only when it is taking appropriate nadi and gathi. Nadi varies from jiva to jiva depending upon whether he is a karma, upasaka or an ordinary man which he takes from hridayam to periphery of the body. Whether he takes Krishna gathi shukla gathi or athogathi differ from jiva to jiva. Here Vyasacharya comes to the critical portion of the mantra.

Tejas dissolves into para devata. Both words are loaded words. The word tejas stands for jiva nucleus consisting of three components which is going to depart from the body. The components are entire sookma sarira which has been folded; the second component of jiva nucleus is pratibimba Chaitanyam the reflected Consciousness, and the third one is the raw material which consists of minute portions of gross five elements which we call sthoola pancha maha bootha amsah. This raw material is meant for the next physical body. All the three put together is indicated by the word tejasa jiva nucleus. Then the next word parasyam devatayam which means Paramatma Brahman. It is also a technical word which occurs in the sixth chapter of Chandogya upanisad. Jiva nucleus merges into Brahman at the time of death. If jiva merges into para devata Brahman at the time of death does not it mean Moksa because of Brahman aikyam which is nothing but Moksa. Vyasacharya says no. It is not jiva's Moksa prapti jiva's merger into Brahman only if jiva has attained aham brahma asmi aikya Jnanam is attained. If jiva is ajnani the merger is not a Moksa but it is a temporary rest. It is only apekshika layah. Sanchita karma will continue. Vyasacharya gives only one argument and Adhi Sankaracharya adds three more arguments. Vyasacharya says jiva's merger into Brahman is only temporary because jiva comes back from Brahman to travel towards various lokas. Since the travel of jiva is talked about takes back its individuality and come for shopping. This is called samsara vyapadesat. If jiva is permanently merged into Brahman there is no question of travel. It is exactly like deep sleep. In sleep we merge into Brahman

and we wake up and continue our journey. Maranam is like sushupti for ajnanis. 2.2.7 of Kathopanisad is the pramanam in this regard. This is one argument given by Vyasacharya.

Adhi Sankaracharya adds three more argument. Vidhi sastra virodhah. If death is Moksa the entire karma kanda will become redundant. If at the time of death if all jiva get Moksa then whatever punyam jiva has acquired through ritual and he will instead of going to svarga gets resolved into Moksa.

Second argument is Vidya sastra virodha or vaiyartham. All Vedanta sastra will become redundant if maranam gives Moksa. Why should jiva study Vedanta and struggle to gain Moksa.

Third argument is logic. Samsara is caused by ignorance which has been made clear in all scriptures. If ignorance is the cause and samsara is the effect and we should remember the law the effect will go only if the cause goes away. That means ajnana nase eva samsara karya nasah. It is Moksa praptih. Logically only when ignorance is gone Moksa is possible. This universal law will be violated if every ignorant person merges with Brahman at the time of death without destroying ignorance. It is violation of universal law karana nase karya nasah. Because of four argument teja merges only temporarily in the case of ignorant people. It is exactly as in sushupti.

Last one more incidental topic. He says why should the dying jiva temporarily merge into Brahman. Then we ask the counter question why should ajnani jiva merge into Brahman in sleep. That he accepts that. He says jiva is tired so goes to sleep. In sushupti tired jiva goes to its moolam jiva for rest so that he can be active the next day. At the time of death also jiva has undergone lot of strain at the time withdrawal of karana. They have caused tremendous trouble and not ready for the journey. If the local packing is so tiresome what to talk of the biggest packing for maranam. Before dying a small coffee dipping into Brahman and start for grand journey.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tad means that fire principle which is the jiva nucleus continue to exist; ah api te until liberation; samsaravyapadesat means this is known from the sruti statements revealing rebirth. Now I will give you the significance of the words. Tad means fire principle and here teja represents jiva principle consisting of three components; it will not permanently merge; a apiteh that means up to or until; that is until Moksa. The Moksa takes place only on gaining Jnanam. Up to Moksa means it does not include Moksa; samsaravyapadesat means rebirth that represents travel of one body to another. Punarabi jananam and punarabhi maranam. It is sruti vakyam. Samsara bodhaka sruti vakyam. Samsara vyapadesat means this is known from sruti statement which reveals that jiva travels after death. From this it is clear that the merger is temporary and not permanent.

## **Topic 5 [[8 – 11] Samsaravyapadesadhikaranam**

The dissolution of fire etc., at the time of death in the supreme deity is only relative

**Sutra 4.2.9 [505]**

***Sukshmam pramanatascha tathopalabdheh***

[this fine body] is subtle [by nature] and size, because it is so observed.

It has been made clear in the previous sutra that jiva nucleus leaves the physical body at the time of death. How come we are not able to sensorial perceive the seeing the departure. Departure is presumed or inferred. There is no specific pramanam to perceive the departure of the soul. We are not able to see. So scientist uniformly say that it is cock and bull story made by the Brahmanas to make money etc. More and more nasthikas are questioning and all people have started questioning and that is why shraaddhas are coming down. All the rituals people don't believe. Vyasacharya says that I know you will ask this question. He says we don't perceive not because of nonexistence of jiva nucleus but because our instruments are not equipped to perceive the departure of the jiva nucleus because it is very subtle. There are two forms of subtlety. One is vayu is subtle even though it is all pervading because of its subtle nature. There is another type of subtlety even gross object will be subtle if the size is minutest. So it is imperceptible. Swarupa sookshmatvam and pramana sookshmatvam. It may be all pervading it is because its nature is like that. In the case of wood also if you make finer and finer particle you cannot see because it becomes too small to perceive. If you take jiva nucleus with three components chidabasa, sookhma sarira and potential sthoola sariram and first and two cannot be perceived because its swarupa is imperceptible. Even of the living person I cannot see because it is imperceptible. But the potential physical body which it carries consisting of the fine raw materials will not be visible because that gross body which is grow into big body later is very very minute like dust particle. This is the answer to the first question. Then second question is also asked. Vyasacharya answers that if jiva nucleus with the raw material for next physical body has to travel it should not be obstructed by any object but we find jiva is able to penetrate the physical body and go out and even if the doors of the house is closed still the jiva is able to go out how. For that the answer is sookshmatvat. Adhi Sankaracharya gives the example when the jiva nucleus is very fine like rays of light and it can penetrate through transparent glass so also the jiva nucleus can penetrate or no gross obstacle can stop the traveling jiva. Finally one more point how do prove the jiva is find. This can be inferred because the sastra talks about the jiva traveling through the nadi to come out. According to sastra nadi is small and fine and if jiva is to travel through nadi it has to be sookshmam.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Sookshmam jiva nucleus is subtle pramanatah in terms of its size cha and nature. Upalapte means because it is understood tatha so [from the scriptural statement] now we will come to the significance of the words. Sookshmam means subtle; that jiva nucleus represented by the word tejah occurring in the Chandogya upanisad. It is sookshmam. It is very small in size. Commentators gives the example when you sweep the floor lot of dust particles is seen in the atmosphere and when the sun's beams of light comes through the window there you can see the sweeping particles. So it is gross or subtle still it is subtle because of the minuteness of the size. Pramanatah means in terms of its size. Cha indicates swarupah ca it is subtle in terms of its nature like the mind. Upalapte means knowledge because we get the knowledge tatha means in this manner only. That it is subtle in measurement and nature from the sruti statement. Sruti statement is all the nadis dwara gamanam. Sruti clearly talks about traveling through very find nadies as per the scriptures.

## **Topic 5 [[8 – 11] Samsaravyapadesadhikaranam**

The dissolution of fire etc., at the time of death in the supreme deity is only relative



**Sutra 4.2.10 [506]**

***Nopamardenatah***

Therefore [this subtle body is] not [destroyed] by the destruction [of the gross body]

The jiva nucleus is extremely subtle both in terms of size and nature because of this nature only when the body is destroyed or burnt nothing happens to the jiva nucleus. It is not affected by fire, water and atom bomb or even if it is consigned to flames. It is applied to sooksha sariram also. Even the greatest weapon can destroy only sthoola sarira and not sooksha sariram. Not only sooksha sariram survives but also it travels. The destruction of the physical body cannot destroy the jiva nucleus. It survives. That is even during the pralayam fourteen lokas are destroyed that is in the next sristi after pralayam jiva nucleus will continue. The nucleus includes the karana sariram also again the ukranti that is leaving from the body is tremendously tedious on me and hence the jiva nucleus takes rest in Brahman, the time taken by the jiva nucleus varies from individual to individual as some people wake up after sleeping for few hours while some others take a long time of sleep.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Atah means therefore; na the jiva nucleus is not destroyed; upamardena by the destruction of the physical body. The significance of the words is atah means therefore; because the jiva nucleus in terms of size and nature; na means not destroyed jiva nucleus is not destroyed; upamardena by the destruction of the sthoola sariram. Sthoola sariram does not destroy sooksha sariram. When someone cuts the head, he can cut the sthoola sariram but not the sooksha sariram. When the sthoola sariram drowns the sooksha sariram is not drowned. Because of subtly jiva is jiva is invisible, jiva is unstoppable, jiva is indestructible. When the sthoola sariram is destroyed the sooksha sariram is not destroyed at the time of death. It is not marana anantaram. After the death of the person this law is not relevant that sthoola sariram nase sooksha sariram nasah na bhavati. After maranam sthoola sariram is here and sooksha sariram is already left and gone. Only both are together there is doubt but once sooksha sariram leaves, it is unaffected and it is undestroyable.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 361

### **Topic 5 [[8 – 11] Samsaravyapadesadhikaranam**

The dissolution of fire etc., at the time of death in the supreme deity is only relative

#### **Sutra 4.2.11 [507]**

#### ***Asyaiva chopapatteresha ushma***

And to the [subtle body] alone does the [bodily] heat belong because this [only] is possible. Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In all the three sutras Vyasacharya is dealing with the jiva nucleus which is an intermediary entity and it does not come under Atma category but now we talk about traveling jiva which is different from physical body also and we introduce an intermediary body of jiva which is important when we talk about rebirth. Atma does not travel and you cannot talk about body traveling. But what travels is the intermediary jiva nucleus. The three sutras are important and these three sutras talk about a new entity, which is different from sariram as well as Atma. He has talked about its invisibility, unstopability and indestructibility.

This nucleus alone lends the warmth of life to the body. The body heat which we experience is lent by the jiva nucleus alone. It is not the nature of the physical body and warmth of the body belongs to the jiva nucleus. As long as jiva nucleus quits the body, the body becomes cold. Body does not have heat indicates that it is a borrowed property. Because it is a borrowed property means somebody lends the heat. It is sachidananda Atma but it is jiva nucleus. It is not the chit that lends the warmth then in the dead body also chit is very much there. If chit lends the warmth the dead body will have warmth. There is something there other than chit, which is absent in the dead body. That which is other than chit that is in the live body is jiva nucleus, or the chidabasa. Therefore in this sutra Vyasacharya says warmth of the body does not belong to body but it belongs to the jiva nucleus.

The second point is that we can know it through anvaya vyatireka logic. When chidabasa is in the body the warmth of life is there. When it is not there the warmth is not there. When the warmth is not there, people decide that the life is gone. Jiva's another feature is indicated that is warmth of life.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. cha means moreover; esah ushma the warmth of life; asya eva belongs to this jiva nucleus only; to connect it to Chandogya upanisad vakyam 6.8.6 jiva nucleus was given a technical word which we must remember and it is tejah. Upapattah this is known from the reasoning of anvaya vyatireka co-presence and co-absence or simultaneous existence or simultaneous absence. Adhi Sankaracharya quotes a sruti support also. That sentence is *ushnah eva jivishyan sheetah marishyan*. Body is warm when the jiva nucleus is there and cold when jiva nucleus departs. The significance of the words is asya eva the jiva nucleus referred to as tejas tattvam. Even though we feel the warmth in the body, it does not belong to the body. It belongs to tejas or jiva nucleus. The fourth feature that it is lender of warmth. Upa pattah means reasoning and in this context reasoning is anvaya vyatireka reasoning. Eshah ushma means the warmth of the body or life.

Eshah means this because for feeling the warmth of life, you need touch somebody else but you yourself experience in your own body.

## Topic 6 [12- 14] Pratishedhadhikaranam

The pranas of the knower of Brahman do not depart at the time of death

### Sutra 4.2.12 [507]

#### *Pratishedhaditi chenna savirat*

If it be said [that the pranas of one who knows Brahman do not depart][ on account of the denial made by the sruti, [we say] not so [because the scriptures deny the departure of the pranas] from the individual soul [and not from the body]

The sutra consists of two parts viz. objection and its reply. The objection portion is *pratishedhatiti chet*. The reply portion is *na sarirat; spashto hyekesham'*

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam it has three sutras. The subject matter here is the implied meaning of the previous adhikaranam. The previous adhikaranam has got an implicit hidden meaning and that hidden idea is brought forward and thrashed. Many people is likely to miss the implicit meaning. The implicit idea is for that we have to the sutra 8. there it was said that the jiva nucleus will continue and it will travel until it is liberated. In this there is an implicit idea not mentioned. Until knowledge jiva will travel means after knowledge the jiva does not travel. Jiva of a jnani does not travel is the implicit idea of the previous adhikaranam. *Jnani jivasya gathih nasti utkranti nasti*.

Here in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya debates whether jnanis have utkranti and gathi. Purva Paksi will says jnani also has got utkranti and gathi. Our siddhanta will be no. jnani jiva does not have utkranti and gathi. Utkranti withdrawal and having assembled in the heart going through shukla gathi marga travel is gathi. This is the general introduction.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. the Purva Paksi raises an objection. We see the siddhantins and what we say the Purva Paksi raises as purva paksa negates our view and establishes their view in the first sutra. we say the jiva does not have utkranti and gathi because of sastra pramanam. Regarding travel and nontravel there is no other pramanam except sastra pramanam is available. Veda talks about something which is not accessible to science. Veda deals with topics which are not accessible to science. Yet lot of people raises this question even after knowing the fact about veda. We also forget the definition of veda. Veda deals with apouruseya vishaya. Jiva's death and travel after death is apouruseya. Sastra says ajnani travels and jnani does not travel. We have to accept sastra pramanam in the absence of any other proof. It is said in 4.4.6 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. The mantra reads as *na tasya Prana utkranti, Brahmaiva san brahmapyete* the meaning of this portion of the mantra is he who does not desire, he who is without desire, who is freed from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the Self, his breaths do not depart, being Brahman he goes to Brahman. All his desires are fulfilled on gaining Jnanam. kama rahita means he does not have even the Moksa desire. Because he is a liberated person. For that jnani all the pranas including indriyas don't withdraw and travel. This is indicated by the word sruti's negation of jnani's withdrawal and travel. When we quote this mantra Purva Paksi says your interpretation is wrong. He says the word tasya Prana means jnani's Prana. now it only has said that jnani's

Prana do not leave; leave from what we are not able to trace from the mantra. Leaving what place or from where is not mentioned here. Apadana is not mentioned in the sruti and you insert the idea and say that the jnani's Prana do not leave the body. He says it is not said in the veda. It means jnani's Prana leaves the body. Then when the sruti jnani's Prana does not leave means leave the chidabasa. When jnani's death happens the chidabasa leaves the body and along with it Prana leaves and chidabasa and Prana having left the physical body travel together Prana does not leave means Prana does not leave the chidabasa. Purva Paksi says in the case of jnani also both travel together Prana does not leave the chidabasa. Therefore apadanam of leaving the place of separation is physical body according to advaidin and according to Purva Paksi it is according to the jiva. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 362

### **Topic 6 [12- 14] Pratishedhadhikaranam**

The pranas of the knower of Brahman do not depart at the time of death

**Sutra 4.2.12 [507]**

#### ***Pratishedhaditi chenna savirat***

If it be said [that the pranas of one who knows Brahman do not depart][ on account of the denial made by the sruti, [we say] not so [because the scriptures deny the departure of the pranas] from the individual soul [and not from the body]

The sutra consists of two parts viz. objection and its reply. The objection portion is *pratishedhatiti chet*. The reply portion is *na sarirat; spashto hyekesham'*

Here we discuss that in the case of jnani the pranas do not leave the body and there is no question of travel. Upasaka's Prana has got departure and jnani's Prana never departs is the topic here. In this first sutra we have Purva Paksi view is presented and Purva Paksi refutes the siddhantis view and after refuting Purva Paksi establishes his view. The first portion is Purva Paksi refutation of our view and Purva Paksi establishment of his view. The whole sutra is Purva Paksi sutra. we say jnani's Prana do not have departure from the body at the time of death. It is our siddhanta. In favour of our siddhanta the logic is pratisheda that is sastra partisheda vakya pramanam is our support. It means a sruti statement which negates the departure of jnani's Prana from the body at the time of death. Therefore jnani's Prana does not leave the body. Here we quote 4.4.6 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad as our pramana vakyam. Na tasya utkramanti the Prana does not leave and word Prana refers to all seventeen indriyas of sooksha sariram. Jnani's Prana do not leave. His is a pronoun and by the study of context we know it is jnani.

If vedantins says so Purva Paksi says I cannot accept. Purva Paksi argument is that there is pratisheda vakyam. He says you carefully study the statement. It says jnani jiva's Prana does not leave. But sruti does not say leave what. That apadanam the point of departure is not mentioned in the vakyam. You take what is convenient to you is Purva Paksi argument. Therefore vedantins says Prana does not leave the body. This is not acceptable to the Purva Paksi. They say jnani's Prana leaves the body. If it does not leave the body the problem will be the body will not die. It has to leave the body. Then the body will be alive all the time. This is not possible.

Whenever a particular point is not clear we look for clarification in some other place. Shukla yajur veda has got two branches. One is kanva saka and the other is madhyantina saka. In kanva saka also Brihadaranyaka upanisad occurs. Brihadaranyaka upanisad occurs in madyantina saka also with slight variation. If you look at madyantina saka there is slight variation in the mantra. Na tasmad Prana utkramanti. From that we gather the jnani jiva's pranas do not leave him [jnani jiva]. It is clear that jnani jiva's Prana does not leave. But it leaves the body. That means the Prana does not leave the jnani jiva. It means wherever jiva

goes Prana will accompany jiva. From that it is concluded that when jnani is within the body the Prana will be within the body and at the time of death when jiva leaves the body Prana also leaves the body but Prana will not leave the jiva. Jiva is the husband and Prana is wife and body is the house. Prana will leave the body but Prana will not leave the jiva and at the time of death Prana's separation from body takes place but Prana does not leave the jiva. Therefore sarirat eva pratishesa. Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam only negates Prana's departure from jiva and it does not negate Prana's departure from the body. He quotes if Prana does not leave the body body will not die. Second argument madyantina saka of Brihadaranyaka upanisad says Prana does not leave the jiva but does leave the body. This is the general analysis.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. pratishedhat this is our view. The Prana of jnani does not leave the body at the time of death; since such an event is negated by the sruti. Iti chet means Purva Pakshi's refutation of our view; if this is the contention, na it is not so; sarirat means the **departure of Prana from the jiva** is negated in sruti statement.

Now we will see the significance of the words. pradishedhat refers to sruti negation that is the departure of Prana from the body. If you take such statement your conclusion is wrong. He questions our interpretation. Sarirat. Means departure of Prana from jiva is negated not from the body. Prana can leave but it goes with jiva. At no time Prana will leave the jiva.

Now we will see our answer.

## **Topic 6 [12- 14] Pratishedhadhikaranam**

The pranas of the knower of Brahman do not depart at the time of death

### **Sutra 4.2.13 [508]**

#### ***Spashto hyekesham***

For the denial of the soul's departure is clear in the texts of some schools.

Vyasacharya gives one answer and Adhi Sankaracharya gives two answers. We will see Adhi Sankaracharya answer first. Vyasacharya's answer is different. Instead of analyzing the Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam says our siddhanta is correct if you see other portions of Brihadaranyaka upanisad statement. But Adhi Sankaracharya dwells this portion and solves the problem.

He says if you read the previous and later part of the same section you will not have confusion. Read the previous and later portion then there will not be any confusion. That is why we should have systematic study. The previous five mantra deals with departure of ajnani jiva. Towards the end of 5<sup>th</sup> mantra the direction of departure is governed by the desire of the ajnani. It says every ajnani jiva leaves the physical body and the direction of travel depends upon the desire of the leaving jiva. Having talked about ajnani's travel based on desire the Upanisad concludes the portion iti nu kamanamayah. It is the lot of the desirer. The travel is governed by the kama that he has. Atha indicates now change the topic. it introduces the new topic of departure of jnani who is desireless. Thereafter Upanisad says akamis Prana do not leave means it does not leave the body is the meaning. The present topic is Prana's not leaving the body alone. The whole topic is ajnani's kama Prana's departure from the body in

the case of ajnani kami. Now akami's Prana is talked about and it should be negation of the departure from the body alone. Pruva अपरा विचारा talks of departure from the body and not from jiva.

Adhi Sankaracharya argues all the pranas along with jiva dissolves into Brahman it is put. When all pranas with jiva dissolves into Brahman where is the question of Prana traveling. A doubt may come. It may travel to Brahman for merger. This question should not arise. Jiva's going to Brahman is ridiculous question. However Upanisad quote a mantra here itself within the body itself Brahman is there, therefore jiva along with Prana dissolves and therefore there is no question of departing. This is the argument number one.

Adhi Sankaracharya gives a second argument. It is sruti based logic. It comes in 3.2.2 of Mundaka Upanisad mantra. The mantra reads as *Kaman yah kamayate manyamanah sa kamabhir jayate tatra tatra paryapta kamasya krtatmanas tu ihaiva sarve praviliyanti kamah* the meaning is he who entertains desires, thinking of them is born again here and there on account of his desires. But of him who has his desire fully satisfied, who is a perfected soul, all his desires vanish even here on earth. kama is responsible for jiva's punar janma. Therefore desire is responsible for travel after death. It is responsible for sooksha sariram leaving the sthoola sariram or desire is responsible for Prana leaving the body. We go for shopping when we want something better. So is the case with jiva. Jiva goes for better body. Adhi Sankaracharya argues if kama is cause for Prana utkranti, kama nasa will certainly stop Prana leaving the body. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad it is clearly stated jnani is akamayamanah. Using mundaka logic Prana cannot leave the physical body and therefore the conclusion is that Prana does not leave the jiva. It does not leave the body. Now comes the last question. Your logic proves this how do account for Brihadaranyaka upanisad madyantina vakyam which says Prana does not leave jiva. This is the Purva Paksi argument. For that, Adhi Sankaracharya says since the majority of Upanisad vakyam, the logic supports our argument, and if one vakyam contradicts and it should be interpreted in keeping with others. You should take lakshyartha and not vachyartha of tasmad. Vachyartha of tasmad is sariram and lakshyartha is jiva.

In the sutra Vyasacharya gives a different answer. If the Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam is confusing, he goes to another Brahmanam of Brihadaranyaka upanisad which is Artha baga Brahmanam 3.2.11 which reads as [in the dialogue between Yajnavalkya and Artha Bagha] *yajnavalkya iti hovaca yatrayam puruso mriyate udasmat pranah Kramanty aho neti na iti hovaca yajnavalkya atraiva samavaniyante sa ucchvayati, adhmayati, adhmato mrtah sete.* The meaning of the dialogue is when such a person [liberated one] dies, do the vital breaths move up from him or do they not? 'No' replied yajnavalkya. They are gathered together in him. He [the body] swells up; he is inflated and thus inflated the dead man [body] lies. Naturally a doubt will come. The doubt is if jnani's Prana does not leave the body, jnani will be eternal. All sages will be alive. Yajnavalkya expects the question and he says Prana does not leave the body but it does not stay in the body also. Prana dissolves into Brahman, which is in the body also. Now the body is without Prana and the Prana did not go out but it dissolves into Brahman and that body without Prana, Prana rahita deha bloats, expands because it is filled with bahya Prana [outside oxygen]. So lies the dead body of the jnani. Vyasacharya says all these are clear from another Brahmanam. By thorough study of Sariraga Brahmanam and study of artha bagha Brahmanam we come to know that jnani's body does not leave.] jnani jiva's state is totally different from that of upasaka jiva's Mukti. One is Krama Mukti and the other is sadhyo Mukti. Jnani jiva Prana does not leave the body at all.

For which Vyasacharya quoted 4.4.6 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Adhi Sankaracharya said even 4.4.6 Brihadaranyaka upanisad is not confusing for the thinking people.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Hi it is not so; because spashtah the negation of departure of Prana from the body is clear. Ekesham means in the vedic portion preserved by some people. The significance of the words is spashtah means clear; the negation of the departure of the Prana of a jnani from the body is very clear; ekesham means in some other vedic portions. Here just as an aside point that you know in the olden days veda was never in written form. They never referred to from the books and it existed only in the brains of the vaidhikas. They cannot refer to library or book. Veda means vaidhika. Whenever they wanted to have sruti pramanam they to go to vaidhika for sruti pramanam. Shukla yajur veda adhyayinam and by referring to he adhyayis Vyasacharya refers to veda itself and not to the people. Shakadyayinam hi means the reason. Because of this reason alone, therefore we ascertain jnani's jiva does not travel. We don't have any proof to find out the above statement. You cannot understand by studying the dead body. Body bloating can happen for all the bodies. We don't have any indication at all for it is based on apouruseya veda pramanam. That some jiva travels and that some jiva merges into Brahman is sastra pramanam alone. We don't have any other proof except sastra pramanam. Veda is the primary source of knowledge this is a fact for you and if your treat veda is secondary source of knowledge it is hypotheses which waits for scientific proof. If you take veda as apramanam, all these are cock and bull story. It all depends on your attitude towards veda. First you should generate the attitude to accept veda as the pramanam for all the apouruseya vishayas. Veda is primary pramanam for purva utara mimamsakas; veda is secondary pramanam for nyaya vaiseshikas. Veda is apramanam for jaina bouddhas. Hi has been used for we are mimamsakas. This alone is the topic we have discussed in Mandana Misra's house whom Adhi Sankaracharya wanted to meet and enquired about the house and other people told even birds would say veda is primary or secondary pramanam. He established swada pramanam and Adhi Sankaracharya did not spend time at all to establish veda is primary pramanam for Purva Mimamsas had already established negating the nyaya vaiseshikas and jainans and bouddhas. Jaimini, kumarila bhattas have driven Bouddha from India and also refuted Nyaya vaiseshikas. Vedas swadha pramanya had already established in 1.1.5 of Jaimini sutras. Vedantins had already accepted this fact. Vedantins assumes every person who comes to Vedanta had already analyzed and understood veda is a fact and no proof is required. If veda is apramanam there is no need of study. We should accept veda is primary source and accept as a matter of fact and it should be taken as the sixth sense organs which does not require further validation. Veda is like an eye.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 363

### **Topic 6 [12- 14] Pratishedhadhikaranam**

The pranas of the knower of Brahman do not depart at the time of death

#### **Sutra 4.2.14 [509]**

#### ***Smaryate cha***

And smriti also says that..

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. it is a simple sutra. this sutra says that there is not only sruti pramanam but we have got smriti pramanam in support of our contention. Our contention that jnani jiva does not leave the body. This is unique to advaitam. In vishistadvaitam there is neither jivanm Mukti nor vidheha Mukti. He does not get liberation through Jnanam but he gets liberation through upasana. This upasaka jiva who is a candidate for liberation has to leave the body, has to travel through Ishukla gathi, and goes to vaikunda. Jivanm Mukti is not there and upasaka jiva who is a candidate for liberation goes to vaikunda. Parama padha vassal symbolizes it. He goes to vaikunta and he is liberated there. there he never becomes vidhegah but he becomes sadhegah. According to vishistadvaita he gets extraordinary body, which is made up of different raw material. In vaikunta upasaka gets aprakruta sariram which is not subject to decay, degeneration and death etc. it is but living permanently in Vaikunta near Vishnu. Prana ukranti is there for vishistadvaitam. This is supported by smriti and sruti.

The support for our argument is found in Mahabharata sloka 239.23 *sarva bootatma bootasya samya bootani pasyatah devabi margam mushyanti apadasya padaihinah* the essence of the verse is he who has become the Self of all beings and has a complete intuition of all, in his way the gods themselves are perplexed seeking for the path of him who has no path. Jnani's travel death even devas cannot see. Because it is not there. why it is not there because jnani does not travel. His Atma is one with Atma of all. He does not have a path of travel at all. He looks at all jivarasis properly. It means he see as one non-different Atma. Devah api margam mushyanti means even devas are confused about the path of the travel of jnani even though they want to see the margam of jnani after death. Nothing is left behind for jnani to travel. Atma cannot travel. Therefore if any devotee sees something on death of a jnani, it has nothing to do with travel as stated in the above Mahabharata slokam. Jnani's Prana does not travel.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. smaryate this is revealed in the smriti also. The significance is word cha is conjunction between the present and the previous sutra. smaryate means this is remembered. Again Vyasacharya does not refer to the book and reference is given to the vaidhikas who remembered the smritis and srutis.

### **Topic 7 [[15] Vagaditayadhikaranam**

The pranas [organs] and elements of the knower of the Nirgunam Brahman get merged in It at death.

**Sutra 4.2.15 [511]**

***Tani pare tutha hyaha***

Those [pranas elements] [ are merged] in the supreme Brahman for thus the [scriptures] say.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. the name of the adhikaranam is not taken from the sutra. totally new name is given on the contents of the adhikaranam. The subject matter is what happens to jnani's Prana at the time of death. In the previous adhikaranam we have established Prana does not go out. Naturally question is what happens to the Prana. you cannot say it continues in the body because if it continues means all acharyas will live for ever. But experience is different. Jnani's body dies at the time of his vidheh Mukti. Prana does not continue with body. Then what happens. The jnani's Prana merges into Brahman which is the adhistanam and therefore present within the body also. It resolves into its karanam. Karana laya takes place. When you say jnani's karanam what do you mean. Upanisad talks about two types of merger. Therefore we have confusion where. We now that all the pranas are born out of panca boothani. In short all the sooksha sariram avayam are born out of panca boothani. Pancha boothani is karanam. Some Upanisad mantras point out all karanams merge into pancha boothani it is said in 3.2.7 of Mundaka Upanisad. kalah panca dasa pratistah gatha all the seventeen limbs of the sooksha sariram which are enumerated as 16 kalas which means parts or organs. It says all the kalas merge into pratistah which means karanani the respective karaanam. Pancha boothas are there and sense organs are to merge in corresponding boothas, whereas in the same Munda 3.2.8 that mantra says *yatha nadyas syandamanas samudre sastam gacchanti nama rupa vihaya, tatha vidvan namaruapd vimuktah parat param purusam upaiti divam* that all the kalas merge into Brahman. The meaning of the mantra is just as all the flowing rivers disappear in the ocean casting of name and shape, even so the knower, freed from name and shape attains to the divine person, higher than the high. He talks about Brahma layah or Purusa laya. 7<sup>th</sup> mantra says it merges in elements and 8<sup>th</sup> mantra says all merge into Brahman. Both seem to be correct. In Birgu valli it is said everything is born out of Brahman and all merge into Brahman.

Which one is correct? Vyasacharya answers brahma laya alone should be taken. Adhi Sankaracharya adds a note brahma laya is ideal and perfect to be taken and says bootha laya is not wrong and that also is correct. How can both be correct. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says vyavahara dristya ajnani jana dristya bootha laya is correct and from the jnani's angle only Brahma laya we should say and we should not take boothani for sarvam brahma mayam jagat. Vyasacharya is talking from jnani's angle.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says jnani's Prana merges into Brahman. Vyasacharya says vachanat veda vakyam says clearly he becomes one with Brahman. The same idea is given in Prasnopaniasad 6.5 the mantra reads as *sa yathema nadyah syandamanah samudrayanah samudram prapyastam gacchanti bhidyete tasam nama rupe samudra ity evam procyate evam evasya paridrastur imah sodasa kalah purusayanah purusam prapyastam gacchanti bhidyete casam nama rupe Purusa ity evam procyate sa esa'kalo'mrto bhavati, tad esa slokah*; the essence of the sloka is the kalas goes to Brahman and jnani exists in brahma rupa vartate. Akalak partless Brahman he becomes. It is not that he

occupies a portion of lord but we say that he one with partless Brahman. It means it is absolute merger. Even panca boothas do not exist and hence there is not question of jnani merging with them. The word analysis we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 364

### **Topic 7 [15] Vagaditayadhikaranam**

The pranas [organs] and elements of the knower of the Nirgunam Brahman get merged in It at death.

#### **Sutra 4.2.15 [511]**

#### ***Tani pare tutha hyaha***

Those [pranas elements] [are merged] in the Supreme Brahman for thus the [scriptures] say.

We see the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra, which is the seventh adhikaranam. tani means those organs pare merge into Brahman; hi we say thus because; aha tatha the sruti declares so; the significance of the words I will give you. tani means entire sooksha sariram; even at the time of jivanm Mukti karana sariram is heavily weakened. Sanchita karmas are gone and hence huge part of karana sariram is destroyed and it is not nourished further by agami karmas. One side the energy is gone and on the other side the meals do not get digested and how the person will live. That person is alive with thin nourishing prarapta factor and when it is also getting depleted and his karana sariram is almost gone even during jivan Mukti and avidya leash is the name of the weak karana sariram of jivan mukta. That is taken for granted and therefore it is not mentioned here. What happens to all of them pare means pare Brahmani. Supply the verb merges that entire sooksha sariram merges into Brahman. There is a discussion where the jnani jiva merges into Sagunam Isvara or Nirgunam Brahman and this will be discussed in the fourth pada. Jaimini maharishi says Sagunam Isvara aululomi says Nirgunam Brahman and Vyasacharya says both are correct. Logic behind is saguna Isvara from vyavahara dristi is Nirgunam Brahman from paramarthika dristi. In vyavahara dristi maya joins and in paramarthika dristi maya is not there to join. Vyavahara dristya jnani merges into Isvara and from paramarthika dristya jnanim merges into Nirgunam Brahman. What will happen to us will be our problem. Therefore apouruseya vishayatvat we cannot find out and we are able to say this because sastram declares jnani's sooksha sariram merges into Brahman. If we are really jnani, we should not be too much bothered about whether sooksha sariram merges into Isvara or not because a real jnani is one who has understood entire prapanca is mithya why should he obsessed with lot of one sooksha sariram. If he is interested in his sooksha sariram, he is not a jnani. It indicates the non-assimilation of the teaching. Then I am not worried it will merge into Isvara and if I am worried it will not merge into Isvara and it will continue to be there. tatha hi aha sruti declares so. Sruti kept in mind is 3.2.8 of Mundaka Upanisad and also 6.5 of prasna Upanisad should be kept in mind.

### **Topic 8 [[16] Avibhagadhikaranam**

The kalas of the knower of the Nirgunam Brahman attain absolute non distinction with Brahman at death.

**Sutra 4.2.16 [512]**

***Avibhago vachanat***

[absolute] nondistinction [with Brahman of the parts merged takes place] according to the statement [of the scriptures]

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. in this adhikaranam also the diversion continues regarding the jnani's death. Here the discussion is based on what we have said in the previous adhikaranam. There Vyasacharya said that jnani's jiva all sooksha sariram and karnams will merge into Brahman. But previously it was mentioned ajnani's jiva also will merge into Brahman while analyzing Chandogya upanisad vakyam. Therefore while studying the first five adhikaranam, it was mentioned that ajnani jiva also merges into Brahman. Tejasa parasyam devatapyam. Here based on Mundaka bashyam we say jnani merges into Brahman. If both merges into Brahman what is the difference. Moksa is defined as brahma aikyam. If you says jnani merges into Brahman means ajnani also at the time of death merges into Brahman and therefore attains Moksa. If that is so, why study Vedanta. Even though ajnani merges into Brahman, he does not attain Moksa should be our argument. Either both should be liberated or both should not be liberated. The merger is common to both. This is the doubt here. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya says ajnani does not get Moksa even though he merges with Brahman on death. But jnani gets Moksa when he merges with Brahman at the time of death. How do you differentiate when merger is common. Vyasacharya answer is one is apekshika merger or the relative merger where the difference is there. avyakta beda is ajnani's merger avyakta beda abhavah is jnani's merger. Sakti shesha layah is ajnani's merger but in the case of jnani it is not there.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. here Vyasacharya uses the word avibhaga which means absolute merger to differentiate the ajnani's merger with Brahman at the time of death. The pramanam for this is veda vakyam. The same two mantra 3.2.8 of Mundaka Upanisad and 6.5 of Prasna Upanisad. there also two expressions are there. even the nama rupas are destroyed in the case of jnani to differentiate from ajnani where the nama rupas are there in potential form. Then comes the next question this differentiation that ajnani's laya is relative merger and jnani's laya is absolute merger and where is the indication in the mantra. This is Purva Paksi argument. There Upanisad does not say apekshika laya. For that Adhi Sankaracharya gives his answer. He says this differentiation we make based on reasoning. What is the reasoning. This is very important. we say the difference between Jivatma and Paramatma is not caused by time space or attributes. The distance between Jivatma and Paramatma is not caused by time. If it is caused by space Jivatma is slowly go and merge with Paramatma. If it is caused by attributes Jivatma is to get gradually the attributes of Isvara. Why we say attributes wise division is not there. it is so because Atma has no attributes. The beda is caused not by time, space or attributes. Ajnanam is only cause for the sense of difference between jnani and ajnani. Because of ajnana I have I sense and as long as I sense is there beda will continue on death as also on pralaya. What happens in pralaya beda goes to potential form. In the case of ajnani beda is either in active form or in passive form and total merger is never possible in the case of an ajnani. Ajnani's merger with Brahman is fake merger. In the case of jnani, beda karanam [that is ajnanam] is gone. Karana nase karya nasah. Ajnana nase beda nasah. Beda nasa only figuratively called aikya prapti. It is called adhyantika aikya prapti. In the case of jnani can the beda come back and it cannot happen because beda can come only if ajnanam comes again. Ajnanam is never a karyam

and it cannot come again. It cannot have a beginning. Therefore there is total merger in the case of jnani on his death.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. avibaghah total merger of the pranas of a wise person takes place; atyantika aikyam bhavati; vacanat we know this from sruti statements; this is the running meaning. The significance is avibaghah means total merger and even potential division takes place. Permanent merger is called avibaghah. This happens in the case of jnani. The next word is vachanat sastra pramanat. The sastra pramanam is Mundaka and Prasna Upanisad as given above. Niranjana h parama samyam upaidi freed from ignorance samyam means aikyam the sruti uses the expression paramam that indicates atyantika aikyam. It differentiates parama samyam of ajnanis.

## **Topic 9 [[16] Tadokodhikaranam**

The soul of the knower of the Sagunam Brahman comes to the heart at the time of death and then goes out through the sookshma nadi.

### **Sutra 4.2.17 [513]**

***Tadoko'grajvalanam tatprakasitadvaro vidyasamarthya ttacchaesha gatyanusamritiyo gaccha hardanugrihitah satadhikaya***

[When the soul of a knower of the Sagunam Brahman is about to depart from the body there takes place] a lighting up of the front of its [soul's] abode [viz. the heart], the door of its egress being illumined thereby; owing to the power of knowledge and the application of meditation in the way which the part of that [knowledge] the soul favoured by Him in the heart viz., Brahman passes upward by the one that exceeds a hundred [i.e., the hundred and first Nadi]

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. We wonder it is a sutra or an essay. Normally sutras are small. One of the conditions is it should be short. Rarely we find long sutras. This is the ninth adhikaranam with only one sutra. in this adhikaranam Vyasacharya comes back to ajnani upasaka's maranam. He has discussed part of the topic up to sutra 11 and then the diversion was from 12 to 16 and the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra must be connected to 11<sup>th</sup> sutra. all ajnani jivas at the time of death withdraw from the golakas and it withdraws from nadis. The physical eyes will be there but perception will not be there. all golakams are there but they will not function. For they have come back to hridayam. All of them temporarily merge with Brahman. The present janma formally comes to end taking a dip in Isvara. One commentator says it takes a bath to take rest and after dip into karnam Brahman and in the case of jnani it is permanent merger. In the case of ajnani it waits for appropriate merge to go out. Vyasacharya will analyse the event. At this time this ajnani jiva looks around and from the hridayam there are openings of several nadis just like doors. They are called nadi dvarams. And it makes internal travel through appropriate nadi. It begins with hridayam up to the periphery of the body. Having come to the periphery of the body jiva has to take appropriate passage to appropriate loka. In 2.3.16 of Kathopanisad and 8.6.6 of Chandogya upanisad. it is mentioned that 101 nadis are mentioned, this jiva remaining in hridayam will scan all the doors. Which dnadi dvaram is to be taken. Once jiva has dipped into Brahman and come out, the next prarapta has been activated; next bunch of vasanas are also activated and the vasanas brighten up to be there in the next janma is brightened up. It is

figurative illumination and it is just activation of the vasanas. The vasana light, lights up the appropriate gate way. Depending upon the loka to be taken the illumination will light up the appropriate dvaram. It is said in 4.4.2 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. the wall of the hridayam in which many nadi apertures are opened and they are lighted for travel. With the help of that light, the departing jiva travels. It is vasana light. it is called pratyodah. Jiva travels through one of the nadis. Now there are ajnani jivas. Vip ajnanis are upasakas. The controversy is whether the ajnani jiva and ajnani upasaka jiva is same for both or it is taken at random. The Purva Pakshi says it is taken at random but we will say the specific passage is there.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 365

### **Topic 9 [[16] Tadokodhikaranam**

The soul of the knower of the Sagunam Brahman comes to the heart at the time of death and then goes out through the sookshma nadi.

**Sutra 4.2.17 [513]**

***Tadoko'grajvalanam tatprakasitadvaro vidyasamarthya ttacchaesha gatyanusamritiyo gaccha hardanugrihitah satadhikaya***

[When the soul of a knower of the Sagunam Brahman is about to depart from the body there takes place] a lighting up of the front of its [soul's] abode [viz. the heart], the door of its egress being illumined thereby; owing to the power of knowledge and the application of meditation in the way which the part of that [knowledge] the soul favoured by Him in the heart viz., Brahman passes upward by the one that exceeds a hundred [i.e., the hundred and first Nadi]

Temporary merger of jiva into Brahman of ajnani jiva marks the end of this present janma. This refreshes Jivatma for there was lot of struggle in extricating from the body. Now it has to take to the next journey. It then departs. The departure takes place through one nadi or other and many nadis are mentioned in the vedas. They are 101 in number. Now ajnani upasaka and ajnani jiva all of them have to leave the body through one nadi or other. Now what is the controversy is whether nadi through which the ajnani departs is a specific nadi or it is any nadi taken at random especially with regard to ajnani upasaka. Whether there is specific nadi for the upasaka. This controversy comes upasaka even though he is a ajnani he is an exalted ajnani. Because of that he is going to have a special gathi also and he is going to attain Krama Mukti. He will go to brahma loka attain nirguna Jnanam and merge into Nirgunam Brahman not to come back again. Non ajnanis come back again while upasaka ajnani never comes back again having gained Krama Mukti. Purva Pakshi says since all of them uniform ajnanis, in support of that they quote 4.4.2 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam which reads as *tasya haitasya hrdayasyagram pradyotate, tena pradyotenaisa Atma niskramati caksusova murdhno va anyebhyo va sarira desebyah tam utkramantam prano nukhramati pranam anutkramantam sarve Prana anutkramanti; sa vijnano bhavati, sa vijnanam evanvavakramati, tam Vidya karmani samanvarabhete purva prajna ca* the meaning of the mantra is the point of his heart becomes lighted up and by that light the Self departs either through the eye or through the head or through other apertures of the body. And when he thus departs, life departs after him. And when life thus departs, all the vital breaths depart after it. He becomes one with intelligence. What has intelligence departs with him. His knowledge and his work take hold of him as also his past experience. This Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra seems to say all ajnanis will take the nadi all right and there is no fixed nadi and therefore upasaka has no special treatment. The siddhantis say no and they say the upasakas have separate goal and therefore they have special passage outside and therefore they have special passage inside the body also and that nadi is called sushumna nadi. This nadi in Taittiriya Sikshavalli is called Indra yoni. Therefore Purva Pakshi says upasaka takes any nadi and siddhanti says upasaka takes sushumna nadi only.



Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. in this sutra Vyasacharya is giving five points with regard to upasaka's departure. First point is hridayagra prajvalanam and it says at the time of departure the purva janma vasanas and present janma vasanas will get activated and the activated vasanas are called brightening up of the top of hridayam. The enlightenment of periphery of the heart where the nadi joins. Here the word brightening is not physical lighting up but it is figurative lightening. It is like saying the talk was brightening. Since the vasans Jnanam vasana vrutti with chidabasa pratibimba and this vasana Jnanam is called brightening. Vasana regarding the next loka. This hridayagrah prajvalanam is common to both ajnani nonupasakas as also ajnani upasakas. This is not there in the case of jnanis. Second point is nadis dvara prakasanam. Because of the brightening up of vasanas this specific nadi aperture or nadi passage and relevant nadi passage gets lighted up. The vasana prajvalanam will illumine the dvaram nadi dvara prakasanam and not any nadi the specific nadi which is relevant to the death of jnani. It depends upon the nature of the ajnani. Higher nadi for better upasakas and lower nadi for sheer ajnanis. Third point is upasya deva anugraha. The blessing of the devata which the upasaka has meditated. Where is upasya devata. He has invoked for upasana in the heart itself. Sometimes he has meditated on Isvara also in the very hridaya akasa itself. In Chandogya upanisad 8<sup>th</sup> chapter dahara akasa Isvara is mentioned. That devata invoked in heart blesses at the time of death. Once the time of departure has come, what vasana should be activated and what nadi dvaram should be illumined jiva cannot decide. Jiva's free will is closed with the immersion in Brahman. At the time of departure I do not have any free will and what thoughts come is decided by the laws of karma and therefore bhagavan decides which vasanas should be brightened and which nadi should be employed and in the case of upasaka the nadi is chosen by bhagava, at the time of departure our will is not operating. Jiva does not have any deliberate thought at the time of departure nor is he aware of the events happening for being aware of the events pramata and ahankara must be active. Since the mind is folded even pramata is folded and therefore the departing soul is now aware of the events within himself. The individual is folded and we cannot know anything and that is why Bhagavan has to take charge of the event after death. When we are human being we use our will and decide. But when will is folded bhagavan takes charge of our life. The fourth point is sushumna dvara brahma loka pratptih. This upasaka through the sushumna nadi goes to brahma loka to attain Krama Mukti later. The fifth point is what is the power behind all these events. What decides all these events. Is it bhagavan's choice or something else. If you say it is bhagavan's choice then He will become partial some will get sushumna nadi and some will take smaller path. He is not the deciding factor and it is the sadhana is the directive force that decides the factor. Sadhana done before departure during our healthy life that decides the path. Your will is stronger in the younger days. You have stronger the will and in old age weaker is the will. What is the sadhana that decides the sushumna nadi. Vyasacharya says sadhana dvayam. Twofold sadhana decides the power one is Isvara dhyanam and the second is marga dhyanam. Upon Isvara as well meditation upon the path leading to Isvara starting from sushumna nadi and there are further details given in the scriptures which we will study in the third pada. the Isvara upasaka not only meditate upon Isvara as also the marga. This is the fifth point. The last point is this is given in the sastra itself.

We have sastra pramanam. The mantra is 2.3.16 of Kathopanisad 8.6.6 of Chandogya upanisad. in Chandogya upanisad daharakasa Isvara upasana is talked about. 8.6.6 of Chandogya upanisad mantra reads as *tad esa slokah satam caika ca hridayasya nadyah tasam murdhanam abhinihsrtaika tayordhvam ayann amrtatvam eit visvann anya utkramane bhavanti utkramane bhavanti* the meaning of the mantra is a hundred and one are the arteries of the heart, one of them leads up to the crown of the head. Going upward through that one

becomes immortal; the others serve for going in various other directions, for going in various other directions.

2.3.16 of Kathopanisad reads as *satam caika ca hrdayasya nadyas tasam murdhanam abhinishrtaika tayordhvam ayann amrtatvam eti. Visvann anya utkramane bhavanti* the meaning of the mantra is a hundred one are the arteries of the heart; one of them leads up to the crown of the head; going upward through that, one becomes immortal; the others serve for going to various other direction.

Sushumna nadi is called one hundred and first nadi. I emphaise this because the word used in Brahma Sutra is sadadhika nadi. Going up through that the life goes. The upasaka gets amrtatvam and it refers to brahma loka prapti and Krama Mukti. Sushumna nadi alone leads to brahma loka Krama Mukti. This is general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. tadoko agrajvalanam there occurs the illumination of the top of the heart which is the abode of the departing upasaka jiva. Taprakasitadvarah the passage through which upasaka jiva has to depart is illumined by that illumination; hardanugrihitah; blessed by the upasya devata which resides in the heart, the jiva departs; satadhikaya means through the sushumna nadi Vidya samarthyat because of the efficacy of upasana; cha and sashagatyanusmritiyogat and because of the injunction of the meditation on the path associated with upasana; this is the running meaning. Tadoko means jiva okha means abode; the abode of jiva which here is heart; agram means the top or the periphery where the nadi joins; it means hridaya agraham the periphery of the heart; jvalanam means illumination, enlightenment; hridaya agraprakasah we have to supply the verb bhavati; at the time of departure of upasaka the heart is lighted. Pramanam is 4.4.2 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad it is clearly said pradyodanam or brightening; tadprakasitadvarah that brightening or illumination jvalanam and prakasitatdvara means the nadi passage, the relevant nadi passage because there are one hundred one passages are there of which one is taken up; in the case of upasaka it is sushumnita nadi is prakasitam; for his benefit the passage is brightened up. This is given in the same Brihadaranyaka upanisad; hardanugrihitah means hardam refers to Isvara who is residing in the heart; the resident of hridaya is Isvara in this context; the Isvara who has been invoked by the upasaka; daharakasa rupi Isvara; by the Isvara upasaka is blessed; he alone directs him through sushumna nadi; satadhikaya means the hundred and first; this refers to sushumna nadi; it is based on kathopanisad and Chandogya upanisad mantra where sushumna nadi is counted as one hundred and first; for the status again sastra is pramanam; vidyasamarthyat all these things happen due to saguna Isvara upasanam; samarthyam means sakti, power or bhalam; punyam generated by the upasana; satseshagatyanusmritiyogat gathi means upasana marga; it means marga dhyanam; Isvara upasanam should go with another anga upasana and he should meditate upon the path also; marga dhyanam; satsesha Isvara upasanam sesha means associated with or connected to; it means marga connected to Isvara upasanam; yagat there is sastric rule; it means vidhih; commandment, rule, injunction etc. by the strength of commandment we come to know upasaka will take that marga; if the upasaka is going to take at random why should Upanisad ask the upasaka to meditate upon the path; the very fact proves that path should be a special path; it is prescribed therefore meditated path must be special path of upasaka. Cha is the conjunction joining the two sadhanas. The essence is upasaka through sushumna nadi departs for brahma loka or Krama Mukti. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 366

### **Topic 9 [[16] Tadokodhikaranam**

The soul of the knower of the Sagunam Brahman comes to the heart at the time of death and then goes out through the sookshma nadi.

**Sutra 4.2.17 [513]**

***Tadoko'grajvalanam tatprakasitadvaro vidyasamarthya ttacchaesha gatyanusamritiyo gaccha hardanugrihitah satadhikaya***

[When the soul of a knower of the Sagunam Brahman is about to depart from the body there takes place] a lighting up of the front of its [soul's] abode [viz. the heart], the door of its egress being illumined thereby; owing to the power of knowledge and the application of meditation in the way which the part of that [knowledge] the soul favoured by Him in the heart viz., Brahman passes upward by the one that exceeds a hundred [i.e., the hundred and first Nadi]

In the last class we completed the 17<sup>th</sup> sutra which is a long sutra belonging to the 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam. After a small diversion in adhikaranam 6, 7 and 8 Vyasacharya comes back to the main topic in 9<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam which being upasaka and his Krama Mukti. Vyasacharya deals with departure of jiva who is ajnani from vedantic standpoint but who has practised upasana in his life. Even if he does not deserve jivan Mukti now he deserves Krama Mukti which is but jivan Mukti in wbrahma loka. Therefore he has got special path through which he has to travel and Vyasacharya in this adhikaranam establish that ajnani upasaka travels through sushumna nadi which has been referred to as 101<sup>st</sup> nadi. This is based on Kathopanisad mantra. Purva Pakshi had a confusion based on Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam wherein it is said that that ajnani jiva will leave the body any one of the nadis. The nadi is presented as random nadi. That confusion of Purva Pakshi was resolved by noting the context of discussion. Brihadaranyaka upanisad as also Kathopanisad mantra deal with ajnani jiva's departure only. Brihadaranyaka upanisad deals with ajnani jiva's departure in general; he may be a karmi or upasaka or he may be a papi also; any kami is talked about. But in Chandogya upanisad and kathopanisad mantra deals with ajnani upasaka alone. Here we talk about upasaka's Krama Mukti. Amritatvam her refers to Krama Mukti alone. For him sushumna nadi specification is there. there is no contradiction between the two Upanisads statements. Now we will go to the next adhikaranam.

### **Topic 9 [18 - 19] Rasmyadhikaranam**

The soul of one who knows Sagunam Brahman follows the rays of the sun after death and goes to brahma loka.

**Sutra 4.2.18 [514]**

***Rasmyanusari***

[the soul of a knower of the Sagunam Brahman when he dies follows the rays of the sun.

The description of the progress of the released soul is continued.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is a small adhikaranam with two sutras. Here also Vyasacharya talks about upasaka ajnani alone. So far he talked about upasaka ajnani chooses the sushumna nadi, takes a dip in Brahman before taking the travel to brahma loka, and all these takes place governed by the karma and the blessings of the Isvara. He is not even conscious of all these things. Here Vyasacharya takes one more step further the preparation of journey beyond the body. So far we talked of preparation within the body at the time of death. Now we talk of the travel beyond the body that is the beam of the light of the sun or the rays of the sun. surya rasmih it is called. It is discussed in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter 6<sup>th</sup> section of Chandogya upanisad elaborately. I will refer to some of the Chandogya upanisad mantras referring to this idea. 8.6.1 of Chandogya upanisad the mantra reads as *atha ya eta hridayasya nadyas, tah pingalasyanimnas tisthanti, suklasya nilasya pitasya lohitasyet asau va adityah pingalah, esa suklah, esa nilah, esa pitah, esa lohita* the meaning of the mantra is now as for these arteries [channels] of the heart, they consist of fine substance which is reddish-brown, white, blue, yellow and red. Verily the sun yonder is reddish-brown, he is white, he is blue, he is yellow, he is red. As I have said often the nadi is physical part of the body and still we are not very clear which physical part sastra mentions. We do not know whether nadi refers to blood vessels, limb vessels, and arteries. The Upanisad says through nadis fluids of different colour flow. I don't want to translate the word nadi for we are not sure what is nadi. We know that it refers to sthoola sariram. It is filled with anna rasam essence of food which has different colours. Adhi Sankaracharya keeping his ayurveda sastra connects it to vada piththa and kapam because of various combination the anna rasa of different colours flow through the nadi. The Upanisad connects the different colours of the nadi the colours of fluids within the nadi to the colours of surya rasmi. Sunlight has got seven colours and therefore sastra says the seven colours are there in the nadi. They connect it to the surya bimbah and therefore Upanisad says surya rasmi is like a long road, or highway. 8.6.2 of Chandogya upanisad says *tad yatha mahapatha atata ubhau gramau gacchatimam camum ca* it connects two destination like highway the hridayam is one part surya bimbam is another part and through this only upasaka goes to Brahma Loka. Vyasacharya is now interested in analyzing the upasaka journey through surya rashmi starting from hridaya nadi and connecting surya bimba. Then 8.6.5 of Chandogya upanisad says *atha yatrataid asmaccharirad utkramati, athaitair eva rasmibhir urdhvam akramate, sa aum iti va ha ut va miyate, sa yavat ksipyen manah, tavad adityam gacchati etad vai khalu loka dvaram vidusam prapadanam nirodhovidusam* the meaning of the mantra is but when he thus departs from this body, then he goes upwards by these very rays or he goes up with the thought of aum. As his mind is failing, he goes to the sun. That, verily is the gateway of the world, an entering in for the knows of a shutting out for the non-knowers. When the upasaka dies, he goes upward only through surya rashmi. This reference is given in 8.6.5 of Chandogya upanisad as above. In the same mantra it is said the departure through surya rashmi take place immediately after death that means there is no time gap mentioned by the mantra. It goes through surya rashmi is one information and it goes immediately is another information. What is the controversy in this adhikaranam. Whether the travel through surya rashmi is common to all upasakas or to some upasakas only. we confine only to upasakas only and not non-upasakas. The surya rashmi gathi is parital or total is the question. Purva Pakshi argues it is partial and siddhanti is going to establish that the rule is universal to all the upasakas. This is the subject matter of this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. Vyasacharya makes a general statement. Purva Paksi will come only in the next sutra. this sutra is only a statement of our preposition. Pratijna here is based on Chandogya upanisad mantras 8<sup>th</sup> chapter we come to know all ajnani upasaka jivas travel through surya rashmi.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. rasmyanusari means the upasaka attains Brahma Loka following the rays of the sun. the significance of the word is it is a compound word rasmi and anusari. Rasmi refers to sunrays and anusari means the following or follower. It is an adjective to upasaka. Following the rays he attains Brahma Loka. When Vyasacharya makes the statement he recalls the Chandogya upanisad mantra in 8<sup>th</sup> chapter.

## **Topic 9 [18 - 19] Rasmyadhikaranam**

The soul of one who knows Sagunam Brahman follows the rays of the sun after death and goes to brahma loka.

### **Sutra 4.2.19 [515]**

#### ***Nisi neti chenna sambandhasya yavaddehabhavitvaddarsayati cha***

If it be said [that the soul does] not [follow the rays] in the night, we say [not so] because the connection [of nadis and rays] continues as long as the body lasts; the sruti also declares [this]

An objection to sutra 17 is raised and refuted.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. it has got Purva Paksi part and siddhanti's part. The objection raised by Purva Paksi is that he says all upasakas cannot travel through surya rashmi to Brahma Loka. All upasakas may not die during daytime. Some of the upasakas may die during night time and during night surya rasmi is not there and therefore surya rashmi will be available for those who die in the day time. This is the logical objection. Vyasacharya concludes no. surya rashmi for all people including those who die in the night. Adhi Sankaracharya's primary argument is based on Chandogya upanisad vakyam. Suppose it is said for the upasaka who die in the night surya rashmi is not there and they won't get Brahma Loka suppose it is argued, then all upasakas will not get Brahma Loka and they cannot order death during daytime. They cannot order death in daytime. Therefore they won't get krama Mukti means that the upasana gives Krama Mukti the sastra vakyam will be falsified. 8.6.6 of Chandogya upanisad will be falsified. Suppose the Purva Paksi says night dying upasakas will go to Brahma Loka not through surya rashmi, it will mean another sruti vakyam will be falsified that is 8.6.5 of Chandogya upanisad that all upasakas go through surya rashmi. All of them should go through surya rashmi necessarily and get Krama Mukti necessarily. To avoid both these problems, Purva Paksi may give a suggestion. Purva Paksi says night dying upasaka should go through surya rashmi and should go to Brahma Loka. Why not the jiva wait for the day to dawn to travel in daytime. Adhi Sankaracharya in collaboration with Vyasacharya says that also will go against another sruti vakyam 8.6.5 of Chandogya upanisad that the upasaka travels immediately after death go to surya rashmi. There is now waiting also. Because of all these reasons, Vyasacharya concludes night dying upasakas and day dying upasakas irrespective of time of death upasaka travels through surya rashmi. Because of sruti vakyam Vyasacharya concludes that during the nighttime also surya rashmi connection between jiva and surya mandalam continues. For this there is sastra

pramanam. Surya hridaya sambanda is there all the time. Adhi Sankaracharya gives an incidental argument. He says because surya is obtaining on the earth during the night also we feel the warmth of the sun. that itself is the proof. Then Purva Paksi asks during summer night we feel the warmth of the sun and then he asks what about the winter night. Adhi Sankaracharya says that sun's warmth is there in winter night but it is not felt due to the wintry night. Surya sambanda between hridaya nadi and surya rashmi all through the birth to death. Surya rashmi may not be used by all the people but in the case of upasaka it is used to go through Brahma Loka.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. na means upasaka does not follow the rays of the sun; nisi means in the night; up to this is Purva Paksi. Iti chet means if this is your contention na it is not so; sambandhasya means because the connection between the nadi and the rays of the sun yavaddehabhavitvat exists as long as the body exists; cha darsayati means sruti also declares so; this is the running meaning. The significance of the words nisi na; in the night you have to understand the upasaka dies in the night; he does not travel through the sun's rays; Purva Paksi does not give reason because it is common that sunrays are not available in the night; iti chet if this is your argument I cannot accept the argument; sambandhasya means connection between hridaya nadi and surya rashmi relations; yavad deha bhavitvat the existence throughout the life; during the night also our hridaya nadi has got surya rashmi. The pramanam is primarily sastra pramanam only. scientists may not accept it. But we take the sastra pramanam. Our argument is not based on science and it is based on sastra pramanam. Darsayati cha sruti vakyam reveals nadi rashmi sambanda during the night also refer to 8.6.2 of Chandogya upanisad. there is highway connection between hridaya and sun's rays like a highway connecting two villages.

## **Topic 10 [20 – 21] Dakshinayanadhikaranam**

Even if the knower of the Sagunam Brahman dies in Dakshinayana he still goes to Brahma Loka.

### **Sutra 4.2.20 [516]**

#### ***Ataschyane'pi dakshine***

And for the same reason [the departed soul follows the rays] also during the sun's southern course.

This sutra is a corollary draws from the preceding sutra.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. This is the 11<sup>th</sup> and final adhikaranam of the second pada. This is the extension of the previous topic. here Vyasacharya wants to find out whether the time of death or the nature of time of death will influence the travel of the upasaka. There is wide assumption in the vedic circle that there is auspicious time of death and inauspicious time of death. Some time is considered inauspicious and some inauspicious. Our controversy is upasaka rasmi travel is affected by marana kalam or not. Purva Paksi will say yes and siddhanti will say no. anytime he may die all time is punya kalam for upasaka. Details in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 367

### **Topic 10 [20 – 21] Dakshinayanadhikaranam**

Even if the knower of the Sagunam Brahman dies in Dakshinayana he still goes to Brahma Loka.

#### **Sutra 4.2.20 [516]**

#### ***Ataschyane'pi dakshine***

And for the same reason [the departed soul follows the rays] also during the sun's southern course.

This sutra is a corollary draws from the preceding sutra.

We have entered into the 11<sup>th</sup> and final adhikaranam of the second pada. it has two sutras. In this adhikaranam Vyasacharya answers a possible question, which may arise in the mind based on the previous adhikaranam. There the topic was that the departure of the upasaka jiva to Brahma Loka by the path of sushumna nadi followed by sunlight. The sushumna nadi takes jiva from heart up to the periphery of the body and from there it goes through the sunrays. This is based on Chandogya upanisad vakyam, which says it connects the hridaya nadi and surya loka. Therefore through surya rays upasaka goes to Brahma Loka and krama Mukti. The connection between the hridaya nadi and sunrays is permaent and exists from birth to death. It is avialble during daytime as also in the night. Therefore whether the upasaka dies in daytime or nighttime upasaka can travel through surya rashmi. He need not wait for sunlight to come. Our conclusion is that instantaneously travels through sunrays in the night also. Upasaka departure and travel is definite irrespective of time of death. In the sastra certain times of death have been said to be auspicious and some time as inauspicious. Daytime, shukla paksa and uttarayana are said to be auspicious. Viparitam is the opposite of each one night, krsihna paksa and dakshinayanam are said to be inauspicious. Therefore doubt will come if the upasaka dies during the inauspicious will have journey and Krama Mukti. Purva Paksi says if the time is inauspicious he will not go to Brahma Loka. Siddhanti says this rule does not apply to the non-upasaka and other ajnanis. In the case of ajnani upasaka this rule will not apply. In the case of jnani also time place etc. is irrelevant. We have seen before. This adhikaranam extends this rule to upasaka also. The conclusion of this adhikaranam is upasaka can die any time and he will get Krama Mukti.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. Vyasacharya extends the conclusion from the previous sutra. there it was mentioned that even if the upasaka dies in the night, he can travel through sunrays. Even if it is dakshinayanam he will travel through surya rashmi. We have to add other inauspicious time also that is Krishna paksa. Night has already been talked about in the previous adhikaranam. Whether he dies in dakshinayanam or Krishna paksa, the upasaka will get Krama Mukti.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. dakshine ayane api the upasaka attains Brahma Loka in dakshinayanam also atah cha due to the same reason; this is the running

meaning. Significance of the words the upasaka who dies in the dakshinayanam and Krishna paksa also; atah cha due to the same reason sruti pramanat; the sruti pramanam is that we gave in the previous adhikaranam chapter 8 of Chandogya upanisad. in those vakyam it is mentioned the upasaka will go through surya rashmi it is said and the connection between the nadi and sun rays is permanent and there is no time gap between the death and travel. Then Adhi Sankaracharya raises a Purva Paksi in his commentary. If the time is immaterial for upasaka to travel to Brahma Loka the why Bheeshma waited for time of death. He should be either a upasaka or a jnani and why he waited for uttarayanam. He need not have waited for it. Even if he had died in uttarayanam he would have got Krama Mukti. Auspicious time is not the reason for which he waited for the death to occur. Adhi Sankaracharya gives two reasons for him to wait. For other ajnanis time of death is relevant and valid. Therefore to respect for the sake of other people Bheeshmacharya waited for death. He rejected the throne and decided to remain a Brahmachari and his father gave the special power to die anytime he chose. And that varam has to be validated and respected. In order to respect the varam he waited for the right time to die. Therefore to respect his father's boon and to glorify his father he waited for uttarayanam. Incidentally he could teach Dharma putra. Vishnu sahasranama he gave to the world. His waiting has nothing to do with auspicious or inauspicious time of death. With this 20<sup>th</sup> sutra is over.

## Topic 10 [20 – 21] Dakshinayanadhikaranam

Even if the knower of the Sagunam Brahman dies in Dakshinayana he still goes to Brahma Loka.

### Sutra 4.2.21 [517]

#### *Yogina prati cha smaryate smarte chaite*

And [these times or details] are recorded by smriti with reference to the yogins and these two [yoga and Sankhya and classed as smritis [only]

In this sutra Vyasacharya answers another objection that may be raised. This objection is based on 8.23 of Gita. Here Krishna clearly says *yatra kale tv anavrttim avrttim cai 'va yoginah prayata yanti tam kalam vaksyami bharatarsabha* the meaning of the mantra is now I shall declare to thee the time in which yogins departing never return and also that wherein departing they return. He says there are two times of death one is auspicious and the other time of death is inauspicious. Superior time of death is the time which will take one to Brahma Loka or Krama Mukti. Inferior time is that time which will take karmis to svarga loka which is the world of return. Krishna has made the time division as superior and inferior time. How do you account for the statement of the Gita. This is the contention of the Purva Paksi. We have got two answers. One is superior answer the real answer and another is temporary answer. The real answer will be given later in the next pada. but I will tell you now. In this sutra the provisional answer is given. The real answer is we say in that particular sloka Gita word kala does not refer to time at all. The word kala refers to kala devata upalakshita shukla gathi or devayana marga. Don't take vachyartham in that sloka. There we have to take lakshartham. How do you arrive at this meaning. I have explained this in Gita class. First reason is Krishna himself explains this verse in the next two verses 24 and 25 of Gita. The two slokas reads as *agnir jyotir ahah sukrajah saumasa uttarayanam tatra prayata gacchanti brahma brahmavido janah followed by dhumo ratris tatha krsnah sanmasa daksinayanam tatra candramasam jyotir yogi prapya nivartate* the meaning of the two



mantras is fire light, day, the bright [half of the month] the six months of the northern path [of the sun] then going forth the men who know the Absolute go to the Absolute; followed by smoke, night, so also the dark [half of the month] the six months of the southern part [of the sun] then going forth the yogi obtains the lunar light and returns.

He explains superior time and inferior time. If Krishna talks about inferior and superior time then he would have given list of timings that come under each category. When you read 24<sup>th</sup> sloka the time is given. Therefore it appears it is list of time that comes under superior time. If that sloka gives a list of superior time what about the two words agni and jyotir. Agni time does not exist and so also jyotir. If you take it superior timing then you cannot explain the two words agni and jyotir. The words refer to devata. It refers to uttarayana and dakshinayana devata. Because there is no agni kala or jyotir kala. Same is the case with sloka 25 also. The word dhuma you cannot explain for there is no dhuma kala. Dhuma means smoke. Then you have to understand that all the words do not refer to time but devata. The devata represents Krishna etc., marga. Kala should not be taken time in this context. Inexplicability of agni, jyotir and dhuma makes us to take that the times mentioned later in the slokas refers to devatas alone.

Suppose we conclude uttarayanam etc. as superior time, and dakshinayanam Krishna paksa and night are inferior time leading to returnable to this loka, there will be problem. Suppose a person dies uttarayana Krishna paksa bhagavan will be confused. What can be done. Uttarayanam is good time and Krishna paksa is bad time.

Another problem is suppose a person dies shukla paksa night, because he dies in shukla paksa he should get Brahma Loka and because he died in night he will go to svarga loka. So the yatra kala should not be taken as time at all.

Third reason is that Krishna concludes this topic in 26<sup>th</sup> verse. The sloka reads as *suklakrsne gati hy ete jagatah sasvate mate ekaya yaty anavrttim anyaya vartate punah* the meaning of the mantra reads as light and darkness these path are thought to be the world's everlasting [paths]. By the one he goes not to return by the other he returns again. What I talked about here is two types of marga. If he had talked about inferior and superior time but he does not refer to time but shukla Krishna gathi alone. It refers to shukla marga and Krishna marga. This will be elaborated 4.3.4 of Brahma Sutra, this is the real answer.

Now we will come to provisional answer given in the sutra. Vyasacharya says let us assume Gita talks about superior and inferior time for the upasakas. It is only an assumption. Superior and inferior time is not there for the upasakas. Then what will be the problem. In previous adhikaranam we have said that superior and inferior time is not there for the upasakas. The how can we accept both. They are contradictory. We have rejected the superior and inferior time on the basis of Chandogya upanisad vakyams. Here now we take the superior and inferior times as per the smriti that is the Gita. Vyasacharya says for shroua upasakas the time divisions are not there. for smarta upasakas time divisions are there. the final question who is shroua upasaka and smarta upasakas. Shroua upasaka is one who does upasanas based on the vedic injunctions. Smarta upasakas are those who does upasanas on non-vedic scriptures. Gita will come under smriti. For smarta upasakas the time will become important for them. It is however not the real answer. Vyasacharya says the upasana and Jnanam given in Gita are called smarta Jnanam and smarta upasana. The knowledge and upasana taught in Gita is called smarta Jnanam and smarta upasana. Jnanam he translates as sankyam and for

smarta yogi the kala division exists. Whereas for dahara upasana karta the time division will not apply.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. smaryate means smriti refers to the time of death prati yoginah from the standpoint of smarta upasakas; etecha means both yoga and sankya [taught in Gita] smarte belong to smriti. The significance of the words is smaryate means the Gita vakyam; [refer to 8<sup>th</sup> chapter verse 23] it is not for Chandogya upanisad upasakas. It is taught to smarta upasakas who practice upasana based on the smriti that is Gita or puranas. This does not come under veda at all. We don't do vedic upasanas now. All are based on puranas only. For such upasaka time is applicable. Ete cha smarte both the Jnanam as also upasana taught in Gita; one refers to nirguna and saguna Vidya. They come under smartam therefore it has separate rule. Here Gita is taken away from vedas. When we look at Gita we do get doubt whether it follows vedic teaching or it has its own path. In some places Gita follows samkya yoga. When gita talks about different methods of meditations it is closer to Patanjali yoga. In some places it appears to be close to Samkya and in some places it is closer to Patanjali yoga. With this the adhikaranam is over and the second pada is also over. The travel path will be taught in the third pada, except intermediary adhikaranam all referred to upasaka's departure after death for Krama Mukti.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4, Pada: 3

Class 368

### **Brief introduction**

In the last class we have completed the second adhyaya of the fourth chapter and now we shall enter the **third chapter**. This chapter consists of the phalam of vidya. The vidya in this context is can be either saguna upasana as well as nirguna jnanam. Phalam also can be upasana phalam or the jnana phalam together is presented as three fold mukti which is jivan mukti, vidheh mukti and krama mukti. Of these three nirguna jnanam gets you the jivan mukti and vidheh mukti phalam and saguna upasanam gives the krama mukti phalam. Jivan mukti and vidheh mukti do not involve any travel whereas krama mukti involves posthumous travel after death to brahma loka. The phalam is gathi rahita phalam or gathi sahita phalam. Mukti can be defined in both negative language and positive language. In negative language it is freedom from bondage, samsara, or dukham. In positive language it is ananda prapti or brahma prapti or attainment of brahmananda. Keeping the various topics in the mind vyasacharya has classified the fourth chapter into four padas. There i had pointed out the first pada focused on banda vrutti aspect especially the bonds of karma. How sanchita karma is destroyed how agami does not stick to him and prarapta karma is exhausted. The fourth pada concentrates on brahma prapti the positive aspects of moksa. Thus first and fourth are complementary dukha nivritti and ananda prapti. Second and third pada are complementary as both deal with krama mukti of saguna upasaka. This krama mukti involves travel after death. Since krama mukti involves travel it can be divided into three parts or portions. The first is the departure from the body for travel; this is there only for krama mukti and it is not relevant to jivan mukti or vidheh mutki. Jivan mukta need not come out of body. Krama mukti candidate will have to come out of the body which is called utkranti body departure from the body. The second is the journey part like any other journey. It is a job. Getting out of the house is a job. So also the departure from the body. The second part is the actual gathi or travel part and the third is brahma prapti the destination brahman. These three put together is called krama mukti. This is called utkranti, gathi and prapti. The first part we had discussed in second pada. We have completed the second pada. We have elaborately discussed the departure part. What is left out is gathi and prapti, the travel and reaching part with regard to krama mukti. Vyasacharya will concentrate on gathi travel through a special part, which is called shukla or devayanam etc. They are special name for the special path of the upasaka. The travel of the upasaka is through shukla gathi or devayanam. The second part is reaching the destination of brahman or sagunam brahman or hiranyagarbha loka. It is not nirgunam brahman. The upasaka is an ajnani and he is not ready for nirguan brahma aikyam. This is the second topic and vyasacharya will use the expression karya brahma prapti. Third pada is shortest pada in brahma sutra. This pada has only sixteen sutras of them first four adhikaranams deal with the gathi or shukla marga gamanam. Then last two adhikaranams deal with karya brahma prapti or hiranyagarhha praptih. This is the broad classification of the third pada. With this background we will enter the text proper.

### **Topic 1 [1] Archiradhyadhikaranam**

The path connected with the deities beginning with that of light is the only path that leads to brahma loka.

**Sutra 4.3.1 [518]**

***Archiradina tatprathitch***

On the path connected with light [the departed soul of the knower of sagunam brahman travels to brahma loka after death that being well known [from the sruti]

It is a small adhikaranam with one sutra. Now i will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is whether there is only one shukla marga leading to brahma loka or many margas leading to brahma loka. The doubt comes because we have many margas in this loka. It may be possible and therefore the doubt is raised here. This controversy comes because of several veda vakyams. Three veda vakyams we take here. One is chandogya upanisad 8.6.5 which says *athaitair eva rasmibhir urdhvam akramate* where it is said the upasaka goes to surya rashmi the rays of the sun. Shukla marga is associated with surya rashmi the rays of the sun. Then 6.2.15 of brihadaranyaka upanisad says *te'rcir abhisambhavanti* which means upasaka goes to the flame; what is the meaning of the word flame we will see later. All of them refer to different devata. Here we will not discuss that matter. And mundaka upanisad 1.2.11 says *te viraja prayanti* where surya bimbam is mentioned. Each mantra refers to each path and the purva paksi feels that they indicate different marga. Thus archi should refer to shukla gathi; rashmibi it must refer to another shukla gathi and brihadaranyaka upanisad elsewhere *vayu agachati* and *vayu* refers to another shukla gathis. Therefore the question is whether shukla gathi is one or many. Our conclusion is shukla gathi is only one and all these indicators are different stations connected to one route. They are different stations linked together refer to one path. Each veda mantra refers to one station or other as an implication of one veda mantra which connects all the station. This we will study later. The method of indication is called *pratyabijna* method that by referring to one stage upanisad wants us to remember it is associated with one destination. Each one mentioned here is intermediary station. What is the order of the station will be our next question. Vyasacharya says that we will discuss in the next adhikaranam. Here he want to say only one shukla gathi. Therefore shukla gathi is one is the conclusion. This is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In this sutra vyasacharya says there is only shukla gathi mentioned in the sastra with several intermediary stages. This shukla gathi with several intermediary stages are already well known in 5.10.1 of chandogya upanisad wherein panchagni vidya is talked about and at the end of that shukla gathi where most of the stages are connected. The stages mentioned there is flame the first stage, the day is the second stage, paksam is the third stage; uttarayanam fourth adhitya samvatsaram the fifth stage and adhithya the sixth stage. The mantra 5.10.1 of chandogya upanisad reads as *tad ya ittham viduh, ye ceme'ranya sraddha tapa ity upaste, te'recisam abhisambhavanti, arciso'hah, abna apuryamana-paksam, apuryamana-paksad yan sad udann eti masams tan* the meaning of the mantra is so those who know this, and those who in the forest meditate on faith as austerity [or with faith and austerity] go to light and from lighth to day, from day to the bright half of the month [of the waxing moon] to those six months during which the sun moves northward.

Shukla gathi is known as wellknown shukla marga. Vyasacharya uses the word *pratitih*. Since the full shukla gathi is mentioned in chandogya upanisad above mantra, in that shukla gathi the first station mentioned is *archih* the route is called *archirathi* marga. The reason is presented as the first stage in the important chandogya upanisad mantra. Therefore

vyasacharya says that there is only one shukla gathi is there. Any other mantra mentioning any other thing should not be taken as main marga. There is no other route is the conclusion.

Adhi sankaracharya gives some more arguments. Before going to that i will give you the running meaning. Archira all upasakas travel by one shukla gathi only; tat partite we say so because this is known from the sruti statement; the significance of the words is archiradhina is a technical word for shukla gathi. It means the route beginning with first station of archi. This is one only. Then the upasaka travels; tad partite the one archiradhi marga connects all the station is well known from the sruti. This connects all the intermediary stations.

Now we will see the other arguments given by adhi sankaracharya. Second argument adhi sankaracharya gives is when all upasakas have one and the same destination it is better to have one marga rather than many margas. Suppose a person argues what is wrong when i assume many margas, adhi sankaracharya says that there is a sastric rule. When you assume something simple assumption is better than complex assumption. When there is possibility of one and many, we have to choose one for simplicity. If you choose it is called gourava doshah. If the veda has mentioned many marga because it is pramana siddham. When veda has mentioned only one marga why should we assume many margas.

Third argument adhi sankaracharya gives is when various veda vakyams refer to various connections we find that all of them are included in the main chandogya upanisad vakyam. All stages and stations are mentioned here. They don't mention separate path but refer to any one of them mentioned in mukhya sruti. So other vakyams refer to one of the stations to remind the main shukla gathi. All the three vakyams we saw in the introduction. They refer to different intermediary stations connected one distination. Then adhi sankaracharya gives the third argument, which is based on chandogya upanisad. Then in the concluding mantra chandogya upanisad says if a person does not go through shukla gathi [brahma loka] and krishna gathi [svarga loka] he will have athogathi [lower stages]. And the chandogya upanisad mantra is 5.10.8 of chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *athaitayoh pathor na katarena cana tanimani ksudrany asakrd avartini bhutani bhavanit jayasva, mriyasveti etat trtiyam sthanam, tenasau lake na sampuryate, tasmaj jugupseta tad esa slokah* but on neither of these ways are those small crature which are continually revolving [those of whom it is said], be born and die. Their's is a third state. By this [it comes about] that that world becomes full. Therefore let one seek to guard himself. To this end there is this verse.says atho gathi is the third path. Athogathi can be called third only when there are two separate gathis before as shukla gathi and krishna gathi. Many krishna gathi and many shukla gathi then athogathi cannot be third. The very fact chandogya upanisad says atho gathi is third which means there is only one shukla gathi and one krishna gathi. It uses different words in different contexts.

## Topic 2 [2] Vayvadhikaranam

The departing soul reaches the deity of the year and then the deity of the air.

### Sutra 4.3.2 [519]

#### *Vayumabd adavisheshaviseshabhyam*

[the departed soul] [of a knower of the sagunam brahman goes] from the deity of the year to the deity of the air on account of the absence and presence of specification.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the second adhikaranam with one sutra. The subject matter is the details of various stages of travel. We study the route map of shukla gathi. We are going to see the order of the stations. Even though chandogya upanisad mantra mentions most of the stages or stations of shukla gathi it does not mention all the stages. Some of them are left out and those left out stations are mentioned in other sruti vakyams. We have to take those stations and combine them and form a full route. When you are borrowing stages from other sruti vakyams to main sruti chandogya upanisad vakyam, six stations are mentioned some more are mentioned in other vakyams. Where to insert is our problem? Thus we are going to take some sruti vakyams as to how to insert the extra stations in the mukya sruti vakyam. We will analyse three vakyams. Each vakyam will talk about various station. First one is 5.10.1 and 2. There most of the stations are mentioned. Flame, day, shukla paksa, uttarayanam, samvatsara and adhithya. Then kaushitaki upanisad the relevant portion of the mantra 1.3 reads as agni loka vayu loka varuna loka, indra loka and prajapathi loka, brahma loka are mentioned here. Now we have to club these two. Of them agni loka need not be added to the previous one because word flame is already mentioned and the flame is nothing but agni. It is called archih there. It is only one station with two different name. The next one is vayu loka. Now the question where to insert vayu loka for vayu loka is not mentioned in chandogya upanisad. Purva paksi gives a suggestion since in the kaushitaki vayu is mentioned after agni in chandogya upanisad after archi insert vayu loka and thereafter day etc., can be added. This is the suggestion from purva paksi. There is problem because of another sruti which 5.10.1 of brihadaranyaka upanisad. This mantra talks about the upasaka going to vayu loka and from there he goes to adhithya loka. *Yada vai puruso'smat lokat praiti, sa vayum agacchati, tasmad sa tatra vijihite yatha ratha cakrasya kham tena sa urdhva akramate sa adityam agacchati; tasmad sa tatra vijihite yatha lambarasya kham;* he goes to vayu devata where he prepares the chariot for further travels and through that only upasaka travels and reaches adhithyam. Vayu loka comes before adhithya. Therefore, going back to main mantra vayu loka according to this mantra vayu should precede this adhithya. Therefore why cannot we add vayu before adhithya. Whether it should come after archi or six stations just before adhithya loka. This is the controversy. It is not after archi but it is before adhithya. Why will be told in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 369

### **Topic 2 [2] Vayvadhikaranam**

The departing soul reaches the deity of the year and then the deity of the air.

#### **Sutra 4.3.2 [519]**

#### ***Vayumabd adaviseshaviseshabhyam***

[the departed soul] [of a knower of the sagunam brahman goes] from the deity of the year to the deity of the air on account of the absence and presence of specification.

I want to add a few point in regard to whether there is one shukla gathi or more than one shukla gathi. Vyasacharya gave one main argument that there is only one shukla gathi which is revealed by chandogya upanisad 5.10.1 & 2. In these two mantras the primary shukla gathi is explained. It is called archi radhi gathi. We said all the other srutis referring to various stages do not refer to different paths but they are only indicating the main path and they are intermediary stations mentioned in the above sruti vakysms. There there is an important point which i left out. This occurs in the above vakyams. There the upanisad says that this shukla gathi is taken by the panchagni vidya upasana performers. Because these ten sections deal with panchagni vidya only. It is phalam for the panchagni upasakas. After saying that, it says whoever practise the panchagni vidya get shukla gathi. Then comes the crucial sentence says that even other upasakas who practise upasanas other than panchagni vidya upasaka will go via the shukla gathi. This is very important argument to show that all the upasakas including panchagni upasaka will go through one shukla gathi which is taken by the panchagni vidya upasakas. This is the point i wanted to add here. After giving vyasacharya's main argument, i said adhi sankaracharya gives three argument in support of the above. I gave the sruti quotations in this regard. In that sruti quotation it is said the people who don't go by either of the two gathis will take athogathi. That was the final argument i gave. If athogathi must be third path, then there must be one shukla gathi and one krishna gathi. The mantra is 5.10.8 of chandogya upanisad. The mantra reads as *athaitayoh pathor na katarena cana tanimani ksudrany asakrd avartini bhutani bhavanit jayasva, mriyasveti etat trtiyam sthanam, tenasau lake na sampuryate, tasmaj jugupseta tad esa slokah* but on neither of these ways are those small crature which are continually revolving [those of whom it is said], be born and die. Their's is a third state. By this [it comes about] that that world becomes full. Therefore let one seek to guard himself. To this end there is this verse.

Now we will come to the vayu adhikaranam which i have introduced. We establish the various stations involved in the shukla gathi. Some of the stages are mentioned in chandogya upanisad and some of them are mentioned in kaushitaki upanisad. Therefore it is academically important. First i mentioned is 5.10.1 and 2 where i mentioned six stages flame, day, paksha uttrayanam samvatsaram and adhithya i gave. Two more you may add. They are seventh one chandrah and eighth one is vidyud the light. Then kaushitaki 1.3 six are mentioned agni loka, vayu loka, varuna loka, indra loka prajapathi loka and brahma loka. The mantra reads as *etam deva yanam panthanam apadyagni lokam agacchati, sa vayu lokam, sa varuna lokam, sa indra lokam,, sa prajapati lokam, sa brahma lokam tasya ha va etasya*



*lokasyaro hrado mukurta yestihā vijara nadilyo vrksah salajyam samsthanam aparajitam ayatanam indra prajapati dvara gopau, vibhu pramitam, vicaksanasandy amilaujāh paryanakah priya ca manasi pratirupa ca cassusi puspany adayavayato vai ca jagany ambas cambayavis capsaraso mbaya nadyah, tam ittham vid agacchati, tam brahma habhidhavatah, mama yasasa vijaram va ayam nadim prapan na va ayam jarayisyatiti* six are mentioned. The last one should not be taken as stage which being the destination. Eight in chandogya upanisad and five in kaushitaki so there are thirteen stations we have to properly arrange. In kaushitaki upanisad the first one is agni lokam and i said in the last class the agni loka need not be added for archi and agni are synonymous. The next one is vayu loka and what we should do with the vayu loka. Where to insert vayu loka. In chandogya upanisad list of eight stages where to accommodate vayu loka. In kaushitaki vayu comes after agni loka. It can be accommodated vayu can be added after agni. But another person says i cannot accept that because in brihadaranyaka upanisad there is another mantra referring two stages of shukla gathi. The mantra is 5.10.1 of brihadaranyaka upanisad. This mantra talks about the upasaka going to vayu loka and from there he goes to adhithya loka. *Yada vai puruso'smat lokat praiti, sa vayum agacchati, tasmāt sa tatra vijihite yatha ratha cakrasya kham tena sa urdhva akramate sa adityam agacchati; tasmāt sa tatra vijihite yatha lambarasya kham;* he goes to vayu devata where he prepares the chariot for further travels and through that only upasaka travels and reaches adhithyam. Vayu loka comes before adhithya. Therefore, going back to main mantra vayu loka according to this mantra vayu should precede this adhithya. Therefore why cannot we add vayu before adhithya. Here it is said upasaka on his journey will got to vayu loka and vayu devata will open and through the opening goes further up in his journey and goes to adhithya loka. From the sruti statement we come to know vayu loka just before adhithya because it is said in brihadaranyaka upanisad. Therefore from brihadaranyaka upanisad we know vayu should precede adhithya and from kaushitaki we know vayu loka should follow agni loka and if it should follow agni loka the insertion of vayu loka should be between one and two. If you go by brihadaranyaka upanisad the vayu loka must come before adhithya and chandogya upanisad eight stages adhithya and it should be between five and six. The controversy whether vayu loka is between one and two or between five and six. We says brihadaranyaka upanisad wins and kaushitaki cannot be accepted with regard to the order and brihadaranyaka upanisad should be accepted that means vayu should be inserted between five and six only. After samvatsara vayu loka will come. The total list will be nine stations instead of eight. This is the conclusion of this adhikaranam.

Now i will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. Vyasacharya says vayu loka is between five and six. Vyasacharya chooses the second option and it should come after samvatsara. Instead of this he says abdah. Now the question is why did you choose brihadaranyaka upanisad order rather than kaushitaki upanisad order. The answer given is vyasacharya says in kaushitaki upanisad various stages are enumerated but the upanisad does not specifically say that the stages are in this order. It means that this may be order or it may not be in this order. The list does not means that this is order. Therefore a mere list does not prove its order. It may be in that order or it need not be in this order. In kaushitaki upanisad that this is the order of travel by the upasaka. Therefore vyasacharya uses the word avisheshah. It is general list without specifying the order. Whereas in brihadaranyaka upanisad there is specific mention of the order. Therefore brihadaranyaka upanisad krama should be taken which is definite and in kaushitaki upanisad the order is not specific. Therefore vayu loka must necessarily precede adhithya loka.

Vayum upasaka reaches after samvatsara; avisehsavisheshabhyam this is known from the general and specific scriptural statements. The significance of the words is vayum the

upasaka reaches vayu loka abdad only after samvatsara loka; avishesha refers to general sruti statement kaushitaki upanisad 1.3. Vishesha means specific statement 5.10.1. Of brihadaranyaka upanisad

Adhi sankaracharya adds one more topic here. There is another brihadaranyaka upanisad statement which is 6.2.15 which also talks about the various stages of shukla gathi and it is very similar to 5.10.1 of chandogya upanisad. Therefore like chandogya upanisad in brihadaranyaka upanisad all the stages are mentioned. If you read brihadaranyaka upanisad we find a problem. Here in the place of samvatsara brihadaranyaka upanisad talks about deva loka. Therefore adhi sankaracharya says that deva loka also must be inserted in the list. Where to insert deva loka and it should be before samvatsara or after samvatsara. He says deva loka be added after samvatsara but before vayu loka. Now the question is why adhi sankaracharya prefer deva loka after samvatsara [varsha the year] adhi sankaracharya says if you look at the previous stages before samvatsara [twelve months] they refer to kala tattvam.samvatsara is also kala tattvam so it should be added in the same order. Now we have got an expanded list of ten stations. We have added deva loka and vayu loks. The order agni, day, shukla paksa, uttarayanam, samvatsara, deva loka, vayu loka, adhithya loka, chandra loka and vidyudh loka. Then three more are to be added.

### **Topic 3 [3] Tadidadhikaranam**

After reaching the deity identified with lightning the sould reaches the world of varuna

#### **Sutra 4.3.3 [520]**

#### ***Tadito'dhi varunah sambandhat***

After [reaching] the deity of lightening [the sould reaches] varuna on account of the connection [between] the two.

The enumeration of the station of the journey is continued.

In kaushitaki upanisad some more stations are mentioned which are to be added. Agni loka is taken care of. Vayu loka is taken care of. It is seventh place. Brahma loka is not a state and it is the destination. The varuna loka, indra loka and prajapati loka re to be added appropriately. In this adhikaranam mainly we take varuna loka where it can be inserted. The subject matter is where to accommodate varuna loka. This is the question. In this adhikaranam vyasacharya says varuna loka must come after vidyut loka the eleventh stage. The greatest relief we need not insert anywhere. Varuna and lightening are close and hence both are close. Thunder and rain come together and hence both be side by side. This is essence of the adhikaranam. Coming to general analysis vyasacharya says varuna loka is after vidyut loka because of close relationship between the lightning and rain. We assume that varuna is adhipathi devata of rain.

Now i will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Varunah varuna loka comes adhitaditah after vidyut loka after the world of lightning. Sambandad because of their close relationship; the significance of the words is adhi means after; tadith means lightning another word for vidyut; varunah means stage of varuna loka comes; sambandhat means close relationship. With this we have eleven stages. We have indra loka and prajapati loka. Vyasacharya does not separately deal with that and therefore adhi sankaracharya in his commentary adds this

portion. He says on analysis we don't see any specific reason to insert them in between. It is a difficult thing. We have to insert if we have any logical or sruti pramanam. On analysis there is no sruti pramanam necessitating their insertion in between. Nor is there any logical pramanam necessitating their insertion. When their insertion in the middle is not compulsorily required put them in the end. They are placed as twelfth and thirteenth stations. This comes under the athanduka nyaya it is said. We have got the final order. Flame, day, shukla paksa, uttarayanam, samvatsara, deva loka, vayu lioka, adhithya loka, chandra loka, vidyut loka, varuna loka, indra loka, praja pathi loka and destination is brahma loka thus all the stations have been covered and placed them in order.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 370

### **Topic 4 [4-6] Ativahikanthikaranam**

Light etc, referred to in the text describing the path of the gods mean deities identified with light etc., who conduct the soul stage after stage till Brahma Loka is reached.

#### **Sutra 4.3.4 [521]**

#### ***Arivahikastallingat***

[These are] deities conducting the soul [on the path of the gods] on account of indicatory marks to that effect.

The description of the path of the gods is continued.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the fourth adhikaranam slightly bigger with three sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is to explain to find out what are the component of 13 stations with ultimate destination of Brahma Loka. We will establish that the 13 stations are the names of the devatas. Purva Paksi gives different suggestions. Purva Paksi says whenever route map is given, we may give the stations that one has to cross over to reach the destination. They are called the landmarks. Therefore Purva Paksi suggest why cannot you take the thirteen stations as the landmarks crossed by the upasaka. This suggestion is based on loukika nyaya our pratyaksa experience. The second Purva Paksi says that when we read the 13 items, which includes the five lokas indicated in the Kaushitaki Upanisad, and the loka refers to fields of experience. A field of experience is called bogha bhumi. Therefore the second Purva Paksi suggests that intermediary fields of experience and upasakas experience pleasures and pains as even they go. Vyasacharya says both of them are not true and they are neither the names of places or they the names of various bogha bhumi but they represent the names of the devatas. Vayu lokam means vayu lokah. Uttarayanam means uttarayana devata. All the thirteen are chetana devata. This is going to be the topic of this adhikaranam.

Now I will come to the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says the thirteen refers to adhi vahika devatas. Literally adhi vahika means a transporter devata who carries or who carries the upasaka jiva from one place to another. They are transporter devatas. That too it is not any devata but specific devata appointed by Isvara. That is the thirteen devatas Vyasacharya says. The question comes as to why it can't be taken as landmarks. Vyasacharya does not refute but leave it to our imagination. If it is to be taken as landmark it should be a place. The moving car cannot be landmark. Sthira alone can serve as landmark. Adhi Sankaracharya argues shukla paksa uttarayanam are not permanently available and they are not desa but kala. Day shukla paksa etc. If they are given landmark they will not be available for people who die in Krishna paksa. Kala tattvam cannot serve as a landmark because it is not a land. Therefore first one is ruled out. You cannot also wait and instantaneously the travel starts. Therefore they cannot be marga chinna. The second Purva Paksi suggested why cannot it be taken as bogha bhumi. Why cannot it be taken as various fields of experience. Adhi Sankaracharya says that it is not possible for upasaka had withdrawn the

physical body and golakam. That means upasaka has got only folded indriyams and not functioning indriyams. They are not functioning. They have been rolled into a ball as it were. In sleep when organs are folded we cannot experience any bogha. A person in coma also cannot experience anything. Throughout the travel he won't even know when crosses which station. It is all our description. So where is the question of crossing the fields of experience. So vayu lokam cannot be taken as vayu boomi. We have refuted the landmark possibility. You cannot call it fields of experience. When we are not able to experience, Vyasacharya says Upanisad gives a clue and it is from that clue we have to arrive at the answer, that clue is called lingam. And it indicates that they are devatas only. Now the question is that blessed clue. Adhi Sankaracharya and Vyasacharya say that very same archidadi is enumerated elsewhere in Chandogya upanisad. That is 4.15.5 Chandogya upanisad and at the end Upanisad makes a statement *tat purusah Amanavah saha enan brahma gamayati*. This means when upasaka has come to the stage of vidyut there in that place a special Purusa appointed by Hiranyagarhha comes to vidyut loka. And that special devata is called Amanava Purusa. Amanava means extraordinary Purusa. At that moment instantaneously created by brahmaji with a sankalpa and Brihadaranyaka upanisad called this Purusa a manasa Purusa created by brahmaji's mind. He transports these upasaka jivas and thus Upanisad indicates upasaka jivas cannot go by themselves but to carried by chetana tattvam and is introduced by Upanisad. Naturally the question comes if Amanava Purusa takes care of the travel who is the one takes care of the travel up to vidyut loka after death. We require a chetana tattvam. The carrying principle the transporting one should be chetana tattvam and therefore we should conclude that the archradi must be chetana Purusa or chetana devata. Amanuva Purusa will carry from vidyut lokam. ]

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Ativahikah means words like archih reveal the transporting devatas tad lingat this is known from the clues which reveals this fact. The significance of the words is ati vahkah means devatas specially appointed to take care of the transportation. Archradhi refers to ativahika only. Tad lingat means the indicatory mark. Because of the clues tat means revealing that fact. The clue kept in mind is 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad. It is a long mantra the portion is tat purusah amanuvah etc. [given above]

#### **Topic 4 [4-6] Ativahikanthikaranam**

Light etc, referred to in the text describing the path of the gods mean deities identified withlight etc., who conduct the soul stage after stage till Brahma Loka is reached.

#### **Sutra 4.3.5 [522]**

#### ***Ubhayavyamobat tatsiddheh***

[That deities or divine guides are meant in these texts they are personal conductors] is established because both [i.e., the path and the traveler] become unconscious.

The sutra is an argument in support of sutra 4

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya answers a possible doubt that can be raised by the Purva Paksi. Upanisad says that amanuva Purusa transport the upasaka jiva from vidyut loka to Brahma Loka. Why do you extend that rule to the previous segment also? May be ativahika devata is not necessary and hence ativahika devata is not

mentioned in the Upanisad for the first segment. For that Vyasacharya answers the extension is necessary because a chetana tattvam is required for directed travel. Suppose you switch on engine any vehicle, achetana vehicle will run, and it will not be a directed travel. If a deliberate movement is needed chetana tattvam is required. From death to vidyut is well-directed travel and we need a chetana tattvam. Flame uttarayanam etc. Are not guiding principle because they are all inert in nature. They cannot be guiding principle. The upasaka cannot also guide. It is so because upasaka being sampinditha karma gamah and he is as good as inert principle and is like a man in coma. We need another chetana to direct him. Since the path is unconscious and the upasaka is unconscious we need a conscious guiding principle between death and vidyut loka. That devata is directly mentioned here. Therefore you have to take laksyartham of each word. Laksyartham here is devata chetana tattvam. Then comes the next question why thirteen of them. Since it is a very long route, in each station separate devata carries the jiva up to the particular area and up to vidyut loka and from there Amanava devata takes up to Brahma Loka. Thirteen devatas takes the unconscious upasaka up to Amanava Purusa and the travel is now even known by the upasaka and the whole journey is based on the karma phalam. When golakams are ready then devata's indriyams and then he opens his eyes in Brahma Loka and he attends the class to gain Atma Jnanam. Vyamohah means unconscious nature. Ubhaya means both traveler and the path. Therefore we require a conscious devata.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tad siddheh the clue is reasonable since the guidance of devatas is validated; ubhaya vyamohat because of the unconscious nature of both [the path and the traveler] this is the word meaning. The significance of the words is tad siddheh means validation of the guidance of the devatas; tat is the guidance of the devatas. Since this is validated the clue mentioned in the previous sutra is reasonable clue only; the next word is ubhaya vyamohat both that refers to path and traveler and vyamohah means unconscious nature in this context; because of the inertia of both of them guidance of chetana devata is validated. Because of that the clue is reasonable.

#### **Topic 4 [4-6] Ativahikanthikaranam**

Light etc, referred to in the text describing the path of the gods mean deities identified with light etc., who conduct the soul stage after stage till Brahma Loka is reached.

#### **Sutra 4.3.6 [523]**

#### ***Vaidyutenaiva tatastacchrutch***

From thence [the souls are led or guided] by the way same [superhuman] person who comes to lightning that being known from the sruti

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya answers another possible doubt. The doubt is it has been said archiradhi devatas will transport upasaka upto vidyut loka and from there amanasa purusah will transport has been established till now. If you see the list in the archiradhi devata we have seen 13 devatas and vidyut loka comes as the tenth one and after vidyut loka three are there varuna loka, indra loka and prajapati loka. And according to our learning till now, you should not take lakshyartham the varuna devata, indra devata and prajapati devatas are also ati vahika devatas must be transporting upasaka to Brahma Loka. They come after vidyut loka. The three devatas should be serving as transporting devata according to your teaching but you say another amanava Purusa is

pecially appointed to transport upasaka to Brahma Loka. The doubt is from vidut loka and Brahma Loka who is the real transporter whether it is Amanava Purusa or the respective devatas as Indra devata or Prajapati Purusa or. Which one we should take? This is the problem Vyasacharya says since both are the sruti vakyams we should accept both of them as correct. Varuana etc are also transporter and Amanava Purusa also is transporter. How can both be transporter? Vyasacharya says Amanava Purusa is the lord of the group and he is assisted by the three varuna, indra and prajapati assist Amanava Purusa. Thus the upasaka is taken to the Brahma Loka. Amanava Purusa is also called as Vaidyuta Purusa and also called Manasa purusa. Therefore the sutra says Amanava Purusa is prime transporter of the departed upasaka's soul. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 371

### **Topic 4 [4-6] Ativahikanthikaranam**

Light etc, referred to in the text describing the path of the gods mean deities identified with light etc., who conduct the soul stage after stage till Brahma Loka is reached.

#### **Sutra 4.3.6 [523]**

#### ***Vaidyutenaiva tatastacchrutch***

From thence [the souls are led or guided] by the way same [superhuman] person who comes to lightning that being known from the sruti

Chandogya upanisad mentions only one vaidyuta Purusa is the prime guide who takes the upasaka's soul to Brahma Loka. All other devatas are the assisting devatas and they help is not to create any obstacles in the journey of the departed upasaka soul. Or they may be positively helping the departed upasaka. It is understood that they help and they being assistants the other devata's names are not mentioned by the name of the leader Amanva Purusa.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tadah after reaching vidut loka the upasaka is led to Brahma Loka vaidyutena eva by the amanava Purusa who comes to vidyut loka; tatchrute this is known from the sruti statement which reveals this; the significance of the words is vaidyutena deva; this does not refer to vidyut deva and here vaidyuta refers to special amanava devata sent by brahmaji; he is called vaidyuta devata is because that amanava Purusa comes to vidyut devata and hence the devata is called so. The upasaka is led further by the amanva Purusa assisted by other devatas like varuna, indra and prajapati. They are only assistants. The upasaka is taken to Brahma Loka is understood. He says tatsrute it is based on sruti pramanam; sruti pramanam kept in mind is 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Tat is part of the compound and tad means that fact the amanva Purusa leads upasaka soul to Brahma Loka. Fourteen devatas escort upasaka soul to the brahma loka.

### **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

#### **Sutra 4.3.7 [524]**

#### ***Karyam buadarirsaya gatyupapatteh***

To the Karya Brahman or hig` or Sagunam Brahman [the departed souls are [led] [thus opines] the sage Baadari on account of the possibility of its being the goal [of their journey

A discussion is now taken up whether the soul is conducted to the bbr` or the Sagunam Brahman. In the previous sutra the ways was discussed



Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the fifth adhikaranam with 8 sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam changes. Here we discuss the third stage of prapti stage after discussing utkranti and gathi stage. Here the controversy is that there is a problem on account of the doubt created by 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Sahan enan brahma gamayati which means amanava Purusa who has come to vidyut loka takes the upasaka jiva Brahma. The controversy is what is the meaning of Brahman whether it is prambrahman or does it refer to Hiranyagarhha, the karya brahma who is the adhipathi of Brahma Loka. This is the controversy. Vyasacharya peculiarly does not give his own verdict. He gives the opinions of two big acharyas one is Baadari acharya given in sutra 7 to 11 and then from 12-14 Jaimini matam. Baadari matham means karyam Brahman Hiranyagarhha only who is finite devata who presides Brahma Loka. Upasaka goes to Brahma Loka. Jaimini matham says that the upasaka goes to Jaimini matham the param brahma. Jaimini is Purva Mimamsa who does not accept gods. As an acharya he does not accept God but as a disciple of Vyasacharya he gives his opinion. Having described both the mathams, Vyasacharya does not give his opinion. But Adhi Sankaracharya gives his opinion that baadari matham opinion is correct after giving an elaborate commentary. First three are siddhanta sutras and it ends with Purva Paksi. This is the general introduction of this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Baadari says upasaka goes to Hiranyagarhha or Brahma Loka alone and not to Parma brahma. He says param Brahman cannot be reached by travel. He is not a gathi vishaya. Only Brahma Loka can be a destination. Therefore Hiranyagarhha can be a destination. Destination status can be enjoyed only by karya brahma. Here the word used karya brahma to indicate Hiranyagarhha. Hiranyagarhha is the first product born out of Brahman. Hiranyagarhha has another name pratamaja which we see in Taittiriya Upanisad. Pratamaja means first born out of Brahman. Therefore the destination can be only karyam Brahman. Param Brahman cannot be destination for param Brahman is of the nature of traveler Himself. I am Brahman and how can Brahman be the destination based on Tat Tvam asi. Param Brahman is the destination of everyone jnani as also ajnani.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Baadarih sage Baadari declares that karyam the word Brahman 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad refers to Hiranyagarhha asya gati upapattih means because it is logical to have this Hiranyagarhha as a destination. This is the word meaning. The significance of the word is karyam means Hiranyagarhha; generally param Brahman is called karanam Brahman. The word Baadari indicates the teaching of Baadari. Asya means Hiranyagarhhasya; he alone can have the status of destination. He can alone logically possess the status of being the destination of upasaka's travel. Only finite thing can be reached by travel. Param Brahman is infinite. Gathi means destination status. Upapattih means logicity of destination status. Because of this reason 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad is correct.

## **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

### **Sutra 4.3.8 [525]**

#### ***Viseshitatvaccha***

And on account of the qualification [with respect to this Brahman in another text]

An argument in support of sutra 7 is adduced

Here Baadari acharya gives further support to his conclusion. He says whenever there is any vagueness in any part of veda, you see any similar teaching occurring in any part of veda. If you scan the Upanisad you will get clarity. Baadari says in 6.2.15 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad the idea is cleared. Te teshu brahma lokesu para paravato vasanti. Here we get clarity. First the word brahma lokeshu is mentioned which indicates the upasaka goes to a particular loka. Brahma lokeshu is in plural number indicating the different region of Brahma Loka. That is possible only in karyam Brahman and different regions are not there in param Brahman which is beyond desa and kala. Brahmanah advaitatvat; this also indicates the adhara or asraya. From this it is clear that upasaka goes to a place and lives there and there is locus located reality. This is also possible in vyavahara prapancha vyavahara brahma loka. But in param Brahman there is no question of adhara adheya division. Therefore also upasaka goes to Brahma Loka and not to Brahman. Vishnu and shiva lokas are other names for Brahma loka. Going to any of the lokas does not amount to liberation. Brahma loka is called Vishnu loka from Vishnu bhakta's angle and shiva loka from shaivaite angle. All the three are finite requiring travel and has nothing to do with liberation.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Viseshitatvat from the descriptions of the destination found elsewhere cha also this is valid. The significance of the word is viseshitatvat means further description [that Brahma Lokeshu] based on Brihadaranyaka upanisad vakyam; cha means also. One reason has already been given in the previous sutra and now we have given sruti pramanam. The conclusion is my argument alone is correct. It is Baadari argument the word Brahman occurring in Chandogya upanisad refers to Hiranyagarhha only that is valid because of the additional reason.

## **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

### **Sutra 4.3.9 [525]**

#### ***Samiptattu tadvyapadesah***

But on account of the nearness [of the Sagunam Brahman to the supreme Brahman it is] designated as that [supreme Brahman]

Here Vyasacharya answers a grammatical dount of Purva Paksi. Normally param Brahman is revealed by Brahman which is the absolute. In Sanskrit language it is neuter gender. It refer to karanam Brahman. When we refer to karyam Brahman we use masculine gender. The word Brahman is there is masculine version. Then we write the word as Brahmaa. It is difficult to differentiate the short brahma and brahmaa. So we have crated our own convention and when we want to indicate neuter Brahman we call it as Brahman. When we want to note refert of karyam Brahman we take ji suffix from Hindi language and call it Brahmaji. Purva Paksi says in 4.15.5 word Brahman is shorter Brahma. How can you say it is karyam Brahmaa. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 372

### **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

**Sutra 4.3.9 [525]**

#### ***Samiptattu tadvyapadesah***

But on account of the nearness [of the Sagunam Brahman to the supreme Brahman it is] designated as that [supreme Brahman]

Vyasacharya says this is only a convention that brahma can be used only for param Brahman and not for Hiranyagarhha. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad the neuter gender is used to denote Brahman. Therefore we have to see the context. Upanisad itself develops a confusion. Upanisad does not rigidly follow that. It is so because Vyasacharya says Upanisad does not intend to confuse but it uses the word loosely because param Brahman and Hiranyagarhha are not totally different entities. The very same Nirgunam Brahman with nama rupa or with vesham it plays the role of Brahman. It is only vesham bedah not veshi bedah. That is the reason Adhi Sankaracharya also uses the word Brahman and Isvara very loosely. Even though normally the word Brahman is nirgunam and Isvara is sagunam, Adhi Sankaracharya also uses the word loosely. The general convention is Brahman is nirgunam and Isvara is saguna and there is no rigid rule. It can either way be used. It is because of the closeness in their essential nature.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tu however; tat vyapadesah the usage of the word Brahman for Hiranyagarhha samipyat is because of its closeness; this is the running meaning. The significance of the word is samipyat means closeness; the closeness between param Brahman and karyam Brahman and param Brahman and Hiranyagarhha because of the closeness; tu however; even though according to general convention should have used the word brahmanam but still violating the general convention is doing that; tat vyapadesah means the usage of the word Brahman neuter word Brahman instead of Hiranyagarhha; therefore the conclusion is upasaka does not go to param Brahman but goes to Hiranyagarhha alone.

### **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

**Sutra 4.3.10 [526]**

#### ***Karyatyaye tadadhyakshena sahatah paramabhidhanat***

On the dissolution of the Brahma Loka [the souls attain] along with the ruler of that world what is higher than that [i.e., the supreme Brahman] on account of the declaration of the sruti.

The individual soul's final absorption in the para Brahman or the absolute is now stated.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. A very important sutra it is. Here Vyasacharya reconciles two important sruti teaching that upasaka will go to finite Brahma Loka. Upasaka attains anithya phalam only. This we have logically established but it creates a serious problem. In several sruti statements that upasaka reaches destination from which there is no return. That means upasaka attains nithya phalam. Also the Upanisad says in several places upasaka attains amritatvam which also means nithya phalam. Until we established that Brahma Loka is finite and Hiranyagarhha is finite. We have got sruti statement that upasaka goes to nonreturnable reality refer to 4.15.6 of Chandogya upanisad says imam manavam avartam na avartante the upasaka after death reaches a destination form where he does not return to this manushya loka or manu nirmita loka that means he is liberated. Kathopanisad 2.3.16 says tadortya mayan amritatvam eti which means the upasaka travels through shukla gathi and attains immortality. This refers to param Brahman. Therefore these two sruti vakysam say upasaka goes to param Brahman. Now the question which is correct whether upasaka goes to karyam Brahman or param Brahman. Param Brahman cannot be reached through travel. We say both are correct. He goes to karya Brahman first and thereafter he goes to param Brahman. Through shukla gathi he reaches karya Brahman and thereafter he attains param Brahman. You have said param Brahman cannot be reached after travel. If accept this he travels to param Brahman from here itself when he can travel up to karya Brahman and from karya Brahman to param Brahman without travel. Now the next question is if you say he goes to karya Brahman from there he goes to param Brahman without travel then your fundamental principle will go. That jnanad eva kaivalyam that Jnanam alone gives liberation that too nirguna Brahma Jnanam or aikya Jnanam. If you talk about upasaka, he does not have Nirgunam Brahma Jnanam. Now you say that ajnani upasaka goes to karya Brahman through travel and from there he goes to param Brahman you say and if he attains param Brahman as ajnani upasaka then there will be violation of the fundamental principle. For this advaitain says I don't want to violate the principle that none can get Moksa without aikya Jnanam. But Upanisad says that he attains param Brahman. For this we supply a clause that in Brahma Loka that ajnani upasaka attains Brahma Jnanam and through that Jnanam without travel he attains param Brahman. Now we know how upasaka travels upto finite destination Brahma Loka and thereafter he attains Moksa without travel but by gaining Jnanam. Then when the prarapta is over he attains vidheha Mukti and this procedure we call as Krama Mukti. We have to derive by applying several principles to gain Krama Mukti. Upanisad does not say but we have to derive this fact.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Karyartyaye at the time of pralaya param atah the upasaka attains param Brahman which is superior to Hiranyagarhha; saha tadadhyakshena along with the lord of Brahma Loka that is Hiranyagarhha; abhidhanat this is known from sruti statements. Hiranyagarhha also will attain Brahman and along with Him the upasaka who have become a jnani will gain liberation without travel. Abhidhanat this is stated in sruti vakyam; thus upasakas will attain Mukti or not we will says he will gain Krama Mukti and he will go to Brahma Loka and he will become jnani there and will gain liberation after gaining Jnanam.

## **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

### **Sutra 4.3.11 [527]**

## ***Smiritescha***

And on account of the smriti [texts supporting the view

An argument in support of sutra 10 is adduced.

Baadari says wherever there is doubt regarding sruti statement we generally take resort to smriti vakyam. We have supplied an idea that upasaka goes to Brahma Loka and he gets Jnanam there and gain liberation. There is no sruti pramanam for this. We have logical support but we do not have the sruti pramanam. The distance here is ignorant. The distance between jiva and Brahman in any loka needs an unique travel of ignorance distance and it is understanding and intellectual travel. If upasaka attains Brahman means he should gain that knowledge. If he does not gain the knowledge here, we say that he can gain that knowledge in Brahma Loka. Baadari says that there is smriti pramanam in support of this statement. It is a vakyam in kurma puranam 12.269the verse. The sloka is brahmana takate sarve samprapte pratisanchare parasa ante pravi santi param padam; parasa is Hiranyagarhha and it is during the end of Brahma Loka or Hiranyagarhha marana kale at the time of pralaya [prati sanchare] when everything including Hiranyagarhha dissolves, all those upasakas param padam pratisanti they attain parama padam which vishistadvatins talk about. We will they are upasakas and go to northern gate and go to Brahma Loka and from there they gain Moksa. They will say Vishnu loka is Moksa but we will say that on gaining Jnanam there they will gain liberation. Kratat manah means jnaniha putva having become nirguna jnani Jivatma Paramatma jnani they become and gain liberation. How they become jnani the Upanisad does not say. It is taken on the basis of logic. We say there they will get Guru upadesam. Who is the Guru we don't know and therefore we assume brahmaji himself takes classes and teach Brahma Jnanam. There is no direct pramanam to say upasaka goes to a Guru and who is the Guru etc. But we know they gave Guru upadesa and gain knowledge. We also admit in extraordinary cases they get knowledge easily. The first one is sutra no 8 there Baadari quotes a Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra which is not vague but it is very clear. Whenever there is a vague mantra acharya looks for a clear mantra. Baadari makes a statement that even though the neuter gender refers to param Brahman only there are occasion that the same word is used for Hiranyagarhha. In the class I said that there are example and I quoted a Brihadaranyaka upanisad mantra and I will give you the reference and that the mantra is 5.4.1. The mantra is *tad vai tat, etad eva tad asa satyam eva sa yo haitan mahad yaksam prathamajam veda satyam brahmei, jayatimaml lokan jita in na asav asat ya evam etan mahad yaksam prathamajam veda satyam brahmeti satyam hy eva brahma*. The meaning of the mantra is this verily this that this indeed was that, the ture. He whoknows that wonderful being the first born as the Brahman conquers these worlds and conquered likewise may that [enemy] be and become non-existent he [for him] who knows that wonderful being the first born as the true Brahman. This is the second thing I wanted to clarify. The third one I want to say that in 11<sup>th</sup> sutra baadari refers to Kurma purana reference wehre Baadari paointed out saguna upasaka will go to Brahma Loka only and he will get go to Moksa not by the power of upasana but by getting Brahma Jnanam and he will gain jivan Mukti. And at the time of maha pralayam in which whole Brahma Loka and all fourteen lokas would resolve and brahmaji will get vidheh Mukti and all the upasakas also would gain Jnanam by then and get liberation. Maha pralaya is indicated there by pratisancharah. Literally it means going back. Or it is returning. Going back to the route here is Isvara. It is an event in which all jivas, all lokas go back to karanam that is Brahman. That is called pralayah here. The fourth point is a question comes does everyone who goes to Brahma Loka gets Jnanam and Mukti and is it natural even and all the people will gain Mukti. Or are there exception who go there and manages not to attend the

classes and do not gain Jnanam. Do we have such returning upasakas is the question. The answer is that there also returning ones are there. Most of the upasakas gain Moksa on gaining Jnanam but there are some upasakas return and they are called abrahma bhuvanat lokah purnavrutti juna as said in Gita. Then the question will come which upasakas will get Krama Mukti and which upasaka will fail in Krama Mukti. For we have to study the next adhikaranam and the answer will become clear.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 373

### **Topic 5 [7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

**Sutra 4.3.12 [528]**

#### ***Param jaiminimukhyatvat***

To the highest [Brahman] [the souls are led]; Jaimini opines, on account of that being the primary meaning [of the word Brahman].

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra.. Jaimini says that word Brahman occurring in 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad refers to param Brahman only. Therefore jaimini says saguna upasakas who travel via shukla gathi will go to vidyut loka and amanava Purusa will take him to param Brahman or infinite Brahman only and therefore there is no question of going to Brahma Loka and gaining nirguna Jnanam etc. There is in between stop is there. For that Jaimini says the word Brahman used in neuter gender refers to param Brahman only. Even if it refers to Hiranyagarhha by implication that implied meaning is secondary. Jaimini says implied meaning is Hiranyagarhha and between implied and mukhya meaning the latter is stronger. Therefore mukhya artha will take precedence over the secondary meaning. So upasaka attains Mukti directly.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Our refutation we will do at the end. Jaimini daimini declares that param in Chandogya upanisad 4.15.5 word Brahma refers to param Brahman only mukhyatvat because that is the primary meaning. This is the running meaning. The significance of the word is param means param Brahman. By this he excludes Hiranyagarhha parichinna Brahma is excluded. The context is upasakas go to param Brahman alone through shukla gathi. This is jaimini matham. His logic is mukyatvat means that is the primary meaning. And primary meaning is stronger. And you Baadari has taken weaker meaning. Therefore you are weaker. Chandogya upanisad 4.15.5 and there also it is said brahma gamayati. Thus this is the first argument of Jaimini. Now he will give his next argument.

### **Topic 5 [sutr 7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

**Sutra 4.3.13 [530]**

#### ***Darsanaccha***

And because the sruti declares that

An argument in support of Jaimini is adduced

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Jaimini quotes another sruti vakyam to his conclusion. He says upasaka gets direct Moksa is his conclusion and he is of the opinion that there is no Krama Mukti. The sruti vakyam he quotes is II.6.16 of Kathopanisad that declares going upwards by that he reaches immortality. This mantra says upasaka travels through sushumna nadi and travels through shukla marga and attains immortality. Jaimini argues when you say upasaka reaches immortality, you have to refer to param Brahman only for Brahma loka is not immortal. Param Brahman alone is immortal. The word amritatvam also refers to param Brahman only. The Chandogya upanisad vakyam also must refer to param Brahman and not Hiranyagarhha. Therefore upasaka gets Mukti directly. This is general analysis of the sutra

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Darsanat means from the revelation of the sruti, also 4.15.5 of Chandogya upanisad is param Brahman. The significance of the words is because of the another clarifying statement which is in my favour Katha Upanisad II.6.16. This is the crucial support for Jaimini. The word cha is conjunction and this adds this argument as second argument to the one given in the previous sutra. Upasaka does not go to Brahma Loka and does not get Jnanam etc., there. But he gets Moksa directly.

## **Topic 5 [sutras 7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

### **Sutra 4.3.14 [531]**

#### ***Na cha karye pratipattyabhisandhih***

And the desire to attain Brahman cannot be with respect to the Sagunam Brahman

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. here Jaimini assumes that Baadari will quote another sruti vakyam to his support. Therefore he wants to forestall that possibility that you may take another vakyam in your favour that is not supporting you. now we have to see that vakyam and how it support Baadari and Jaimini has to say that it does not support Jaimini. Now he quotes VIII.14.1 and there in the middle there is a statement *brajapate raban deshma prabatye*. In Chandogya upanisad 6<sup>th</sup> chapter there are two big portions. First six chapter talks about saguna Brahma upasana and from section 7 to 12 and another six kandas deal with Nirgunam Brahma Vidya or Jnanam which is also called Dahara Vidya. it is called dahara Vidya because in both Brahman is invoked in hridaya akasa. The word dahara means alpa akasa the small space obtaining within the heart. The word Vidya is used for Jnanam saguna and nirguna. We interpreted and pointed out that both will give Moksa. But there is slight difference. Dahara Vidya one being saguna upasana will give Krama Mukti which means upasaka will travel to Brahma Loka and thereafter get liberation. the dahara Vidya number two one gets Jnanam and get liberation directly. Nirgunam Brahman as turiyam is revealed in dahara Vidya two. After the six sections of dahara Vidya number 2 twelve sections are over. in 13 and 14 we get a prarthana and it is given out by dahara Vidya one practitioner. Their prayer that I should travel without any obstacles to Brahma Loka. And amanava Purusa should come and reach brahma loka and this prayer is given by upasaka. Nirguna brahma jnani will not pray fro liberation because he knows he is one with Brahman. One prayer is given here. Similar prayer is there in Isavasya Upanisad also. Baadari followers can take this mantra as their support. Here upasaka clearly says may I reach sabam deshma extraordinary hall, which belongs to karyam Brahman. veshma means residence of



Hiranyagarhha. this means Brahma Loka. In this prayer the upasaka clearly asks I should go to Brahma Loka and go to the residence of Brahma Loka which is discussed elsewhere 8.5.3 of Chandogya upanisad. It clearly talks of finite hall of finite Hiranyagarhha. from this it is clear upasaka does not go to param Brahman but Hiranyagarhha who occupies the physical hall. Therefore baadari people say that he does not go to Brahman but Brahma Loka. Assuming that baadari answers. The question will come how do you that meaning. For that Jaimini says you read the previous line. That begins with brahma is used in the meaning of param Brahman the infinite one. Sarvagatham Brahman is stated there. there is controversy there. since the beginning of section is with param Brahman and the prakaranam should also be param Brahman. The context should be seen. Since context is prakarana Brahman therefore prajapati should refer to param Brahman only and therefore upasaka prayer should be prajapathi sabha, which means param Brahman only and therefore this prayer, does not favour Baadari and it favours me jaimini only. this is the general analysis of the sutra.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. cha means moreover; pratipatti abhisandhih the desire to attain Brahman; na karye is not with regard to karya Brahma that Hiranyagarhha. this is the running meaning. The significance of the words is karye means Hiranyagarhha; pratipattiabhisandhih refers to prayer of upasaka. It means sankalpah also; it is prayer desire etc. it is prapti sankalpa this is the hope of the upasaka before dying. It is done by upasaka. The controversy is whether this refer to Hiranyagarhha or param Brahman. na karye the prayer is not for reaching Brahma Loka but to reach Brahman only. it gives an impression that it refers to a place but here prajapati means param Brahman only. so something like anticipatory bail even before baadari quotes jaimini says do not take this sruti vakyam and take my conclusion as correct. More Adhi Sankaracharya's argument that baadari matam is correct and upasaka will go to Brahma Loka will be established. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 374

### **Topic 5 [sutras 7-14] Karyadhikaranam**

The departed souls go by the path of gods to Sagunam Brahman

#### **Sutra 4.3.14 [531]**

#### ***Na cha karye pratipattyabhisandhih***

And the desire to attain Brahman cannot be with respect to the Sagunam Brahman

The upasamas after death will travel through shukla gathi pass through several devatas and ultimately come to vidyut loka and all the upasakas assembled in vidyut loka will be taken by a special messenger called amanava purusah. Amanava Purusa takes upasaka vidyut loka to Brahma. The controversy is what the definition of Brahman whether it is Sagunam Brahman located in Brahma Loka or Nirgunam Brahman. Whether upasaka will go to Brahman or Brahma Loka. Vyasacharya passes two opinions without passing his verdict. Five sutras give Baadari matham and it says upasakas will be directly taken to Brahma Loka. Then in the sutra 12 – 14 jaimini says that the upasakas will be taken to infinite Brahman that is direct Moksa. Each one tried to establish each view with appropriate logic. Adhi Sankaracharya writes a very elaborate commentary and he points out that Baadari matham alone is correct and concluded that upasakas will go to Brahma Loka alone and not go to Brahman. If we are to conclude baadari matham, supporting arguments have been given by Baadari himself and Adhi Sankaracharya has to negate Jaimini arguments. And refutation of these three is hinted by Baadari. We have to take appropriate answer and refute Jaimini. Jaimini first says tht word Brahman refer to all pervading Brahman alone. For this he said we should take the primary meaning of Brahman and he said that alone wins. He said that Brahman in neuter gender cannot convey the secondary meaning. Answer is hinted by Baadari. Baadari says that meaning is primary all right but when you take the meaning it goes against the reasoning. It goes against anumana and pratyaksa pramanam. It is because jaimini says upasaka will reach all pervading Brahman. It is evidently contradiction and all pervading is that one that has already reached and reaching and reached is mutually contradictory. You can reach Calcutta but you cannot reach all pervading space. The interpretation you should take primary meaning first and if it contradicts other pramanam, then you get illogical meaning and then the rule is you can give up the primary meaning and use secondary meaning and the most well known sentence is tat tvam asi Jivatma and Paramatma aikyam. That is why we take meaning of pure Consciousness for there is no question of aikyam of Jivatma and Paramatma. In this regard Vakya vritti sloka 47 says if the direct word meaning thrown up an inconsistency with what is pointed out by other proofs evidences the sense consistent with its word meaning that is intelligently suggested by the terms, is to be accepted and this is the suggestive meaning [takshana]. [Chinmaya bookj page 90] first you respect the primary meaning and after taking the meaning and if the conveyed meaning is illogical against other pramanams, then you take the secondary meaning that is not illogical. This is the rule. Primary meaning is all pervading Brahman only. When we say upasaka reaching the all pervading Brahman is jarring to the ears and hence give up the primary meaning and take such a meaning that is acceptable to us. That is why baadari says gathi upapapte. My

argument alone is logically fitting. Logically fitting secondary meaning is superior logically unfitting primary meaning. Therefore mukhyatva argument is not proper. With this first argument of jaimini is refuted.

Now we will take up the second argument of Jaimini occurring in 13<sup>th</sup> sutra. He takes up the Katha Upanisad 2.3.16. He says that upasaka will reach immortality. So Jaimini argues that upasaka reach immortality means it should be Nirgunam Brahman for immortality is associated with all pervading Brahman. Hiranyagarhha is not associated with Hiranyagarhha. How will you link Brahma loka and immortality. Adhi Sankaracharya gives a different answer. We have already hinted the answer in 10<sup>th</sup> sutra that the upasaka is going to Brahma Loka only. And upasaka will immortality also. Therefore my statement is also right and kathopanisad statement is also correct., he goes to Brahma Loka is correct and he attains Moksa is correct. In Brahma Loka he attains Jnanam and he attains immortality without traveling and therefore Krama Mukti is our answer to your question. He attains Moksa not directly but indirectly. There is no logical contradiction and contradiction to the scriptural statement.

Now we come to the third argument in sutra 14. There Jaimini tried to refute a possible argument of Baadari that a prayer given by the upasaka in 8.14.1 of Chandogya upanisad. That prayer seems to be favourable to Baadari. Therefore Jaimini is worried about Baadari. The prayer is prajapataye sabam deshma I should reach palatial hall of Hiranyagarhha. From this prayer it is clear that the upasaka is going to Brahma Loka only. If Baadari claims so Jaimini says you don't quote the prayer and in that prayer it refers to all pervading Brahman only. Even though golden hall of Brahma Loka is dictionary meaning he says you don't take dictionary meaning but take it as Brahman all pervading. For that he gave the reason just before the prayer look at the previous sentence that it talks about parama Brahman only. All pervading Brahman is the beginning of the section and therefore it deals with all pervading Brahman alone. It is called prakaranam. Prakaranartha is all pervading Brahman and keeping the total context in mind you have to interpret the intermediary statement also and because of this, it should refer to Brahman only. Prakarana is one of the six pramanams under the mimamsa rule. The context is a valid means of interpreting sastra. That Baadari has to refute. Adhi Sankaracharya has to refute for Sankara has joined Baadari. We say that sruti vakyam directly mentions brahma loka sabha only. Whereas from the standpoint of prakaranam based on the first section it should mean param Brahman. Sruti vakyam reveals Brahma Loka and the context reveals Brahman. For me the pramanam is sruti vakyam and for jaimini pramanam is total context. When the two contradict each other we have to find which one wins. Adhi Sankaracharya asks Jaimini that you have written a sutra which says prakarana pramanam is weaker than sruti vakyam pramanam. So the conclusion is sruti vakyam that Brahma Loka is correct and not Brahman which is a weaker pramanam. After refuting these argument Adhi Sankaracharya gives a general series of arguments, I will mention two or three points. One point Adhi Sankaracharya emphasizes is traveling and reaching an infinite goal is illogical. After death travel and reaches all pervading Lord and how come nobody applies the intellect and see the contradiction. How can you reach the all pervading Bhagavan. If He is limited it is understandable. If He is all pervading, where is the question of reaching. Then Jaimini group suggests why cannot you say that one part of all pervading Brahman and upasaka goes to another part of Brahman. Why cannot you say that Bhagavan of local earth and one in vaikunta etc. One gives inferior security and Bhagavan in another place give better security. Adhi Sankaracharya says I would be happy to accept your statement but I cannot because buloka has got parts and one part has got to superior attributes and another inferior attributes and with regard to earth different parts and attributes are there

in different areas but unfortunately Upanisad does not accept such parts for Bhagavan for Bhagavan is nishkalam. He is partless. All pervading space itself is partless and where is the question of Bhagavan has parts and how can you say one part is inferior and another is superior etc. Adhi Sankaracharya says Bhagavan has not attributes where is question of better Bhagavan in Vaikunta and inferior Bhagavan is here. Bhagavan is attributes. You cannot say space in dirty room is dirty space and clean room is clean. When you say space is dirty it is only an expression. Hence how can Nirgunam Brahman has gradation in different lokas. Bhagavan is here and I need not go to vaikunta and even go to buloka vaikunta. I can get Bhagavan here itself. For reaching Bhagavan you need not go.

The next point is that the destination or the goal to be reached must be distinct from the traveler. Both have to be different. I want to go to Ganga. I am not Ganga. There is difference between reached and the person go to reach it. This beda is a precondition for any travel. If Jivatma has to travel and reach Paramatma the precondition is Jivatma and Paramatma must be different then only I can says I can reach Brahman. There is no question of travel of Jivatma going to Paramatma. You say it is symbolic means it is understandable. He travels upwards-downward etc., is not acceptable. If there is actual traveling we don't question the possibility but it has nothing to do with jivatma paramatma aikyam. He brings in the previous adhikaranam and also 2,3,12 and 3.2.5 of Brahma Sutra where Jivatma and Paramatma and their relationship is elaborately analysed. They are one and the same and their relationship is no relationship.

Third point is adhikaranam 4.2.6 of Brahma Sutra, where it is stated that jnani reaches Brahman without travel. Also refer to 4.4.6 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad the jnani attains Brahman without travel. Because of this reason there is no question of reaching Brahman by travel.

With this the adhikaranam 5 is over.

## **Topic 6 [sutras 15-16] Apratikalambanadhikaranam**

Only those who have taken recourse to the worship of Brahman without a symbol attain Brahma Loka

### **Sutra 4.3.15 [532]**

#### ***Apratikalambanannayatiti baadarayana abhayathadoshattatkratuscha***

Baadarayana holds that the superhuman being leads to Brahma Loka only those who do not take recourse to a symbol of Brahman in their meditation there being no fault in the twofold relation resulting from the opinion and it being construed on the doctrine as is the meditation on that i.e., Brahman so does one become.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is the final adhikaranam of the third pada with two sutras. The topic of discussion here is the word occurring in Chandogya upanisad the one we had analyzed in the previous adhikaranam which is 4.15.5 saha enan brahma gamayati. Saha means this special messenger amanava Purusa gamayati leads to Brahman and we have analysed the meaning of the word Brahman which has been established as Brahma Loka. He escorts the upasaka. Enan here means upasaka. The context is upasakas traveling through shukla gathi is the context and that too

upasakas who have completed most of the 13 stations. The tenth one is vidyut loka. Upasakas have assembled in vidyut loka. That is the meeting place. The amanava Purusa came from Brahman to brahma loka. Amanava Purusa carries the upasakas to Brahma Loka. The controversy is enan upasakan do you mean all the upasakas without exception or is there some division in that. The Purva Paksi take sthe stand all the upasakas will be taken to Brahma Loka. He gives proof. But siddhantins take the stand no. Most of the upasakas will be taken to Brahma Loka while some of them will not be taken to Brahma Loka and they will go to some other lower lokas. That will be above svarga loka but below Brahma Loka. There they will take the appropriate body. They don't experience sukha dukha anubhava and after going to some other loka and start experiencing sukha dukha anubhava in the lokas they reach. Therefore the topic whether all upasakas go or some will go to Brahma Loka. In the previous adhikaranam we discussed destination but here we take up the traveler discussion. This we will take up in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 375

### **Topic 6 [sutras 15-16] Apratikalambanadhikaranam**

Only those who have taken recourse to the worship of Brahman without a symbol attain Brahma Loka

**Sutra 4.3.15 [532]**

#### ***Apratikalambanannayatiti baadarayana abhayathadoshattatkratuscha***

All the upasakas who travel through shukla gathi will go to Brahma Loka is stated in chapter VIII Gita. We siddhantis will say all will not go to Brahma Loka but we say some of them will go to Brahma Loka while others will go to other lokas and take the form which suits the lower lokas to experience sukha dukha anubhava. It is lower than Brahma Loka something superior to svarga loka but inferior to Brahma Loka. All karmis who have not practised upasanas will go to svarga loka. Those who have done upasanas will go to loka higher than svarga loka. Shukla gathi takes to loka superior to svarga loka. Anyway the net result is that all upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka. This is the general introduction to this adhikaranam.

First portion talks about the specific people who go to Brahma Loka. Purva Pakshi quoted sruti and smriti and supporting law or the principle. First part says who will go to Brahma Loka and the second part answers the argument and the third part the supporting principle. Vyasacharya divides all the saguna brahma upasakas into two types. the first group is direct upasakas. The direct upasakas are those who meditate upon Sagunam Brahman as described in the sastras. First is direct upasanas and second is that those who do not directly meditate upon Sagunam Brahman but meditate on symbol only. they don't think of Hiranyagarhha or Isvara but they focus on salgrama or shivalinga. Before that they invoke Hiranyagarhha in that symbol. In veda there are many such upasanas are mentioned and they are called pratika upasanas in this upasana the meditator directly think of Sagunam Brahman and therefore they are called secondary Sagunam Brahman upasaks. First one is primary upasakas and second one is indirect or secondary upasakas. We have huge list of such upasanas and upasakas. In Chandogya upanisad 7<sup>th</sup> chapter section 1 to 14 nama brahma vak brahma mano brahma vayu brahma jala brahma upasana etc, are suggested. They meditate on fire and in fire Brahman is invoked and these are called pratika upasanas. They are primary upasakas and direct upasakas. They are indirect or secondary upasakas. Indirect upasakas are called pratika upasakas. Vyasacharya uses the word pratika alambanas. This is the name of the upasakas who practice secondary or indirect upasanas. What should be the direct meditators and Vyasacharya make it easy and add a. apratika alambanas are direct upasakas and Vyasacharya says both primary and secondary upasakas will go through the shukla gathi. All of them both the group will go to vidyut loka. Only direct saguna brahma upasakas will be escorted by amanava Purusa to Brahma Loka and all secondary and indirect upasakas the pratika alambanas will not go to Brahma Loka and they have shukla gathi and they are superior to Krishna gathi people and after vidyut loka they will not go to Brahma Loka but go to higher loka than svarga loka. They will not Krama Mukti and they will have punar janma.

The second part we have to answer the Purva Pakshi. Sruti and smriti says that all the upasakas will go to shukla gathi and all will go to brahma loka and all will not return to this loka. Vyasacharya himself used the expression that the all upasaka will get Krama Mukti, will go to Brahma Loka and will get liberation. for that Vyasacharya says previously the word all upasakas was general rule. All the general rules will have exceptions. This 4.3.15 I talk of apavadas that certain upasakas will not get Krama Mukti. In keeping that sarva should be taken with restriction. The example we give is in the sastra it is said nahimsa sarva bhutani one should not injure any living being; the very sastra talks about dharma rakshinartam and Krishna asks Arjuna to kill the people. Ahimsa is emphasised in three places in Gita by Krishna but He himself says you fight Arjuna. In fact there are certain sacrifices where animal sacrifices are there. animal sacrifice it is killing but they are exceptions. So exceptions are applicable to the upasakas also some will go to Brahma Loka and some others to other lokas. If you divide upasakas into two there is no dosha.

Third part is giving supporting principle. It is known as tatkratu nyayah. This occurs in 3.14.1 of Chandogya upanisad and 4.4.5 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. In 8.6 of Gita. It says as a man thinks so he becomes. Thought crystallizes into your future personality. Chandogya upanisad mantra yatha kratuh asmin loke tata ita preti bhavati. English proverb shows the example in present janma and our examples shows the future janmas. Whatever a person seriously thinks at the time of death that he becomes in the next janma and we have jada bharata story to support this view. Vyasacharya says that this nyaya supports his view. Direct upasaka alone thinks of Sagunam Brahman and therefore he will go to Brahma Loka and get Krama Mukti. But indirect upasakas do not think of Sagunam Brahman and they think of symbol only. Their mind is preoccupied with symbol and therefore they are called atakratu brahma chinta rahitah and they have not thought of Sagunam Brahman and therefore they don't deserve Brahma Loka and don't deserve Krama Mukti also.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya view is that nayati amanava Purusa leads apratikalampnat direct brahma upasakas other then indirect indirect upasakas to Brahma Loka. Uphayatha this twofold approach is valid adoshat because there is no contradiction. Cha moreover; tatkratuh means the direct upasakas are Sagunam Brahman meditators; this is the word meaning. The significance of the words is apratikalampnat means this I have already explained; direct meditators of Sagunam Brahman; amanava Purusa is to be supplied in the sutra. amanava Purusa escorts. This is my conclusion or saint Vyasacharya conclusion. Ubhayatat means twofold approach; that upto vidyut loka all upasakas travel and thereafter there is bifurcation. this divided approach adoshat is without contradiction. Some go to Brahma Loka and some don't go there is the contradiction, which has since been resolved. This is not just managing and there are such exceptions in the vedas. Tatkratuh means Hiranyagarhha dhyanam; Sagunam Brahman upasakah; here Vyasacharya says the upasakas who go to Brahma Loka is direct meditators unlike symbol meditators. Brahma Loka going upasaka is direct meditators. Symbol meditators will not go to Brahma Loka because they will be attached to symbol and not to the Isvara or Sagunam Brahman. upasyam has become secondary to the lord. The focus is on idol and therefore he is asakratuh and he does not deserve Brahma Loka.

## **Topic 6 [sutras 15-16] Apratikalambanadhikaranam**

Only those who have taken recourse to the worship of Brahman without a symbol attain Brahma Loka

**Sutra 4.3.16 [533]**

***Visesham cha darsayati***

And the scripture declares a difference [in the case of meditation on symbols]

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. In the previous sutra Vyasacharya gave a principle that the pratika upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka. They think of pratikam and therefore they don't deserve Brahma Loka. Here Vyasacharya gives sruti support in this regard. Chandogya upanisad section VII.1. to 14 there are several pratika upasana. First one is nama brahma upasanas. The word you use as the symbol; then it talks about vak brahma upasana speech ebcoms the pratikam and then mano sankalpa etc. and at the end of each pratika upasana distinct worldly result is given. Anna upasana will give good annam and jala upasana will give enough water. If all are taken as brahma upasana all should go to Brahma Loka or Krama Mukti. If they are taken Sagunam Brahman upasana Chandogya upanisad does not talk of krama Mukti but depending upon symbol different phalams are mentioned. The very fact different pratika upasana get different phalams indicate that all do not get the same Brahma Loka and they will not get Krama Mukti is clear.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha means moreover. Darsayati sruti reveals visesham distinct results for pratika upasaka or indirect upasakas. This is the running meaning. The significance of the words is visesham means different results; distinct from Brahma Loka and Krama Mukti and get result other than that is clear here. Darsayati means sruti reveals Chandogya upanisad 7<sup>th</sup> chapter section 1 to 14. Therefore amanava Purusa will elave them in vidyut loka. Cha is to join the sruti support along with the nyaya given in the previous sutra. With this 16<sup>th</sup> sutra is over; sixth adhikaranam is over and the third pada is over.



## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 376

### **Topic 6 [sutras 15-16] Apratikalambanadhikaranam**

Only those who have taken recourse to the worship of Brahman without a symbol attain Brahma Loka

#### **Sutra 4.3.16 [533]**

#### ***Visesham cha darsayati***

In the last class we have completed the sixth and final adhikaranam of the third pada. It dealt with saguna brahma upasana gathi and brahma loka prapti were the main topic of the pada. First four dealt with gathi and the rest brahma loka prapti. The sixth is a prasangiha adhikaranam, this dealt with the traveler. The sub commentators present as gathi vicharah, gandhavya vicharah gantru vichara path enquiry, destination enquiry and traveler enquiry. The first two are primary topic and the third one is incidental topic. In the last adhikaranam it was pointed out even though all upasakas travel through shukla gathi not all of them reach Brahma Loka. All Sagunam Brahman upasakas will go to Brahma Loka but exception is subtle body pratika upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka. They will go only up to vidyut loka. We quoted various sruti and smriti and Vyasacharya sutra pramanam in support of our arguments. The exception is given in the last adhikaranam. The pramanam is Chandogya upanisad 7<sup>th</sup> chapter section 1 – 14. a principle is also used tatkratu nyaya. Here exception is also established. Saguna brahma pratika upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka. The brahma upasakas are primary medittors and brahma pratika upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka and they go up to vidyut loka and they get birth in some other lokas and will have to return and Krama Mukti is not possible for pratika upasakas. I said that I had one more point I wanted to discuss.

We had pointed out by tatkratu nyaya only those people who are direct upasakas alone will go to Brahma Loka and secondary upasakas will not go to Brahma Loka for they think of symbol only, for this rule we will talk about an exception. Before knowing the exception you should know tatkratu nyaya. As one meditates so he becomes. If he meditates on Brahma Loka he will go to Brahma Loka. The exception is pancagni Vidya upasana. Also Brihadaranyaka upanisad 6.2 brahmanam talks of the pancagni upasana. We have already seen this at various occasions. The various travels are seen as agni tattvam. Jiva entering and coming out of five agnis are called as entering homa and coming out is called homa phalam. Parents offer children as fire to the school and the children come out as better human beings. In this upasaka the upasaka does not meditate upon Sagunam Brahman or Hiranyagarhha or Isvara. He is meditating upon agni devata only, therefore pancagni upasaka is not primary Sagunam Brahma upasaka. And he is not direct meditator of Sagunam Brahman or Hiranyagarhha or Isvara, by applying tatkratu nyaya he should not legitimately go to Brahma Loka. This logic we applied in brahma pratika upasana. This will not apply to pancagni upasana is the statement here. Pancagni upasaka may travel through shukla gathi but he comes under special exemption and because of the exception we say that he will go to Brahma Loka. He will be accompanied by amanva Purusa will go to Brahma Loka creating jealousy of the pratika upasakas. The question will come as to how can this injustice happen.

Adhi Sankaracharya answers the Upanisads while talking about pancagni upasakas specifically mentions that they will go to Brahma Loka. For this exemption there is sastra pramanam. 5.10.1.2 of Chandogya upanisad gives the pramanam specifically makes it clear that such upasakas will go to Brahma Loka. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad Pancagni Vidya also endorses this view. Then the question is, how can we accept the sruti pramanam here. Here it is said that karma phalam comes under apouruseya vishaya and therefore we cannot apply logic here. The reasoning is supporting sruti pramanam and therefore we say sastra vakyam is exception to tatkratu nyayah. This much is mentioned by Adhi Sankaracharya in his bashyam.

There is an interesting extension given to this idea by Madusudana saraswati in his Gita bashyam. There a discussion comes that Krishna says even Brahma Loka is subject to return. That means those who go to Brahma Loka are subject to return. All those Krama Mukti Mukti vakyam say those who go to Brahma Loka gets attain Krama Mukti. In the Gita 8<sup>th</sup> chapter Krishna says even those who go to Brahma Loka return. There is some contradiction. Tell me the candidates in Brahma Loka will Krama Mukti or not. There Madusudana saraswati brings out this adhikaranam, and he says both the statements are true. Naturally the question comes how can this happen. The Madusudana saraswati says some will get Krama Mukti and some return. Who returns and who will get Krama Mukti. He says those Sagunam Brahman upasakas who go to Brahma Loka by tatkratu nyaya will attain Krama Mukti. Those who go after doing panchagni upasakas who go to Brahma Loka illegitimately as an exception to tatkratu nyaya through a special ticket will return. This is said by Madusudana Saraswati and Nilakanda who has written entire Maha Bharata.

Now we have three types of upasakas are there. one is saguna brahma pratika upasakas, pancagni upasakas and Sagunam Brahma upasakas respectively. Of them saguna brahma pratika upasaka go up to vidyut loka though they travel through shukla gathi. Pancagni upasaka go through shukla gathi go up to vidyut loka and they return. Saguna brahma upasakas will go up to Brahma Loka and gain Krama Mukti. With this sixth adhikaranam and third pada is over.



## BRAHMA SUTRA - Chap: 4, Pada: 4

Class: 376 Cont'd

### **Brief introduction**

First we will take stock of the situation. We are in the fourth chapter of the Brahma Sutra. This talks of Sagunam Brahma Vidya and Nirguna Brahma Vidya and their phalam. When Vidya is used with Sagunam Brahman it is upasana and when Vidya is used with Nirgunam Brahman it is Jnanam. The word Vidya is associated with both Nirgunam Brahman as also Sagunam Brahman. Karma nirvritti or freedom from akarma, bondage and prarapta we have seen in first pada. In the second pada we have seen the phalam of saguna brahma upasakas. They cannot gain liberation but they have to leave the body, reach Brahma Loka called prapti/ they have to go through utkranti gathi and prapti. All these three are not there for Nirgunam brahma jnani. The first stage of departure of Sagunam Brahma upasaka was discussed, how it takes a dip in Brahman and leave the body and in the third pada we saw the travel through shukla gathi and the thirteen dvata that takes the upasaka jiva stage by stage including amanava Purusa messenger and going to Brahma Loka and we saw the Brahma Loka prapti. We said the Brahman occurring in sruti is not Nirgunam Brahman but it Sagunam Brahman alone. Vedanta does not accept a separate Vishnu loka or shiva loka and both are but alternative name of brahma loka that is reached by the upasaka. We also analysed all the upasaka will not get Karma Mukti and some don't reach Brahma Loka and some reach Brahma Loka and return and some reach Brahma Loka and get Karma Mukti. These were the topics we covered in the fourth adhyaya and the third pada.

The fourth pada talks about the saguna Vidya phalam as also Nirguna Brahma Vidya phalam even though both have been talked about in the earlier padas. We get some more information in this regard. Previously we talked of freedom from bondage, etc., in the form of nirvritti phalam but now it will be seen in the form of ananda prapti or Moksa prapti in this pada. What are the extraordinary powers enjoyed by upasaka and leaving aside the Karma Mukti what are the extraordinary advantages by those who go to shiva loka or Brahma Loka will also be seen. Sathya sankalpatvam etc. which belongs to Isvara will be attained by these upasaka. They fall within samsara is the additional information.

Both Sagunam Brahma Vidya and Nirguna Brahma Vidya is the topic here. Fourth pada has 22 sutra spread over seven adhikaranams. Of these three first seven sutras deal with sadhyo Mukti Nirguna Brahma Vidya phalam and later fifteen sutras and five adhikaranam deal with the glories enjoyed by the upasakas going to Brahma Loka. Glories are talked about more than Mukti. This is the split of the fourth pada. Now we will enter into the first adhikaranam.

### **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

#### **Sutra 4.4.1 [534]**

*Sampadyavirbhavah svena sabbat*

[when the jiva or the individual soul] has attained [the highest light] there is manifestation [of its own real nature] as we infer from the word 'own'

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with three sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is the analysis of very important statement occurring in Chandogya upanisad which talks about liberation attained here and now and the statement is VIII.12.3. the mantra reads as *evam evaisa samprasado'smac charirat samuthaya parah jyotir upasampadya svena rupenabhinispadyate, sa uttama purusah sa tatra paryeti, jaksat hridan ramamanah sribhir va yanair va jnatibhir va nopajanam smarann itdam sariram; sa yatha prayogya achrane yuktah, evam evayam asmin sarire prano yuktah* the meaning of the mantra is even so that serene one when he rises up from this body and reaches the highest light appears in his own form. Such a person is the supreme person. There such a one moves about, laughing, playing, and rejoicing with women, chariots or relations not remembering the appendage of this body. As an animal is attached to a cart so is life attached to this body.

This jiva is called samprasadh and he resolves in Brahman during sleep and lies calmly; this jiva asmad sarirad samuthaya during the enquiry comes out of the three sariram; when we say he comes out sariram means abhimana thryagah. I give up the I notion in the body. I don't look upon sthoola sariram as myself; sooksha sariram as myself even the karana sariram as myself. For worldly transactions I say about my address. This refers to tvam pada artha vichara; then Param jyotibhir is tat pada lakshyarthas upasambathya means merging; tvam comes out of the body and unites with tat padartha. Uniting or joining means it is not actual merging but understanding for it is not spatial difference and it is purely caused by ignorance and notion difference is set right cognitively intellectually and that is why we say it is only intellectual knowledge and what need is that because distance is notional alone. Svena rupena he emerges himself in his original swarupam; this is the statement and to give you a little bit background. In Chandogya upanisad eighth chapter first six chapter deals with brahma upasana Dahara Vidya. first six sections deal with Sagunam Brahman upasana and then Nirgunam Brahman Jnanam presented as chatuspad Brahman which is very much similar to Mandukya Upanisad and here the teacher is Brahmaji prajapati and students are two. When you teach and you get less students you should remember of Brahmaji with students and Krishna with one student. The students are virochana and indra. Virochana attends first class and disappears. In the seventh section the students are introduced and eight nine visva ten tejasa and twelve praja are discussed. Visva is Chaitanyam associated with sthoola sariram, tejasa is associated with sooksha sariram, and prajna is associated with karana sariram. The student indra says I am not satisfied with that aham because each one has problem. Sthoola sariram has got its own problem, sooksha sariram has got its own problem and karana sariram has got its own problem and indra states I neither know the world nor know myself in sushupti there is total destruction of the whole thing that I was there in sushupti after waking up in memory and in sushupti I don't know myself. A sleeper is not aware his own existence. Self-destruction is the dosha of prajna. When indra expresses his dissatisfaction, prajapati says I shall teach the fourth pada. For each pada he has to do gurukula vasa for thirty two years. And then after ninety-six years, or after hundred and one years chaturtha pada is talked about. This is what is going to be analysed here. The controversy in this mantra we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 377

### **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

#### **Sutra 4.4.1 [534]**

#### ***Sampadyavirbhavah svena sabdat***

[when the jiva or the individual soul] has attained [the highest light] there is manifestation [of its own real nature] as we infer from the word ‘own’

Here a Chandogya upanisad mantra is analysed in which turiya Atma is revealed by Prajapati to Indra the student [given in the last class]. In this mantra the Upanisad or teacher prajapati talks about the emergence of turiya Atma in the case of wise person. A wise person gets liberated. With regard to this statement an enquiry is undertaken.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. what is the controversy here. Purva Paksi says that Mukti must be a new status attained or accomplished by a sadhaka. The word for new status is athantuka dharma. The siddhanti we the vedantins are going to refute the idea and say Mukti is not new status acquired by jiva and in fact jiva does not acquire any new status at the time of liberation. we say that it is swabavikam of the jiva. We should know why should Purva Paksi holds that view. He gives several argument. The first is logical argument. He says you yourself talk about Moksa sadhanani starting from karma yoga, sravana yoga nididyasanam yoga etc., from that it is clear that Moksa is the result of the sadhanas. That means it is consequence of all the sadhanas and sadhyam or phalam of all the sadhanas. The very word phalam or sadhyam means it is a new status acquired after the sadhana. Before sadhana it did not exist, during sadhana it did not exist and after completion you get the new status like svarga etc. svarga is a new status achieved after some karma. Therefore he makes an anumanam Moksa is adanguta dharmah a new status acquired being result of sadhana like heaven etc. in Mukti jiva must attain a higher status. Even some describe mukta is in higher status of Consciousness that means we belong to lower status of Consciousness. This is argument number one of Purva Paksi.

The second argument is Moksa has to be necessarily new status because if there is no status at any level in Moksa there will be no difference between banda and Moksa. There will be no difference between previous status and after sadhana old status continue and then there will be no status wise difference then who will do any sadhana at all. This is a logical contradiction.

The third argument he gives is based on Chandogya upanisad mantra as above. The mantra says esa sampradhayah asman sarira samudhdhaya jiva comes out of the body and it merges with Brahman at the time of liberation and merges into Brahman and emerges out as mukta swarupah. It becomes a liberated soul. The Purva Paksi underlines the verb used there and he

emerges out as liberated person. The bound person as a result of the sadhana becomes a liberated person. It means utpadyate. That is a birth is talked about fresh emergence is talked about and it can be talked only when jiva takes a newer status. Because of this Mukti means a new status. Therefore the student looks for that new status wishing to get liberated. This is held by Purva Paksi and is a natural orientation of every seeker. He looks for new status. So there is hallow. We always looks for some kind of newer status. If teacher insists nothing new will come, the student may not come to the class even. Therefore students also instinctively look for extraordinary event that transforms the banda I into mukta I. That is why mysticism is always appealing. Jiva wants some transformation and clear demarcation between the banda state and mukta state. This appeals every seeker of liberation. What happens before and after before attending the classes and after attending classes every wants to know. This is Purva Paksi. The siddhanta will says if at all there is transformation it is 'cognitive' in terms of understanding or assessment. This is our general introduction of this adhikaranam.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. this mantra is thoroughly analysed by Adhi Sankaracharya in Brahma Sutra 1.3.19. with regard to the attitude to Moksa. He gives some important clarification there. the meaning of the mantra is Jivatma the Consciousness principle, emerging out of the body; here Adhi Sankaracharya points out the emergence of creation from body cannot be a physical event and Consciousness cannot come out of the body. The reason being sooksha sariram can come out of the body at the time of death and that is what is happening. Karana sariram coming out is possible. Chidabasa reflected Consciousness also can come out when the sooksha sariram comes out sooksha sariram also comes out. Now we talk of Saksi Chaitanyam which is already all pervading. It is all pervading. Therefore, how can we talk about I the Saksi Chaitanyam coming out of the body? Adhi Sankaracharya argues since the direct meaning cannot be taken we have to take the implied meaning. When vachyartham cannot be taken take the lakshyartham. Therefore Adhi Sankaracharya says samuddhanam means only giving up the identification the intellectual conclusion that I am the body. I am physical body I am subtle body and I am karana sariram is confusion three I am viswa taijasa or prajna and even the idea that I am within the body is wrong for all pervading Consciousness cannot be enclosed in the body as all pervading space cannot be contained in the pot space. I am located in the body etc are misconceptions. Samkya philosopher says Atma is an individual different from the other Atma. He accepts plurality and therefore Adhi Sankaracharya that samuddhanam means dropping of the four conclusion that I am visva, I am taijasa and I am prajna and any conclusion we have is at the intellectual level and this we have to drop. It is arriving at lakshyartham of the word aham. Then the mantra says upasambatya which means merging. Paramjyoti means Param brahma sarva gatha Chaitanyam and it is tatpada lakshyartham aikya prapti. It is again removing the notion of the division between me and Param Brahman. Why do we take that meaning and why cannot take the actual meaning of the merger. Ganga originates in Himalaya top and it merges into ocean and why cannot we talk about at a particular time of mystic experience merges with Brahman and why cannot we take it as physical merger. I and the Saksi Chaitanyam is all pervading not after Jnanam and even before. So merger is not an event. It is dropping the intellectual notion of difference that I am different and Paramatma is different. It means tat pada lakshyartham aikyam praptiye. When I thought I am separate Jivatma and Paramatma is separate I had one strong misconception and I thought Paramatma is mukta and I am baddhah and when I recognized jivatma paramatma aikyam that ever free Paramatma is myself then I drop the notion that I am baddhah. I am not free is a notion. It is an adhyasa. That adhyasta bandah the superimposed bondage is dropped. Previously I was the same Chaitanyam with superimposed bondage and now I am same Chaitanyam with no superimposition of bondage. Adhyasta samsara was there before and it is absent now. What is

the difference between 'rope' superimposed snake and the rope non-superimposed snake. Previously also rope was there where I noticed a snake and now also the rope is there as it is with no superimposition of the snake. There is no difference at all in the rope but what is the difference is my wisdom to see the rope as rope and not rope as snake. This is called knowledge. You have not added or removed any attribute from the rope or snake. It is not removal of anything. The removal of imaginary snake cannot bring any change and hence, there is no change in the rope and if at all there is any difference it is superficial difference. Rope with imaginary snake is previous condition and rope without imaginary snake is knowledge. The snakeless rope [imaginary snake] rope without superimposed snake is the phalam of knowledge. The difference before the knowledge was different and it was kalpita sarpa sahita rajjuh is previous one; rope with imaginary snake is previous condition and rope without imaginary snake is present condition. Adhi Sankaracharya says this is liberation. Previously with imaginary snake he was sweating and he was about to phone Snake Park etc to catch his snake. It disturbed him. After the knowledge that 'disturbance' is not there as the imaginary snake is not there. Here I was a mukta before also and after knowledge. Before knowledge mukta turiya had superimposed sthoola sariram abhimanam, superimposed sooksha sariram abhimana and superimposed karana sariram abhimana and therefore he was not called turiya. Now a new name is given that is mukta. All the abhimana is gone. Turiyam with imaginary problem one is visva, with two is tejasa, and with three is prajna. Kalpita visvatvam tejavam kalpita prajnatvam goes on gaining knowledge. The difference is imaginary notion is dropped. Mukti is manifestation of original nature. The manifestation of original nature as a consequence of dropping the false notion is called liberation. the best example is the example of karna. Until Kunti revealed that he is her own son, was the original nature of Karna. Because of peculiar situation or prarapta a charioteer brought him up and in front of society he was the son of a charioteer. Even before he was the son of Kunti and even though it was imaginary notion the inferiority complex was real problem caused by a simple notion that I am not a ksatriya. In one counter he tells Arjuna that he cannot accept that. At a particular time Kunti said you are ksatriya.. Karna did not get any new status. New birth had not taken up. Everything remained same. Only he said yes. That is all. Otherwise there was no change at all. Intellectual transformation is silent and invisible. There was no change in karna and only dropping of superimposed status that he is born of a charioteer family. That gave enough problem was dropped. Tat tvam asi will give only a transformation that I am neither visva, taijasa or prajna. This Adhi Sankaracharya writes in 1.3.19 bashyam. This is the general analysis of the sutra. Moksa is not a new status but comes to light or manifestation of original status after dropping the superimposed notion.

Now what is the proof that new status is not acquired. What is the hasis for Vyasacharya conclusion. When there is a clear verb how to say that new status has not come. For this Vyasacharya says read the mantra again. There is an expression svena rupena the jivatma comes out in its original nature. The very word original means it is not new one. It is intrinsic one. Whatever is swarupam cannot be agantikam. Agni ushnavat. Then the question will come if it is original nature it was there before also why should Upanisad use the word arise. It is a contradiction. How do you explain this contradiction. For this we say that the original nature seems to arrive because of the removal of the false notion. It is not actual arrival and it is 'seeming' arrival. For karna kaunteya status after Kunti's Maha vakyam. It did not arrive but it seemingly arrived. Previous it was obstructed by false notion. False notion pratibanda is now removed on gaining Jnanam. the manifestation of swarupam when obstacle is removed appears as new arrival. It is aupacharika utpatti not vastavika utpatti. When jnani claims liberation, initially he has lot of excitement of losing banda etc. initially from the standpoint



of mithya banda, from that angle Moksa is an excitement and when he looks back false banda, he thinks liberation is not a real exciting thing.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. ahirbbhavah Moksa nature comes to manifestation sampadye after the knowledge of the oneness with Brahman; svena sabdat this is known from the expression 'own' nature. The significance of the words is sampadya means this is the translation of paramjyoti upasampadya means after merging into Brahman; it is after brahma aikyam; after the knowledge of Brahman; there is no question of physical merger. Avirbhavah means coming to manifestation; pratibanda nivrutyah it is gained after the removal of pratibanda which is nothing but false notion; the old status comes to manifestation and new status does not arise; Purva Paksi view of new status arrival is negated. Svena sabdat means you come to know from the expression svena means swarupam and not a new status. It comes with its own old nature. Unobstructed old nature appears to be a new nature like gold shining after cleaning. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 378

### **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

#### **Sutra 4.4.1 [534]**

#### ***Sampadyavirbhavah svena sabdat***

[when the jiva or the individual soul] has attained [the highest light] there is manifestation [of its own real nature] as we infer from the word ‘own’

we see the first adhikaranam of the fourth pada of fourth chapter in which nirguna brahma jnana phalam of sadhyo Mukti is established. For this purpose Vyasacharya examines an important Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.12.3. [see previous class]. Jivatma detaches from sariram merges into Paramatma and comes out as a liberated one. This is the gist of the mantra. The discussion is when we say Jivatma comes out as liberated one does it refer to new status attained or not. Purva Pakshi says it is a new status for Upanisad talks of a process detaching and merging and coming out as liberated one. There seems to be a process and the result is new status of liberation. Purva Pakshi claims that it should be a new status because of the verb in the mantra and if the liberation is not a new status there will not be difference at all between the bondage and liberation. if it is old state it means continuation of bondage. Vyasacharya refuted the idea by taking the crucial word svena rupena in its own original nature it emerges. Its intrinsic nature is not incidental nature and therefore it is not acquired. Then the Purva Pakshi asks if the original nature is already there why should the Upanisad says comes out as liberated one. There must be some specialty intended by the sruti. For that Vyasacharya says there seems to be a specialty but there is no spatiality. Previously jiva was associated with superimposed bondage and now it is not associated with superimposed bondage and the freedom from superimposition appears as new nature. Therefore the verb becomes should be taken as figurative. There is one more aside Purva Pakshi. Some other commentators have hinted this. Vyasacharya said the word svena rupena is important and it means liberation is intrinsic nature. Then he said if the word svena rupena in its right meaning the word abhi nishpaddate must be taken as figurative for both are contradiction. The word of becoming and original nature cannot go together. If we say becoming means we cannot say original nature. Swarupam and abhinishpaddi will not go together. We resolve we took swarupam in its primary meaning and said abhinishpaddi is figurative expression. Purva Pakshi asks to resolve the contradiction you take one word in primary meaning and the other uncomfortable word in its figurative meaning. Why cannot you take the other way round. You jiva becomes liberated. All take Moksa as a new status. Why cannot you take abhinishpaddi in its primary sense and svena rupena in figurative sense. Why not svena as sweeya. For that our answer is o.k. let us assume this possibility. Jivatma does not have Moksa as an intrinsic nature and it is acquired status. Then the problem will be Moksa also will be the temporary status acquired in time and it be as good as Indra or prajapati status a time bound one. If it is incidental nature it will become anithyam. You will tell jiva attained

Moksa a temporary one. All darsanams work for nithya Moksa or sasvata ananda. All talk of eternal heaven. They come to Moksa sastra not for impermanent result and they come for permanent result. If it is impermanent result why to come to karma kanda itself and why should we come to jnana kanda. If nithya Moksa is also incidental it cannot be called nithya Moksa. Veda has promised nithya phalam and therefore abhinispaddi must be figurative.

Now we will go to second sutra.

### **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

#### **Sutra 4.4.2 [535]**

#### ***Muktah pratijnanat***

The self whose true nature has manifested itself is released; according to the promise made by the scripture.

Here Vyasacharya answers a possible question based on the same mantra. Jivatma detaches from body and merges into Paramatma and comes out in its original nature. Now Purva Pakshi asks the Upanisad only says Jivatma comes out in its original nature and it does not say mukta swarupam. Mukta swarupam you are saying and it is not there in the Upanisad. how am I to understand that it is the liberated nature. Vyasacharya gives the answer in this sutra.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says if you see the development of the entire teaching you can understand this. if you take one mantra you cannot follow anything. only if you see the entire development from pratijna vakyam you cannot know anything.

The Upanisad begins with the teaching in the 7<sup>th</sup> section 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Chandogya upanisad and is concluded in 12<sup>th</sup> section. There the Upanisad says prajapati Brahmaji talks about Paramatma in the beginning by giving the virtues or glory of Paramatma in the well known mantra *ya Atma apahata papma vijaro vimrtyu\|r visoka vijighatso pipasah satya kamah satya samkalpah so nvestavyah so vijijnasitavyah sa sarvams eva lokan apnoti sarvams ca Kaman yas tam atmanam anuvidya vijanati; iti praja patir uvaca* the meaning of the mantra is the Self which is free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from grief, free from hunger and thirst, whose desire is the real whose thought is the real, he should be sought, him one should desire to understand. He who has found out and who understands that Self, he obtains all worlds and all desires. Thus spoke Prajapati.

Generally brahmaji broadcasts advertisement regarding the Brahman ashtavidha vishista Paramatma. One has to seek that Paramatma and know It. When you see Paramatma we find Paramatma is free from all evils. Paramatma is free from all papms, without papams, thirst, hunger and in short Paramatma has not samsare. This is heard by deva raja Indra and Asura Raja virochana. They request Brahmaji to teach mukta Paramatma. Brahmaji asks whether you are visva Jivatma and in Chandogya upanisad visva Jivatma is aksi purusah. When the visva the waker and Paramatma is equated naturally there will be difficulty in udneratanding

for waker is limited individual and Paramatma is all pervading. Brahmaji said you have to take waker Jivatma after separating from sthoola sariram and take the lakshyartha. Separate the sariram and take Chaitanyam and visa creation and Paramatma Chaitanyam are identical and prajapati said this visva is Paramatma. Indra commits a blunder and instead of separating sthoola sariram taking Consciousness alone he mixes the sthoola sariram also and takes the vachyartha. Vachyartha visva and Paramatma cannot be identical for waker is riddled with problems therefore indra is not able to swallow. Therefore he goes back and comes back. He asks how can I be visva and Paramatma and he now introduces taijasa Jivatma and equates him with Paramatma. And taijasa Jivatma is called swapna purusah. Taijasa Jivatma is Consciousness contained in sooksha sariram. When prajapati meant taijasa Jivatma in lakshyartha and take sooksha sariram and see Paramatma aikyam and here also indra commits same blunder and instead of separating includes sooksha sariram and instead of upahita Chaitanyam takes vishista Chaitanyam and goes and comes back and asks how can taijasa be free and says I have more problem in dream than waking state. If taijasa is free why should one pray for avoiding the swapna. Then prajapathi tells I will teach once again and in third time he equates prajna Jivatma with Paramatma. Prajna Jivatma is called sukta Purusa or sukta purusah. Here also sukta Purusa is Consciousness enclosed in karana sariram and prajapati wanted indra to remove karana sariram and indra complains in sushupti I am not even aware of my existence and I feel I am non existence in sushupti and again indra goes and comes back again. Now prajapati gives some clue. He says previously he said that contained Consciousness alone and wanted you not to take the container of the Consciousness and wanted you to do the pahatyaga lakshana. Prajapati said that I wanted you to know the sariram had some problem and as long as you include the body in you you will have samsara. Then he makes the statement as long as sarira sambanda is there samsara will be there. sarira sambanda thyagah alone is Moksa. Sarira viyogah is Paramatma aikyam. Then he says 8.12.3 Chandogya upanisad he says when the visva gets out of sthoola sariram taijasa separates from sooksha sariram and prajna separates karana sariram then you discover paranjyoti and merge into Paramatma. If you remove three sarira sambanda you become one with Paramatma. In all the three containers only one Consciousness is there and that one Consciousness is same as Paramatma. Ashta guna vishista Paramatma aikyam pratyah. Separate three bodies you will merge with Paramatma. 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad. paramatma aikyam means Moksa for Paramatma is nithya mukta. Therefore the entire teaching is to reveal that you the visva taijasa prajna is mukta purusah or mukta Paramatma rupena. The mukta Paramatma after aikyam is also given a title utama purusah. Thus we have four Purusa aksi Purusa is visva, swapna Purusa is taijasa; sukta Purusa is prajna and utama Purusa is turiya. If you want to note aksi Purusa is 8.7.4 and swapna Purusa is 8.10.1 and sukta Purusa 8.11.1 and utama Purusa is 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad. utama is superlative one and indra's journey is over and he has attained Mukti. We come to know from the pratijna vakyam swena rupena means mukta Paramatma rupena.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. jiva is free. Pratijnanat means this is known from the initial proposition. This is known from pratijna vakyam. The significance of the words is mukta means the swarupam mentioned in 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisadis mukta swarupam only. that swarupam refers to mukta swaruapm only. this is known from pratijna vakyam. 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad. therefore Jivatma after aikyam should be mukta.

## **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

### **Sutra 4.4.3 [536]**

#### ***Atma prakaranat***

The light into which the individual soul enters is the supreme Self owing to the subject matter of the chapter.

The sutra says that the individual soul and recovers his own Self [the supreme Self] as stated in sutra 2.

Here we see the possible Purva Paksi. He says that I cannot accept your interpretations. We said Jivatma detaches from three sariramams. thereafter we said this Jivatma gets nithya mukta Paramatma aikyam. Who is that nithya Paramatma and he one who said in 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad. because Jivatma merges into nithya mukta Paramatma, Jivatma becomes mukta. This was our argument. Purva Paksi asks where is the word nithya mukta Paramatma in the mantra. Upanisad uses the word paramjyoti and where jyoti means Atma and the word jyoti means light only. and the param means superior light the great light and I am willing to take great light as suryah. But surya is param jyoti and therefore Paramatma merges into karya jyoti the prakasa and therefore Jivatma is within the world only. he says he cannot accept Mukti. The answer is in this context word jyoti means Atma. Because of two reason. One is even though in common parlance jyoti means light and in scriptural language word jyoti is often used in the sense of Paramatma. Presenting Paramatma as light is common in the scriptures. We have several mantras to support our view. I have explained the reason in the Upanisad class. The Consciousness is called light. the definition of light is in whose presence things are known and in whose absence the things are not known. I am able to see all of you because of surya prakasa. In the night I will not be able to see. If you take this definition you will call surya and chandra are light. in the presence of sense organs sabda etc., is known. In Brihadaranyaka upanisad even words are called light. that is why when a speech is very informative we call it enlightening speech for he threw light on many important things. Mind is also called jyoti and if your mind is not there now you will not know what I am talking. Extending that ultimate light is called Consciousness. Consciousness is called so because all the others are lights because of Consciousness. Sense organs can light up mind can light borrowing light from Atma but Atma is light without depending on anyone. Therefore others are called aparam jyoti while Consciousness is called paramjyoti. Therefore our answer is in scriptures jyoti is used in the sense of Paramatma.

Second reason is the topic is about Paramatma. In the very beginning Paramatma is introduced. The whole prakaranam is Paramatma. While talking about Paramatma how can Upanisad suddenly talk about surya. When I says sun in this context you will put appropriate spelling sun and not son. In putra context you will write son. Since it is Paramatma prakaranam paramjyoti should be understood as Paramatma only.

After this portion the Upanisad talks about Mukti and glory of mukta purusah. Mukta Purusa enjoys and moves about and enjoys and Moksa description is given. If it is surya devata how can Upanisad talk about uttama purusah. Superlative cannot be used. because of Paramatma

prakaranam and Moksa phalam and scriptural convention we have to conclude paramjyoti means Paramatma. That is why swena rupena means mukta urpe only.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. The word paramjyoti refers to Paramatma; prakaranat means because of the context. The word analysis I will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 379

### **Topic 1 [Sutras 1 – 3] Sampadyavirbhavadhikaranam**

The liberated soul does not acquire anything new but only manifests its essential or true nature.

#### **Sutra 4.4.3 [536]**

#### ***Atma prakaranat***

The light into which the individual soul enters is the supreme Self owing to the subject matter of the chapter.

The sutra says that the individual soul and recovers his own Self [the supreme Self] as stated in sutra 2.

We are doing the analysis of first adhikaranam of the fourth pada of fourth chapter. here first few adhikaranam nirguna brahma Vidya phalam is given and Vyasacharya establishes with the help of analysis of Chandogya upanisad mantra. This talks about Jnanam as also jnana phalam. The difficulty with the mantra is all the words used in the manta leads to different types of interpretation. First problem is whether the jnana phalam is an event happening in time or not because the mantra talks about brahma aikyam as though it is an actual process. Jiva getting detached from sariram, merging with Paramatma and coming out of mukta Purusa looks as though we have to wait for that to happen. This is the orientation of the vedantic students also. All hope for liberation one day. Vyasacharya says there is no physical change involved and it is only dropping of the notion which is purely an intellectual and cognitive process.,. This is established in this adhikaranam. we have completed Atma prakaranat in the third sutra. Here Vyasacharya analysed the meaning of paramjyoti. It is something luminous and something shining and therefore Purva Paksi assumes that jyoti means some bouthika jyoti and the significance of the adjectivbe param is there are many luminaries in the sky like sun stars etc., of all of them surya jyoti is biggest one and param jyoti Purva Paksi takes it as surya jyoti. Vyasacharya refutes this contention because we talk of liberation here. surya bhagavn cannot give liberation for it is karya jyoti for it falls within the karya prapancha. It is perishable and merging with perishable karya jyoti one cannot get liberation. From the context we have to take karana jyoti, which is nothing, but Atma jyoti. How can you say Atma is jyoti or luminary? In sastric parlance the word light can refer to spiritual light also although in loukika vyavahara it is material light. jyoti often refers to nonmaterial spiritual light. Adhi Sankaracharya pointed out that such an expression is found in sstr` and smriti also. The references are Mundaka 2.2.1; avih refers to jyoti rupa Atma; mundaka 2.2.9; Brihadaranyaka upanisad 4.3.9; atrayam purusah swayam jyoti bhavati; the whole section reveals Self effulgent light of Consciousness; in Gita 13.18 jyoititam etc. there are several such context where jyoti means Chaitanyam. In this context paramjyoti should be translated as Paramatma. This topic has been discussed previously in 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad and that word paramjyoti has been taken for analysis and Vyasacharya has established that jyoti means Paramatma only 1.3.40 of Brahma Sutra. the very adhikaranam is

called jyotir adhikaranam. Vyasacharya does not therefore go into detail. He expects us to remember the same. this Chandogya upanisad reveals that jnani becomes one with Brahman instantaneously on gaining Jnanam. jivan Mukti is phalam of Brahma Vidya. the significance of the word I will give you now; Atma means the word jyoti occurring in 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad is Atma. The word param jyoti is said so we should take it as Paramatma. Prakaranat the very context is the reason the context being liberation light means liberation.

## **Topic 2 [Sutra 4] Avibhagena drishtatvadhikaranam**

The released soul remains inseparable from the Supreme Soul

### **Sutra 4.4.4 [537]**

#### ***Avibhagena drishtatvat***

The jiva in the state of release exists as inseparable from Brahman because it is so seen from the scriptures

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. the subject matter of the adhikaranam is the very same Chandogya upanisad. in the previous adhikaranam we analysed the word param jyoti. Even before that we analysed the word bvir nishpadyate. Now Vyasacharya analyses the word upa sampatyate. Literally the word means approaching or entering. Close and intimate approach is the meaning of the word upa sampatyate. The question is who is doing with whom. Jivatma is intimately and closely reaching Paramatma. Intimate reaching or entering is mentioned in the mantra. The controversy is what do we mean by intimate entering. Will Jivatma merge into Paramatma or inseparably will it merge in such a way you cannot differentiate which is which. It is called avibhagena upasambatti. It is indistinguishable merger. Of does it mean Jivatma merges with Paramatma and the differences continue. Jivatma continues as infinite Jivatma and Paramatma continues as infinite and then both join together. Body and dress are intimate even then both continue to remain as dress and body. Both do not merge as such. The individuality is maintained. Jivatma and Paramatma remain separable and distinguishable even after merger is called vibhagena upasambatti. Purva Pakshi says that there is no total merger. Jivatma cannot become Paramatma and Paramatma cannot become Jivatma. Paramatma is Paramatma and Jivatma is Jivatma and they continue to remain as such even after gaining liberation or Jnanam. total merger is not accepted by some people. You remain different from Paramatma and Jivatma will continue to depend upon Paramatma even after gaining Jnanam. before Jnanam I consider myself is independent and after study I have become dependence. Dependence on the lord is vishesha paratantryam and this will give ananda.

We say that no the merger is absolute and total. Avibhagena aikyam. We says there is no question of merger itself. Only when we take Jivatma and Paramatma different then we have to see the merger is total or parital. But we take Jivatma Paramatma aikyam. Then the merger itself does not arise. There is no merger at all and there is only one Chaitanyam with two different nama. In advaitam merger means again the dropping the notions that there are two things to merge together. Therefore Purva Pakshi is vibhagena upasambattih and advaita is avibhagena upasambattih.



Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. here Purva Pakshi has the doubt that he has his own logic and it is the very fact that veda uses two words Jivatma and Paramatma indicates they are two. There is karta and karma and subject and object is there and transitive verb is there that reveals there are two things. Both are eternal and they are two separate things being and each one is eternal and therefore there is no question of merger. If Jivatma disappears in Paramatma eternity of Jivatma will go away. It is separate and it is eternal and it cannot disappear and it can be close and it can never be one. It is one reason given by Purva Pakshi.

Second reason is based on phala vakyam. In the same mantra later part the Upanisad says this jnani who has merged into Brahman moves about enjoying life. This wise Jivatma this liberated Jivatma moves about in Brahman and that too enjoying everything. Purva Pakshi says if the liberated Jivatma should move about in Brahman it is very clear that Jivatma continues his individuality and he has not become one with Brahman. therefore vibhaga has to be accepted.

Vyasacharya says no avibhagena. He says that the very central teaching of the Upanisad is jivatma paramatma aikyam as revealed by every maha vakyam tat tvam asi, prajnanam Brahman etc. every vakyam reveals jivatma paramatma are not two entities but one Chaitanyam swarupam. Two Chaitanyams are not possible at all. Sajadiya vijadiya swahata rahitam and then how can be there two Consciousnesses. How can there be one small Consciousness and big Consciousness for it is said there is no part and whole in Consciousness. Niravayavatvat Chaitanyasya and how can there is Paramatma Chaitanyam and Jivatma Chaitanyam. You are Paramatma and Paramatma is you. student says I have gained this knowledge. I am Brahman and Brahman is me. As a result of knowledge will I merge into Brahman swamij is the question posed by a student. The teacher will be sorry. When the teaching is aikyam where is the question of merger? It is beda dhyasa nivrutti. It is elimination of superimposed division. The central teaching reveals that.

Even when sruti gives jnana phalam in Mundaka 3.2.9 says phalam reveals total merger only. brahma veda brahma eva bhavati the knower of Brahman does not go near Brahman does not sit on the lap of Brahman and he is Brahman and he does not even become Brahman. Brihadaranyaka upanisad 4.4.6 brahmaiva san brahmapveti Brahman as jivan mukta and merges as vidheh mukta. He is Brahman and he becomes one with Brahman. being Brahman 'merges' into Brahman. Kathopanisad 2.1.15 says *yathodakam suddhe suddham asiktam tadrg eva bhavati evam muner vijanata Atma bhavati Gautama* the meaning of the sutra is as pure water poured forth into pure becomes the very same so the Self O Gautama of the seer who has understanding becomes [one with Brahman]

Here also the example should not be stretched too much. Water can be poured into water because there is spatial distance. But in the case of Atma this spatial difference is not there.

If that is so total why Chandogya upanisad says that two merges and Jivatma moves about in Brahman enjoying etc. Adhi Sankaracharya says it should be properly interpreted.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. avibhagena means liberated jiva remains [non separate from Paramatma]; drishtatvat because it is revealed so [in the sruti]

The significance of the words is avibhagena means non-separate and Vyasacharya does not say between what and what and we have to understand it is between Jivatma and Paramatma.

Why do we say only liberated Jivatma is not separate. Ignorant jivatma thinks they are separate. There is no actual separation. Liberated Jivatma knows they are non-separate. Child on the lap of mother thinks of separation in dream. The child is frightened of separation. Child dreams on the lap of mother separated. It has to wake up to find the truth. Ignorant think they are separate but wise man knows he is not separate. Drishtatvat means this is seen in the Upanisad. Jivatma and Paramatma are ever non-separate.

Purva Pakshi argues if both are separate and identical why Upanisad talks of liberated soul to move about and sporting and enjoying with many women also written there. before liberation he had one wife and after liberation he has more wives. It is disturbing statements. Adhi Sankaracharya says this should not be taken literally. He says jnani knows I am one with Brahman totally. Therefore jnani knows I am the Chaitanyam behind all the people. Therefore any type of enjoyment enjoyed by any jiva anywhere jnani does not miss that and he does not feel separation and he sees all enjoyment his own. Indra enjoying with all people jnani does not say I miss that. All anandas are included in brahmananda. It is not literally but he enjoys means all sense pleasures are included in brahmananda. There is no such thing called sense pleasures. Even during sense pleasure we only manifest the ananda of Atma. Therefore jnani has got all the ananda. In pancadasi vidyaranya says all anandas are brahmananda. So don't take it literally. I am one with Brahman is the fact.

### **Topic 3 [sutras 5 – 7] Brahmadhikaranam**

Characteristics of the soul that has attained the Nirgunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 4.4.5 [538]**

#### ***Brahmena jaiminirupanyasadibhyah***

The released soul exists as possessed of the attributes of Brahman thus Jaimini opines on account of the reference etc.

The view of the sage Jaimini is stated in this connection.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. this is the third adhikaranam with three sutras. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is we analyse Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.12.3. we establish that jivan mukta as a result of this knowledge merges totally into Atma. Paramjyoti means Paramatma. Jivatma merges with Paramatma. The question is what is the Paramatma kept in the mind by the sruti is the question and if you study the beginning of the prakaranam the teaching starts in chapter 8 7<sup>th</sup> section and this mantra is in 12<sup>th</sup> chapter. there the Upanisad itself defines Paramatma. Ashtaguna vishista Paramatma is defined. Eight visheshanams are given. If you study them six features talk about freedom from all types of attributes. Free from old age free from death etc. it is all description of Paramatma. It is free from all attributes are talked about. The last two attributes are sathya kamas desires never go futile and sathya sankalpa the programmes that are sathyam. This belongs to Nirgunam Brahman or maya sahitam Brahman jiva can have kama and sankalpa but not sathya kama and sathya sankalpa. Our kamas are not always fulfilled. It is maya sahitam saguna. 8.12.3 mentions Jivatma merges into Paramatma. The controversy is jiva merges with Nirgunam Brahman or Sagunam Brahman. does the liberated jiva merges into Nirgunam Brahman or saguna Isvara. this is the controversy. Vyasacharya

will present three opinions and first is Jaimini aikyam. Jaimini will say Isvara aikyam and Audulomi will say brahma aikyam and what we are going to say that we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 380

### **Topic 3 [sutras 5 – 7] Brahmadhikaranam**

Characteristics of the soul that has attained the Nirgunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 4.4.5 [538]**

#### ***Brahmena jaiminirupanyasadibhyah***

The released soul exists as possessed of the attributes of Brahman thus Jaimini opines on account of the reference etc.

The view of the sage Jaimini is stated in this connection.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam with three sutras. The subject matter of the adhikaranam is nirguna Vidya phalam or brahma prapti phalam. To establish this Vyasacharya takes the well-known Chandogya upanisad mantra 8.7.1. once we talk about total aikyam with Paramatma a doubt will come that in Chandogya upanisad itself Paramatma has been defined in the above mantra. There eight features of Paramatma has been defined and six of them related to negation of the attributes. They are all nirguna rupe and the last two are sathya kama and sathya sankalpa and it realtes to saguna Brahman. having introduced this, Jivatma's aikyam with Paramatma is mentioned. Now the question is whether jivatma merges with Nirgunam Brahman or Sagunam Isvara. if he merges into saguna Isvara naturally jivan mukta also will have all the glories of Isvara. on the other hand if he merges into Nirgunam Brahman, vidheha multa will be free from all the attributes. Jivan mukta at the time vidheh mukta is a saguna or nirguna. Vyasacharya presents two opinions in two sutras. 5<sup>th</sup> sutra presents the opinion of Jaimini and 6<sup>th</sup> sutra presents the opinion of Audulomi rishi. The third one Baadarayana siddhanta matham. Jaimini says that a jnani merges with Isvara only. Audulomi will merge with Brahman and Vyasacharya says both are correct. From vyavahara dristya Isvara aikyam and paramarthika dristya brahma aikyam from jnani dristya brahma aikyam and ajnani dristya Isvara aikyam. From jnani's angle Brahman alone is there for we have negated all the three. from ajnani angle it is Isvara aikyam for he does not know Nirgunam Brahman at all. This will be siddhanta. Only one incidental point. Jaimini's opinion is jnani attains Isvara aikyam and this can create some doubt. Sometime back Purva Mimamsa does not accept Isvara and the founder of Purva Mimamsa is Jaimini. If Jaimini Isvara himself where is the question of him talking about Isvara prapti. One answer is we should remember that he is Vyasacharya sishya and therefore in his heart of heart he is vedantin only. Being Vyasacharya sishya it will be disgrace for Vyasacharya the Guru. We says he accepts Isvara and he and his Guru does not have any difference. He plays two roles. When he wrote karma kanda, he took a stand and it is not his philosophy. In the same way Isvara stand is taken by him to give his own opinion. In Gita when Arjuna asks as tho' he does not know the avatara of Krishna. He raises the question on behalf of all the people. In this adhikaranam Jaimini agrees with Vyasacharya but temporarily takes a different role but he is a pacca vedantin is our contention. This is the essence of the adhikaranam. jnani merges with Isvara. but our answer is both Isvara and Brahman. Here Jamini presentgs his view that

jnani merges into Isvara only and he acquires all attributes and glories which jaimini calls brahma dharma or Isvara sambandam. With Isvara dharma with aisvarya guna jnani will have all Brahman attributes. For that he gives reasons.

Jaimini gives three reasons. From the introductory and latter statement of Chandogya upanisad we come to know this. what are those statements. 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad there clearly last two sathya kama and sathya sandkalpa are the attributes of Isvara. later statements are 8.12.3 of Chandogya upanisad. the latter portion talks of jnani's glory. Jnani moves about enjoying everything that is sathya sankalpatvam. Whatever pleasure he wants he can instantaneously enjoy. Thus 8.12.3 reveals this. The third statement comes in seventh chapter where also Brahma Vidya phalam is talked about. Bhuma Vidya phalam is given in 7.25.2 of Chandogya upanisad that jnani can move in all lokas in any form he likes. This is possible for Isvara alone. Nirgunam Brahman cannot move at all. Sathya kamah sathya sankalpah. Sarva loka kama charah. From these three statements Jaimini argues jnani becomes Isvara himself. It is not clearly said that in Purva Paksi thinks that Isvara is absolute and is sathyam. He does not tell it as vyavahara sathyam but he says it is paramarthika sathyam. He says jiva becomes paramarthika sathya Isvara. if he takes it as vyavahara sathyam, he will automatically become a siddhanti.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. brahmena the liberated jiva exists; with the attributes of Sagunam Brahman or Isvara. upanyasadibhyah this is known from the introductory mantra and other mantras. Jaimini thus declares Jaimini. The significance of the words is brahmena here it refers to Isvara dharma attributes of Sagunam Brahman. it refers to group of Isvara's attributes. So jnani becomes Isvara. he remains with Isvara's glory. Jaimini refers to one of the views of Jaimini. Upanyasadhibyah means upakrama vakyam. It is technical Purva Mimamsa word. Upakrama vakyam means introductory statement kept in mind is 8.7.1 of Chandogya upanisad where ashta guna of Brahman is given. Adhi means the other vakyams. That is upasamhara vakyam, or the concluding statement. 8.12.3 where the jnani's glory is mentioned. Third statement is taken from bhuma Vidya 7.25.2 sathya sarvesu lokesu etc. all these phalams are possible only through Jivatma Isvara aikyam.

Now we go to the second opinion of Adulomih

### **Topic 3 [sutras 5 – 7] Brahmadhikaranam**

Characteristics of the soul that has attained the Nirgunam Brahman.

**Sutra 4.4.6[539]**

***Chitanmatrena tadatmakatvadityaudulomih.***

The released soul exists solely as pure Consciousness or intelligence, that being its true nature or essence; thus Audulomi thinks

The view of the sage Audulomi is stated in this connection.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. audulomi says it is not correct because the primary teaching of Moksa sastra is Nirgunam Brahman alone. No doubt saguna Isvara is talked about he says the tatparyam is Nirgunam Brahman alone. He says the emphasis is

Nirgunam Brahman only. Nirgunam Brahman alone is primarily taught in several places. The examples are Brihadaranyaka upanisad 2.4.12; where Brahman is introduced as pure Consciousness without anything else. *Sa yatha saindava khilya prasta udakam evanuviliyeta na hasya udgrahanayeva syat yato yatas tv adadita lavanam eva* as a lump of salt thrown in water becomes dissolved in water and there would not be any of it to seize forth as it were, but whatever one may take it is salty indeed so verily this great being infinite, limitless consists of nothing but knowledge. Here Brahman is introduced as prajna gana without anything else. This means there is no attribute to Brahman. then Brihadaranyaka upanisad 2.4.14 *yatha hidvaitam iva bhavati tad itara itaram jighrati tad itarah itaram pasyati* here Brahman has no duality it is said and once you intrduce Isvara the duality arises the ruler and ruled. If jiva and jagat is not there Isvara loses his Isvara status. Brihadaranyaka upanisad says ultimate truth Brahman has no jiva jagat Isvara beda also. So Brahman is nirguna is central teaching and it is this Nirgunam Brahman jnani attains stated in 3.2.9 of Mundaka Upanisad. *brahma eva brahmaiva bhavati* knower of Brahman becomes Brahman is the central teaching of all the Upanisad and it is said Isvara is lower order of reality. It is also said upasaka who identifies with Isvara is to be pitied. Therefore Audulomi says jnani knows Nirgunam Brahman and jnani merges into Nirgunam Brahman. because of these reasons Audulomi says jnani has brahma prapti and not Isvara prapti. Naturally Audulomi will be further questioned. What about the quotations given by Jaimini. All the glories if the Upanisad talks about Isvara. how do you account for what Jaimini has quoted. Audulomi says they are to be taken figuratively and not literally., it is meant to show all anandas are included in Brahman and also it is meant to show Brahman is behind the sense pleasures of all the people to teach sarvatma bhava. To show sarvatma bhava it is jnani enjoys all etc. it is the argument of Audulomi. The absence of dukham and inclusion of all pleasures are the intention of the Upanisad when it says jnani enjoys on gaining Jnanam. They are not sathyam. They don't exist at all. Jaimini takes all of them as total reality while Audulomi takes it as asathyam.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. *chititan matrena* the liberated jiva exists in the form of pure Consciousness; pure means attributeless; *tatatmakatvat* means because that is the nature of the jiva; *iti Audulomih* so says rishi Audulomih. The significance of the words is *chititanmatrena* means *chaitanya matra rupena*; *tanmatram* means *swarupam chitih* means *Chaitanyam* which means *chaitanya swarupena* in the form of pure Consciousness alone he remains; the significance of this word is by *sadying* that he is *swarupa matrene* audulomi rejects all the attributes are not there for a jnani. There is no question of becoming of omniscient Isvara or omnipresent Isvara. *tadatmakatvat* means *chaitanya swarupatvam* and it is the real nature of the jiva; jiva being *chaitanya swarupa* as known through *maha vakyams*. As he assimilates the *maha vakyam* he grasps the *aikyam* by taking *lakshyartha*, when I say I am Brahman the I is Brahman after negating inferior attributes, and when I say I am Paramatma it is pure Consciousness with all superior attributes. At the time of attaining jnani status I discard all inferior attributes and attains all Brahman qualities of superior attributes. Where is the question of attributes for jnani has dismissed all the attributes. Where is the question Isvara himself and where is the question of attributes. He is *Chaitanyam* alone and jnani remains with *swarupa Chaitanyam* only. by this he excludes the inferior and superior attributes. There is no *banda* not even *Moksa*. When we talk about jiva *banda* we have to say Isvara is *muktah*. For jnani there is nothing like *banda* or *Moksa*. He is above all. Therefore Jaimini matham is unacceptable Audulomi negates the views of Jaimini. *Iti Audulomi* means thus declares Audulomi rishi. When he negates Isvara attributes he negates the total non-existence. He negates Isvara and Isvara dharma as *atyanta asat* whereas Jaimini takes it as *atyanta sat*.

### Topic 3 [sutras 5 – 7] Brahmadhikaranam

Characteristics of the soul that has attained the Nirgunam Brahman.

#### Sutra 4.4.7 [540]

#### *Evamapyupanyasat purvabhavadaviruoatham Baadarayana*

Thus also, an account of the existence of the former qualities admitted owing to reference and so on, there is no contradiction between the two; so thinks Baadarayana.

The author's view is now stated.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says that I accept both the mathams of both the rishis because both are based on sruti pramanam vakyam. Jaimini has quoted from which Isvara aikya srutis are there and audulomi also has given sruti support that says Vedanta negates jiva jagat Isvara beda and negates all attributes of Brahman. audulomi's views are also sruti based. Jnani becomes saguna Isvara and he himself becomes Nirgunam Brahman. Both have to be accepted. But there is logical problem if we accept both the rishis are correct. The interpretation of sruti should not contradict logic and pratyaksa. If we take both the matham there is logical problem and if we say jnani becomes Isvara, jnani becomes Nirgunam Brahman, and thus jnani will become both sagunatvam and nirgunatvam. This is logically untenable for opposite attributes cannot coexist in one and the same time. Saguna means presence of attributes and nirguna means absence of attributes. Here we slightly vary with both. When Jaimini talks of Isvara aikyam it is vyavahara sathyam and not paramarthika sathyam. From empirical plane Isvara aikyam is acceptable to us. When audulomi says brahma aikyam we say nirguna brahma aikyam we accept as paramarthika sathyam and as far as saguna aspect we don't totally reject as Audulomi does. We say it does not have absolute reality. It is not totally absent and it is absent from paramarthika dristi and is present from vyavahara dristi. From vyavahara dristi jnani is saguna Isvara and from paramarthika dristi jnani is paramarthika dristya. Opposite attributes can be there if they belong to two different order so reality. I go to bed with my clothes dry but in dream I dream rain and my clothes become wet. From dreamer's angle my clothes are wet but the same clothes are dry from waker's angle. So is jnani also. From vyavahara angle jnani is saguna Isvara with attributes and from paramarthika angle the same jnani is Nirgunam Brahman with no attributes. Dryness and wetness can coexist from the angle in which we look at it. Isvara is vyavahara sathyam and Brahman is paramarthika sathyam. So there is no contradiction. Jnani will say he has merged with Nirgunam Brahman with no attributes while the ajnanis will say he has merged with Isvara with attributes. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 381

### **Topic 3 [sutras 5 – 7] Brahmadhikaranam**

Characteristics of the soul that has attained the Nirgunam Brahman.

#### **Sutra 4.4.7 [540]**

#### ***Evamapyupanyasat purvabhavadaviruodham Baadarayana***

Thus also, an account of the existence of the former qualities admitted owing to reference and so on, there is no contradiction between the two; so thinks Baadarayana.

The author's view is now stated.

We see the seventh sutra, which is the final sutra of the third adhikaranam. in this adhikaranam also like the previous two adhikaranam Vyasacharya analyses a Chandogya upanisad vakyam which talks about Nirgunam Brahman jnani. The Chandogya upanisad vakyam is 8.12.3 as stated above. In this vakyam sruti talks about a jnani jiva merging into Brahman and he is referred to as sampradhah and Brahman as param jyotih. Jivatma merges into Paramatma as a result of Nirgunam Brahman Jnanam. here there is vagueness because this paramjyoti Atma is talked about in the beginning of the portion. Paramatma is discussed both in Sagunam Brahman and Nirgunam Brahman version. When Upanisad says jnani merges into Brahman the question comes does he merge into Saguna Brahma Isvara or Nirgunam Brahman. we have already discussed the two views of Jaimini and Audulomini giving different opinions. Jaimini says jnani jiva merges into Saguna brahma Isvara while Audulomi says that he said jnani jiva merges into Nirgunam Brahman only. but here Vyasacharya says jnani merges into both Sagunam Brahman and Nirgunam Brahman and it all depends from which angle we look at the merger. If we take it from vyavahara angle jnani merges with saguna Brahman while from paramarthika angle jnani merges with Nirgunam Brahman. the various argument Vyasacharya gives for his opinion we are presently discussing. He reconciles Jaimini and Audulomi for both their views are supported by sruti. Jnani merges into Isvara and jnani merges into Nirgunam Brahman. Jnani becomes saguna Isvara and jnani becomes Nirgunam Brahman. jnani becomes saguna he is saguna and if he merges with nirguna he nirguna and how can be both with attributes and without attributes at the same time. Opposite attributes cannot coexist. Normally they cannot coexist but under certain condition they can coexist if both of them are in different degrees of reality just as mirage water can coexist in the driest sand. One is water and the other is dry. How can driness and water can coexist. Mirage water belongs to pratibasika sathyam and water belongs to vyavahara sathyam. From vyavahara dristi jnani merges into Isvara; for vyavahara dristi Nirgunam Brahman is not there. from vyavahara dristi saguna jiva is there saguna jagat is there and saguna Isvara is there. nothing else is there. vyavahara dristi Nirgunam Brahman is not there. from vyavahara dristi jnani becomes Isvara and thereafter worship you give to jnani will go to Isvara only., if you look jnani from paramarthika dristi he 'merges' with Nirgunam Brahman. to put in another language from jnani's angle he is one with Nirgunam Brahman and he will not accept merging with Sagunam Brahman. he was Brahman and he is Brahman



and he will be Brahman during vidheha Mukti also. Therefore we say from jnani's angle he merges with Brahman. from ajnani angle since he does not know Nirgunam Brahman and he sees jnani as Sagunam Brahman or Isvara only. therefore there is no contradiction. Therefore avirodham there is no contradiction between Jaimini and Audulomi. Their opinions can be taken only when two orders of reality is accepted. In the same order of reality you cannot accept because opposite attributes cannot coexist. Accept jaimini from vyavahara dristi and accept Audulomi from paramarthika dristi and then where the problem. This is the contention of Vyasacharya.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. *evam api* means still avirodham there is no contradiction; *pruvabhavat* because of the acceptance of the existence of attributes mentioned before *upanyasat* which attributes are arrived at from the introductory statement. The significance of the words is *evam api* means still; still means even though Audulomi is correct as given in the previous sutra from jnani's angle there is no saguna Isvara for merging and from jnani's angle Nirgunam Brahman only from his angle still acceptance of Audulomi need not exclude Jaimini's opinion. Audulomi need not exclude Jaimini. They can coexist; *upanyasat* means the reason given by Jaimini the introductory statement and the significance of the statement is there the saguna Isvara is talked about; *upanyasat* is based on this *vakyam purva bhavat* we can accept the saguna Isvara aikyam as suggested by Jaimini. *Purva bhavat* refers to Jaimini opinion given in sutra 5 above. Avirodham there will be no contradiction. Nriguna saguna never exist. Advaitam dvaitam contradiction never exists because Nirgunam Brahman and Sagunam Brahman Isvara can eternally coexist. Both are eternal. Maya is also eternal. Therefore maya sahita Sagunam Brahman can eternally continue and both are parallelly etenal. Sagima Brahman is eternal from vyavahara angle and Nirgunam Brahman is eternal from paramarthika angle. From vyavahara angle Sagunam Brahman will not end and paramarthika Nirgunam Brahman is not there to end. there is no question when will dvaitam ends. From vyavahara dristya it will not end and paramarthika angle it need not end. the question is not right. We need not answer. Still we say when your vision is shifted from vyavaharam to paramarthikam the dvaitam ends as it were. That is called falsification and that is called *badah*. There is no physical end but it is only changing the dristi from vyavahara to paramarthika. Therefore both can be Sagunam Brahman and Nirgunam Brahman can co-exist. This is our conclusion. Baadarayana thus declares Vyasacharya.

When you talk about jnani merging into Isvara or Brahman are you referring to jivan mukta jnani or vidheh mukta jnani. Jivan mukta merges with Isvara from vyavahara dristi and suppose some one asks as long as jivan mukta has *prarapta* he cannot merge into Isvara and wait for exhaustion of *prarapta* and as long as *prarapta* is there he will remain separate from Isvara and he will maintain individuality and his *sathya kamatvam* and *sathya sankalpam* will be relative, he cannot be like Isvara. still because of purity of the mind jivan mukta jnani certain exalted attributes closer to Isvara. that is why in *mundaka Upanisad* it is said jivan mukta jnani can be worshipped like God and he *sathya kama* and *sathya sankalpa*. Even that elevation cannot be hundred percent equal to Isvara for certain amount of *prarapta* will be there. but he will become total when the *prarapta* ends and when the three *sariram diappaars* and *vyasti chidabasa* becomes merge into *samasti chidabasa*. Therefore *vidheh mutka* merges into Isvara totally from vyavahara angle.

Now does a jivan mukta merges into Nirgunam Brahman from paramarthika or not. form paramarthika dristi does not exist. The difference is there from vyavahara dristi. There is no *prarapta* from paramarthika dristi. The difference exists from *prarapta* angle only. since from

paramarthika angle prarapta is not there and hence be merges into Nirgunam Brahman. with this seventh sutra is over. Third adhikaranam is over. 3427

#### **Topic 4 [Sutras 8 – 9] Sankatpadhadhikaranam**

The soul which has attained the Sagunam Brahman effects its desire by mere will

##### **Sutra 4.4.8 [541]**

##### ***Sanktapadeva tu tacchruteh***

But by mere will [the liberated souls attains their purpose], because scriptures say so

The powers and privileges, which a liberated soul acquires are stated here

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It is a short adhikaranam with two sutras. From this adhikaranam we enter the second part of the fourth pada. fourth pada has got 22 sutras of which first seven sutras talks of nirguna prapta of jnani jiva. The rest talks of upasaka jiva or saguna brahma or brahma loka prapti. Saguna brahma Vidya means upasanam and nirguna brahma prapti means Jnanam.

Now we enter the upasana portion and how upasaka will get brahma loka and will get extraordinary vibhuthis or glories. The subject matter here is a statement occurring in Chandogya upanisad 8.2.1 which reads as *sa yadi pitr-loka-kamo samkappad evasya pitarah samuttisthanti tena pitr lokena sampanno mahitaye* the meaning is if he becomes desirous of the world of the fathers, by his mere thought, fathers arise. Possessed of the world of fathers he is happy. We have already discussed the upasaka goes to Brahma Loka and he is very similar to Hiranyagarbha. he is similar to brahmaji and all attributes he meditated upon, all glories and capacities he attains in Brahma Loka. He becomes sathya kama and sathya sankalpa in brahma loka. This is described by vaishnavites as Vishnu loka that is reaching Vishnu loka or Vaikunta. We do accept this but we only add that it is stop before realizing Brahman and gaining Moksa.

Whatever the upasaka wishes gains everything in Brahma Loka. If he wished to see parents then their parents will appear before them. Whatever he wishes he gets there. he gets all the boghas. He becomes sathya kama and sathya sankalpa in Brahma Loka.

The controversy here that in this mantra that talks of Sagunam Brahma Vidya phalam, gets everything by mere sankalpa or wish or will. Whether sankalpa alone is enough or anything else is required. When he should take any effort or he gets everything automatically with the meditation. The Purva Pakshi views that mere wish will not produce any thing. That is our worldly experience. Without wish we cannot accomplish but that is to be accompanied by some efforts. This is *lokika nyaya*. *Buloka nyaya* should be extended to Brahma Loka or vaikunta. Vyasacharya says don't extend this *nyaya* to Brahma Loka and vaikunta. It is because of extraordinary sadhan he got the benefit and therefore he becomes similar to God. God created the world by mere sankalpa alone. So also the upasaka gets everything by mere sankalpa. What about *lokika nyaya*? For that Vyasacharya says that in first sutra. Vyasacharya says what happens in Brahma Loka or what are the laws governed in Brahma Loka and the very existence of Brahma Loka we cannot know with the instruments available

to us here. it is apouruseya vishaya and we have believe the sastram totally. The source of knowledge regarding the existence of Brahma Loka should the same for the laws of Brahma Loka. Either reject Brahma Loka and reject the laws. Or accept both. For this you take sastra pramanam. Sastra says sankalpat eva pitaras samudyastaha. That means no other efforts are required to get their wishes fulfilled. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 382

### **Topic 4 [Sutras 8 – 9] Sankatpadhadhikaranam**

The soul which has attained the Sagunam Brahman effects its desire by mere will

**Sutra 4.4.8 [541]**

*Sanktapadeva tu tacchruteh*

But by mere will [the liberated souls attains their purpose], because scriptures say so

The powers and privileges, which a liberated soul acquires, are stated here

A person in Brahma Loka is not a mukta and in these few adhikaranam word mukta is used to indicate the upasaka in Brahma Loka is likely to get Mukti on gaining Jnanam there. The limitations suffered by the jiva is not there for upasakas who have reached Brahma Loka. In fourth adhikaranam we discuss the sathya kamatvam and sankalpatvam of the upasakas in Brahma Loka. By mere thoughts they get all the boghas. The discussion is whether the sankalpa alone produce all things they want or they have to make efforts to get things. Purva Paksi says that prayatna is needed for which we say there is not need of any efforts to get their wishes fulfilled. He says not to extend buloka nyaya to Brahma Loka. In buloka the upadhis have got limitation from jiva to jiva. What we do the birds cannot do and what the bird does we cannot do. Don't attribute the buloka upadhis to Brahma Loka upasaka's upadhis. The life in Brahma Loka has to be known from sastra alone which being apourusaeya vishaya. The whole focus is on the word eva in the Chandogya upanisad mantra. Without material cause matter cannot be created or destroyed. In the case of upasaka in Brahma Loka, he need not go after material and sankalpa will produce necessary factors for production and sankalpa will give the bogha vastus as based on the vedas. Reading veda is like seeing. Therefore other factors other than sankalpa are not required in the case of upasaka in Brahma Loka.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Upasaka in Brahma Loka fulfills his desires by mere sankalpa. Tacchruteh this known from such sruti statements. The significance of the words is sankalpat means by means of mere sankalpa meaning wish will or monition. The word eva indicates non-requirement of any other factors including time and space. The word tu indicates that Brahma Loka condition is unlike the other loka conditions. Dream is the best example for other loka. In dream desa is different, kala is different, body is different time is different. You should not ask what law it is for it is the law of the dream loka. It is an imagination and unreal from waker's standpoint. In dream loka it has sufficient reality to produce sufficient pleasures and enormous pains also. If it is totally different loka and if you don't have any approach to that loka, it means we have to trust the sruti pramanam which reveals the above fact.

### **Topic 4 [Sutras 8 – 9] Sankatpadhadhikaranam**

The soul, which has attained the Sagunam Brahman, affects its desire by mere will

**Sutra 4.4.9 [542]**

***Ata eva chananyadhipatih***

And for this very same reason [the released soul is] without another lord.

The previous topic is continued.

The sankalpa alone the upasaka jiva in Brahma Loka is without any other controller or boss and he is the ultimate boss all powerful. Anya athipathi rahitah without anyone else having power to obstruct the sankalpa. By sankalpa matrena what I want I get. The power requires sankalpa sakti. Without sankalpa sakti power gets obstructed. In the case of upasaka even time factor is not involved. Even the time factor is not involved in his case. Yet you will lose it after lapse of period or after the exhaustion of the punya.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha means and; athah eva therefore only and ananyapathih upasaka is without a master to control him Brahma Loka; this is more a corollary of the last sutra. Cha is moreover extend it further; athah eva therefore only because of the sathya sankalpa only; the sankalpa which cannot be obstructed; ananya athipathih he is another master to control; without any other force to restrain or restrict his sankalpa sakti; Brahma Loka is called saguna Mukti kshetram a field wherein a jiva enjoys saguna Mukti or extraordinary powers. These powers upasaka gets not only in Brahma Loka but also in the buloka itself anima mahima etc., when these are attainable in buloka what to talk of Brahman where upadhi limitation is not there and therefore he gets unrestrained powers. Incidentally there is another sruti quotation also given by Adhi Sankaracharya in the previous sutra for ananyapathih is 8.1.6 of Chandogya upanisad tesham sarveshu lokeshu kama charah bhavati. The upasaka gets free movements to all the lokas. They can have interlokas travel. He has movement at will.

**Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

**Sutra 4.4.10 [543]**

***Abhavam baadarirah hyevam***

There is absence [of body and organs in the case of the liberated souls] [asserts] baadari for thus scriptures say.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam which has five sutras. The topic here is an analysis of a sruti statement occurring in Chandogya upanisad 8.12.5 and the mantra says manasa itan Kaman pasyan ramate which means the upasaka revels the pleasures of bogha vishaya mentally. Now a doubt is created. If the upasaka enjoys all pleasures mentally is it only a field of mental enjoyment or whether there are body and sense organs going along with the mind. Is it like day dreaming experience. Is it mere imaginary pleasures? Or he has body and sense organs backed by mind to enjoy the pleasures. Is it bodiless mind

or embodies mind that enjoys the pleasures. Sariran sahitam manah or sarira rahitam mana is the question here. Another thing is you imagine eating and enjoy the pleasures. Sarira indriya bhavam va or sarira indriya abhavam va is the issue here. Vyasacharya gives three opinions. One is Baadari matham and the other Jaimini matham and another is his own view. I will give you the gist of the whole adhikaranam. Baadari says abhavam and Jaimini says bhava and Vyasacharya says both the sariram and mind are there. Here also we cannot confirm and accept sastra as it is. Because of his sankalpa sakti he can have both the pleasures.

Baadari says all the pleasures are mental as is stated in 8.12.5 of Chandogya upanisad. How you enjoy imaginary object which is a mental projection Baadari says don't we enjoy it in the dream. We have mental projection of Venkatachalapathi and gets blessings and the dreamer gets the pleasure of darsanam. What we get in dream is to in our control but in Brahma Loka the upasaka gets the dream experience as you wish. That is the difference between dream and the power one gets in Brahma Loka when he is an upasaka. The upasaka sankalpa has the power to do anything at will and the pleasure remains as long as you want. In Brahma Loka can decide the dream and continue the dream as long as one wants.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Baadari means sage Baadari suggests; abhavam the absence of body and senses for the upasaka in Brahma Loka; hi because; aha evam the sruti declares so. The significance of the words is abhavam means the absence sarira indriyani; only pleasurable and the pleasure is there in the mind; this is the suggestion of Baadari rishi. This rishi is different from Baadarayana; evam means as I say, says Baadari rishi; sruti statement kept in mind is 8.12.5 of Chandogya upanisad. Manasa pasyam means sense organs are not there. The whole emphasis is the word manasa that is our pramanam.

## **Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

### **Sutra 4.4.11 [544]**

#### ***Bhavam Jaiminirvikalpamananat***

Jaimini asserts that the liberated soul possess a body and the organs because the scriptures declare the capacity on the part of such a soul to assume various forms.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Jaimini declares that saguna mukta upasaka has got body and sense organs appropriate to that loka which is not visible to us as we have one in our dream world. We experience a dream body that is different from our jagrat body. This body is not visible to other people. Through that body they enjoy and through that sense organs they perceive. He says aa mananat and he says he supported by sruti 'vikalpa amananat'. It is by option. It is there again in Chandogya upanisad 7.26.2 ta 'ekata bhavati tridha bhavati, pancadha saptadhi etc. Etc. He multiply himself into many forms. He multiplies into two, three or any forms. This can be there only body is accepted and mind being formless you cannot apply the multiplication of body. Even raksasas have power to take many bodies as per the puranas. Such powers are mentioned in the sastras. When some of the powers are available in buloka what to talk of Brahma Loka. There is another sruti vakyam also. The context here is Nirguna Brahma Vidya. How can you quote a sruti vakya occurring nirguna Brahma Vidya while we talk so saguna Vidya. Then there is

another sruti 1.5 of Kaushitaki Upanisad. This upasaka shares his bed with brahmaji himself and he sits on brahmaji's bed and converses. It is called paryanka Vidya and he places his food on brahmaji's foot. To have the foot he must have the body. He steps over brahmaji foot etc. These things we will see in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 383

### **Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

#### **Sutra 4.4.11 [544]**

#### ***Bhavam Jaiminirvikalpamananat***

Jaimini asserts that the liberated soul possess a body and the organs because the scriptures declare the capacity on the part of such a soul to assume various forms.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. After dealing with Nirguna Brahma Vidya phalam of vidheh Mukti in the first three adhikaranam from fourth adhikaranam Vyasacharya deals with Sagunam Brahma Vidya phalam. Up to the end of Brahma Sutra the topic is Sagunam Brahma Vidya phalam or Isvara upasaka phalam. We have discussed saguna upasaka will go to Brahma Loka through shukla gathi. We have been highlighting Jnanam and Krama Mukti in Brahma Loka. In these adhikaranam of Brahma Sutra the topic is not Krama Mukti. Before getting Mukti in Brahma Loka, what power the upasaka will have is being discussed here for they have practised Isvara upasana. They get glories and powers closer to Isvara. They cannot become hundred percent Isvara and will never ever become equal to Isvara but becomes closer to Isvara and the closeness is indicated in the words sathyam kamatvam and sathya sankalpam in dahara Vidya phalam in Chandogya upanisad. Dahara refers to hridaya akasa. In the hridaya akasa Isvara is talked about ashta vishista guna Isvara. Because of dwelling upon that about Isvara constantly meditating upon Isvara he attains Isvara's powers. Even in munushya sariram upasaka gets powers and in Brahma Loka the limitations caused by manushya sariram is gone. In Brahma Loka the upadhis is also miracle friendly upadhi and the mind having extraordinary sankalpa sakti. These portions are analysed in this adhikaranam. Nothing to do with Nirgunam Brahman. This status enjoyed by the upasaka and the virtues and vibhuties are closer to Isvara and this status is called a form of Mukti. We have jivan Mukti, vidheh Mukti and Krama Mukti. Here we introduce a fourth type of Mukti and it is called Saguna Vidya Mukti or avanthara Mukti. It is called figurative liberation. He enjoys not only powers but also the looks of Isvara he gets in Brahma Loka. Only difference between vishistadvaitam and advaitam is the avanthara liberation in dvaitam and similarity of the upasaka to lord is different from advaitam. In the previous adhikaranam which we completed in the last class Vyasacharya established he is able to generate bogha vishayas by mere sankalpas or my mere thought. Object, people and status and set up he can order at his will. He gets materials also by mere sankapa. It is almost similar to Bhagavan taking an avataram. In extraordinary cases from maya the materials are produced. The subtlest form of maya can produce the materials not only by Isvara but also the upasakas in Brahma Loka. Thus sankalpa alone is enough for upasakas in Brahma Loka. For manushya sankalpa should be followed by prayatna. This was established in fourth adhikaranam. In the fifth adhikaranam the method of vishaya bogha is analysed. The methodology or manner of experience is discussed in this adhikaranam. Here the enquiry is the experience takes place through sarira indriya experience. When the body experiences the



pleasures or with the mind alone, the requirement of mind is accepted but the controversy is whether the sariram also will be there. Upasaka sasirika va or asariraka va. He has the mind there is not controversy. He has physical body or not is the question.

Baadari says he is asarirah or abhavam or he has not body as such. Jaimini says that he has the body. But Vyasacharya says he has both. If he is asarirah he cannot be sasirah. Vyasacharya will say that later that sankalpa anusarena he can be sasirah or can be asarirah. Once you accept sathya sankalpatvam why question whether he has body or not. He can enjoy with body or without body based on his sankalpa sakti. This is Vyasacharya's verdict. We have completed first opinion of Baadari.

Now we discuss the opinion of Jaimini. Jaimini's quotation is 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. The problem is that this sruti vakyam is in the context of Nirguna Brahma Vidya phalam and how do you give this in the context of Sagunam Brahma Vidya phalam. In the Nirguna Brahma Vidya it is included to say that the saguna upasaka phalam of body multiplication is included in Brahma Vidya phalam also and it does not negate the multiplication of body and it is only to say that through multiplication of ananda enjoyed by the saguna upasaka is included in the Nirguna Brahma Vidya phalam also. There is another sruti support in Kaushitaki Upanisad. Here in 1.5 of the Upanisad there is a statement *tam ittham vid padenaivagra arohati tam brahma prechati hositi tam pratibruyat*. The meaning of the mantra is that on this couch brahmaji sits, he who knows this ascends it just with one foot only. Brahmaji asks 'who are you?' and he should answer. Here the experience of the upasaka is mentioned in detail. Bhagavan's cot is explained as pariyankah cot. Amita yocah means extraordinary brilliant cot. Upasaka comes near and climbs on Isvara's cot. He steps over the cot of Bhagavan. Adhi Sankaracharya accepts all the description as possible in Brahma Loka as a result of upasaka. But he says it is avanthara Mukti and not vidheh Mukti. Jaimini underlines the word adhena. If there must be feet he must have the body also. Once the body is there the golakams also must be there and if the golakam is there he has the indriyam also. This is Jaimini's argument.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Jaiminih means the sage Jaimini suggests; bhavam means the presence of the body and the senses or the existence of the body and senses; vikalpa mananat this is known from the sruti statement of options [with regard to number of bodies]. Because of this reasons upasakas in Brahma Loka has body mind complex. The significance of the words is jaimini means jaimini declares; bhavam means the presence of sense organs or body; vikalpa amananat the sruti statement; vikalpa amananam means he has the choice to have the body or otherwise. The vedic statement reveals the choice. The choice is with regard to the number of the bodies that is 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. Jaimini says mind being common sruti mentions the mind and you should note that with the help of sense organs and body the mind works. With this Jaimini's view is over. Now we will come to Vyasacharya verdict in this regard.

## **Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

**Sutra 4.4.12 [545]**

***Dvabahasahavadubhayavidham baadarayanotah***

For this reason Baadarayana opines that the released person is both kinds as in the case of twelve days sacrifice.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya says why should Jaimini and Baadari quarrel unnecessarily with both having sruti support and we accept sruti as pramanam in the case of apourusheya vishaya. We have no way of knowing and we accept sruti as valid in the case of apourusheya vishaya. One reveals asariratvam and the other reveals sasariratvam. Why cannot we accept both. Vyasacharya addresses both why do you dismiss each other, why cannot you have peaceful coexistence. Then the question comes how to accept two when they are contradictory. How can both be the same when they mutually opposite views. Opposite attributes cannot coexist but at the same time it can exist in kala beda. In a room darkness and light cannot coexist and cannot exist at the same time. They can exist if during daytime it is bright but at the time it is dark. Upasaka can be asarira at some time and sarira at some other time. It is like we put on clothes and we put off the clothes. Upasaka can add the body and remove the body. Being in Brahma Loka the upasaka has no limitation and can do anything he likes being close to Isvara. He can have body at will, many bodies at will; add or decrease the number of bodies. The pramanams have been given both Baadari and Jaimini. In support of this Vyasacharya gives an example from karma kanda. In karma kanda a particular ritual is talked about which is called dvada saha. Dvada saha is the name of a ritual which has got it because it is twelve days ritual. Therefore it is called dvadasa. In karma kanda when they talk about the nature of the ritual and the status depends upon various parameters and one of them is the type of commandment or type of verbs used in the vedas. I have talked about it 3.3.1 of Brahma Sutra. This commandment is called codana and its status vary from ritual to ritual. This ritual begins with certain titles also and one of them is satram. Codana parameter based title for certain types of ritual is satram. Another title based on codana is ahinam. Another status based title for another group of rituals. Dvadasa comes under which category is the question. Ritual is same; but two different codanas or commandments are given in two different contexts by using two different verbs. Because of this for the same ritual gets both statuses. We don't negate one status by taking the other or don't take them as controversy. Because of sruti pramanam we say the ritual can be performed in both ways. In satra status it is performed by many and when it has got ahina status it is performed by one individual. It is not contradictory, for it is said that contradiction only when you attempt both methods simultaneously. When it is performed in different occasions, it is acceptable with no contradiction. It need not be one day you can do that as ahina dvada saha and other time it can be termed as satra dvada saha. This is done through sankalpa sakti. The support is dvada saha rigdi kama upeyuh those who desire prosperity they should perform together. The verb is in plural number. There is another sruti vakyam dvada sakena praja kama yajayet. Praja kama means desire of progeny. First get children and then seek prosperity. Here the verb is yajayet. This is singular number. First one gives the satra status and the second one gives the ahina status. Because of sruti pramanam it is possible for upasaka also to have many bodies or otherwise. The word analysis we will do in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 384

### **Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

#### **Sutra 4.4.12 [545]**

#### ***Dvabashavadubhayavidham baadarayanotah***

For this reason Baadarayana opines that the released person is both kinds as in the case of twelve days sacrifice. Since both sruti vakyams are there and as we don't have any way of contradicting the sruti vakysms, we may accept both the statuses of upasakas in Brahma Loka. Even though we can accept sruti if there is any logical contradiction how can we accept both since one cannot be at the same time one be with and without sarira at the same time. Vyasacharya says that the opposite conditions cannot be there at the same time but it can be there in different status at different times. This is Vyasacharya verdict in the matter. This he can have by sankalpa matrena in the Brahma Loka it is concluded.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Athah means therefore only ;ubhayavidham both types of powers exist; dvadasakavat means like the dvatasaka ritual. Baadarayanah thus declares Vyasacharya; the significance of the words is dvatasakavat means the word dvatasaka is a proper name and it is the name of the ritual. The body we talk of sooksha sariram not of sthoola sariram. This is the verdict of Vyasacharya; athah means therefore. The reason is Vyasacharya need not find out separate reason for two. Sruti ubhayavidha pramana tattvat ubhayavidha aisvaryam

### **Topic 5 [sutra 10 – 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

#### **Sutra 4.4.13 [546]**

#### ***Tanvabhava sandhyavadupapatteh***

In the absence of a body the fulfillment of desires is possible as in dreams as this is reasonable.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya in the previous sutra establish that the upasaka can be either sasarika or asariraka while enjoying the pleasures in Brahma Loka. In different times they can enjoy with or without the body as the enjoyment is there on the basis of sankalpa. Our entire conclusion should have sruti and yukti anubhava. Now the Purva Paksi asks how can upasaka enjoys sense objects when the sariram is not there. For this Vyasacharya quotes the example of swapna where one enjoys all pleasures without any separate boudhika sariram but with the mind. Dreamer enjoys swapna with mind and the thoughts. In the same ways upasaka also can enjoy in Brahma Loka without or with

body. Asarira bogha is comparable to swapna bogha and sasarirka bogha is comparable to jagrat bogha. The proof is there in the buloka itself.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Tanvabhava means in the absence of body the fulfillment of desires takes place sandhyavad as in dreams. Upapattah means this is valid based on sruti statements. The significance of the words is tanvabhava means tanu means a physical body or boudhika sariram and abhava means in the absence. Sandhyavad means swapna; *tridiyam sandhyam swapna sthanam* is used in Brihadaranyaka upanisad. Swapna is called dream being it is junction between day and night and it is intermediary between jagrat and sleep. Upasaka experience both waking and swapna that jagrat with body and swapna without body. Dreams of manushyas are determined by prarapta and upasakas dream-like experiences are decided by his sankalpa sakti and it can give as much pleasure as a nice dreams gives. It is not swapna and it is something like swapna. If it is sasariratvam means it is like jagrat avastha.

### **Topic 5 [sutra 10 - 14] Abhavadhikaranam**

A liberated soul who has attained Brahma Loka can exist with or without a body to his liking.

#### **Sutra 4.4.14 [546]**

#### ***Bhave jagradvat***

When the body exists the fulfillment of desires is as in the waking state.

Vyasacharya has accepted Jaimini madham asrariratvat bogha prapti. Upasaka can have any body at will just as Bhagavan taking the avatara. Isvara has the power over maya and upasaka also has got power over maya and through intervention of maya he can take any sariram at will. Even in manushya loka these miraculous powers can be attained and what to talk of upasakas in Brahma Loka.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Bhave in the presence of the bod; jagradvat the fulfillment of desires takes place jagradvat as in the waking state. The significance of the word is bhave in the presence of sthoola sariram; the enjoyments are possible we have to supply; in jagrat avastha in the waking state. All these come under saguna Mukti. This is different from jivan Mukti, vidheha Mukti and Krama Mukti. Saguna Mukti is gained without gaining Jnanam. This takes the upasaka nearer the Bhagavan. This is called gauna Mukti or avantara Mukti and Vedanta does not accept as real Mukti. With this 5<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam is over.

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 15 - 16] Pradipadhikaranam**

The liberated soul, which has attained the Sagunam Brahman, can animate several bodies at the same time.

#### **Sutra 4.4.15 [548]**

The entering of the released soul into several bodies the multiplication of the flame of a lamp because thus the scripture declares.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. This is small adhikaranam with two sutras. It deals with Sagunam upasana phalam. Vyasacharya continues the topic of upasaka who is in Brahma Loka with the power to have sariram and enjoy or not to have physical body. Now we will focus on the power to have a physical body. The pramanam vakyam is 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. It is said that the upasaka can also decide the number of bodies he can take with mere sankalpa. This means he can have many bodies simultaneously. In our case also we have many bodies based on prarapta in different janmas. When you take body it is falling and when I take the body it is descending. Here taking many bodies simultaneously. Suppose upasaka takes many physical bodies with one mind and that mind occupy the current body with which he did sankalpa. When there are many bodies will he have sooksha sariram or mind or not more than one. If there is no mind all the bodies will be inert. It will be a corpse and vishaya bogha is not possible. Suppose you want to provide a body how can you do that. All sooksha sariram belongs to jiva and it is anadhi. We cannot create sooksha sariram. Sthoola sariram can however be created. Mind depends on karma. Suppose a mind is created then there will be problem and if different mind is given to the different bodies and it cannot be bogha of the upasaka. If new mind is created the upasaka cannot benefit from that bogha. So what will happen is the discussion of this adhikaranam. Whether minds are there or not is the vichara. The answer is mind is there and it is not a new mind. But it is the extension of upasakas own mind through his sankalpa sakti. One upasaka enjoys through several bodies as is stated by the sruti.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Vyasacharya uses the word avesah. It means pravesah and pravesah means entry and entry means extension. There is subtle difference between entry and extension. It is not entry but extension of one mind to several bodies. How is possible? Vyasacharya gives a fantastic example. Imagine there is a candle light and there are many unlighted candles with wick. The flame is one. But you can extend that flame from one candle to second and other candles. Agni in one candle can be extended to many candles. When second candle is lit, the first will be exactly like the same. If a new one comes, none can find out which is original and the other is duplicate. You can light any number of candles. Similarly the new bodies are like candle, the mind is flame in the original upasaka's body, the mind can be extended to the first, second, and third body and it is done through sankalpa sakti. Therefore ekada bhavati, tridha bhavati is pramanam for mental extension the mind. Sarira utpatti and mano vyapti both are possible through sankalpa sakti. He gets all these powers through upasanas. It is the phalam for his efforts. Statutory warning is that this also comes to an end and after exhausting the punyam one has to come back and take rebirth.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Avesah means the upasaka jivas extension into other bodies pradipavat is comparable to the extension of a flame; darsayati tatha hi sruti reveals so; the significance of the words is simple pradipavat means like a flame; avesah means extension; upasaka expands or extends like rubber band into many bodies. Sruti reveals so. The pramanam vakyam is 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. More in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 385

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 15 - 16] Pradipadhikaranam**

The liberated soul, which has attained the Sagunam Brahman, can animate several bodies at the same time.

#### **Sutra 4.4.15 [548]**

#### ***Pradipavadavesastatha hi darsayati***

The entering of the released soul into several bodies the multiplication of the flame of a lamp because thus the scripture declares.

We have completed the 15<sup>th</sup> sutra. Here Vyasacharya analyses the sathya kama and sathya sankalpam sakti which an upasaka enjoys in the Brahma Loka sankalpa matrena bogha prapti it was pointed out. Further it was pointed out that he could be with or without the body. If he is with body, it is like jagrat ans if he is without body it is compared to swapna bogha anubhava. He can it was said that he can have number of sariram as he wished. He can take any type of body at will. The came the question if several physical bodies are created who will provide sooksha sariram for him in the absence of which he cannot enjoy the bhogas. Whether bodies had the mind or not was the next question. Since the mind refers to Jivatma the Chaitanyam associated with mind alone is Jivatma we can says differently whether the extra bodies is satmaka or niratmaha or with or without Jivatma. Fresh Jivatma cannot be created the creation of new one not possible therefore only fresh mind cannot be done; and even if new mind is created the bogha will belong to new mind and upasaka will not get the benefit of that mind. Fresh mind cannot be created and even if created this upasaka cannot enjoy those pleasures and without mind experiences are not possible. The answer was given in 15<sup>th</sup> sutra and the upasaka's mind can be extended to the other bodies. It can pervade the other bodies also. Each body will have a mind but it will not an independent mind but it will be extended mind. The mind will be under the control and governed by upasaka's mind. If you ask how is it possible that Brahma Loka is apourusaya vishaya and you have to believe the sastram as its. To assimilate the sruti vakyam we can have an example. It is to assimilate the sruti vakyam and not to support the sruti vakyam. Here candle example was discussed in the last class. The original candle continues to enjoy the light and similarly the upasaka jiva will continue to be the one with light and he can withdraw also at the will. In yoga sutra also it is stated there. Kaivalya pada sutra 4 and 5 nirmala chitrani asminit matat he can create as many chittam as he wants. In the next sutra Patanjali says normally man has got many mind each one is independent but in our case the controlling mind is one. The upasaka mind can control all the others. This is sutra 15. Now we will go to sutra 16

### **Topic 6 [Sutra 15 – 16] Pradipadhikaranam**

The liberated soul, which has attained the Sagunam Brahman, can animate several bodies at the same time.

**Sutra 4.4.16 [549]**

***Svapyayasampattyoraayatara pekshimavishkritam hi***

The declaration of absence of all cognition is made having in view either of the two states viz. Deep sleep and absolute union with Brahman for this is made clear by the scriptures

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. This upasaka who has gone to Brahma Loka as a result of saguna upasana who gets all facultites which is almost equal to Isvar. It is also 'Mukti' and it is not real or abekshika Mukti or saguna Mukti. Here Vyasacharya wants to different the abekshika Mukti which is saguna upasana phalam. This is done through a question asked by Purva Paksi. He raises an objection how do you say that the upasaka experiences pleasures as a mukta purusah. The upasaka in Brahman is called mukta purusah. That word confuses the Purva Paksi. How can upasaka at the time of Mukti have duality and dualistic pleasures. Advaita is said to be Moksa. Here you talk of pleasure experiences and use the word Mukti. In Mukti dvaitam is there or not is the question here. In vishistadvaitam the Mukti is dvaitam and relates to going to higher loka where Vishnu is there and enjoy all pleasures. How can you call the dualistic pleasures as Mukti while non-duality is said to be the Moksa as per Vedanta. Purva Paksi claims 2.4.11 to 14 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad where it is clearly said after vidheh mutki the localized Consciousness or chidabasa is resolved. After vidheha Mukti the liberated mukta does not have individual Consciousness for individual Consciousness is there because of the sariram. Sariram serves as the reflecting medium, in vidheh Mukti sariram is resolved, and therefore reflected Consciousness is also resolved. There is no sense I am in the case of vidheh mukta. He cannot think I am a vidheh mukta without a mind. In fact many lose interest in vidheh Mukti. If you want to retain your individuality and again vidheh Mukti you have to gain saguna Mukti. Thereafter the Upanisad continues once a vidheh mukta loses individuality there is question of cognizance of individuality. Only if the individual is there triputi is possible. Who is there to experience with what and what experience. Therefore now Purva Paksi asks in one place Mukti is defined as advaitam and here you says it is aneka sarira prapti. This is the objection. The siddhanta says that there are two muktis one is abekshika Mukti which is called Brahma Loka pratpti and the other is vidheh Mukti. This you get after nirguna Jnanam and here saguna Mukti is nothing but upasaka enjoying powers closer to God in Brahma Loka as a result of upasana. He does not have advaita Jnanam. This is the Mukti which is talked about by most of the other systems other than advaitam. Our mind is oriented towards that concept of enjoying with the body. State of advaitam is different from saguna Mukti and it is also of twofold. One is abekshika advaitam obtaining in sushupti and the other is the adhyantika advaitam which is paramarthika drisyā or vidheha Mukti dristyā. The pramanam for this is Mandukya Upanisad in sushupti I am in advaitam no jagrat duality no dream duality also. Vyasacharya calls this swapyayah. In the sutra the swapyā indicates the sushupti. Therefore the conclusion of this sutra is that all particular cognizant experiences specific cognizance and experience are there in saguna abekshika Mukti and all specific cognizances are negated in sushupti or vidheh Mukti. Nirguna Mukti is not changeable. Decide before taking to vidheh Mukti. All others claim the Mukti as eternal. But it is not so says advaitins. Saguna Mukti is temporary it is stated. This is the general analysis of the sutra

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Anyatarapeksham means the negation of specific experiences is from the standpoint of anyone of the two states svapyaya sampatyoh namely sleep or primary liberation or absolute liberation. Hi because avishkrutam this is

clarified by the sruti itself. This is the running meaning. The significance of the words is svapyaya sampatoyo nayatara means swapyaya means deep sleep; a person resolves in sleeps in his own real nature. We temporarily resolve into our real nature. Sampattih means total merger atyantika aikyam which refers to vidheh Mukti and this expression comes in 6.14.2 of Chandogya upanisad. Sampattih means adyantika aikyam the total merger with Brahman. In sleep and in absolute liberation one is merged with Brahman. From the standpoint of these two states alone it is the negation of duality. Dvaita nishedanam or samkya nishedanam the negation of specific experience is only from the standpoint of either sushupti or absolute Mukti. In saguna Mukti specific experiences are there with body, pleasures etc. Therefore specific experiences are not negated in saguna Mukti and therefore there is contradiction. Avishritam means this is clarified in the sruti itself. For all the three we should remember the sruti Mandukya Mantra no 6 and for vidheh Mukti it is 2.4.11 to 14 of Brihadaranyaka upanisad. For saguna Mukti the sruti is saha ekata bhavati 7.26.2 of Chandogya upanisad. Therefore what we discuss in these adhikaranams are only saguna Mukti and don't mix up this with the real one. Avishkrutam means clarified by the sruti. Hi refers to the reason because of which there is no contradiction in the sruti vakyam. Now we will enter the 7<sup>th</sup> adhikaranam.

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.17 [550]**

#### ***Jagadvyaparavarjam prakaranad asannihitattvaccha***

The liberated soul attains all lordly powers except the power of creation etc., on account of the lord being the subject matter of all texts where creation etc., are referred to and the liberated souls not being mentioned in that connection.

Now I will give you the general introduction to this adhikaranam. It has six sutras. It is the last adhikaranam of the last pada of the last chapter. The subject matter of this adhikaranam is in all the previous adhikaranams we talked of sathya kama satki and sathya sankalpa of the upasakas who had meditated that include the sathya kama and sathya sankalpa and meditated all through life and according to the law tatkratun nyaya he [as a person meditates so he becomes after death] got the sathya kamatvam and sathya sankalpam. He got boghas and could get bogha or bogya sristi he could do and even manas sristi he could do. So much creative power he has. Not only he has sristi sakti and he can maintain so long as he wants. He can sustain the sristi also. At will he can resolve also and thus we find he has sristi sthithi laya power. He got sristi sthithi laya sakti of various objects, bodies and mind and our question is whether he can create the whole universe, maintain and resolve the whole universe is the subject matter discussed here. This includes the panca bhutas and Vyasacharya calls this as jagat vyaparah the world business. It is world administration or operation business. This is generally attributed to Bhagavan. Jagat vyapara means sristi sthithi laya kriyas. It is generally attributed to Isvara and controversy here is when upasaka goes closer to Isvara whether he will get all the aiswaryam or power of Isvara with regard to the creation. Or put it in different language is whether upasaka's aiswaryam is restricted or otherwise; savagraham or niravagram va; paricchinnam va or aparicchinnam va. We are saying that the



aiswaryam is limited. He cannot become Isvara himself. Purva Pakshi argues that he must become Isvara and in support of this argument gives some pramanam in various Upanisad. First is tatitriyam Upanisad he attains absolute power; I have sway of all of them; 1.5.3 of taittiriya Upanisad and he says even devatas offer pujas to this upasaka. He has absolute power and all respect him. 7.22.5 of Chandogya upanisad these people have free access to all the lokas. There is sruti pramanam in support of that and also there is tatkratut nyaya. He only tells the story of Jadabharata. Extend that rule. He should have sristi sthithi laya sakti. Siddhanta says he does not have or cannot also inherit the power. He is upasana phala dada. He makes sure that none comes near him. That is the conclusion of this adhikaranam.

Vyasacharya gives two reasons in this sutra. One is prakaranat whenever there is a discussion or definition of Isvara, in all these prakaranams or topics the Upanisad talks of one Isvara and never mentions the other upasakas. The Upanisad does not say that jagat karanam is Brahman. Sristi sthithi laya kartrutvam is the very definition of Isvara. If this power belongs to other upasakas also then the definition cannot become the definition of Isvara. The upasakas use the word Brahman. Jagat karanatvam and Isvara jagatvam are linked together and saguna upasakas is not mentioned anywhere/ also asannihitvat it is almost the extension of the first sutra only. Isvara is mentioned, saguna upasaka is not mentioned, and therefore saguna does not have the aiswaryam of anykind.

The commentators give two more reasons. If there are many gods or many heads there will be problems. Every one had one head and you are master and we are dadas/ if more than one had is there, can the God can have one head alone. Therefore you cannot have many rulers and Bhagavan will have one mind and if not there will be chaos in the world. Saguna upasaka has got sristi sakti but he does not sue that power. Suppose he has sristi sakti will he create current world or the next world. Current one he cannot do because sristi is already there. In pralaya will get liberated and get merged into Brahman. Therefore for the next sristi one Bhagavan alone will be there/ more in the next class.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 386

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul, which has attained Brahma Loka, has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.17 [550]**

#### ***Jagad vyaparavarjam prakaranad asannihitattvaccha***

The liberated soul attains all lordly powers except the power of creation etc., on account of the lord being the subject matter of all texts where creation etc., are referred to and the liberated souls not being mentioned in that connection.

As the upasana is so he becomes after death is tatkruta nyaya and as per this saguna upasaka becomes as equal to Isvara and he enjoys all that is enjoyed by Isvara and takes as many body as he likes and simultaneously enjoys many things at many places. Whether the saguna mukta upasaka is close to Isvara or will he be an another Isvara himself is the question here. Whether he has the aiswaryam for jagat vyaparah. By the word jagat vyaparam consists of sristi sthithi laya. Whether he can do the sristi sthithi laya is the topic of discussion in the last adhikaranam. Saguna cannot become equal to Isvara anytime it is stated by Vyasacharya. His power is higher but it is restricted as per Vyasacharya. Here two reasons are given by prakaranat we mean wherever there is sristi prakaranam Upanisad talks of one eternal God. If all these upasakas also become Isvara there will be anithya Isvara. They have become Isvara and they will get vidheh Mukti and then there will be many anithya Isvara subject to changes. If that be the case Upanisad should have talked about them. It is not there. There is only one jagat Isvara is there. Almost all the sastras define Isvara as jagat karanam. If the upasakas gains this power of creation, it cannot be said Isvara alone is the creator. If there are many sristi sthithi laya karthas then sristi sthithi laya kartrutvam cannot be used as definition for Isvara. In Brahma Sutra Isvara is defined as jagat karanam. Wherever sristi comes Isvara's name is mentioned and sristi karanatvam and Isvara go together and saguna Isvara's name is not mentioned in this context. This is the logic given by Vyasacharya.

The commentators give two more reasons. If there are many Isvaras there will be utter confusion for one Isvara will like to create while many others will like to take some other action. There is will be karma phala dhanam also will be different from one Isvara to another Isvara. Any difference amongst many Isvaras will create great confusion. The third and final clinching reason is [Ananda Giri] and saguna upasaka will not have an opportunity to use the power. If saguna upasaka has to create either he has to create the current world or the next world. He cannot create the current world which is already created and present. To create the next world this world has to go to pralayam. Then at the time of pralayam all saguna upasaka will Nirgunam Brahma jnanam and get liberated. Then there will be only one Isvara will be there to carry on the creation with all saguna upasaka having merged into Brahman. Saguna upasakas don't exist as upasaka as individual. Then how can they create the world. Therefore also saguna upasakas will have restricted powers to enjoy the powers in Brahma Loka.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Jagatvyaparavarjam means the powers of the upasakas exclude the control of the world; prakaranat means this is known from the context of creation; cha asannihitvat and from the absence of the mention of the upasakas in that context. The significance of the words is jagat vyapara varjam aiswaryam means the power of the upasakas is jagat vyapara varjam means excluding without jagat vyaparah means world operation is the literal meaning and it is nothing but sristi sthithi laya business. Varjam means without that function. He is closer to Isvara but not Isvara. Prakaranat means the sristi prakaranam the portion of creation occurring in the creation. Vyasacharya means when you study the sristi prakaranam you come to know of one Isvara and not many. Asannihitvat means the saguna upasaka is nearer to Isvara. Non proximity of the upasaka and it is that upasaka's name is nowhere near in the context of creation. Therefore we know he does not get the powers of creation. Therefore also he does not have the powers of creation. Cha means both reasons are taken as one common reason.

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.18 [551]**

#### ***Pratyakshopadesaditi chennadhikarikamandalathoktech***

Here Vyasacharya answers a Purva Paksi who raises a question. First part upto iti chet is the Purva Paksi question and latter portion is our answer. Purva Paksi says I cannot accept your argument for Upanisad says that saguna mukta Purusa gets unrestricted powers and therefore you should accept the upasaka as Isvara with jagat vyapara aiswaryam. Veda says so. Direct statement of veda supports that upasaka will be equal to God. This is said in 1.6.2 and 1.5.3 of Taittiriya Upanisad. There is a word swarajyam in the Upanisad vakyam that one gets absolute freedom. He is not under anyone says the Upanisad. Upasaka becomes Isvara it is said. Vedanta says that upasaka is under the control of original Isvara with unrestricted powers. The upasaka will have the restricted powers. That means upasaka is not totally free. Therefore Purva Paksi says in your siddhanta upasaka cannot have swarajyam cannot have swatantryam and upasaka will have paratantryam only. Swatantryam is possible only when power is unrestricted and uncontrollable. Always there will be problem as to who is most powerful. Karma upasana will not have absolute power. Purva Paksi quotes the vakyam and says that he has absolute power. Vyasacharya says no to the question.

He says if you study the very same Taittiriya Upanisad mantra you will get the answer. Vyasacharya argues after getting swarajyam he is supposed to go to manasapatim and the word manasapati in this context refers to original absolute Isvara. The controller of all the mind is Isvara and it is surya mandalastha adhi karika Isvara he is referred to manaspathi in taittiriya Upanisad. One who gives karma phalam according to karma and upasana and all the saguna upasakas who arrive at Brahma Loka must meet Isvara in manasapati rupa Narayana. It is like the employer of the institution who appoints the recruits. The employer gives the limited powers to the employee. So is Isvara takes the upasakas under him and he gives powers to the upasaka as per their karmas. The powers he give is not unrestricted but it is vishaya bogha. The power of sense pleasures he enjoys. For bogha prapti if he wants several bodies he can have. It is bogeswara aishwaryam not limitless

powers for sristi sthithi laya karta. Therefore saguna mukta upasaka has limited powers for boga and don't extend it to the sristi sthithi laya.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Pratyakshopadesat this is Purva Paksi; the upasakas unrestricted powers is known from the direct reference in the sruti. Iti chet means if this is the contention of the Purva Paksi, it is not so is the reply from Vyasacharya. Siddhanti says if this the contention of Purva Paksi it is not so. Adhikarika mandalastho tehe means because Isvara is mentioned separately [as one approached by the upasaka] the significance of the words is pratyashopadesat from the vedic statements; pancami vipakti because of the direct statement which reveals the unrestricted powers of the upasaka where the apnoti swarajyam which reveals the unrestricted powers of then upasaka. If such question is raised by Purva Paksi we cannot tolerate it because it is said so in the Upanisad. Adhikarika and mandalasya are two adjective attached to Narayana Isvara. Even before the upasaka came to Brahma Loka, Isvara was there. Adhikarika means one who controls the deserving people by giving them with appropriate powers. That controlling boss is called adhikarika. Allotter is called adhikaris mandalasthah means surya mandalasthah. Generally Isvara is involved in surya mandala. Jiva Isvara aikyam is said in the scripture that Bhagavan is invoked in the orb of the sun. This orbit is called surya mandala. Uttehe means a statement. This refers to separate mention of Isvara. It is separate from saguna upasaka different from Isvara. Then he goes to apnoti manasaspatim the upasaka goes to Isvara as boss and the upasaka asks what are the powers. All these things indicate that upasaka is under Isvara alone. Because of this statement upasaka has restricted powers. If he is under Isvara with restricted powers why did the Upanisad used the word swarajyam. Swarajyam means unlimited powers with regard to bogha sakti. For bogha sakti he is the master. It is like a person having infinite powers in his company and in another company he cannot do anything/ so also the upasaka can have power with regard to himself and no any other realms.

## **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

### **Sutra 4.4.19 [552]**

#### ***Pratyakshopadesaditi chennadhikari kamandalasthokteh***

If it be said that the liberated soul attains absolute power on account of direct teaching of the scriptures, we say, no because the scriptures declare that the liberated soul attains Him who entrusts the sun etc., with their offices and abides in those spheres.

Now the upasaka is disappointed because the upasaka thought by practicing upasana one can go to Brahma Loka and he can be Isvara himself. Now the restriction is mentioned and he thinks that there is something is wrong. He thinks that meditator should become what he meditated violating tatkruturn nyaya and therefore he raises the objection for which answer comes in this sutra.

As a person meditates so he becomes is the nyaya and upasaka meditated upon Isvara with all the powers including sathya kamah and sathya sankalpa. How you says that he has the restricted powers and Vyasacharya says that tatkratur nyaya is not at all violated. Whatever

be the lord, whatever be the object or virtues those virtues he will get. Isvara has several features and whatever feature he meditated upon, he will get that features he meditated upon. We all know that saguna Isvara has got many features and Vyasacharya takes one example and that is nirguna chaitanya swarupam. He has the paramarthika nithya muktatva amsa is there in that Isvara. But saguna upasaka does not meditate upon or he is not aware of that nirguna swarupam and since he has not meditated upon that nithya muktatva amsa and he does not get the Mukti. This is tatkratur nyaya what he did not meditate, he did not become. In Chandogya upanisad in the ashtaguna the sristi sthithi laya is not mentioned. Jagat vyapara aiswaryam is not mentioned in the upasana vakyam and since that is not there, there is no question of attaining that sakti. No such upasana is mentioned elsewhere. Jagat vyapara is not upasya amsa and therefore there is no question of upasaka becoming Isvara. More details in the next class

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 387

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.19 [552]**

#### ***Pratayakshopadesaditi chennadhikari kamandalasthokteh***

If it be said that the liberated soul attains absolute power on account of direct teaching of the scriptures, we say, no because the scriptures declare that the liberated soul attains Him who entrusts the sun etc., with their offices and abides in those spheres.

We do the general analysis of sutra 19. This and the next sutras are odd ones where Vyasacharya talks about nirguna swarupam of Isvara. This is odd information because our context is saguna upasaka's meditation of saguna Isvara and as a result of that he goes to Brahma Loka which is called saguna Mukti. We have already seen nirguna jnana phalam in the first part of this adhikaranam. Here Vyasacharya mentions Isvara's nirguna swarupam. Vyasacharya does not mention any connection and Adhi Sankaracharya and other commentators give the connection. What we will do the two sutras separately and independently see the meaning out of the context and after completing the two sutras I will tell you the connection between the two sutras.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. Here Vyasacharya says Isvara is nirgunam swarupam also. By using the word also, Vyasacharya accepts the saguna swarupam and in addition to that higher nature of nirguna swarupam is also there. Saguna swarupam is subject to change and it is also called vikara varti swarupam. It means saguna swarupam which is within the field of change. Nirguna swarupam is not subject to change and the changeless nirguna swarupam is vikara avarthi swarupam. It is not within change that means vikara athitha swarupam. Or it is nirvikara swarupam. It is nirguna swarupam. Vyasacharya says in this sutra says Isvara has got nirguna swarupa. What is the proof that Isvara has got nirguna and saguna swarupa,. Vyasacharya says there are veda pramanams. Ethavan asya mahima refers to saguna viswarupam of the lord; it has infinite glory; it is of course within the vikara. Beyond that Isvara, there is someone that is called nirguna swarupa Brahman. If you want the proportion, the Upanisad gives an approximate mathematical calculation saguna swarupam is one fourth and three quarters is nirgunam and the net result is that Isvara has got sagunam and nirgunam aspect. 3.12.6 of Chandogya upanisad repeats the above Purusa sukta mantram.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha moreover; vikara varti means Brahman has a higher nature which is changeless; hi because aha sruti talks about the sthithim the existence of the Isvara in that manner; the significance of the words is vikara avarthi means vikara athitham; it is an adjective to swarupam. Nirvikara means attributeless. Cha means also; in addition to saguna swarupam,. Sthithim aha means sruti talks about

Isvara's existence. Tatha in that manner; Isvara has nirguna swarupam. That is further corroborated in the next sutra also.

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22]**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.20 [553]**

#### ***Darsayatascha iam pratyakshanumane***

And thus perception and inference show

In this sutra Vyasacharya says the same idea is further supported by other sruti and smriti vakyams. Pratyaksam means sruti pramanam. Just as pratyaksa pramanam is independently valid, sruti is independently valid in this context. Anumanam refers to smriti pramanam just as anumana pramanam is dependently valid that is pratyaksa and similarly sruti pramanam is also independently valid. Anumanam depends upon pratyaksam, anumana is also valid pramanam in this case. This reveals Isvara's nirguna swarupam. Sruti vakyam is 2.2.15 of Kathopanisad natatra suryo bhata na tantra tarakam that says Brahman's higher nature is that which cannot be illumined by surya chandra etc. It is not illumined by any pramanam. It is therefore aprameya and therefore it is beyond tripiti. Therefore it is desa kala and therefore it is nirvikaram. The same idea is repeated 15.6 of Gita. Therefore also Vyasacharya says Isvara has got higher nirguna swarupam he does not say why he so said it. For this Adhi Sankaracharya gives the answer. Sruti smriti pramanam reveals Isvara's nirguna pramanam.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. Cha again; pratyaksha anumane sruti and smriti even reveals in this manner. The significance of the word; that is pratyaksha anumane prathad dvi vachanam. Darsayathah is believed. even means in this manner; nirguna swarupena varthamanam that Isvara has nirguna swarupam also. This is in addition to those given above. This is more reinforcement of the previous sutra.

How to connect this with the present topic. Saguna upasaka in Brahma Loka has got the facility to create, preserve and destroy the world. The commentators talk about three important corollaries from this sutra. Saguna upasaka meditates upon saguna Isvara and his upasya excludes nirgunam Brahman that has higher nirguna swarupam. Saguna upasaka is ajnani with regard to sagunam Brahman. Therefore Isvara upasana is incomplete; because this upasana Isvara and the bhavam he can get is nearer to Isvara and the total Isvara is reserved for jnani for he gets total aikyam at the time of departure. Only jnani merges with Isvara totally. vyavahara dristya he merges and paramarthika dristya he joins to get nirguna brahma aikyam. Saguna Isvara has art of that Nirgunam Brahman. So he does not enjoy the total freedom.

Even the saguna Isvara he meditates is Nirgunam Brahman. It is only ashta guna vishista Isvara is saguna Isvara. saguna upasaka will get various virtues of the lord including sathya kamatvam and sathya sankalpatvam but it does not include jagat vyapara sakti for it is not included in ashta gunas. Therefore tatkratur nyaya is second corollary.

Third one is suppose a person claims sathya kama and sathya sankalpa includes jagat vyapara sakti, and it includes jagat sristi also or the upasaka claims some other meditation that includes the creation aspect also 3.14.1 of Chandogya upanisad where jagat karana bhuta Isvara is mentioned. Suppose a saguna upasaka meditates on Isvara with creative power then naturally upasaka will claim that I should get as I meditated and get jagat vyapara sakti also. Then we says such persons also will not get jagat vyapara sakti for it will not be applicable in this upasana and it will be an exception for tatkraturu nyaya. We have already seen tatkraturu nyaya is not applicable in panca agni Vidya. we will say in this case also it will be an exception. Then the upasaka will argue and for that the commentators says if you apply the law there will be so many problems. If one meditates upon jagat vyapara Isvara and gets sristi sthithi laya karta and then there will be many Isvaras and we dknow veda talks about only one creator. It will be sruti virodha. The second problem is if there are many gods there will be many confusion one deciding to have sristi and the other having interested in destruction. There will be chaos and therefore upasakas cannot become Isvara status. Even if he gets sristi sthithi laya sakti it will be totally useless for at the time of pralaya they merge into Isvara and then how can they create the next sristi. Therefore our conclusion is that saguna upasaka is lower than Isvara. therefore Vyasacharya says that the upasaka is never like a nirguna jnani.

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul which has attained Brahma Loka has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.21 [554]**

#### ***Bhogamatrasamyalingaccha***

And because of the indications in the scriptures of equality of the liberated soul with the lord only with respect to enjoyment.

In this sutra we will see the general analysis. We have other sruti vakysams which indirectly indicates the upasaka does not have sristi sthithi laya sakti. He becomes closer to Isvara but he does not have sristi sthithi laya sakti. The vakyam kept in mind is 1.5.20 and 23. that says as all ebings honour that deity so do all beings honour him who knows that and trh` it he attains identity with the deity or lives in the same world with it. Isvara is served by all devatas and the saguna upasaka who becomes equal to Isvara the samasti and that Isvara is also served by other devatas. Upasaka will get service from all beings and devatas and this refers to bhoga pratpti alone. The upasaka equality to Isvara is only with regard to bhogah. It is not in sristi sthithi laya sakti vishaye. He is not getting the power of kartrutvam. He enjoys and he cannot create. These upasaka gets salokyam. Here it is aid the upasakas get salokyam. The world loka in Sanskrit means the field of enjoyment only. salokyam means the saguna upasaka also will get similar field of enjoyment and in the enjoyment of pleasures Isvara Hiranyagarhha or upasaka become identical and there is no samyam with regard to sristi sthithi laya sakti. It indirectly reveals niravagrah aiswaryam with regard to the creation.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. cha also; bhoga matra samya linghat means from the scriptural reference to the equality with regard to enjoyment upasaka does not have unlimited powers. The significance of the words is bhoga matra samya lingam means indirectly indicating the sruti statement Brihadaranyaka upanisad 1.5.20 and 1.5.23 that



saguna upasaka equal to Isvara or Hiranyagarhha both being samasti and equality with regard to bhoga matram or the enjoyment; that means not with regard to world operations; tasya lingam means sruti vakyam tasmad from that also we conclude that the saguna upasaka does not have jagat vyaparam.

### **Topic 7 [Sutra 17-22] Jagadvyaparadhikaranam**

The liberated soul, which has attained Brahma Loka, has all the lordly powers except the power of creation.

#### **Sutra 4.4.22 [555]**

#### ***Anavrittih sabdad anavrittih sabdat***

There is no return for these liberated souls on account of the scriptural statement to that effect.

Now I will give you the general analysis of the sutra. this is the last sutra of the last adhikaranam and the last chapter of Brahma Sutra. Vyasacharya says that he removes a possible doubt. In all previous sutra we said upasaka is an ajnani. He is not totally identical with Isvara and beda continues we said. We talk about his limitation. If he is still ajnani and still in beda naturally he will have punar janma and will he not return from Brahma Loka and get punar janma. For that Vyasacharya says no because eventhough he enters as an ajnani, even though he is in duality in Brahma Loka and there in Brahma Loka he gets jnanam by the grace of lord and getting direct teaching from Brahma Loka or from Vishnu if he is vishnuloka or in kailash from Lord Shiva and because of that Jnanam and at the end of Brahma Loka pralaya kale alongwith Brahman and Hiranyagarhha he will get vidheh Mukti. All of them Jnanam and Mukti which gets a new name Krama Mukti. Sabda pramanam is there 2.3.16 of kathopanisad; 8.15.1 of Chandogya upanisad; na cha punaravartate saguna upasaka does not retrun; that knowledge is possible in Brahma Loka as stated in Kathopanisad elsewhere also; yatha adharse tadatmini; saguna upasaka will get Krama Mukti and therefore anavrutti.

Now I will give you the words analysis of the sutra. anavrittih the upasaka does not have rebirth sabdad means this is known from sruti statements; the significance of the words means anavritti non return which means no punar janma and sabdad that is known from sruti [refer to the above vakyams] anavritti is na avruttih anavrittih; this is repeated because to indicate the end of Brahma Sutra text itself. Sutra avritti is repeated to indicate the end of the Brahma Sutra. Brahma Sutra grandha is also over.

## BRAHMA SUTRA

Class 388

### **Summary of Brahma Sutra**

Today I will give you a summary of Brahma Sutra text. It is known by different names as Vedanta sutras because it is the analysis of Vedanta; sariraga mimamsa sutra sariraga meaning Atma; since it analyses the Atma swarupam; it is known as vyasa or baadarayana sutras being written by Vyasacharya and it is also known as utara mimamsa sutra for it is the analysis of end portion of Vedanta. These are different names of this text written by Vyasacharya. This is an analysis of Upanisads which are the final part of the vedas. By way of analyzing the Upanisads Vyasacharya extracts a systematic teaching. Thus Vyasacharya's job is not propounding a new system but of extraction of a system of Vedanta darsanam. It is there in the Upanisad in hidden form and Vyasacharya makes it explicit form. Just as we extract the butter from milk a process of extraction, so is Brahma Sutra extracts the Vedanta darsanam butter out of Upanisad milk. Vyasacharya does this process by writing in sutra form capsule statement, which is called aphorisms. By writing in sutra forms Vyasacharya extracts Vedanta darsanam out of Upanisads. We saw in the introduction that the Brahma Sutra has four chapters each one known as adhyaya. Each chapter is subdivided into sections known as pada. Since each chapter has four sections we have got sixteen padas in Brahma Sutra and each section is subdivided into topics or adhikaranam. the sixteen padas of Brahma Sutra has got 191 adhikaranams or topics; each adhikaranam is subdivided into sutras and we have totally 191 adhikaranam divided into 555 sutras. This is the body of the text.

What I propose to do is to give you the bird's eye view of four chapters and thereafter I will briefly mention the subject matters of sixteen padas referring to important topics in those padas.

The first chapter is meant to reveal that Brahman is the central theme of all the Upanisads. Even though normally we say jivatma paramatma aikyam is central theme, both are the same. it is so because Brahman is inner essence of both Jivatma and Paramatma. So Brahman is the central theme here. He says all the Upanisadic statements are ultimately points out one Brahman only. This characteristic of this statements revealing one subject matter is called samanvaya characteristics. We can roughly translate the samanvaya is convergence into One Brahman. This convergence samanvaya is the proof to show that Brahman is the central theme. During election statements they will say so many things but what is the one they aim at is vote for my candidate.

One is hetu and another is sadhyam. Vyasacharya shows all statements have got Brahman convergence. For that we have got mimamsa criteria of shad linga are taken. Shad lingas are upakrama, upasamhara, ekavakyata [unity of thought in the beginning as well as in the end] abhyasa [reiteration or repetition] apuvata [novelty or uncommon nature of the proof] phala [fruits of the teaching] arthavada [eulogy praise or persuasive expression] upapatti [illustration] some consider yukti [reason] as the sixth sign instead of upapatti. Thus shad lingas reveals samanvaya and samanvaya proves samanvaya and samanvaya proves tatparyam. The central theme here is Brahman and once Vyasacharya proves this means Vedanta is pramanam and Brahman is prameyam. Vedanta pramana reveals brahma prameya and therefore through Vedanta study we get Brahma Jnanam. Adhi Sankaracharya in his

commentary adds two corollary one is borrowed from third sutra of Brahma Sutra purusartha adhikaranam says Brahma Jnanam itself gives liberation without requiring any karma. Therefore Vedanta is different from Purva Mimamsa darsanam karma kanda. Purva Mimamsa gives prayojanam through karma and Vedanta gives prayojanam through Jnanam itself. [1.1.4 of Brahma Sutra] Vyasacharya reveals Brahma as jagat karanam and Brahma being sentient entity it means that we are chetana karana vadhis or we accept chetana vastu as jagat karanam. Adhi Sankaracharya says Vedanta darsanam is different from other four darsanam samkya, yoga, nyaya and vaiseshika. All the four say matter is cause of creation. they are achetana karana vadhi and we are cheta karana vadhi. Thus Vedanta darsanam is different from all the previous five. They say matter is cause of creation and we say Consciousness is the cause of creation. Vedanta is different Purva Mimamsa also because Purva Mimamsa says karma gives benefit and we say Jnanam itself gives Moksa. Thus we are different all five darsanams and Vedanta is unique sixth darsanam. In the first chapter Vedanta darsanam comes out as sixth type of teaching in the first chapter. know Brahma by studying the Upanisad and be free by that mere knowledge. Since samanvaya is established in the first chapter it is called samanvaya adhyaya Brahma convergence revelation chapter. it establishes Brahma convergence.

In the second chapter defends the Vedanta darsanam. First chapter gives Vedanta essence and second chapter gives defence. First chapter is sravanam chapter and the second is mananam chapter. he defends Vedanta darsanam by showing any contradiction or logical deficiency. He eliminates three types of doshas smriti viroda sruti viroda or tarka viroda and the Vedanta darsanam does not contradict itself, the reasoning and logic also. Sruti smriti tarka virodha pariharah. The refutation of threefold contradiction is done and therefore it is called avirodha adhyaya. Not only Vyasacharya defends the Vedanta darsanam and he also establishes all other darsanams have sruti smriti tarka virodha. Defensive approach as also offensive approach.

Third chapter deals with scriptural disciplines leading to Brahma Jnanam. karma yoga is taught to purification of mind; upasana is talked about for concentration of mind and maha vakya vichara or jnana yoga is taught for knowledge of Brahma; and nididyanam for assimilation of knowledge. All are talked about in the third chapter and hence it is called sadhana adhyaya.

In the fourth chapter Vyasacharya deals with phalam and the benefit for Nirgunam Brahma Jnanam and Sagunam Brahma upasanam; for Nirgunam Brahma Jnanam the benefit is twofold Mukti known as jivan Mukti while living and vidheha Mukti after death. For saguna upasanam also there is twofold Mukti the first one is saguna Mukti the fake liberation enjoying powers in Brahma Loka as a result of which enjoying sense pleasures; sathya kamah sathya sankalpah etc/ this seeming liberation and latter through Nirgunam Brahma Jnanam and saguna and krama Mukti are twofold Mukti for saguna upasaka. Therefore it is called phaladhyaya.

First one is sravanam, second is mananam and third is nididyanam and fourth adhyaya

talks of phalam.

The first chapter first pada is called spashtabrahmalingavakyasamanvaya dhikarah. Here Vyasacharya analyses those statements that has clear indicators to show that vedantic statements are converging into Brahma. it is relatively easier to know that all these reveal

Brahman only. the clear clue statements are analysed in this adhyaya. In this pada four adhikaranams are important 1.2.3 and 4 of the first chapter and it is known as chatusutri. Those who cannot study the entire Brahma Sutra and people used to say read these four chapter alone.

The second pada deals aspashta brahma linga upasana vakya samanvaya here Vyasacharya takes the Brahman clues which are asphastam. Unclear clues are taken and analysed and established that these unclear clues are also proves revealing Brahman convergence. In this mostly the statements taken are Brahman vakyams only but they are upasana Jnanam and not Jnanam to gain Mukti.

Third pada also reveals aspashta brahm vakyas only which have unclear clue of Brahman. Vyasacharya establishes even though they are unclear clues revealing Brahman only and there also one will get used to get known of the convergence with Brahman. the statements are directed to upasanas.

Third pada deals with jnana vakyani for gaining liberation. here also I have taken one adhikaranam 8. this is a technical adhikaranam wherein some important adhikaranam are given. They are known as to how veda pramanyam or validity of vedas discussed in Purva Mimamsa are brought in here. whether devatas are existent or not if you get such a question Purva Mimamsa says they don't exist. They are but names. Vyasacharya establishes that devatas are not merely words. Academically it is important. There is an analysis of sphota vada also. All these are technically important.

In fourth pada he borrows some words of Samkya philosophers. As the pada is discussed by both samkya and Vedanta there is some possibility of confusion because of some common words. Vyasacharya wants to discuss the various problems between samkya and Vedanta. This is done by analyzing the contents. We don't take sentences here but important words are taken. I have chosen four adhikaranam number 1.4,7 and 8. prakriti of samkya and prakriti of Vedanta are discussed in 1.4.7 and 8.1

Smriti tarka viroda parihara is discussed in the fourth chapter. it is a logical system and it is intellectually convincing system. Vedanta can stand the challenges posed by the scientist. This pada is most important veda in the entire Brahma Sutra. [refer to 1 to 13 of Brahma Sutra.

Next pada is offensive pada. offensive means that Vyasacharya tells them that in your system you have several fallacies. Smriti sruti tarka virodhas are there. here nasthika darsanams are also critically analysed. This pada will help those who are interested in anya mada dushta darsana pada.

Vyasacharya says vedantic teaching does not contradict any sruti vakyam. Vedic statements dealing with nature of jiva, pancha bhootas are taken up and is shown that there is no contradiction in vedas. Veda does not have any internal contradiction. 10 to seventeen the nature of Jivatma is analysed. In fact these are the portions in the commentaries of vishishtadvatam and other commentators. Fourth pada is sooksha sariram sruti virodha pariharah. This discusses the nature of Prana. Vyasacharya shows that there is no internal contradiction anywhere. The nature of Prana is also discussed.

Third pada of third adhyaya the first adhyaya analyses gathi agathi vichara dvara vairagya nirupanam. He says ajnani jivas travel after death. There is nice compilation of the travel and how he travels from buloka to Brahma Loka. if you are interested in life after death read this pada. I have not chosen any adhikaranam. the purpose of the discussion is to get vairagyam wich is an important qualification being tired of the helpless journey.

The second pada is tat padartha or Isvara nature. Jivatma paramatma aikyam is pointed out. This is maha vakya vicara pada. adhikaranam 5, 6, 7 and 8 where Isvara's nature is discussed in these four adhikaranam.

Third one is varieties of upasanas are taken predominantly. Saguna upasanam sand dissimilarity and similarity are talked here. one adhikaranam 30 where Vyasacharya has refuted carvaka madham or dehatma vada. Consciousness is proved as a separate entity.

Fourth deals with param brahma sadhanani. This is an important pada from sadhana angle. Nididyasanam also is discussed. 1,7 to 14 freedom from sanchita agami karma is discussed in detail.

The second pada discusses saguna upasakas Mukti. How he leaves the body at the time of death is talked about. Utkranti departure.

Third pada reveals the special padas. I have not chosen any adhikaranam for study.

Fourth upasana deals with Brahma prapti and Brahma loka sthithi. The Brahma Loka and the powers he enjoyed is discussed. How he attains Krama Mukti later through nirguna Jnanam. the important adhikaranams are 1,2,3 jivan Mukti, vidheha Mukti saguna Mukti and Krama Mukti are talked about. I have selected totally 57 adhikaranam and 196 sutras.

This is the summary of Brahma Sutra.

[www.arshaavinash.in](http://www.arshaavinash.in)

WEBSITE FOR FREE E-BOOKS ON VEDANTA & SANSKRIT



Pujya Swami Dayananda Saraswati launched Arsha Avinash Foundation's website [www.arshaavinash.in](http://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 Introduction to Vedanta, Tattva Bodha, 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), Atma Bodha, Vivekachudamani (2038 pages), Panchadasi, Manisha Panchakam, Upadesha Saara, Saddarsanam, Jayanteya Gita, Jiva Yatra, Dhanyastakam, Advaita Makaranda, Dakshinamurthy Stotram, Drg Drsya Viveka and Naishkarmya Siddhi.

**BRNI MEDHA MICHKA'S BOOKS ON SANSKRIT GRAMMAR:** Enjoyable Sanskrit Grammar Books- Basic Structure of Language, Phonetics & Sandhi, Derivatives (Pancavrttayah), Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi, Study Guide to Panini Sutras through Lagu Siddhanta Kaumudi, Sanskrit Alphabet Study Books- Single Letters, Conjunct Consonants.

There are many more books and articles on Indian culture and Spirituality, Chanting, Yoga and Meditation. There are also books in Tamil on Vedanta.



**Arsha Avinash Foundation**

**104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, India**

**Phone: +91 9487373635**

**E mail: [arshaavinash@gmail.com](mailto:arshaavinash@gmail.com)**

**[www.arshaavinash.in](http://www.arshaavinash.in)**