

# DRG DRSYA VIVEKA

By Swami Paramarthananda

Transcribed by S. Chandrasekaran

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



Published by :

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)

# **Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ**

**Transcript of classes given by**

**SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA**

## **DDV-01 = 1 and 2**

We all know that there are three primary source books giving us the knowledge of our spiritual nature, *ātmajñānam* and those three primary source books are known as *prasthāna trayam*, *prasthānam* meaning method, *prasthāna trayam* meaning three methods of revealing the nature of *ātmā*. The first one is called *śruti prasthānam*, *śruti* meaning the Vedas, especially the final part of the Vedas, namely Vedānta, otherwise also known as the Upaniṣad. Vedānta *prasthānam*, *śruti prasthānam* or *Upaniṣadprasthānam* is one primary source. The second one is the *Bhagavad Gītā*, which is called the *smṛtiprasthānam* and it is the most popular one because it presents the teaching in a simpler manner and it also highlights the *sādhanas* of *karma-yoga* and *upāsana-yoga*. Thus, *Bhagavad Gītā*, that is part of the *Mahābhārata*, comes under *smṛti*. The word *smṛti* means any spiritual literature whose content is borrowed from the *śruti*. *Smṛti* does not have an original teaching of its own but it has borrowed the teaching from the Vedas and presents it in a different manner. The third one is called the *nyāyaprasthānam* in the form of *Brahma Sūtras* and it is called so because the support of reasoning is given to the Vedāntic teaching. *Śruti* and *smṛti* are primarily based on the revelations of the *ṛṣis* whereas the *nyāya prasthānam* is logically defending the teaching. Of these three, for the *śruti prasthānam*, we do not know the author because the Vedas have been coming down through the *guru-śiṣya paramparā* and we do not know who the original author is and therefore we call it *apauruṣeya pramāṇam*, a source of knowledge that has super human origin. Otherwise it is said that it has been given out by God himself. This *śruti* does not have an author, but the other two *prasthānam*s, *smṛti* and the *nyāya prasthānam*, *Brahma Sūtras* have been authored by Vyāsacārya. We are very much indebted to Vyāsa and on *Gurupūrṇimā* day, we offer worship to Vyāsa. In fact, *Gurupūrṇimā* is also called *Vyāsapūrṇimā*. Thus these three *prasthānam*s are the foundational texts.

But many people may not have access to these three original texts, and the texts being voluminous also, people may not be able to study them completely. Therefore, to help such people, *ācāryas* condensed the *prasthāna trayam* and wrote simpler and smaller works. Thus we have numerous Vedāntic texts, which are simplified and relatively smaller versions of *prasthāna trayam*. All these manuals are called Vedānta *prakaraṇani*. *Prakaraṇam* means a treatise or a simplified version. These *prakaraṇa granthas* can be classified into two types. One group presents all aspects of Vedāntic teaching but in a simple form, the best example being *Tattvabodha* itself. It presents all aspects of the teaching. By all aspects we mean all the six aspects of *prasthāna trayam*: *jīva*, the individual; *jagat*, the world; *Īśvara*, the Lord; *bandha*, the bondage including the cause of bondage; *mokṣa*, liberation; *sādhana*, the means by which the *jīva* can travel from bondage to liberation. *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*, *Vedāntasāra*, and *Sarva vedāntasiddhānta sāra sangraha* are some other examples of *prakaraṇa granthas* that give an overview of the totality of Vedānta. There is another type of *prakaraṇa grantha*, which does not deal with all aspects of Vedānta but highlights a particular aspect of the teaching alone thoroughly and comprehensively. Some *prakaraṇa granthas* will concentrate on the *jīva* study alone without talking much about *Īśvara*, creation, etc. But as we saw in *Vākya Vṛtti*, *jīva*, *Īśvara* and other topics were not highlighted, but only the *mahāvākya-vicāra*, which is *sādhana*, is highlighted. Even in this text other *sādhanas* like *karma-yoga*, *upāsana-yoga* were not talked about. Only the *mahāvākya* analysis is

elaborated in 53 verses. Thus the second group of *prakaraṇa granthas* highlights any one of the six aspects of the Vedāntic teaching. Both the two types of *prakaraṇa granthas* are very important. In the beginning stages, one should have an overview of the entire teaching and when receiving this overview, one gets several doubts regarding some aspects of the teaching and then the second group of *prakaraṇa granthas* will clarify those doubts. Thus in the tradition, both types of *prakaraṇa granthas* are present, highlighted and learnt. We learnt *Tattvabodha* and *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi* that come under the first type, and *Vākya Vṛtti* that comes under the second type.

Now we are going to see another text, which is of the second type. That text, *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ*, which is another *prakaraṇa grantha* that highlights the *jīva-vicāra*. *Īśvara* is not talked about much. Creation is not talked about much. *Jīva*, his bondage, liberation and the *sādhana* are talked about. *Jīva*, *bandha*, *mokṣa* and *sādhana* are highlighted in *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ*. It is a relatively smaller *prakaraṇa grantha* consisting of 46 verses. The author of the text is not clearly known. According to some people, Ādi Śaṅkarācārya is the author and some others say that Vidyāraṇya is the author. Some people say that Vidyāraṇya's *guru*, Bhāratī Tīrtha is the author. A majority of people say that this text was written by Bhāratī Tīrtha, who was also one of the Śaṅkarācāryas of the Sringeri Matha about six or seven hundred years ago in the 14th century. When we study the style of the text, we see that the author is not Ādi Śaṅkarācārya, but that the author is Vidyāraṇya or Bhāratī Tīrtha. These two authors have very close writing styles. In fact, it is claimed that *Pañcadaśī* was written by Vidyāraṇya and Bhāratī Tīrtha together. The style found in *Pañcadaśī* is found in *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ* also. In the title of this text, *viveka* means discrimination referring to resolving confusion, and clarity in thinking. Clear knowledge is called *viveka*. The topic is the discrimination between, *dṛk*, the observer, experiencer, seer, illuminator or subject and *dr̥śyam*, the observed, experienced, seen, illumined or object. Why should we do the discrimination or the sorting out? Sorting out is required when there is mixing up. That mixing up is called *aviveka*, otherwise called *moha*, *adhyāsa*. Because there is non-discrimination or mixing up we have to sort out. When we have confusion at different levels, why should we sort out this specific confusion? For that Bhāratī Tīrtha says that other confusions will not seriously affect our life whereas this is one confusion that we cannot afford to have because this confusion is the cause of all our problems that is *saṃsāra*. We have to resolve this confusion to attain *mokṣa*. Therefore *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ* becomes important. With this background, we will enter into the text proper.

## Verse 1

*rūpaṃ drśyaṃ locanaṃ dr̥k taddrśyaṃ dr̥ktu mānasam |  
dr̥śyā dhīvṛttayaḥ sākṣī dr̥geva na tu dr̥śyate || 1 ||*

As I said, Vidyāraṇya is going to focus on the *jīva-vicāra*. The individual is going to be highlighted in this text. The author begins the text with an analysis of the individual. What are the various constituents or components of the individual or the various layers of the human personality? We have done that very elaborately in *Tattvabodha*, *Vivekacūdāmaṇi*, etc. From one angle, these texts talk about *śarīra-trayam*, the three bodies, *sthūla*, *sūkṣma*, *kāraṇaśarīra* and *ātmā*. From another angle, they talk about *pañcakośa*, *annamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, etc., and *ātmā*. Here the author is talking about the body, *deha*, sense-organs, *indriyāni*, the mind, *manaḥ* or the *buddhi* and the *ātmā*. We all know that of all these four components three are made up of the five elements. The physical body is made up of the five inert elements starting from space, etc. The sense-organs are also made up of the five elements (matter), and the mind is also made up of matter. Since they are all material products, they are inert by themselves. Just as the desk, carpet, and chair are inert matter, the body-sense-mind complex is also inert matter. But even though the body-sense-mind complex is inert, it behaves as though it is sentient. The body is able to sense the external stimuli, like heat, cold, etc., which problem the desk does not have. Similarly, the sense-organs are also sentient because they are able to sense the touch, form, smell, etc. The mind is also sentient capable of sensing or having an emotion. So if the inert can function as though sentient, they must be borrowing consciousness from somewhere else. The fan does not have the capacity to rotate by itself, but it rotates borrowing the moving power from some other principle. That principle is not physically seen and therefore it must be an invisible principle, which is called electricity. In the same way, the functioning sentient body, sense-organs and mind must be blessed by some other principle. That principle is invisible because it is not perceived and it must be lending sentiency to the body, etc. In *Kenopaniṣad (1.1)*, the student asks:

*Willed by whom does the mind fall (on objects as though) it is forced? Directed by whom does the main prāṇa function? Willed by whom do (the people) utter this speech? Which effulgent principle, indeed, directs the eyes and ears? (1.1)*

The Upaniṣads are the basis for Bhāratī Tīrtha to write the verses of this text. That invisible lending principle is called *ātmā*, the consciousness principle. The author will call it *sākṣī* or *citiḥ*. It is this *ātmā* that is lending consciousness to all these three components of the body-sense-mind complex. How does it lend? It can be either by direct lending or indirect lending. The indirect lending is a series of exchanges involving one or two or many intermediaries. In the case of *ātmā* lending consciousness to the mind, sense-organs and the body, how does it happen? The author says that it is not directly happening but it is in the form of gradual transference stage by stage. *Ātmā* lends consciousness to the mind directly. It never lends consciousness directly to the sense-organs. Thus *ātmā* becomes the illuminator and the mind becomes the illumined. When the mind becomes illumined or sentient, the mind gets the capacity to lend consciousness to the sense-organs. The mind gives consciousness to the

sense-organs and thus the mind becomes the illuminator and the sense-organs become the illumined. The sense-organs lend consciousness to the body and thus the sense-organs become the illuminator and the body becomes the illumined, and through the body, the external world gets illumined. Thus the author says that the *ātmā* is *ḍṛk*, the mind is *ḍṛśyam*; the mind is *ḍṛk*, sense-organs are *ḍṛśyam*; sense-organs become *ḍṛk*, the body and the world become *ḍṛśyam*. Thus in the form of a gradual flow, *ātmā* illumines the whole world. That is why when the intermediaries in this flow are absent, like when the mind and sense-organs are absent, *ātmā* does not illumine the external world because the *ātmā* cannot directly experience the external world. *Ātmā* cannot directly illumine the world. If you take the intermediaries, every intermediary has a two-fold status. On a full moon night, the sun illumines the moon. The sun is the illuminator and the moon is the illumined. Even as the moon becomes illumined, it gets the status of an illuminator and it is capable of illumining the earth. If I ask whether the moon is the illuminator or the illumined, what will be the answer? It is both. From the standpoint of the sun, the moon is the illumined. From the standpoint of the earth, the moon is the illuminator. How to differentiate between the illuminator sun and the illuminator moon? The sun is an illuminator without becoming an illumined. It is a non-illumined illuminator. The sun is an absolute illuminator. The moon is not an absolute illuminator. Because it is an illumined illuminator, it is called a relative illuminator.

The author says that *ātmā* is the absolute *ḍṛk* because it is a self-effulgent illuminator and never illumined by anything, whereas the mind and the sense-organs are relative illuminators. Thus every individual is a mixture of absolute and relative *ḍṛk*. Every individual is a mixture of the absolute illuminator, *sākṣī ātmā* and the relative illuminators, mind and the sense-organs. This is the first topic of *Ḍṛgḍṛśyavivekaḥ*. In the first five verses, the author presents this topic of how the individual is a mixture of the absolute illuminator called *sākṣī* and the relative illuminators called the mind and the sense-organs. He will call the relative illuminator as *ahaṅkāra* later. For now we keep the name, relative illuminator, for the mind-sense complex. This is the topic in the first five verses. Thereafter, the author will say what is our problem, what is *samsāra* and what is its cause. It will be pointed out that mixing up of the absolute and relative illuminators is *samsāra* and so sorting out these two needs to be done.

Look at the verse. ***rūpaṃ ḍṛśyaṃ locanaṃ ḍṛk***: The forms and colors of the external world including the physical body are experienced or seen objects and the eye is their experiencer or the seer subject. ***tatḍṛśyam***: The eyes themselves are experienced because the conditions of the eyes are known. When the eyes themselves become *ḍṛśyam*, who is the experiencer of the eyes? ***ḍṛktu mānasam***: The mind is the seer and the eyes are the seen. Even when the eyes are closed, the mind is capable of visualizing and imagining things. In fact, the mind knows that the eyes are closed. The eyes enjoy two-fold status, seers and seen. The eyes are relative seers. The mind is also not the absolute seer. ***dhīṛttayaḥ***: Mental functions, like thinking, doubting, worrying, etc., are entertained in the form of thoughts and are objects of experience. The very condition of the mind is very intimately experienced by us. We give expression to all our thoughts. We cannot do that if we do not experience them and the thoughts are never inferred. Worry, knowledge, the understanding and non-understanding functions, etc., of the mind are directly experienced. If the mind is the *ḍṛśyam*, what is the *ḍṛk*? *Sākṣī* is the *ḍṛk*. The original consciousness, which is called the witness, *sākṣī-caitanya* is the *ḍṛk*, the illuminator and observer. Who is the seer of

the *sākṣī*? The *sākṣī* is the unobserved observer. It is the non-observable observer, non-seeable seer, non-experienceable experiencer, non-objectifiable subject. It is the absolute observer. You can never attempt to experience the *sākṣī*. You can never attempt to objectify the *sākṣī*. This is the *saṃkṣepa śloka* or *pratijñā śloka*. In this verse, the author has introduced three observers, three illuminators: 1. sense-organs, 2. mind, 3. *sākṣī*. 1 and 2 are relative illuminators and 3 is the absolute illuminator. Thus the two relative *drk* and the one absolute *drk* are the components of the individual. The author feels that this requires further clarification. The following 4 verses are the author's commentary on the first verse. Each part of the first verse will be elaborated. We will now go to verse 2.

## Verse 2

***nīlapītasthūlasūkṣmahrasvadīrghādibhedataḥ***

***nānāvidhāni rūpāṇi paśyellocanamekadhā* || 2||**

In the first verse, the author introduced the three illuminators or observers, sense-organs, mind and the *sākṣī*. Of these three, the author is clarifying the first one here. It was said in the first verse that form is seen and the eyes are the seers. The first quarter of the previous verse is explained now. The author says that the observed objects are many and the observing eye is only one. To see the green color one uses the same eye that would be used to see the red color. This shows that there is plurality in the *drśyam* and there is non-duality in the *drk*. I am the only observer person in the room (for me) and I am observing so many things. I, the observer, am one and the observed are many and varied. The blue color, yellow color, big object, small object, short object and long object are pluralities and varieties of the observed. In each plurality itself, there is variety. There is plurality in the colors and forms. But the eye is one. In the manifold manner the forms and colors are many and varied, whereas remaining single, the eyes see the plurality. This discussion will be extended and the consequence of this discussion will be evident when we come to consciousness. It will be said that in consciousness there is no variety, plurality, bigness, smallness, etc. As *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* says, the ultimate consciousness is only one. The author is laying the foundation for that conclusion here in this verse.

## **DDV-02 = 3 to 5**

### **Verses 1 and 2**

*rūpaṃ dr̥śyaṃ locanaṃ dr̥k tad̥dr̥śyaṃ dr̥ktu mānasam |*

*dr̥śyā dh̥iv̥rttayah̥ sākṣī dr̥geva na tu dr̥śyate || 1 ||*

*nīlapīsthaśūksmahrasvadīrghādibhedataḥ |*

*nānāvidhāni rūpāṇi paśyellocanamekadā || 2 ||*

I said that the *Dr̥gd̥śyavivekaḥ* is a *prakaraṇa grantha* in which the *jīvātma* or the *tvam padārtha* is highlighted. Īśvara or the *tat padārtha* is not very elaborately dealt with. But still the complete vision of Vedānta is given through this text. Since the analysis is in the form of the observer-observed division, the text is called *Dr̥gd̥śyavivekaḥ*, the discrimination between the observer and the observed. In the first five verses the author is talking about the nature of the individual, *jīvātma*, who is a composite entity consisting of several layers. Normally, in *Tattvabodha* and the other texts, the difference is presented as the three bodies, the five sheaths, etc. Here the author approaches this topic slightly differently. He says that the individual consists of three types of seers or three types of observers. Seer 1, seer 2 plus seer 3 is the individual. Of these, two are relative seers and the third one is the absolute one. The first relative seer is the sense-organs and from that standpoint, the external world is the object. Then the sense-organs themselves are seen or experienced and so they become the object, and from that standpoint the mind becomes the seer and so the mind is seer 2. The mind is also a relative seer because the mind itself is experienced or illumined and when the mind becomes the object of experience, *sākṣī caitanyam*, consciousness, becomes the seer, which is seer 3. This consciousness itself is not objectified or seen by anything else. Therefore consciousness is ever the seer and never the seen. Thus sense-organs are both the seer and the seen and therefore they are relative seers. The mind is both the seer and seen and therefore it is a relative seer. *Ātmā* is ever the seer and never the seen and therefore it is the absolute seer. Thus two relative seers plus one absolute seer is the individual's composition. This is how the text is started with a summarizing verse.

The first verse is a summarizing verse, which the author himself explains in the later verses. All the three seers are introduced in verse 1. The first seer is explained in verse 2. The second seer is explained in verse 3. The third absolute seer is explained in verse 4. So far we have seen the first and the second verses. In the second verse the author said how every sense organ is the seer and every relevant sense object is the seen. The word 'relevant' is used because with respect to the eye, the object is the forms and colors, with respect to the ear, it is the sound and so on. Thus sound, touch, forms (colors), taste and smell are the sense objects. Then the author made a note that the forms and colors are many and varied whereas the eye is one and the same. The size of the sense objects are varied but the eye is one and the same. Without undergoing any change, remaining the same, the eye illumines all the varied sense objects. The forms, dimensions and colors of the sense objects are many and varied but the eye,



remaining the same and single, observes all of them. Therefore *drśyam* is many and *drk* is one. This has to be noted specifically because when we come to the absolute seer later, it can be said that the absolute seer is *advaitam*. Non-dual consciousness is the absolute seer. Then only we can establish that the absolute seer is not limited by time or space. The infinitude of the absolute seer is established by establishing non-duality. From an understanding of non-duality one understands infinitude. Now we go to the seer 2.

### **Verse 3**

*āndhyamāndyapaṭutveṣu netradharmeṣu caikadhā |*

*saṅkalpayanmanah śrotratvagādau yojyatāmidam || 3||*

Here seer 2, the mind is explained. When the mind becomes the seer, the sense-organs are the seen. The sense-organs are seen by virtue of their perceptual power in three different levels. Total perception is one, i.e., the sense-organs are sharp enough to totally and clearly perceive the objects. Total non-perception is the second, i.e., the sense-organs do not function at all. For example, in the case of a blind person, the eyes are totally non-functional. Total perception and total non-perception are the two extremes and between these two extremes, there is a third condition, partial perception and partial non-perception. Dullness of the eyes is an intermediary condition. These are the three conditions, full function, full non-function and partial function, that are possible for every sense organ. All these conditions are known to us. These three conditions in the case of the eye are mentioned in this verse: total blindness, partial function of the eyes, which is vague vision, and sharp clear vision. All these conditions are experienced by us. The mind experiences or illumines these three conditions of the eye, and the mind is the seer 2. Even though the conditions are many and varied, the mind does not undergo any change. Blindness of the eye does not make the mind non-functional, and the dull vision does not make the mind dull. These conditions are variable with regard to the sense-organs and they do not belong to the mind. The mind remains the same and is not affected by the pluralities and the variety of the sense-organs. When the act of perception is changed from the eye to the ear, a different mind is not required. Here again, the principle of the observed being many but the observer is one applies. This principle can be extended to the other four sense-organs such as ear, skin, etc. Thus the seer 2, the mind, that was introduced in the first verse has been explained in this third verse. Next the absolute seer is explained.

### **Verse 4**

*kāmaḥ saṅkalpasandehau śraddhā'śraddhe dhṛtūtare |*

*hrīrdhīrbhīrityevamādīn bhāsayatyekadhā citiḥ || 4||*

In the previous verse, the mind was introduced as seer 2, the relative seer. In this verse, the author says that the mind itself is 'seen', experienced or clearly known. The mind goes through different emotional conditions like happiness, sorrow, jealousy, compassion, fear, etc., In addition, there are several

cognition conditions of the mind like ignorance, knowledge, partial ignorance, partial knowledge, doubt, etc. These various conditions of the mind are experienced. What is the proof that they are experienced? If they are not experienced, we will never talk about them. Even though we experience these varied conditions and they are known to us, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* enumerates them in the first chapter, fifth *Brāhmaṇam*. The author borrows from that enumeration and lists them here: desire, making plans to implement a desire, doubt as to whether the plan will be successful, faith in God, guru, and scriptures, lack of faith, will power or steadfastness, diffidence, modesty, knowledge, fear, etc. All these conditions of the mind are illumined and made known by the Consciousness, while itself remaining changeless. It is like the light pervading the room. Whatever be the movement of the hand or the body, the light falls over the body and makes the body known or seen. The movement belongs to the body but the light itself does not move. The light cannot move also because the light is pervading the entire room. Similarly, consciousness spreads over the mind and illumines the conditions of the mind. Thus the *caitnyam*, called *citiḥ* in this verse, is the seer 3 and the mind is the seen.

Consciousness illumines without any movement, will or change. That consciousness is not a part, product or property of the mind, is an independent entity that pervades and illumines the mind, is not limited by the boundaries of the mind, survives even in sleep when the mind is resolved, but consciousness in sleep is not available because the medium, the mind, is asleep and not because it is absent in sleep. This pure independent consciousness is the seer 3. What is the nature of this seer? This seer 3 is unlike the other two seers. It is ever the seer and never the seen. It is ever the experiencer and never the experienced. One should never look for the experience of *ātmā*. When we say that we do not have the experience of the *ātmā*, we make the blunder of thinking that one day we will get that experience in future and this indicates that we think that *ātmā* is an object of our experience. The author says that there is no such thing as the experience of *ātmā* because *ātmā* is ever the experiencer. *Ātmā* is the self-evident experiencer. This is explained in the next verse. *Ātmā* is our higher component, our superior nature. To use the language of the 7th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, *ātmā* is the *parāprakṛti*.

### Verse 5

*nodetī nāstametyeṣū na vṛddhiṃ yāti na kṣayam |*

*svayaṃ vibhātyathānanyāni bhāsayet sādhanam vinā || 5||*

Here the author talks about the nature of Consciousness. What was presented as the five features of Consciousness earlier is beautifully summarized here. This Consciousness, seer 3, does not rise nor is it born. It does not have origination or creation. Therefore it does not end. It is never destroyed. **Thus consciousness is not limited by time.** This is a very important teaching because according to Science, consciousness is generated in matter at a particular time. For Science, matter is fundamental and as matter evolves and combines in a particular form, life originates. Science says that life or consciousness originated in time. But Vedānta says that what Science talks of as origination of life is the origination of *cidābhāsa*. When matter forms in an ideal configuration, the reflected consciousness originates. When the reflecting medium originates, the reflected consciousness originates. Science talks about the

origination of RC (reflected consciousness), whereas Vedānta talks about the eternity of OC, the original consciousness. The original consciousness does not fall under the domain of Science because the scientific instruments are not designed to study the OC. Original consciousness can be known only through the means of *śāstra*. Consciousness is prior to creation. Consciousness is never destroyed. In the *Maitreyi Brāhmaṇam* of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, it is said that even if the whole creation is destroyed, only the reflected consciousness is destroyed. In this important section of the *upaniṣad*, the original and the reflected consciousness are differentiated. Consciousness does not die, when the medium is destroyed. Consciousness does not expand or increase in size. It does not contract or decrease in size. Thus consciousness does not have dimension or size unlike any object in space that is subject to expansion and contraction. **Thus consciousness is not limited by space.**

## DDV-03 = 5 to 8

### Verse 5

*nodeti nāstametyeṣā na vṛddhiṃ yāti na kṣayam |*  
*svayaṃ vibhātyathānanyāni bhāsayet sādhanam vinā || 5||*

In the first five verses, the author talks about the individual who consists of three factors in the form of three seers. Normally the individual is presented as one with three bodies or five sheaths but here the author introduces the individual as a composite entity consisting of three factors. Each one is a seer. Seer 1, seer 2 plus seer 3 is the individual. Each seer has got a corresponding seen object also and of these three seers, two are relative seers and one is the absolute seer. Thus we have got three seer-seen pairs. Then the author enumerated them. The first pair is the sense-organs (the seer) and the external world (the seen). The second is the mind (the seer) and the sense-organs (the seen). The third is *sākṣī* (the seer) and the mind (the seen). Thus the sense-organs are the seer 1, the mind is the seer 2 and the witness-consciousness is the seer 3. The first two are relative seers because the sense-organs are the seers with respect to the external world but the seen from the standpoint of the mind. Since the sense-organs are both the seer and the seen they are called relative seers. Similarly the mind is the seer from the standpoint of the sense-organs but it is the seen from the standpoint of the *sākṣī*. Thus the mind plays a two-fold role of the seer and the seen, and so it is also a relative seer. The *sākṣī* is never the seen and it is ever the seer and therefore *sākṣī* is the absolute seer. Thus the author nicely introduced three seers and pointed out that *sākṣī* is the seer-less seer or the absolute seer.

Thereafter, the author is defining the nature of this absolute seer in verse 5. *Sākṣī*, the absolute seer, is in the form of pure consciousness. It is that consciousness that does not have a beginning or an end. Therefore, it is eternal consciousness. From that itself it is very clear that it does not have any connection with the body because the body has a beginning and an end. It is an independent entity pervading and enlivening the body. Not only it does not have birth or death, it does not have expansion or contraction meaning that it is formless and all-pervading. Consciousness is time-wise limitless and space-wise limitless. Consciousness is ever the seer and is never illumined by anything because it is self-luminous. The moon has to be illumined by the sun because it does not have a light of its own but the sun does not have illumination by anything because it is self-shining. Similarly the *sākṣī* is self-evident, self-luminous. Therefore we need not work for the experience of the *sākṣī*. It is ever experienced. If there is no experience of the *sākṣī* at any particular time, then it will not be self-luminous and so it would have to be illumined by something else. Being self-luminous, it is self-shining and so it is ever experienced. Thus consciousness does not require any special effort to be experienced. Not only it is

self-shining, it illumines all the other things also without requiring any instruments for illumination whereas the mind can illumine anything only with the help of thought. For the mind to perceive any object, the thought of the object has to be formed. The mind requires an instrument but *sākṣī* does not require a thought to illumine any object. *Sākṣī* does not require sense-organs to illumine any object, i.e, the mind, and it does not require an action to illumine the mind. It illumines by its mere presence. The verb “illumines” may be taken to mean that *sākṣī* is doing the action of illumination done at a particular time and not at some other times. This is not correct. Here illumination is not an action. The mind becomes alive in the mere presence of the *sākṣī*. *Sākṣī* “illumines” not by will, desire, plan, or action. *Sākṣī* just is and in its presence, the mind becomes alive and sentient. That is figuratively called as *sākṣī* illumining. Thus *sākṣī* does not undergo any modification also by illumining. Without undergoing change, or having any will, or desire, *sākṣī*, by its mere presence “becomes” the seer of the mind without requiring any other instrument.

### Verse 6

*cicchāyā''veśato buddhau bhānaṃ dhīstu dvidhā sthitā |*  
*ekāhaṅkṛtiranyā syādantaḥkaraṇarūpiṇī || 6||*

With the previous verse, the author has concluded the topic of the composition of the individual, which is the three-fold seers. From the 6th verse up to the 12th verse, the author talks about the mechanism behind the arrival of these three seers. How are they formed? How do these three seers originate? What are their functions? What are their roles? What are their activities? The activities of these three seers make up the life of the individual. The author talks about the formation and function of the three seers in verses 6 to 12. Of these three seers, the third one, *sākṣī* is never formed in time. *Sākṣī* is always present and it always illumines the mind. The illumining function is not an action in time, but it is always there. *Sākṣī* illumines whatever is around and if there is nothing, it illumines the nothingness also. The author takes up the seer 2, the mind. This has to be discussed because the mind by itself can never become the seer of anything because the mind is made up of matter and so inert by nature. The mind is made out of the *sattva guṇa* of the five elements. It is inert, subtle, invisible matter or substance. Matter being inert cannot experience anything. How does the mind become the seer? A good example here is the moon. How does the moon illumine the earth on a full moon night? The moon borrows the light from the sun. A reflection of the sunlight is formed on the moon’s surface. When the reflection is formed, the moon gets illumined and the moon becomes the illuminator of the earth. The author says that the same phenomenon takes place with regard to the mind. *Sākṣī* can be compared to the sun and the mind can be compared to the moon. The *caitanya* of the *sākṣī* is formed on the mind called *chāyā praveśa*. *chāyā* means the *pratibimba caitanyam* or *ābhāsacaitanyam* is formed on the mind. The moment the reflected consciousness is formed, two things happen. First, the mind becomes known, experienced and shines. Not only does the mind gets illumined, the mind also becomes the seer or the illuminator of the sense-organs. This is how the mind becomes seer 2. Because of the formation of the reflected consciousness (RC) in the mind, the mind becomes sentient as though it has its own light or sentiency. The mind appears to be naturally sentient but we have to know that the mind does not have natural

sentiency because it is made up of matter. It has only borrowed sentiency. The mind has got two portions. For the sake of analysis, the author divides the mind into two portions. One part of the mind is *ahaṅkṛtiḥ*. Here the word *ahaṅkṛtiḥ* has a technical meaning, which should be carefully noted and remembered throughout these few verses. *Ahaṅkṛtiḥ* means the mind, the mental substance, *manodravayam*. The second part is the thought part. The word *antaḥkaraṇam* refers to the thought part of the mind. The two parts are *dravyaamśam* and *vṛttiamśam* respectively. In a lake with waves, the top portion, the waves, is one part and the lake, the bottom portion, is another part. Just like the lake and the waves, the two parts of the mind are the mental substance and the waves of the mind, called *vṛttis*. This subtle difference is made for a particular purpose. Whenever the mind perceives an external object, the substantial part of the mind is supposed to remain within the body and the thought part of the mind is supposed to travel out as described in the 4th verse of the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*:

*nānācchidraghaṭodarasthitamahādīpaprabhā bhāsvaram  
jñānam yasya tu cakṣurādikaraṇadvārā vahīḥ spandate |  
jānāmīti tameva bhāntamanubhātyetatsamastam jagat  
tasmai śrīgurumūrtaye nama idam śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtaye ||4||*

The mental part remains within and the thought part goes out and pervades the external object to experience the object. Therefore the author divides the mind into *dravya amśa* and *vṛtti amśa*. Another example can be the flashlight wherein the flashlight remains in the hand and the light beam goes out to illumine an object. Both parts of the mind are inert by themselves but they become sentient because of the reflected consciousness.

### Verse 7

*chāyā'haṅkārayoraikyaṃ taptāyaḥpiṇḍavanmatam |  
tadahaṅkāratādātmyāddehaścetanatāmagāt || 7||*

What is the connection between the mind and the reflected consciousness? How strong or close is the connection? The author says that the mind and the reflected consciousness are very intimate and physically inseparable. The reflected consciousness and the mind material (*manodravayam*) are inseparable like the iron ball placed in fire. The fire penetrates the iron ball and the iron ball becomes red hot and glows. Both the light and the heat of the fire interpenetrate into every part of the iron ball. When the iron ball is taken out of the fire, the iron ball and the fire have mixed together very intimately. Just as the fire and the iron ball get intimately connected, the mind and the reflected consciousness get intimately connected. This is the teaching of the tradition. This mind-RC (reflected consciousness) mixture comes in contact with the inert physical body at the time of every birth and the body borrows sentiency from the sentient mind. The mind borrows sentiency from the *sākṣī* and the body borrows sentiency from the mind and not from the *sākṣī*. The body becomes sentient because of its intimate contact with that mind, which has become sentient. The physical parts of the sense-organs in the body being available, the sense-organs become the seers. Thus seer 1 is formed. Seer 3, the *sākṣī*, makes the

mind, seer 2. Seer 2 through the body, makes the sense-organs, seer 1. Sense-organs operate through the respective physical parts in the body. Thus seer 3 creates seer 2 and seer 2 creates seer 1.

All the three components of the individual are thus sentient and so there is a live individual. Whenever a live individual is talked about, it refers to the three seers put together. Whenever I say that I experience the mind (object), the 'I' refers to the *sākṣī*. Whenever I experience the sense-organs, 'I' refers to the seer mind. Whenever the forms and colors, etc., are talked about, the 'I' has the meaning of the sense-organs. The word 'I' is focussed on either seer 3 or seer 2 or seer 1. But what has happened? We have mixed up all the three and we have seer-wise confusion. We do not see the seers properly. All these three cannot be separated physically because they are inseparably and intimately mixed together. Therefore, it is a struggle to differentiate and discern these three seers. Vedānta's aim is that we should know that the seer 3 is the real 'I' and the other two are incidental and that we should not be obsessed with them. They are useful but we should not get caught in them. This teaching comes later. The body gets consciousness from the mind and the mind gets consciousness from *ātmā*. At the time of death, the mind quits the body and the body becomes insentient because the body cannot borrow consciousness directly from *ātmā*, which is all-pervading. Seer 2 leaves the body at death and seer 1 becomes a non-seer.

### **Verse 8**

*ahañkārasya tādātmyaṃ cicchāyādehasākṣibhiḥ |*

*sahaḥ karmajaṃ bhrāntijanyaṃ ca trividhaṃ kramāt || 8||*

We see a unique form of analysis in this verse which is not normally seen elsewhere. It may initially appear hairsplitting and tough but the analysis is worth studying. The author says that the mind material is in the close proximity of three things. The first is the body. The body is alive only because it is in close association with the mind. The expression, 'the *jñāni* has destroyed the mind' is used in Vedānta. Many people get confused by this statement and think that *jñānis* do not have mind. If *manonāśa*, destruction of the mind, is taken literally, every *jñāni* will be dead when *manonāśa* happens. The second factor is the reflected consciousness, which is intimately connected with the mind. It is similar to the moon being closely associated with the sunlight that spreads over it or the mirror being connected with the reflected object. The third factor is the original consciousness (OC), *ātmā*, which has to be wherever the mind is. The original face has to be wherever the reflected face is because the reflection cannot form without the original. The mind is closely connected to the reflected consciousness, *cidābhāsa*, and the original consciousness, *cit*. The author analyzes the type of relation that is present between the three pairs, mind-body, mind-reflected consciousness (RC) and mind-OC.

## **DDV-04 = 8 and 9**

### **Verse 8**

*ahaṅkārasya tādātmyaṃ cicchāyādehasākṣibhiḥ ।*

*sahajaṃ karmajaṃ bhrāntijanyaṃ ca trividhaṃ kramāt ॥ 8॥*

In the first five verses, the author introduced the three seer-seen pairs. The world is the seen object with regard to which the sense-organs are the seer. Sense-organs are the seen object corresponding to which the mind is the seer. The mind is the seen object and from that standpoint, *ātmā*, the *sākṣī caitanyam* is the seer. Of these three seers, which every individual has, two are relative seers and one is the absolute seer. Sense-organs is a relative seer because it is a seer from the world's standpoint but it is the seen from the mind's standpoint. Similarly the mind is a relative seer because it is the seer from the standpoint of the sense-organs but is the seen from the *sākṣī* standpoint. *Sākṣī* is the absolute seer because it is the seer from the standpoint of the mind and it is never seen or objectified. Thus every individual is a mixture of these three seers and whenever an individual says, 'I' it can refer to any one of the seers at anytime. Whenever I refer to the external world, the 'I' corresponds to the sense-organs. Whenever I am passing remarks about the sense-organs by objectifying them, the meaning of the word 'I' is the mind. Whenever I am referring to my mental condition, objectifying the mental condition, then I am the *sākṣī*. Thus the word 'I', depending on the context, can refer to seer 1, seer 2 or seer 3. But people do not discern them distinctly because they are mixed together intimately. Therefore physical separation is not possible. Therefore we have to use discrimination to separate them. Thus the three seers were introduced in the first five verses. Then from the 6th verse up to the 12th verse, the formation and function of these three seers are discussed. How are these three seers formed and what are their functions? Of them the *sākṣī*, the seer, is never formed in time because the *sākṣī* is of the nature of consciousness, and therefore it is ever self-effulgent capable of illumining anything around, just as the sun is self-shining capable of illumining anything. The mind can never be naturally a seer or an illuminator because it is an inert entity made up of the five elements. The mind is insentient by itself and becomes a seer because of the borrowed consciousness called *cicchāyā* or *cidābhāsa* exactly like the moon illumining the earth on a full moon night with borrowed light from the sun. This is how the seer 2 is formed or becomes a seer. This mind, seer 2, is responsible for making the body sentient. The body and the sense-organs are not sentient by themselves because they are also made up of matter only. The mind, which has borrowed consciousness, lends consciousness to the body which includes the five



*golakas* also. Once the body and the *golakas* have borrowed consciousness, the sense-organs become live and sentient, which means that seer 1 has been formed capable of illumining the external world. Thus because of seer 3 seer 2 is formed and because of seer 2 seer 1 is formed, and because of seer 1 the world is experienced. In *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (2.2.11), *ātmā* is presented as the light of all lights: “*tameva bhāntamanubhāti sarvaṃ tasya bhāsā sarvamidaṃ vibhāti; Everything shines after that self alone which is the light of all lights. By its light all this shines.*”

Having introduced the formation of the three seers the author divided the mind into two parts for the sake of discussion. The first part is the substantial part of the mind. Mind, being a subtle material, has substantiality of its own called *manodravayam*. The second part of the mind is the thoughts that rise and fall in the mind like the waves in a lake. Similar to the waves in a lake, thoughts are constantly formed and resolved in the mind. Each thought is capable of coming out through the sense organs and illumining the external world by pervading the object like the light beam coming out of the torch light and pervading the object and illumining it. According to the Vedāntic epistemology, objects do not enter the mind but the thoughts go out and envelop the object. While the *dravya aṃśam* remains in the body, the *vṛtti aṃśam* is capable of expanding and contracting. It expands, envelops and illumines the object and this expanding-contracting part of the mind, like the rays of the sun, is called the *vṛtti aṃśa*. Thus the mind has *dravya aṃśa* and *vṛtti aṃśa*, the substantial part and the thought part. Both the parts are inert by themselves and become sentient because of the *cidābhāsa praveśa*. Just as the sunlight illumines the wave and the lake, *sākṣī* illumines the mind and the thought wave.

After introducing these two parts of the mind the author introduces another subtle point. He said that the mind is associated with three things intimately. The subtle, invisible, substance mind is intimately associated with the physical body, and the very life of the body is dependent on the mind. In the 15th chapter (15:7) of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, Kṛṣṇa refers to this: “*manaḥṣaṣṭhānīndriyāṇi prakṛtisthāni karṣati; When the one who rules (the body) departs, he draws to himself the five senses and the mind, the sixth, obtaining in the body.*” At the time of death, the mind quits the physical body. The mind is not seen quitting but then the residing mind is also not seen because the mind is subtle in nature. The mind is associated with reflected consciousness (RC), the *cidābhāsa* like a mirror is associated with the reflected object. The mind is also associated with the original consciousness (OC), *sākṣī*. The mind and the body are intimately connected. The mind and the RC are intimately connected. The mind and the OC are intimately connected. Three pairs, mind-body, mind-RC and mind-OC are crowded together in an individual. The questions that are asked about the three pairs are: What type of intimacy is present? What is the relationship? How strong is the bonding?

The mind material has intimate association with RC, physical body, and *sākṣī* (OC). The relationship between the mind and the RC is natural, permanent, inseparable. Any reflecting medium and the reflection cannot be physically separated. As long as the reflecting medium is present the reflection will also be present. Therefore the mind will be eternally connected with the *cidābhāsa*. There is no time when the mind is alone present without *cidābhāsa*. That is why people get confused and think that the mind has intrinsic consciousness. When the borrowed consciousness is permanently present, it appears

as intrinsic. When the mind resolves in the deep sleep state and exists in potential form, the RC remains in potential form. The mind and the RC can never be separated. Even during dissolution of the creation, the mind and RC exist in potential form as in deep sleep. At the time of *videhamukti*, when the mind gets destroyed permanently, the RC also gets destroyed. Thus the mind and RC has inseparable permanent relationship. The body-mind relationship is never inseparable or permanent because the body dies at some point. That shows that the mind separates from the body. If the relationship is permanent, the body would never die. The body and the mind have association and dissociation. Dissociation is death and association with a new body is rebirth. Kṛṣṇa refers to this dissociation-association in the *BhagavadGītā*:

*Just as a person gives up old clothes and takes up new ones, so does the self, the one who dwells in the body, gives up old bodies and takes others which are new. (2:22)*

The mind drops one body and then takes another body and lives for sometime and drops that body and the cycle goes on. The mind-body relationship is temporary. What principle causes their association and what principle causes their dissociation? The association is caused by *prārabdha karma* and the association will last until the *prārabdha karma* lasts. There is no relationship possible between the mind and the *sākṣī* because *sākṣī* is like space which is not connected to anything. The second reason is that *sākṣī* belongs to a higher order of reality, and the mind belongs to a lower order of reality. No connection or bonding is possible between the higher and the lower orders of reality. A person in the waking state cannot get married in that state to someone that he comes across in the dream state. No relationship is possible between *sākṣī* and the mind but due to ignorance we make the connection between the *sākṣī*, the original 'I' and the mind. I am the *sākṣī* and I do not have connection with the mind but I am worried about the mind and its conditions and I say I am disturbed, I am happy, I am jealous, etc. In all such expressions I am connecting 'I' the *sākṣī* with the mind because of delusion. The whole Vedānta is about knowing that I do have no mind and that I do not have any connection with the mind. Therefore the conditions of the mind cannot make me a *saṁsārī*. I do not have this knowledge and so I feel connected to the mind and jumping to the tunes of the mind and throughout life I am trying to satisfy the unsatisfiable mind. It is all because I have bonded with the mind out of sheer delusion. The connection between *sākṣī*, the real I and the mind is called delusion-born bondage. The 19th chapter of the *Upadeśasāhasri* called *ātma-mana-saṁvāda prakaraṇam* is a dialog with the mind. How does the jñāni look at the mind objectively? As an unconnected *sākṣī* how does the jñāni have a chat with the mind is the subject matter. But we never remain as *sākṣī* and look at the mind objectively but we get involved with the mind, and the conditions of the mind become our conditions and make our lives miserable whereas that misery actually belongs to the mind. The mind-RC connection is natural, the mind-body connection is due to karma and the mind-*sākṣī* connection is due to delusion.

### Verse 9

*sambandhinoḥsatornāsti nivṛtṭiḥ sahajasya tu |*

*karmakṣayāt prabodhācca nivartete kramādubhe || 9||*

Why should we know the nature of all these three relationships? The author says that we have to learn this nature because that knowledge gives an appropriate attitude towards them. With the appropriate attitude we can handle these relationships without getting affected. Greater understanding leads to better handling. Knowledge is power because knowledge gives confidence to handle things properly. We can never separate the bonding between *cidābhāsa* and the mind, which is natural. The bonding between them lasts as long as they exist. The relationship is not eternal because in *videhamukti*, the mind gets destroyed and the relationship comes to an end. Since the mind-body connection is due to karma, that relationship will continue as long as the *prārabdha karma* lasts. Death will not happen as long as the *prārabdha* lasts. The *prārabdha karma* controls both the doer aspect and the experiencer aspect of an individual. Even after a person becomes unable to contribute to life he may still live because there are experiences that he would have to undergo. Understanding this we can have a proper attitude towards life. Even self-knowledge cannot remove the connection between the body and mind. Knowledge gives a new perspective to this truth so that our emotional reaction to the pain, sorrow, comes down. Pain is caused by *prārabdha karma* but sorrow is caused by ignorance. Kṛṣṇa describes *asthitaprajña* in the *Bhagavad Gītā* thus:

*The one who is not affected by adversities, who is without yearning for pleasures, and is free from longing, fear and anger, is said to be a wise person whose knowledge stays (unshaken) (2:56).*

The bond between *sākṣī* and the mind will go with the knowledge that the mind and the *sākṣī* had never had any connection. The mind cannot touch the *sākṣī*. Kṛṣṇa describes the *sākṣī* in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*This (self) cannot be slain, burnt, drowned, or dried. It is changeless, all-pervading, stable, immovable, and eternal. (2:24)*

This discrimination between the *ātmā* and the mind should happen. Even though the light and the hand are intimately together, whatever the conditions of the hand, those conditions cannot affect the light. If the hand moves, the light does not move. If the hand gets dirty, the light does not get dirty. Similarly, whatever happens to the mind cannot touch the *sākṣī*. Knowledge consists of two parts: First I have to separate mind and consciousness. After separation, I should learn through *nididhyāsanam* that I am the *sākṣī* and that the mind is only a temporary medium, which is enlivened by me. The existence, operation and even the destruction of the mind cannot disturb me. In sleep, the mind is resolved and the transactions end, but I know that I exist in sleep. The mind and the transactions may end but I exist all the time. This *sākṣī-mano-viveka* and the identification with the *sākṣī* is Self-knowledge. In *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*, this identification is described: “*yaḥ sākṣātkurute prabodhasamaye svātmānamevādvayaṃ, The identity of brahman and ātmā is apparent after self-illumination.*” With this knowledge the relationship between the mind and the *sākṣī* is removed. Removal of the relationship is knowing that there is no relationship.

## DDV-05 = 10 and 11

### Verse 9

*sambandhinoḥsatornāsti nivṛttiḥ sahajasya tu |*

*karmakṣayāt prabodhācca nivartete kramādubhe || 9||*

In the first five verses, the author introduced three seers and the three seen, *dr̥k* and *dr̥śya*. *Sākṣī* is the seer, mind is the seen, mind is the seer, the sense organ is the seen, sense organ is the seer, the external world is the seen. Of these three, *sākṣī*, being only a seer, is called the absolute seer. Since the mind is the seen from the *sākṣī* angle and the seer from the sense organ angle, it is called a relative seer. Sense organ also is the seen from the mind angle and the seer from the external world angle and it is also a relative seer. Every individual consists of these three seers, one absolute and two relative seers. When the individual uses the word ‘I’ it can refer to any one of these three depending upon the context. As far as the lay people are concerned, they do not know the *sākṣī* by itself and therefore they generally use the word for the relative seer, whereas when the wise people say, “*aham brahma asmi*”, they are referring to the absolute seer. Thus the word ‘I’ can refer to any one of the seers. These three seers cannot be physically separated and it requires a probing enquiry. Only with the help of an enquiry supported by the *śāstram* we come to know these three seers. Having introduced the three seers in the first five verses, the author is talking about the formation and function of these three seers from the verse 6 up to the 12th verse. As we saw in the last class, *sākṣī*, the original seer need not be formed because the *sākṣī* ever is. The *sākṣī*’s function is unique. It does not function willfully in the form of an action. *Sākṣī* functions by its mere presence. That function is blessing the mind with reflected consciousness. That blessing the mind with *cidābhāsa* is a function of *sākṣī* without doing. When I stand in front of a mirror, I lend my reflection to the mirror. This lending is not a will-based, thoughtful, deliberate action. In my presence the reflection is formed in the mirror. The mirror has the capacity to receive the reflection. Objects that do not have this capacity cannot form my reflection not because of any will on my part. Similarly the function of the *sākṣī* is to lend the reflection of consciousness to the mind. This is not an event in time. The mind with the reflected consciousness becomes a seer. Without the *cidābhāsa* the mind can never be the seer similar to the moon never being an illuminator without the sunlight. With the lending function of the *sākṣī*, the seer-mind is ‘formed’. It should be noted that this is not an event happening in time. Once the seer-mind is formed with borrowed consciousness, the mind chooses to bless the sense-organs including the *golakam*, namely the physical body with *cidābhāsa*. The whole physical body is the *golakam* for the sense-organs. With the blessing of the mind, the sense-organs become another relative

seer. The formed seer-sense-organs start sensing sound, touch, forms and colors, taste and smell and this forms our experience in the waking state. The moment we wake up, transactions start due to the three seers.

Even though not necessary for the flow of discussion, the author then talked about the relationship of the mind with the body, the *cidābhāsa*, and the *cit* or *sākṣī*. The mind-body relationship is maintained by *karma*, especially the *prārabdha karma*. The relationship ends when the *prārabdha karma* is exhausted. Then the mind quits the body and does not bless the body with *cidābhāsa* anymore resulting in the death of the body. The mind-*cidābhāsa* relationship is eternally present because wherever the mind goes *sākṣī* is present and *sākṣī* by its mere presence will bless the mind with reflected consciousness (RC). *Cidābhāsa*-free mind never exists. Even during the dissolution of the universe, when the mind is in potential form, the *cidābhāsa* will be present in potential form. The mind-*sākṣī* relationship is non-existent. The relationship between the mind and the *cidābhāsa* is possible because both belong to the empirical reality. The mind and the *cit* or *sākṣī* belong to two different orders of reality, mind belongs to empirical reality or is *mithyā*, but *sākṣī* is absolute reality or *satyaṃ*. Even though no relationship is possible a relationship is made out of confusion or ignorance. This is *adhyāsa*. Śaṅkarācārya, in *Adhyāsa-bhāṣya*, his introduction to *Brahma Sūtra*, discusses *adhyāsa* using the example of rope-snake. When someone says, ‘This is snake’ on looking at a rope in dim light, ‘this is’ refers to the rope and ‘snake’ refers to something that is not there and so false. The real rope and a false snake can never have any connection. The real and the unreal can never have any connection but we still make the statement in which the real and the unreal are mixed up. Mixing the non-mixable is confusion. Similarly, the ‘I’ referring to the real ‘I’, absolute truth, and the mind and the sense-organs, empirical truth, should never be connected but I make that connection and say, ‘I am born, I am growing old’, etc. Thus the connection between the mind and the *sākṣī* is based on *adhyāsa*. This connection, based on confusion, will continue as long as the confusion continues and the moment the confusion goes, the absolute seer will be identified with and the non-connection with the relative seers, mind and the sense-organs will be understood. Thus the *jñāni*, by this understanding, can say that he does not have likes, dislikes, pride, jealousy, etc., and can claim that he is the limitless consciousness. When the mind is thus ‘disconnected’, the mind does not give problems anymore. Only when the connection with the mind is created, the mind gives problems. This is *saṃsāra*. The author will discuss this in detail later. Verses 8 and 9 are the seed or foundation verses for that discussion.

### **Verse 10**

*ahaṅkāralaye suptau bhaveddeho'pyacetanaḥ |*

*ahaṅkāravikāsārdhaḥ svapnaḥ sarvastu jāgaraḥ || 10||*

Now the author talks about the function of seer 2, the mind, in a little more detail. The mind has three states of experience called *avasthā-trayam*. When the mind is totally passive it is in *susupti-avasthā*. When the mind is partially active meaning that the mind does not use the sense-organs, it is in *svapna-avasthā*. In this state, based on past experiences, the mind projects an inner world called dream for

which the sense-organs are not required. The mind is active enough to project an inner world but not active enough to make use of the sense-organs. In this state, the mind does not contact the external world. The dream world has sufficient reality to disturb the mind. The mind is partially active with the *vāsanā* part only. When the mind becomes fully operational and active using the sense-organs, seer 2 taking the support of seer 1, the mind does not experience the internal world, but it experiences the external world. When the mind is fully active, that state is called the *jāgrat-avasthā*. The mind has this *avasthā-trayam* and therefore it is clear that the *sākṣī* does not have *avasthā-trayam*. In *sūṣupti* the mind is fully resolved. In *svapna* the mind is partially active with *vāsanās* operating. Waking, dream and deep sleep continue in a cyclic manner. Death is only a relatively longer sleep because the mind goes into a passive state during that time. The mind exists in death. Can the mind dream after death? No, because the mind requires a body for dreaming. Only in a body, waking and dream states are possible. During the dissolution of the universe, the mind continues to exist in a deep sleep like state called the causal state and in the next creation, the mind takes birth with all its *karmas*. This cycle will go on and on and will end only at the time of *videhamukti* when the individual mind merges into the total mind. When the mind goes to sleep, the body cannot borrow consciousness fully from the mind and the body becomes as though dead. When the mind is actively present, the body is alive. When the mind is absent, the body is dead. When the mind is passively present, the body is as though dead. The body is not aware of its condition in that state.

Thus the function of the mind is explained, which is that the mind goes through three states of experience. The function of the sense-organs has also been explained, which is assisting the mind during the waking state. The function of the body is assisting the mind during the waking state. Thus the functions of the *sākṣī*, the mind, the sense-organs, the body, and three states, i.e., the whole individual, have been explained. The mechanism of life has been explained. Any experience that an individual has can be explained by this paradigm. The entire phenomenon of life and death can thus be explained. It is a very beautiful paradigm that is comprehensive.

### **Verse 11**

***antaḥkaraṇavṛttiśca citicchāyaikyamāgatā |***

***vāsanāḥ kalpayet svapne bodhe'kṣairviṣayān bahiḥ || 11 ||***

Here the author comes to another part of the system that he has left out. A particular aspect of the system was introduced earlier but has not been discussed. This is based on verse 6. There it was said that the mind has two parts. One is the material part, *dravyaamśa* and the other is the thought part, *vṛtti amśa*. It is similar to the lake and the waves. Waves are part of the lake but they are as though separate because they rise and fall. The author has not talked about the *vṛtti* part so far. What is the job of the thought? Thoughts, being part of the mind, are inert by themselves and subject to the three *guṇas*. The thoughts do not have any power to illumine any object by themselves. Thoughts get that power when they borrow consciousness from the *sākṣī* just as the mind borrows reflected consciousness. Just like the lake has the reflected sunlight, the waves also have the reflected sunlight. Both the mind and the thoughts have the

capacity to borrow consciousness directly from the *sākṣī*. Every thought has reflected consciousness. This thought plus reflected consciousness alone is called cognition or knowledge, or experience. Every experience, knowledge, cognition or memory requires not just the mind but the thought also. It is called *vr̥tti-jñānam*, thought plus RC. *Vr̥tti-jñānam* determines the quality of life and thus plays an important role, which the author explains in this verse.

## **DDV-06 = 11 and 12**

### **Verse 10**

*ahaṅkāralaye suptau bhaveddeho'pyacetanaḥ |*

*ahaṅkāravikāsārdhaḥ svapnaḥ sarvastu jāgaraḥ || 10||*

In the first five verses, the author introduced the three-fold seers, the sense-organs, seer 1, the mind, seer 2 and the *sākṣī*, seer 3. Every individual is a mixture of these three components put together. Then from verse 6, the author talks about the formation and function of these three seers. *Sākṣī*, as the seer, is never formed in time and is always there as the seer. By its mere presence it lends consciousness to the mind and the mind becomes the seer. The mind lends consciousness to the sense-organs and sense-organs become the seers. This is how the three seers are formed. The author then pointed out that the mind, seer 2, alone goes through the three-fold states of experience. *Avasthā-trayam* is the function of the mind and does not belong to the *sākṣī*. When the mind is totally passive, that state is called the deep sleep state in which no experience takes place except one experience that there is no experience. The experience of the absence of experience is the only experience registered in the passive mind. When the mind expands partially, that state is called the dream state. In this intermediary state, the mind projects an inner world out of its own registered *vāsanās*. The mind does not gather any fresh experience in this state. *Vāsanās*, registered in the *cittam* in the form of memories are replayed, and at that time, the mind is partially active because it does not use the sense-organs, and does not experience an external world. When the mind expands and functions fully, the mind uses the seer 1, the sense-organs, that join the mind, and the mind along with the sense-organs experiences the external world. This is called the waking state. Thus the three states of experience belongs to the mind, seer 2. As far as the sense-organs are concerned, their function is that they join the mind in the waking state. The mind functions in both the waking and the dream states. The sense-organs, along with the mind, functions in the waking state only. Therefore assisting the mind in the waking state is the function of the sense-organs, seer 1. The sense-organs do not play this role in the dream and the deep sleep states. The three states of experience have thus been explained.

Previously, the author divided the mind into two parts in verse 6. Those two parts are the substantial mind, called *ahaṅkāra* and the thought part of the mind, called *antaḥkaraṇam*. These are the *dravyaamśa* and *vr̥tti amśa* similar to the lake and its waves. Imagine the mind as the lake and the

thoughts as the waves. The mind exists in all the three states of experience but the thoughts rise and fall. During the deep sleep state, the thoughts are almost zero when the mind is as though non-existent. In the dream state, some thoughts are present and in the waking state many thoughts are present. What is the function of the thought part of the mind? That function is discussed in verse 11.

### Verse 11

*antaḥkaraṇavṛttiśca citicchāyaikyamāgatā |*

*vāsanāḥ kalpayet svapne bodhe'kṣairviṣayān bahiḥ || 11 ||*

First the author points out that the thought part is also inert by itself because thoughts are parts of the mind and the mind is a product of the five elements, which are inert. The moon does not shine by itself but it becomes luminous by borrowing the sunlight. Similarly the thoughts have the power to borrow consciousness directly from the *sākṣī caitanyam*. This borrowed consciousness is called *cidābhāsa*. The *sākṣī* simultaneously illumines the mind and the thoughts. The *sākṣī* simultaneously forms the reflection in the mind and in the thoughts. As even the thought arises it arises with *cidābhāsa* only. Every rising thought is called *vṛtījñānam*. *Vṛtījñānam* is a technical name given to every thought that is born along with the reflected consciousness (RC). Every sentient thought is called a cognition or an experience. Experience is not the name of the pure thought or the pure consciousness but is the name of the mixture of thought plus the RC. As even the thought arises, it forms the reflection of consciousness and this thought along with the RC is the experience. When you experience anything, the relevant thought arises and the RC is formed in the thought and the experience is known. The author now discusses the function of this thought or cognition.

In the deep sleep state, the thoughts are minimal, almost zero, and therefore there are no experiences in that state. There is total blankness. We say that thoughts are minimal and not zero because there is a very subtle thought present in deep sleep. The very blankness of the deep sleep state is an experience. The absence of experience is also an experience. For example, when it is said that there is no book in the hand, the absence of the book is experienced. This experience can be recollected later which means that the experience of the absence of the book also required a thought. The absence of experience in deep sleep has to be registered in the form of an experience and therefore it requires a *vṛtti*. That *vṛtti* is called *avidyā vṛtti*, *kāraṇa-sārīra vṛtti*, *nidrā vṛtti*, etc. In deep sleep, the thoughts are minimal but not totally absent. There is a thought registering the blankness. As seen in *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*, the waker is able to recollect the experience of the absence of experiences in deep sleep.

*rāhugrastadivākarendusadrśo māyāsamācchādanāt*

*sanmātraḥ karaṇopasaṃharaṇato yo'bhūtsusuptaḥ pumān |*

*prāgasvāpsamiti prabodhasamaye yaḥ pratyabhijñāyate*



*tasmai śrīgurumūrtaye nama idaṃ śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtaye ॥6॥*

That *vṛtti* registering the absence is in the deep sleep state.

In the dream state, the thoughts are generated from our own past experiences registered in memory. Out of the activated *vāsanās*, a subjective universe is projected. These *vāsanās* are registered in the memory in the waking state, some more recently, and some in the distant past including previous births and creations. Thus the dream experience is created by the thought part of the mind.

In the waking state, the thoughts go out through the sense-organs like the light beam from a flash light and illumine the external world. The mind material, *dravyam* is the ‘light source’ and the thought, *vṛtti* is the ‘light beam’. Five such *vṛttis* come out through the sense-organs as noted in *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*.

*nānācchidraghaṭodarasthitamahādīpaprabhā bhāsvaram  
jñānaṃ yasya tu cakṣurādikaraṇadvārā vahiḥ spandate ।  
jānāmīti tameva bhāntamanubhātyetatsamastam jagat  
tasmai śrīgurumūrtaye nama idaṃ śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtaye ॥4॥*

Whatever is in the field of these *vṛttis* is registered and experienced by the mind and thus the objective external world is experienced. The external world is experienced only because of *vṛttis*. *Vṛttis* are responsible for the subjective world in dream and the objective external world in waking. Once the *vṛttis* are dissolved the world is not experienced. When the mind goes blank, the world may be very much present but it is not experienced. *Vṛttis* are responsible for the world that we experience. The three-fold world, i.e., no world, internal world and external world are experienced because of *vṛttis*. The thought part of the mind also functions by its association with *cidābhāsa*. Thought associated with the RC registers the absence of experience in deep sleep, activates the *vāsanās* in dream projecting an internal world of experience, and in waking, projects an external world of experience with the help of the sense-organs.

A technical question comes up. One can say that the internal world is projected by the thought. But can one say that the external world is also projected by thought? This would mean that when the thoughts are not present, the world would become non-existent. The external world is not projected by my thought but it is created by the Lord already, and so, how can the author say that the external world is created by my thoughts? The world projection by one’s thoughts alone is the subjective idealism of Buddhism. Here the author seems to say that the external world is projected through the sense-organs by thoughts. How are we to understand this? By making a difference between the *Īśvara*-created world and the thought-created world. The former is called *Īśvara-sṛṣṭi* and the latter is called *jīva-sṛṣṭi*. *Īśvara* has created an external world already but that external world does not create any problem for me. Whereas when my thoughts perceive the external world, and I relate with the external world and develop likes or dislikes, then that part of the world with which I develop *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra* is capable of giving me joy or sadness, which is *samsāra*. The intrinsically non-hurting or non-pleasing objects of the world

are the observed world but the hurting or pleasing objects are the experienced world. The observed world is the *Īśvara-sṛṣṭi* and the experienced world is the result of converting *Īśvara-sṛṣṭi* into objects of pleasure and pain. This conversion happens because of *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra* and that alone is *samsāra*. Therefore thoughts are responsible for the creation of the experienced world. That experienced world is the creation of the *vṛttis* or thoughts of the *jīva*. Vidyāranya discusses this elaborately in *dvaita-vivekaprakaraṇam* in *Pañcadaśī*. In this verse, the author is talking about the *jīva*'s creation, the experienced world, which is created by thoughts. *Mokṣa* is reducing the experienced universe into the observed universe by the elimination of *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra*. Then, the relative pleasure and pain will go away. A *jñāni* is described by Kṛṣṇa in the *Bhagavad Gītā* (12:13): *nirmamo nirahaṅkāraḥ samaduḥkhasukhaḥ kṣamī*; *who is free from 'mine'-notion, free from 'I'-notion, same in comfort as well as discomfort, and forbearing.*

Vedānta is not an academic exercise but an intellectual transformation, which should change my perspective such that even my own relations should be seen as *Īśvara*'s property. This is freedom from 'I' and 'mine'. This is the only option for liberation. Removing *ahaṅkāra* and *mamakāra* by seeing everything as *Īśvara*'s property is the only method for liberation.

### Verse 12

*mano'haṅkṛtyupādānaṃ liṅgamekaṃ jaḍātmakam |*  
*avasthātrayamanveti jāyate mriyate tathā || 12||*

Here the author adds an incidental information which is required for further development. Until now the mind that has the substantial and the thought portions had been discussed. This two-fold mind is a part of the parent body called subtle body, which is the material cause of the mind. The subtle body is the invisible body behind the visible, live physical body. The subtle body consists of the five organs of knowledge, five organs of action, five-fold physiological systems called *prāna* along with the mind and thought. All these together is one unit. So it can also be said that the subtle body has three states of experience. Previously it was said that the three states of experience belong to the mind and here it is said that the three states of experience belong to the subtle body.

The mind-thought part has a parent body, which is called the subtle body. It is one unit and inert by itself but becomes sentient because of reflected consciousness. This subtle body alone goes through the three states of experience. The author adds another important information in this verse. At the time of death, the physical body alone is destroyed. The subtle body survives. Previously it was said that consciousness, *sākṣī*, continues to survive even after the fall of the body. But here it is said that the subtle body also survives the death of the physical body.

## **DDV-07 = 12 and 13**

### **Verse 12**

*mano'hañkṛtyupādānaṃ liṅgamekaṃ jaḍātmakam ।  
avasthātrayamanveti jāyate mriyate tathā ॥ 12॥*

After introducing the three-fold seers, which are the integral part of the individual, the author talked about the formation and function of all these three seers, the sense-organs, the mind and the *sākṣī*. *Sākṣī*, by its mere presence blesses the mind with *cidābhāsa* and the mind with the *cidābhāsa* becomes the seer blessing the sense-organs. Thereafter, the mind, the seer alone goes through the three states of experience. A fully passive mind experiences deep sleep, a partially active-passive mind experiences dream and the fully active mind experiences waking. When the mind is fully active, sense-organs join the mind. They do not stay as separate seer. The mind and the sense-organs together experience the waking state. Then the author said that when one talks about the mind, one should remember both parts of the mind, the substantial part and the thought part. Both of them receive *cidābhāsa* and together go through the three states of experience. What we call life is nothing but the mind constantly going through one state of experience or the other. In one state, the mind experiences the external world and in another state, the mind experiences the internal world and in between these two experiences there is temporary rest. The author then adds a point in the 12th verse. Not only the mind goes through these three states, the very same mind goes to the next birth also. This mind is a part of the bigger parent body called the subtle body, which enlivens the gross body. The subtle body has seventeen parts and the mind happens to be one of the important components of the subtle body. The subtle body along with the mind, at the time of death, leaves the physical body and takes another physical body and goes through the three states of experience. Thus the seer 1, the sense-organs and the seer 2, the mind, in the form of the subtle body, travel from body to body. The seer 3, *sākṣī*, does not travel, need not travel and cannot travel because *sākṣī* is all-pervading and available all over. When it is said that the *jīvātma* travels from one *loka* to another, the travel refers to the seer 1 and seer 2 components, i.e., the sense-organs and the mind, the ego *jīvātma*, and not the *sākṣī*. This is referred to in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*This (self) is never born; nor does it die. It is not that, having been, it ceases to exist again. It is unborn, eternal, undergoes no change whatsoever, and is ever new. When the body is destroyed, the self is not destroyed. (2:20)*

Vedānta is nothing but shifting from seer 1 and seer 2 and claiming oneself to be the seer 3, *sākṣī*. Until that shift take place, the cycle of birth and death will continue. The mind-sense-organs bundle called the subtle body goes through the three states of experience when the individual is alive and after death it leaves and takes another birth. Death is the dissociation of the subtle body from the physical body and birth is the association of the subtle body with the physical body. The *sākṣī* never leaves or goes anywhere just like space not vacating the house when the occupants of the house vacate the house. The cycle of birth and death has been going on from beginning-less time and will go on endlessly unless the individual gets *jñānam*. With this verse, the author concludes the discussion of the formation and function of the three seers. Hereafter the author gets into the main topic of the text, namely the cause of *saṃsāra* and its remedy.

### **Verse 13**

***śaktidvayaṃ hi māyāyā vikṣepāvrttirūpakam |  
vikṣepaśaktirliṅgādibrahmāṇḍāntaṃ jagat sṛjet || 13||***

From this verse up to verse 21, the analysis of the cause of *saṃsāra* and the remedy is done. The author wishes to establish that ignorance is the cause of *saṃsāra*. The self-ignorance of one's own composition, i.e., that one is a mixture of three seers, two are *mithyā* and one is *satyaṃ*, and that *satya sākṣī* is one's own real nature, is the cause of the *saṃsāra* problem. Who or what is responsible for this ignorance? The author points out that *māyā* is responsible. Once the topic of *māyā* comes, the topic of *Īśvara* and creation come into the picture. Therefore the topic of creation is briefly presented so that *māyā* can be introduced. Then, *māyā* leading to ignorance, and ignorance causing the *saṃsāra* problem can be discussed. Creation, *māyā*, ignorance and *saṃsāra* is the order of analysis. Since the presentation of this analysis in the text is very brief, a general introduction is now given.

What is creation? Creation can be defined as the production of an effect or a product from a cause. When an effect is produced out of a cause what happens exactly? What is the mechanism? The words cause, effect, etc., are normally used very loosely. Take the example of a potter making a variety of earthenware, like pot, jug, etc., out of a lump of clay. Clay is said to be the cause and the varieties of earthenware are said to be the effect. We say that the potter has produced, created or made many pots. The author asks the question: when one says that the potter created the earthenware, what has the potter created? On enquiry we find that the potter has not produced or created anything at all. In fact, nobody can create anything. Matter can never be created or destroyed. Thus the potter has not produced even an ounce of matter. He has not produced any substance at all. Previously there was clay and now also there is only clay alone. Then why do we say that the potter has created a pot? Then we come to know that the meaning of the word 'creation' is nothing but adding a shape to the already existing clay. The potter

cannot and does not produce anything and all his efforts are to add a shape to the wet clay. Before shaping, there was only clay and after shaping also there is only clay. Before the shaping it is called clay. When the shape is given, the very same clay is given a new name, pot. What has the potter done? He has not produced anything. He has given *arūpam*, shape and in keeping with the shape, a new *nāma* has been given, either pot or jug or plate or lid, etc. Addition of varieties of *nāma-rūpa* is called creation, not production of substance. Addition of configuration to a substance is called creation. Cause plus addition of *nāma-rūpa* is creation. Clay plus *nāma-rūpa* is equal to earthenware. Gold plus *nāma-rūpa* is equal to ornaments. Wood plus *nāma-rūpa* is equal to furniture. Cause plus addition of *nāma-rūpa* is called 'production' of an effect. This is lesson number 1.

Now we will go to next lesson. It was said that the potter does not produce anything but that he gives only shape. The next question that is asked is from where does the shape come. Where does the potter bring the shape from? The shape is not added by the potter. All shapes are already present in the clay itself. The spherical clay has all the geometrical shapes in potential form. Spherical shape is nothing but all the shapes in unmanifest form. Clay contains all the names and forms of earthenware in potential condition, called *avyaktanāma-rūpa*. The potter does not do anything to the substance, clay, but only brings the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* into manifestation. Nothing is produced including the *nāma-rūpa*. Substance plus unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* is called the cause. The same substance plus the manifest *nāma-rūpa* is called the effect. What is the benefit of the efforts of the potter? He has neither created the clay nor has he created *nāma-rūpa*. He has only changed the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* into manifest *nāma-rūpa*. This *nāma-rūpa* transformation is called creation. Creation is the manifestation of *nāma-rūpa* upon the substance, which substance remains the same before and after the manifestation. This is lesson number 2.

What about the creation of the universe ? The universe must also be a basic substance with the manifest *nāma-rūpa*. If the universe is a created substance, a product or an effect, it must also be a substance with manifest *nāma-rūpa*. Before the production of the universe, the basic substance must have existed with unmanifest *nāma-rūpa*. The universe in the current condition is one basic substance with infinite *nāma-rūpa*. The basic substance cannot be created by any one including God. Nothing can be created by anyone including God. Gauḍapāda establishes this principle in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Therefore, the basic substance must have been present with the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa*. What is that basic substance, *mūla-vastu*? What is the truth of this universe? Vedānta calls that basic substance, Brahman. Just as clay is the basic substance from the standpoint of earthenware, from the standpoint of the whole creation including the five elements, time, etc., the basic substance is Brahman. What is the nature of that substance? It is *sat-cit-ānanda*. Pure existence and pure consciousness which is limitless. Limitless existence-consciousness is the basic substance which was present before creation and is present after creation also. Now we have the basic substance with varieties of manifest *nāma-rūpa*. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (6.1) says that everything in this world may be classified into names, forms and actions. The manifest *nāma-rūpa* has appropriate function. In fact, the *nāma* is given to refer to whatever the function of the *rūpa* is. What is the universe? It is Brahman plus manifest *nāma-rūpa*. Before the creation Brahman must have been present with the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa*. Brahman plus the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* is the cause and

Brahman plus the manifest *nāma-rūpa* is the effect. The technical name for the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa*, which is located upon Brahman, is *māyā*. Brahman plus the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa māyā* is the cause and Brahman plus the manifest *nāma-rūpa māyā* is the effect. To differentiate Brahman plus the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa*, the cause, and Brahman plus the manifest *nāma-rūpa*, the effect, two distinct names are given. Brahman plus the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa māyā* is called *Īśvara*. Brahman plus *māyā* is *Īśvara*. Brahman plus the manifest *nāma-rūpa* is called *jagat*, universe. Brahman continues to be present all the time without having any transformation at any time. During *sṛṣṭi*, *sthiti* and *pralaya*, Brahman is Brahman. The substance, Brahman, continues to be the same always. The *nāma-rūpa* that is upon that Brahman goes through the unmanifest and manifest conditions. Conversion of unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* into manifest *nāma-rūpa* is creation. Conversion of manifest *nāma-rūpa* into unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* is dissolution. This goes on and on. Kṛṣṇa describes this process in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*At the beginning of the day, all things that are manifest arise from the unmanifest. At the beginning of the night, they resolve in that alone which is called the unmanifest. (8:18)*

There is only Brahman. In one condition it is called *Īśvara* and in another condition it is called *jagat*.

The author says that this *māyā*, which is nothing but unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* and located in Brahman is also known by the name *brahma-śakti*. This *māyā* is known by the name, *śakti*. Any *śakti* or power cannot exist independently. It has to exist in some substance. For example, the speaking power cannot exist separately from the person that has the power. *Māyā-śakti* rests in Brahman depending on Brahman for its very existence. This *māyā-śakti* has two powers. One is the *vikṣepa-śakti*, the power to manifest, the power that converts the unmanifest to the manifest condition. *Vikṣepa* means ‘throwing out’ or ‘projecting’. The manifestation of the universe is in the hands of the *vikṣepa-śakti* of *māyā*, which rests on Brahman. The second power is *āvaraṇa-śakti*, the power of covering or veiling the truth. First the *vikṣepa-śakti* of *Īśvara* starts functioning at the time of creation. *Īśvara* is not affected by the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā*. When the *vikṣepa-śakti* is operating, all the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* gets manifested. All the universes and the individual *jīvas* are thrown out. Once the *jīvas* and the *jagat* come into manifestation, the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā* becomes active and because of that, every *jīva* is ignorant of the basic truth that everything is Brahman plus *nāma-rūpa* and that the *jīva* is also Brahman plus *nāma-rūpa*. This is called *ajñānam* and the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā* is called *ajñānam*. This self-ignorance leads to the fear of mortality, which is *saṃsāra*. Self-knowledge is the solution for this *saṃsāra*. The foregoing will be dealt with elaborately in verses 13 to 21.

## **DDV-08 = 13 to 15**

### **Verse 13**

*śaktidvayaṃ hi māyāyā vikṣepāvṛtirūpakam |  
vikṣepaśaktirliṅgādibrahmāṇḍāntaṃ jagat sṛjet || 13||*

From this 13th verse, the author talks about the cause for human bondage and the remedy. He points out that ignorance regarding one's own nature is the cause of the bondage. This ignorance is caused by the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā*. To explain the origin of ignorance the author enters the creation topic even though it is not the main subject matter of the text. Brahman is the cause of the universe and the universe is the effect. The emergence of the effect from the cause is creation. Brahman is of the nature of *sat-cit-ānanda*. Thereafter we saw that any product is nothing but *nāma-rūpa* and does not exist substantially. Thus the world is nothing but *nāma-rūpa*. This world *nāma-rūpa* should have existed in Brahman in potential form before creation because what is in potential form alone can come into manifestation because of the law that nothing can be created or destroyed. The unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* is called *māyā*. This *māyā* has two powers, *vikṣepa-śakti* and *āvaraṇa-śakti*. At the time of creation, the *vikṣepa-śakti* operates and the *āvaraṇa-śakti* does not operate at the cosmic level. *Īśvara* is not affected by the *āvaraṇa-śakti*. The *karmas* of the *jīvas* determine the time of creation. During dissolution all the *sañcita-karma* are dormant. When a portion of the *sañcita-karma* of the entire cosmos is ready to fructify as the *prārabdha-karma*, the *vikṣepa-śakti* of *māyā* becomes operational. The *vikṣepa-śakti* makes the unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* into the manifest *nāma-rūpa*. All the five elements, fourteen *lokas*, the gross bodies, and the subtle bodies, which are all non-substantial *nāma-rūpa* come into manifestation. There is only one substance behind all the *nāma-rūpa*. That original substance, which is the only substance behind the non-substantial *nāma-rūpa*, is Brahman. *Vikṣepa-śakti* will operate until the creation of the individual *jīva* consisting of the three seers.

When the *jīva* uses the word 'I' to refer to himself it does not refer to any single seer because these three seers are inseparably together in an individual. If *sākṣī* alone is present, it can never say, 'I'. *Sākṣī*

cannot say, 'I' because it does not have a mind to think and it does not have a mouth to speak. The mind by itself cannot say, 'I', because the sense-organs are required to utter the word. The mouth by itself cannot say, 'I' because the mouth has to be backed by the mind and *sākṣī*. The one that says, 'I' is a mixture of all the three seers. The composite entity of seer 1 plus seer 2 plus seer 3 says the word 'I'. How should I understand? I should understand that I am a composite entity consisting of seer 1, seer 2 and seer 3. Of these three, seer 1 and seer 2 are the products of *māyā* because the *vikṣepa-śakti* produced the sense-organs and the mind. When I say, 'I', I should be aware that the mouth (seer 1) that says the word and the mind (seer 2) that has the thought corresponding to that word are non-tangible *nāma-rūpa* produced by *māyā* and therefore come under the *mithyā* category. Thus I have a *mithyā* component. Śaṅkarācārya calls this *anṛta-aṃśa* (unreal part) in his *Adhyāsabhāṣyam*. Seer 3 is not *anāma-rūpa* product born out of *māyā*'s *vikṣepa śakti* or *māyā*, but it is Brahman itself. That seer 3 is the *satya-aṃśa*, the real part of mine. Thus I am a mixture of real and unreal parts. Does the real part say, 'I' or the unreal part say, 'I'? Who says, '*aham brahma asmi*'? Who says, 'I'? The unreal part can never say by itself because it cannot exist by itself. The real part can exist by itself but the real part cannot think or speak and so *sākṣī*, by itself cannot say, '*aham brahma asmi*'. The one that says, 'I' is the mixture of the real and the unreal parts. What should be understood is: I have two parts. One is the *mithyā* part. The *mithyā* part is useful for transaction. It has empirical reality. Since the *mithyā* part is unreal, I should not claim it as the real 'I'. I have a higher, real 'I' part, which transcends all transactions as defined in the *mantra 7* of the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. That real 'I' is none other than the *satya Brahma aṃśa*. If I know this truth that I have these two components, a *mithyā* part subject to arrival and departure and a real part which is eternal, I will have no *samsāra*. That right knowledge will allow me to accept all the temporary conditions of the *mithyā* part and not be affected by them and thus not have *samsāra*. The author says that the individual does not know his composition and that he is a mixture of *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. Further the individual does not know which is *satyaṃ* and which is *mithyā* and expects immortality out of the mortal body. Thus there is a lot of confusion because of the ignorance regarding the *satya-anṛta* composition of the individual. Why does the individual not know this? This ignorance is due to the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā*. After the *jīvas* are created, the *āvaraṇa-śakti* starts operating and covers the *jīva* with the concealing power. There is no concealment for *Īśvara* at the macro level. *Āvaraṇa-śakti* operates only at the *jīva* level. Instead of claiming the real 'I' the *sākṣī*, the individual claims the unreal mind and sense-organs and mistakes himself to be those and takes that identity as real, and expects perfection at that level. *Karma* controls that level and the individual can never be the master. As seer 1 and seer 2, the individual can never be a master but be only a slave of *prārabdha-karma*. As long as the individual takes himself to be the *mithyā* part, he will have problems. Seer 1 and seer 2 can never be saved from *karma*. The body can never be saved from *karma* in any birth. Instead of trying to rescue seer 1 and seer 2, one should dis-identify from them, not claim them as the real 'I', but elevate oneself to the level of seer 3. Śaṅkarācārya refers to this in the *Ātmaśatkaṃ*:

*I am not the mind, the intellect, the ego or the memory,  
I am not the senses of hearing, taste, smell, or sight,  
I am not space, not earth, not fire, or wind,  
I am the form of limitless consciousness,  
I am the eternal Śiva, I am the eternal Śiva. (1)*



That is called *jñānam*. *Ajñānam* and the consequent mix-up is the cause of *saṃsāra*. *Jñānam* and the subsequent elevation is called *mokṣa*. This is the topic from verse 13 to 21.

In the verse, the author says that there is a principle called *māyā*, which is located in Brahman. Unmanifest *nāma-rūpa* is *māyā* and it is unreal. Pure existence and consciousness is Brahman, which is real. This unreal *nāma-rūpa māyā* has two-fold powers, projecting power and veiling power. At the time of creation, at the level of *Īśvara*, only the projecting power operates and projects the universe consisting of the individuals and the entire cosmos. Then at the individual level, the concealing power of *māyā* operates and covers the truth about the creation and oneself from the individual. This is very similar to the dream of an individual. In dream, the individual's *snidrā-śakti* operates. *Nidrā-śakti* also has the same two powers. The projecting power projects the dream out of the individual's *vāsanās* and the veiling power conceals the truth of the dream from the dreaming individual.

#### **Verse 14**

*sṛṣṭirnāma brahmarūpe saccidānandavastuni |*

*abdhau phenādivat sarvanāmarūpapasāraṇā || 14||*

In the previous verse, it was said that the *vikṣepa-śakti* creates the world. The author gives more details in this verse. The creation is nothing but the manifesting of *nāma-rūpa* and not a production of even an ounce of matter. Nobody including God can create matter. 'Matter cannot be created or destroyed' is a universal law that even God cannot violate. Then, how did God create? God did not create! Nothing is created. Even the *nāma-rūpa* existed in potential form. Only the manifestation of *nāma-rūpa* is done by the *vikṣepa-śakti*. It is like the bubbles, waves and froth in the oceanic water. These are not substances but only forms. The wind causes the manifestation of these forms in the ocean. If the creation is only *nāma-rūpa*, that *nāma-rūpa* requires a substance on which it is present. That substance is Brahman. The creation *nāma-rūpa* is resting on only one substance, which is called Brahman. What is the nature of Brahman? Brahman is independently existing and the *nāma-rūpa* is dependently existing. The desk *nāma-rūpa* depends on wood for its existence. Wood can exist independent of the desk whereas the desk depends on wood for its existence. Similarly, *nāma-rūpa* depends on Brahman for its existence but Brahman does not depend on *nāma-rūpa* for its existence. So *nāma-rūpa* is *mithyā* and Brahman is *satyaṃ*. Brahman's nature is *sat-cit-ānanda*. *Sat* means existence, *cit* means consciousness and *ānanda* means *ananta*, meaning limitless. The translation of *ānanda* as happiness is not correct because happiness is an emotion that comes only after the minds are created but Brahman is prior to the mind. Limitless existence-consciousness is Brahman. The 'limitless' implies the following:

Pure existence-consciousness is not a part, product or property of matter; it exists independent of matter; it pervades and enlivens matter; it continues to survive even after the disintegration of matter; and the pure existence-consciousness without matter does exist but not available for transaction.

Pure consciousness cannot even say, 'I am pure consciousness' because that statement is a transaction. Transaction comes only when *nāma-rūpa* is present. What would the pure existence-consciousness be like? We all know that already. Whatever Vedānta teaches we have experienced. There is nothing mystical about Vedānta. Only people import mysticism into Vedānta. Non-transacting pure existence-consciousness is experienced in the deep sleep state. In the deep sleep state, all the *nāma-rūpa* is dissolved and we exist as existence-consciousness. In that state, we exist without claiming our existence, and we are consciousness without knowing that we are consciousness. That is pure *sat-cit-ātmā*. This is the condition at the dissolution of the creation also. Upon the *sat-cit* Brahman, all the names and forms are projected and that is called the waking and dream states of *Īśvara*. The dissolution of the universe is the deep sleep state of *Īśvara* and the creation of the universe is the waking and dream states of *Īśvara*. Thus we have all come in *Īśvara*'s dream. Who is that *Īśvara*? We are that *Īśvara*. But we do not know it due to *māyā*'s veiling power and that is discussed in the next verse.

### **Verse 15**

***antardṛgdrśyayorbhedam bahiṣca brahmasargayoḥ |  
āvṛṇotyaparā śaktiḥ sā saṃsārasya kāraṇam || 15||***

Due to the *vikṣepa-śakti*, the universe and I, the *jīva*, have manifested. The universe is a mixture of Brahman and *nāma-rūpa*. The world is *satyaṃ* plus *mithyā* and I also am *satyaṃ* plus *mithyā*. The body and mind are *mithyā* and *sākṣī* is *satyaṃ*. However, the *jīva* does not have the *satya-anṛta viveka* due to *āvaraṇa-śakti*. The other power of *māyā*, the *āvaraṇa-śakti*, covers the distinction between the *satyaṃ* part and the *mithyā* part. This covering is the cause of *saṃsāra*. Not knowing *mithyā* from *satyaṃ*, the *jīva* takes *mithyā* to be real and leans on it for security and experiences sorrow when unwanted things come and wanted things go.

## **DDV-09 = 15 to 18**

### **Verse 15**

*antardṛgdrśyayorbhedam bahiṣca brahmasargayoḥ |  
āvṛṇotyaparā śaktiḥ sā saṃsārasya kāraṇam || 15||*

In these verses beginning from the 13th verse up to the 21st verse, the author is talking about the cause of *saṃsāra* and also its remedy. As a part of this discussion, he introduced the *āvaraṇa-śakti* and *vikṣepa-śakti* of *māyā*. *Vikṣepa-śakti* is responsible for the creation of this world and *āvaraṇa-śakti* is responsible for covering the difference between *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. This covering takes place at two places. *Satya-mithyā* mixture is present at the individual level and at the external world level also. Because of *āvaraṇa-śakti*, the individual is unable to differentiate *satyaṃ* from *mithyā*. *Āvaraṇa-śakti* starts operating only after the arrival of the individual and not at the start of the creation. To understand this, our own dream is a good example. The dream has two powers, *vikṣepa-śakti* and *āvaraṇa-śakti*. When we go to sleep, *vikṣepa-śakti* takes over and an internal world is generated. Once the waker, when going to sleep, enters the dream world as the dream individual operating the dream body and experiencing the dream universe, the *āvaraṇa-śakti* starts operating and the dream individual does not know the dream as dream and the dream becomes a problem. If the *āvaraṇa-śakti* was not operating, the dreamer will have total knowledge and control of the dream, enjoy it and end the dream at will by waking up. Similarly for the waker individual also, the *āvaraṇa-śakti* covers the truth regarding what is *satyaṃ* and what is *mithyā* and is the cause of *saṃsāra*.

What does the *āvaraṇa-śakti* cover? The *āvaraṇa-śakti* covers the distinction between the mind and the *sākṣī caitanyam* at the internal individual level. The mind is the unreal part projected by *māyā* subject to arrival and departure. The *sākṣī caitanyam* is *satyaṃ* which always remains as the substratum. I, the *sākṣī*, am *satyaṃ* and the mind is a *mithyā vastu*. But I am not able to know the following differences and therefore I mistake myself to be the mind. The differences are: I am the observer and the mind is the

observed. I am the consciousness principle and the mind is inert. I am free from modifications and the mind is subject to modifications. I am *satyaṃ* and the mind is *mithyā*, *māyā*'s projection. Thus there are so many differences between the *sākṣī* and the mind, but I do not notice these differences because of the *āvaraṇa-śakti* of *māyā*.

The very same *āvaraṇa-śakti* causes confusion at the external level. Externally, the *āvaraṇa-śakti* covers the distinction between Brahman, the cause and the world, the effect. The differences between the cause and the effect are: Cause is the only substance and the effect is non-substantial *nāma-rūpa*. Cause exists in all three periods of time and the effect is impermanent, subject to arrival and departure. Cause is *satyaṃ* and the effect is *mithyā*. This cause-effect difference is also not noticed by the individual. Thus Brahman-world distinction is not known.

Not knowing the differences at the two levels is the cause of *saṃsāra*. We expect eternity from the non-eternal. The effect, the world, is non-eternal and it cannot give security. Brahman alone can give security but not knowing that we make a blunder in depending on the world for security. We expect support from people, objects and situations. All the suffering is because of expecting security from the insecure world and this is *saṃsāra*. The author will explain this hereafter.

### **Verse 16**

*sākṣīṇaḥpurato bhāti liṅgaṃ dehena saṃyutam |*

*citicchāyāsamāvesājīvaḥ syādvyaāvahārikaḥ || 16||*

Here the author explains the cause of *saṃsāra* due to two mistakes, one at the internal subjective level and the other at the external objective level. At the internal level, if I know that I am *sākṣī*, I will never require support from anyone because I will know that I am ever secure and full. When I do not know this fact, I make a self-misjudgment. First, I make the mistake that I require support. Second, I think that I am going to get that support from the world and so I seek support from the perishable people, possessions, power, etc. The first mistake is the subjective mistake and the second is the objective mistake and this leads to *saṃsāra*. The author is explaining this in a technical language.

I am the *sākṣī caitanyam* and the subtle body, especially the mind, is appearing as an object in front of me. That mind is associated with the gross body. The mind-body mixture is ever insecure. This mind-body complex can never have freedom and is always subject to time, place and *prārabdha-karma*. It is this body-mind complex that is called the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, *ahankāra*, doer, experiencer and *saṃsārī*. I, the *sākṣī*, lend reflected consciousness to the *jīva* and enliven it. This *jīva* does not have any freedom because the mind is affected by the sub-conscious, the unconscious and the latent impressions from prior births. As long as I identify with the body-mind complex, I will never have freedom. While living in the world, the mind has to go through the three states of experience. All the experiences associated with these states cannot be avoided. The body-mind complex cannot stop any of this because it is its nature. The only way to escape is to dis-identify from the body-mind complex and claim that I am the *sākṣī*. To

do that, I should know that I am not the mind. The reason that I do not this is because the *āvaraṇa-śakti* is concealing this truth.

### **Verse 17**

*asya jīvatvamāropāt sākṣīnyapyavabhāsate |*

*āvṛtau tu vinaṣṭyāṃ bhede bhāte'payāti tat || 17||*

Because of the ignorance of the fact that I am the *sākṣī* and the mind is an object different from me, I identify with the mind as though I am the mind and I am the body. How do I know that I am committing this mistake? Whenever the body has some problem I never say that the body has the problem but I say that I have the problem. Whenever the mind has any disturbance, I do not say that the mind is disturbed but I say that I am disturbed. This total identification leads to the status of a *samsārī*. The *samsāra* problem of the body-mind complex is wrongly superimposed on me the *sākṣī* even though I do not have those problems. This is called *dharma-adhyāsa*, transference of the properties of one object on to another object. The example given is the colorless crystal and a red flower. When the colorless crystal and the red flower are in close proximity, the red color of the flower is falsely transferred to the crystal and the crystal appears red. Suppose the observer starts cleaning the crystal to remove the red color, the color will not go because the color is due to false transference. Similarly all our problems are because of false transference. Instead of knowing the false transference as false, I go on trying to remove the problems, which will never go because they have been falsely transferred upon me. Not only that, but I keep complaining to God that my efforts are not giving results. God cannot solve these problems because I do not really have these problems. There is no solving the problems but only dissolving the problems by understanding. This is Vedānta.

Instead of trying to solve the problems, I should raise a question as to whether I have these problems. Ramana Maharshi asked the seekers who came to him with questions about their problems, 'Who has the problems?' The seeker will naturally say, 'I have the problem'. Then he will say, 'Who are you?' The answer will invariably display the confusion about one's identity and the superimposition of the body-mind complex on the *sākṣī*. Then Ramana will ask them to sort out that confusion and after the seeker does that, he will give the remedy. When such a line of enquiry is done, the problematic 'I' resolves. The ignorance is gone by *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. *Śravaṇam* is consistent and systematic study of the Vedāntic scriptures for a length of time under the guidance of a competent and live *ācārya*. *Śravaṇam* will raise a lot of questions. *Mananam* is the process by which all the questions and doubts are answered and cleared. When the ignorance is gone thus, the mind and body will continue, but the identification with the mind and body is gone. I, then, learn to detach from the body and the mind and remain as their *sākṣī*. I am not the mind. The mind is part of the world. The mind is subject to several problems. For some problems there are remedies. For many problems there are no remedies. I allow the body and the mind to go through the unavoidable choice-less problems reminding myself that I am neither the body nor the mind. I am the limitless *ātmā*, the *sākṣī*. That *ātmā* is always free. I do not need to work for the freedom of the body or the *sākṣī*. The body can never be free and the *sākṣī* was never

bound. What should I work for? I do not need to work for anything. I should learn to abide as the *sākṣī* and see everything as it is. This is called *samyak-darśanam*. When the difference between the *sākṣī* and the body-mind is clear and evident, the *saṃsāra* transferred from the body-mind ‘goes’. It is like when I understand the crystal as the ever clear crystal and the red flower as ever red, I will not transfer the redness to the crystal, even though the crystal will continue to appear red. The appearance of the red color will continue but in my intellect the crystal will be clear. Other examples are the sun appearing to rise and set, the earth appearing flat, and the earth appearing to be stationary. There is no change in the appearance but the change is in my understanding. Once this understanding is clear *saṃsāra* goes away.

### **Verse 18**

*tathāsargabrahmaṇośca bhedamāvrtya tiṣṭhati |*  
*yā śaktistadvaśādbrahma vikṛtatvena bhūstate || 18||*

Here the author says that because the confusion is at two levels the resolution has to be done at two levels. First confusion is that I require support. That confusion is resolved by understanding that I am the *sākṣī* through *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. The author does not talk about *nididhyāsanam* here because he will talk about *nididhyāsanam* exclusively later. In this verse, the author explains the confusion about the external world. When we look at the world there seems to one entity but there are actually two entities, Brahman and the world. The world and Brahman are mixed together. When a desk is looked at, one is looking at two things, one is the wood and the other is the desk. Wood is the substance and the desk is only *nāma-rūpa*, a non-substantial entity. But we mix up both of them and we think that the desk is a substance. Then we talk about the properties of the desk like weight, etc. Similarly we think that the world is substantial but the truth is that the world is only *nāma-rūpa* just like the desk. When we rely upon the non-substantial *nāma-rūpa* world we are in trouble because it is subject to change and destruction. The difference between the non-substantial world, which is hollow *nāma-rūpa*, and the substantial Brahman, which is the substance, is not known to us because the *āvaraṇa-śakti* covers that difference. Because of this confusion the non-changing Brahman falsely appears as the changing one. The changes of *nāma-rūpa* have been attributed to the non-changing Brahman because the non-changing Brahman is not known. Not only the changes of the *nāma-rūpa* world have been falsely transferred to the substantial Brahman, but the substantiality of Brahman has been transferred to the *nāma-rūpa* world. Once the substantiality of Brahman has been transferred to the non-substantial *nāma-rūpa*, the hollow *nāma-rūpa* world is mistaken to be substantial and real. When that mistake happens, I decide to lean upon the non-substantial world. It is similar to sitting on the non-substantial chair made of cardboard, which appears real. Therefore in the non-substantial world, I should not depend on any person, possession, or position but depend on only one thing, which is Brahman. Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*Those people who (see themselves as) non-separate from Me, recognizing Me, gain Me. For those who are always one with Me, I take care of what they want to acquire and protect. (9:22)*

Brahman alone is dependable. I have forgotten that and so I depend on the world. There is thus a mutual transference of the attributes of Brahman and the world to each other. This transference needs to be sorted out and then I can continue to see the world with the understanding that it is hollow. Handle the world, live in the world with the understanding that there is no essence in the world. Whenever the mind seeks security, I should depend upon that Brahman. Otherwise, life will be an eternal struggle.

## **DDV-10 = 18 to 20**

### **Verse 18**

*tathāsargabrahmaṇośca bhedamāvr̥tya tiṣṭhati |*  
*yā śaktistadvaśādbrahma vikṛtatvena bhāsate || 18||*

From the 13th verse, the author is talking about the cause of *saṃsāra* and the remedy for it. It is pointed out that the cause for *saṃsāra* is the *māyā-śakti* of Brahman, the creator, and this *māyā* has two-fold power, one is *vikṣepa-śakti* and the other is *āvaraṇa-śakti*. *Vikṣepa-śakti* has the power to create and the *āvaraṇa-śakti* has the power to conceal. *Vikṣepa-śakti* is beautiful and useful because it is responsible for the creation of this whole world, our bodies and minds. If we do not have the body and mind, we will continue to exist, but will exist as *sākṣī-caitanyam*, the original seer, the seer 3. I, the *sākṣī-caitanyam*, am not a creation of *māyā*, and I always remain uncreated. *Māyā-śakti* has given me the body-mind complex, which is very useful to me. Otherwise, I, the *sākṣī-caitanyam*, will remain without any transaction. I cannot see the world, interact with the world, cannot enjoy anything and I cannot even claim that I am *sākṣī*. To claim that I am *sākṣī* I require the body-mind complex. Thus the gift of the *vikṣepa-śakti* is wonderful and useful.

However, *māyā*'s second power, *āvaraṇa-śakti* makes me not able to differentiate between the real 'I', the *sākṣī-caitanyam* and the unreal *māyā*-created appendage, the *mithyā* body-mind complex. When I do not know the difference between the *vāstavam* (factual) and the *māyikam* (material), *ātmā* and *anātmā*, *dr̥k* and *dr̥śyam*, *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*, I take on the problems of the *māyikam* upon myself, the *vāstavam*. All the problems of the body-mind complex put together is called *jīvatvam*, otherwise called *saṃsāra*.

The body's *saṃsāra* is temporary but the mind's *saṃsāra* continues across many births. That *jīvatvam* is superimposed on me, the *sākṣī*, and I become a *saṃsārī*. This is at the subjective individual level.

*Āvaraṇa-śakti* causes problems at the objective world level also. At the objective level, there is the changeless Brahman and the changing *nāma-rūpa*. The changeless reality at the objective level is pure existence and at the subjective level it is the pure consciousness. What is continuously present at the objective level is the 'is-ness' or existence. When it is said, the 'clip is', the 'is' is the *vāstavam* Brahman and the 'clip' is the *māyikamnāma-rūpa*. Here also the difference between the *satyaṃ* and *anṛtam* is not known. So the changes of the *nāma-rūpa* are transferred to the changeless Brahman. When I say, 'the world is changing', I am connecting the adjective 'changing' to both the 'world' and the 'is-ness'. I am transferring the changing attributes of the world to the changeless Brahman and Brahman, the changeless existence, itself appears to be changing. In fact, the use of the word 'non-existence' is not correct because 'non-existence' is never possible because 'existence' is always present. At the subjective level there is *ātma-anātma* confusion and at the objective level, Brahman-world confusion. This two-fold confusion is the cause of all the problems. How does the *saṃsāra* problem express itself at the practical level? Because of the mistake, at the subjective level, I have concluded that I am insecure. The sense of insecurity is the *saṃsāra* that is experienced by everyone. The continuous insecurity that is experienced throughout one's life is the expression of *ātma-anātma-aviveka*. The mistake expresses itself in another way in the expectation of security from the changing world. Instead of seeking security from Brahman, I seek security from the insecure changing world. Naturally many disappointments come and this leads to mental suffering, which is *saṃsāra*. Sense of insecurity is *saṃsāra 1*, reliance upon the unreliable is *saṃsāra 2*. This will go on and on. The only remedy is either I should know that I am never insecure or if that is not known, I should never rely upon the changing world and people, but rely upon something that is changeless and reliable, which is Brahman or *Bhagavān*. The author says that the solution is sorting out the confusion, which is explained in the next verse.

### **Verse 19**

***atrāpyāvṛtināśena vibhāti brahmasargayoḥ |***

***bhedastayorvikārah syāt sarge na brahmaṇi kvacit || 19||***

The problem is not with the *vikṣepa-śakti*. It is welcome because it has given me a body and mind to enjoy the world. The problem is with the *āvaraṇa-śakti*. A *jīvanmukta* is one who has removed the *āvaraṇa-śakti* but allows the *vikṣepa-śakti* to continue as long as the *prārabdham* is present. Body-mind continuing is not the problem, *āvaraṇam* is the problem. *Āvaraṇam* is ignorance. Ignorance will only go with knowledge. That knowledge is *ātma-anātma-viveka* which requires *śāstra pramāṇam* in the form of *śravaṇam* and *mananam* with the help of a *guru*. To do the *śravaṇam* and *mananam* effectively, one needs to have the qualifications of discrimination, dispassion and the six-fold mental discipline. This process removes the ignorance and I know that I am the *sākṣī* and not the body-mind. This sorting-out has to be done at both the levels. At the subject level, the discrimination is between the factual *sākṣī* and the material body-mind complex, which is called *ātma-anātma-viveka*. This was mentioned in the 2nd



line of verse 17. In this 19th verse, the author says that the sorting out has to be done at the objective level also between the factual Brahman and the material world through *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. The first one is called *tvam-pada-viveka* (verse 17) and the second one is called *tat-pada-viveka* (verse 19).

With regard to the objective creation also one has to destroy the ignorance regarding the difference between Brahman and the world. Our mind is experiencing both Brahman and the world but we do not know which one is which. To illustrate this, the example of the experience of the hand is considered. When I look at my hand, I am experiencing the hand and the light that illumines it. The light spreads all over the hand and makes it known to me. But I only focus on the hand in my experience of the hand and miss the light taking it for granted. But for the light, I will not even be able to see the hand, but yet I fail to distinctly see the light. If someone were to ask what I see, I will say, my hand. While I am experiencing the light, I fail to recognize it. But when a person gives me the knowledge of the light, I recognize the light that I have been experiencing all along. Similarly I am experiencing Brahman. Brahman is experienced along with the world all the time. Śaṅkarācārya refers to this in *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra*:

*yasyaiva sphuraṇam sadātmakamasatkalpārthakam bhāsate*  
*sāksāttattvamasīti vedavacasā yo bodhayatyāśritān |*  
*yatsāksātkaraṇādbhavenna punarāvṛttirbhavāmbhonidhau*  
*tasmai śrīgurumūrtaye nama idaṃ śrīdakṣiṇāmūrtaye ||3||*

When I say, ‘the clip is’ I am referring to the ‘is-ness’ because I am experiencing ‘is-ness’. I am experiencing the clip along with its ‘is-ness’. That ‘is-ness’ is Brahman. The ‘is-ness’ is not a part of the clip but it is an independent entity, which will continue even after the clip is removed. But the ‘is-ness’ cannot be seen after the clip is removed similar to the light being imperceptible when the hand is removed in the example. When the hand was there the perceptible light is present. When the hand is removed, the imperceptible light continues. Similarly, existence is experienceable when the clip is. The non-experienceable existence continues when the clip is removed. Even when it is said that nothing ‘is’ there, the existence of ‘nothing’ is referred to because that existence is experienced. What it means is that other than ‘is-ness’, no *nāma-rūpa* is present. In *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, one of the meditations prescribed is meditation on space. Space is something that is taken for granted all the time because it is too subtle. Practicing meditation on space sensitizes the mind to appreciate pure existence. By *śravaṇam* and *mananam* I will understand the difference between existence and the objects. I have to separate existence from the objects, not physically but using the intellect. Through cognitive understanding, I should know that existence is Brahman and the objects are material *nāma-rūpa*. Vedānta deals with only *ātmā*, *anātmā* and the difference between them. The more I listen to this subject matter in various Vedāntic texts, the more sensitized my mind gets and begins to appreciate this difference. Clarity improves with repeated listening and reflection. After sorting out this difference, it is known that the

changes belong to the *nāma-rūpa* world and not in the pure existence, Brahman. When the hand is moved, only the hand moves and not the light. But the light seems to move but the all-pervading light does not move. It only manifests in the new location that the hand, the reflecting medium, has moved to. Similarly the pure existence, Brahman is everywhere. What is God? What 'is' is God? That 'is-ness', which is called *sat*, and internally, which is called *cit*, and which is a source of *ānanda*, that *sat-cit-ānanda* is God.

### **Verse 20**

*asti bhāti priyaṃ rūpaṃ nāma cetyaṃśapañcakam |*

*ādyatrayaṃ brahmarūpaṃ jagadrūpaṃ tato dvayam || 20||*

What is said in the previous verse is further clarified and consolidated. It was said that through enquiry the seeker differentiates between what is Brahman and what is creation. The differentiation is an intellectual process because they can be never separated. The objects can be physically separated from each other because they are limited. But Brahman being limitless cannot be physically separated from the objects. Existence and consciousness being all-pervading cannot be physically separated from the world. Only intellectual separation is possible and actually intellectual separation alone is enough. At the objective level pure existence cannot be seen separately. At the subjective level, I cannot physically separate consciousness from the three bodies. In the waking state, the gross body continues, in the dream state, the dream body continues, in the deep sleep state and even in the *samādhi* state, the causal body continues. I am never going to experience pure consciousness, but it is only in terms of discriminative understanding that the differentiation is done. How is that discrimination done?

The author presents the method of discrimination in this verse. This is a very oft-quoted verse. We are experiencing five factors outside. All our experiences have five components. Three of those components belong to Brahman and two belong to the creation. Three are factual and two are material. Thus all our experiences are mixed. The five components are:

***Asti***: existence; words like 'is', 'am', 'are' refer to existence. I never experience anything as non-existent. Even non-existent is referred to as 'nothing *is* existent'. *Asti* is otherwise known as *sat*. It is common to all experiences but I take existence for granted. Vedānta is not helping me to experience the existence because it is always experienced. Vedānta's aim is only drawing my attention to the already experienced fact and giving some additional information about that fact.

***Bhāti***: it is known to me; it is, it is known or experienced. Everything that is experienced is known. It is known because if it is not known, I will never say, 'it is'. The very talk about existence presupposes experience. The existence of what we do not experience cannot be talked about. No one can talk about an unknown thing. For example, if I say that I do not know Chinese language, the fact that I do not know Chinese language is known to me. Everything is known to me as known or unknown. 'Known' refers to knowledge of a known entity or an unknown entity. Knowledge is associated with consciousness. Thus

*bhāti* = known = associated with knowledge = associated with consciousness. Everything is associated with existence and consciousness.

**Priyaṃ:** dear; everything is associated with dearness. Everything is an object of my or someone's liking. Objects are liked by me in two different ways. Some are liked when they come and some are liked when they go. Some people give happiness wherever they go and some others give happiness whenever they go. Every object is associated with like or dislike. Even disliked objects are liked when they go. Liking is associated with *ānanda*. *priyaṃ rūpaṃ* means *ānandasvarūpaṃ*. Everything in the creation has *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*.

**Nāma:** everything is associated with a name.

**Rūpaṃ:** form, refers to any property.

All our experiences have *sat*, *cit*, *ānanda*, *nāma* and *rūpa*. A wise person is one who knows that the first three belong to Brahman and the last two belong to the world.

## **DDV-11 = 20 to 22**

### **Verse 20**

*asti bhāti priyaṃ rūpaṃ nāma cetyaṃśapañcakam |*

*ādyatrayaṃ brahmarūpaṃ jagadrūpaṃ tato dvayam || 20||*

In these verses beginning from the 13th to the 21st verse, the author is talking about the cause for *saṃsāra* and the remedy for *saṃsāra*. He pointed out that *saṃsāra* is due to the ignorance caused by the *āvaraṇa-śakti* or more precisely, the *aviveka* caused by the *āvaraṇa-śakti*. By *aviveka* is meant the lack of discrimination between *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. This indiscrimination takes place at both the subjective and the objective levels. At the subjective level, *dr̥k*, the *ātmā*, is *satyaṃ*, and *dr̥śyam*, the *anātmā*, is *mithyā*. This difference between *dr̥k* and *dr̥śya* is not known. *Dr̥k-dr̥śya-aviveka* is the first indiscrimination that is caused by *āvaraṇa-śakti*. There is a *satyaṃ-mithyā* mixture at the objective level also, which is the Brahman-world mixture. The difference between these two is also not known. Brahman-world-*aviveka* is the second indiscrimination caused by the *āvaraṇa-śakti*. Now the author has entered into the second *aviveka*. In the 20th verse he pointed out that when we experience the world outside, it is not the pure world that is experienced but it is world mixed with Brahman. In the example described earlier, the hand is never seen by itself but it is always seen mixed with light. Otherwise, the hand can be seen even in darkness. The hand and the light are experienced together but the subtle, formless light is missed. The experience of light is present but the knowledge is absent. The teaching is only to draw one's attention to the already experienced fact. The light is continuous and unitary,

irrespective of the varied objects that it illumines. To teach that Brahman is always present in all our experiences of the outside world, the author writes this important verse.

In all our experiences five factors are involved. One is *asti*. I use the word 'is' but I never pay attention to the 'is-ness'. In every statement that is made every word should correspond to an entity. I am taking the word 'is' for granted when it is used in statements. Vedānta draws our attention to that. 'Is-ness' is factor 1. Whenever I say that something is, I have experienced that object and known the object. I can never talk about the 'is-ness' of an unknown object. Thus 'is-ness' presupposes 'known-ness'. I can never talk about the existence of an object without making it an object of knowledge. Known-ness is possible only when I am conscious of the object. Therefore, the author says *bhāti* is the second factor. 'Something is known' means that consciousness is associated with that object whose existence I talk about. *Asti* means *sat* association, *Bhāti* means *cit* association. *Sat* and *cit* are in every object. *Cit* is present as 'known'. *Sat* is present as 'is'. Every object is associated with *ānanda* also. This association with *ānanda* is expressed in statements such as 'I like this clip'. Every object is liked by someone or the other. *Priyaṃ* means *ānanda* association, which is the third factor. Two more factors are *nāma* and *rūpa*, name and form. In this context, *rūpa* can be taken to be any attribute or object. These two are the variable factors. All these five factors are experienced simultaneously. Of these five, three are present unchangingly everywhere, especially two. *Priyaṃ* can change, but two are unchanging and uniform. Whatever is unchanging and uniform is not paid attention to normally. Vidyāraṇya describes this fact in the 10th chapter of *Pañcadaśī*. He asks us to consider the situation after a play is over and all the actors have retired to the green room and the scene set has been removed. If someone in the audience is asked what or who is there on the stage, that person would invariably say, 'no one or nothing is on the stage'. That statement shows that the light, because of which we could see the actors earlier and also know that no one is on the stage now, is missed. Even though the light plays such an important role, it is not noticed because it is uniform and changeless. Similarly space that is everywhere is not noticed. Statements like empty space is a contradiction because space is always present. Whatever is uniform and changeless is taken for granted. Only the moving gets human attention. *Asti*, *bhāti*, and *priyaṃ* are *brahma-rūpam*, which are uniform and everywhere. *Nāma-rūpa* abounds in variety and are always changing. People do not notice the *brahma-rūpam*, which is the truth but fall in love with the variety, which is the untruth. Untruth is attractive and truth is not attractive. Thus *māyā* always wins. One should enjoy *māyā* holding on to Brahman.

*Asti*, existence, *bhāti*, consciousness, *priyaṃ*, happiness, *rūpam*, form, and *nāma*, name are the five components. Of these, the first three, *sat-cit-ānanda* belong to Brahman, which is uniform. A question may come up as to how *ānanda* can be uniform because *ānanda* is experienced to be changing. The *ānanda* that manifests in the mind is never uniform. Experiential pleasure is not *brahma-ānanda*, but it is the *ānanda* that is reflected in the mind. Since the mind has fluctuations, the *ānanda* seems to have fluctuations. The original *atmānanda* in every living being is the same, but when that original *ānanda* reflects in the mind it varies according to the condition (*sattva*, *rajas* or *tamas*) of the mind. The other two, *rūpam* and *nāma* belong to the unstable, changing *mithyā* world and are unreliable.

## Verse 21

*khavāyvagnijalorvīṣu devatiryannarādiṣu |*

*abhinnāḥ saccidānandāḥ bhidyate rūpanāmani || 21 ||*

In the vision of *Sāṃkya*, every *jīva* is a mixture of *ātmā*, called *puruṣa* and *anātmā* called *prakṛti*. However *Sāṃkya* holds that this *ātmā* is different from body to body, but all-pervading. The author points out that *ātmā* is one and all-pervading, otherwise known as Brahman. The consciousness in one body is the very same consciousness in another body. The existence in every person is one existence. The consciousness is the same in every one. *Ānanda* is the same in every one also. There are no three all-pervading attributes of Brahman. There is no *cit* separate from *sat* and there is no *ānanda* separate from *sat-cit*. *sat=cit=ānanda*. When it is said that the clip is, it indicates that *sat* is present in the clip and so *cit* should also be present. Wherever *sat* is, *cit* also is. If the clip has *cit*, it should be sentient. But it is not sentient because *cit* is not manifest, not because it is absent in the clip. The suitable manifesting medium, the mind, is absent in the clip. An example can be given to illustrate this point. Consider an iron piece placed in a fire and a cup of water heated on a fire. Fire penetrates both the iron piece and water. The heat of the fire expresses itself in both the water and the iron piece, but the light of the fire does not express itself in the water. Water does not become bright but the iron piece becomes red hot and bright. Similarly, in the clip, only *sat* is manifest but in the mind (body), both *sat* and *cit* are manifest.

*Sat-cit-ānanda* is equally present in all the insentient things of the world and also the sentient beings. In the verse, the insentient things are referred to by the five elements and the sentient beings are referred to by three grades of beings, the superior celestials, the inferior animals and the intermediate human beings. But *nāma-rūpa* make all the things and beings appear different. *Sat-cit-ānanda* is *satyaṃ* and *nāma-rūpa* is *mithyā*. One should differentiate between *satyaṃ* and *mithyā* and not mix them up. The mixing-up becomes evident when I expect permanent support from *nāma-rūpa* people, money, position, power, etc. Expecting permanence from the impermanent indicates that I have mixed up *satyaṃ* and *mithyā*. How do I know that I have this wrong expectation? The indication is that I get emotionally shattered when the imagined support goes. It is not the fault of the world or God. The fault lies in expecting permanence from the impermanent. Therefore this *satyaṃ-mithyā* discrimination is required. The *āvaraṇa-śakti* has to be removed to remove wrong expectations and thereby remove emotionally shattering experiences.

## Verse 22

*upekṣya nāmarūpe dve saccidānandataparāḥ |*

*samādhiṃ sarvadā kuryāddhṛtaye vā'thavā bahiḥ || 22 ||*

With the previous verse the author has completed the important central topic of the text, the cause for *saṃsāra* and the remedy for *saṃsāra*. The cause for *saṃsāra* is *satya-mithyā-aviveka* and the remedy is

*satya-mithyā-viveka*. From the 21st verse up to the 31st verse, the author goes to the next topic. Vedānta students generally say that they have studied and understood Vedānta well. Then the student says that he knows that he should drop the attachment to *mithyā* and hold on to *satyaṃ*. But the complaint is that the intellect understands the problem and the solution well but the mind is incapable of implementing the solution. There is thus an eternal gap between what the rational mind knows and what the emotional mind is. There is intellectual knowledge but there is no corresponding experience. By lack of the experience is usually meant the continuation of the emotional problems. Some people attribute that to the non-experience of Brahman and say that there is only knowledge but there is no experience of Brahman. However, the teaching is that there is no such thing as experience of Brahman because Brahman is not an object. The example is that light experience is not lacking but one takes the light for granted. In fact, the problem is not a lack of Brahman experience, Brahman realization, *samādhi*, or mystic experience. The problem is that the knowledge gained has not been internalized. This internalization is important. It is similar to coffee with sugar added not tasting sweet because the sugar has not been mixed well so that it pervades the entire coffee. Internalization of the knowledge through alert living is extremely important. This is called *nididhyāsanam*. This internalization is done by dwelling on the teaching as often as possible and in the process, the word ‘*ātmā* or Brahman’ is replaced by the word ‘I’. Otherwise I would say that *ātmā* is free but I am miserable. This process of dwelling on the knowledge can be done in several ways. Repeated *śravaṇam* is one method. In *śravaṇam*, the word ‘*ātmā*’ or ‘Brahman’ should be replaced by ‘I’. Sharing, teaching, and writing are also methods. In all these methods the important thing is to replace *ātmā* or Brahman with ‘I’, the seer 3, the *sākṣī*. Among several methods of *nididhyāsanam*, one method is called *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*, a *nididhyāsanam* in the form of *samādhi-abhyāsa*. *Samādhi-abhyāsa* is exclusively giving some time for dwelling on the teaching. During that time I should deliberately withdraw from all transactions, and deliberately distancing from all the *ahaṅkāra* roles, I should invoke my *ātmasvarūpam*. There are many *nididhyāsanam* verses that can help me do this. Kṛṣṇa talks about this *nididhyāsanam* in the 6th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gītā* very elaborately.

Is this *samādhi-abhyāsa* compulsory or not? If a person can internalize the teaching without the practice of *samādhi* and can effect an emotional transformation and not get disturbed by the ups and downs of life, then *samādhi-abhyāsa* is not required for that person. For a person who is incapable of internalizing the teaching thus, the author is prescribing six types of *samādhi-abhyāsa* from verses 22 to 31.

## **DDV-12 = 22 to 24**

### **Verse 22**

*upekṣya nāmarūpe dve saccidānandatparaḥ |*  
*samādhiṃ sarvadā kuryāddhṛtaye vā'thavā bahiḥ || 22 ||*

From the 13th verse up to the 21st verse, the author dealt with the central theme of the text, which is the cause of *saṃsāra* and the remedy for *saṃsāra*. The cause for *saṃsāra* is the ignorance-based mixing up of the real and the unreal. This mixing-up takes place both at the subjective level between the seer and the seen, and the objective level between Brahman and the universe. We have a wrong self-image and have a wrong expectation from the world. These two together cause *saṃsāra*. These two have to be sorted out by *viveka*, discrimination, through proper enquiry. That enquiry is done by Vedānta *śravaṇam* and *mananam*, which leads to correction at the subjective and the objective levels. Subjectively, I learn that I am emotionally independent and objectively, I learn that the unstable *nāmarūpa* world cannot give lasting security. Kṛṣṇa uses two adjectives to describe this, *nityatṛptaḥ*, *always contented*, at the subjective level, and *nirāśrayaḥ*, *independent*, at the objective level.

From verses 22 to 31, the author talks about the assimilation of the teaching because without internalization, the teaching will remain an academic knowledge. Emotional benefits are possible only

when the knowledge is internalized. For this *nididhyāsanam* is prescribed from verses 22 to 31. *Nididhyāsanam* can be practiced in many ways. The definition of *nididhyāsanam*, Vedāntic meditation, is dwelling upon the teaching intently by providing quality time and not trying to get rid of thoughts or remaining thought-free. If dwelling on the teaching is meditation, it can be done in any manner that is convenient to us. It can be in the form of repeated listening aided by the teacher, or it can be done independently in the form of reading, writing, discussing or teaching. Physical posture is not the primary component of meditation. It is only incidental but the mental posture is the primary component. One can do the meditation dwelling on the teaching even while walking on the beach. Sitting meditation, taking care of the physical posture is also a form of meditation, which is called *samādhi-abhyāsa*. In this meditation, a person sits in a particular posture, withdraws the sense-organs, closes the eyes, and intently dwells upon the teaching. Whatever be the form of meditation, one factor is very important, which makes meditation different from *śravaṇam*. Whenever the word, Brahman or *ātmā*, and their descriptions come in *śravaṇam* we always think of Brahman and *ātmā* as some external entities, which we have to directly come across in meditation or some other *sādhana*. This is objectification orientation. Any amount of dwelling on the teaching with this orientation will not bless the student completely. Every time, the words Brahman and *ātmā* have to be replaced by the word 'I' with consistency and with conviction. I should also remind myself that I am not going to get freedom during this meditation. If the attitude is that this *nididhyāsanam* will lead one to freedom, then I have gotten out of the teaching. The teaching says that freedom is not a future event but it is the eternal nature of myself. The teaching never says that I will become Brahman, but it says that I am Brahman. If I am not free now, I will never be free. There is no corridor connecting bondage and liberation. The bound can never become free. Finite can never become infinite. That means that either I am eternally finite or eternally infinite. If I am eternally finite, I can never be free. If I am eternally infinite, I am ever free. If I am ever free, I am free during *nididhyāsanam* also. When I sit for *nididhyāsanam*, I should tell myself that I am practicing this *nididhyāsanam* not for getting freedom but for claiming the fact that I was, am and ever will be free. This is the difference between *śravaṇam* and *nididhyāsanam*. During *śravaṇam*, the objectification orientation can set in, and it is not a problem. But in *nididhyāsanam*, the I-orientation with respect to *ātmā* or Brahman, in the form of non-doer, etc., should be practiced. This need not happen in *śravaṇam*, but if this orientation happens in *śravaṇam*, then *śravaṇam* itself is *nididhyāsanam*. If that does not happen in *śravaṇam*, then in meditation, I should make it an I-oriented meditation.

In this verse, the author is talking about *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*. Six-fold *samādhi* is described in this section. This is a unique approach that is not found in any other Vedāntic text. A general enumeration of the six practices will be given and the details will be seen later through the verses.

The author describes the six *samādhis* in a chart form. First, *samādhi* is divided into *antara*, internal and *bāhya*, external. Then, the internal *samādhi* is divided into *savikalpa* and *nirvikalpa*. Then, the internal *savikalpa* is divided into object-associated and word-associated. Then, the external *samādhi* is divided into *savikalpa* and *nirvikalpa*. Then, the external *savikalpa* is divided into object-associated and word-associated. The six *samādhis* are the following.



1. *antara-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi, internal-object-associated-savikalpa-samādhi*
2. *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi, internal-word-associated-savikalpa-samādhi*
3. *antara-nirvikalpa-samādhi, internal-nirvikalpa-samādhi*
4. *bāhya-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi, external-object-associated-savikalpa-samādhi*
5. *bāhya-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi, external-word-associated-savikalpa-samādhi*
6. *bāhya-nirvikalpa-samādhi, external-nirvikalpa-samādhi.*

*Nididhyāsanam* is an exercise in which the mind is focussed on *sat-cit-ānanda*, the limitless existence-consciousness, as ‘I am’, the subject meditator himself, by filtering out the *nāma-rūpa* that is mixed with *sat-cit-ānanda*. *Sat-cit-ānanda* is not available in pure form in any state, waking, dreaming, sleep or even *samādhi*. *Sat-cit-ānanda* is always mixed with either manifest *nāma-rūpa* or un-manifest *nāma-rūpa*. In meditation, I should remember verse 20, in which the five components, *asti, bhāti, priyaṃ* (changeless), *nāma, rūpa* (changing), were described to be mixed always. This mixture is meditated upon focussing on the changeless feature and ignoring the changing feature. Even though the changing *nāma-rūpa* is falling in the purview of knowledge, it is not focussed on, but the changeless aspect is focussed on for absorption and the practice is repeated often.

This meditation is done in two ways. One is meditating on any internal object, such as a thought. Every thought has the five components. Every thought is considered and the *sat-cit-ānanda* part is focussed on ignoring the name and form of the thought. This is absorption in the changeless aspect of thoughts, the internal objects. This is closed-eye meditation. The other is meditating on any external object focussing on its changeless aspect. This is open-eye meditation.

### **Verse 23**

*savikalpo nirvikalpaḥ samādhirdvividho hṛdi |*  
*dṛśyaśabdānuvedhena savikalpaḥ punardvidhā || 23 ||*

*Samādhi* is divided into *savikalpa* and *nirvikalpa*. *Savikalpa-samādhi* itself can be divided into two, one associated with an object, and the other associated with the Vedāntic words, such as *sākṣī, satyaṃ, nityam, adhiṣṭhānam*, etc., which have been thoroughly studied and become personally meaningful during *śravaṇam* and *mananam*. In *savikalpa*, some support is used as an aid, for example, using the hand for meditation on light. Then the support, the hand, is removed and the focus is turned towards the un-manifest light that still continues. When the light is focussed on without the support of the hand it is called *nirvikalpa*. Similarly, the support in the form of the thought or the word is used and then the focus is turned towards the *sat-cit-ānanda* Brahman.

### **Verse 24**

*kāmādyāścittagā dṛśyāstatsākṣitvena cetanam |*

***dhyāyedrśyānuviddho'yaṃ samādhīḥ savikalpakaḥ* || 24||**

From this verse onwards, the author describes how the six *samādhis* are to be practiced. Verses 24, 25, and 26 deal with the first three *samādhis* and verses 27, 28, and 29 deal with the second three *samādhis*. This verse describes the internal, thought-associated *savikalpa-samādhi*. This is thought meditation. There is no need to remove the thoughts. Many people recommend removal of thoughts for meditation. That is very difficult to do. The author prescribes a meditation here in which thoughts can be entertained.

Consider the following exercise as an example for this meditation. Visualize a room. Imagine that there is a powerful central light in the room. The light pervades the entire room. Imagine that people are coming into the room and going out of the room. Every one that is coming in and going out is known because of the light principle, which is normally ignored. First, the attention is focussed on the people and then on the light. Then, the features of the light and the people are compared and contrasted. People and objects are many and the light is one. People and objects arrive and depart. Light does not arrive and depart. People are divisible from one another. Light is indivisible. People have forms. Light does not have form. People can be contaminated by the dirt in the room . Light cannot be contaminated. Then the focus should be on the light alone with its characteristics. Using this example, one can then do the first meditation, the internal meditation as described by the author.

**DDV-13 = 24 to 26**

**Verse 24**

*kāmādyāścittagā dṛśyāstatsākṣitvena cetanam* |

***dhyāyedrśyānuviddho'yaṃ samādhīḥ savikalpakaḥ* || 24||**

In these verses beginning from the 21st verse up to the 31st verse, the author is talking about *nididhyāsanam* for the assimilation of the teaching. The type of *nididhyāsanam* that is being described is the *samādhi-abhyāsa-rūpa nididhyāsanam*. Six types of *samādhi* are described as was seen in the last class. Having enumerated them, the author is explaining the *antara-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi* in verse 24. It is nothing but attention upon consciousness as the witness of thoughts. It is paying attention to the consciousness principle as the illuminator or witness of the thoughts as they arise in the mind.

An example for the practice of this meditation was given earlier. Imagine a room in which many people come and go and objects are brought in and taken out. All these are illumined by the light principle in the room. The light principle is all-pervading and it illumines the arriving and departing objects. First the attention is turned from the objects to the light and the light is noticed. Usually, when someone enters

the room, the objects are noticed but the light by which the objects are known is missed. It is not that light is not experienced every moment. There is no lack of the light experience but the light is taken for granted. The exercise is to focus the attention on the light and compare and contrast the features of the light and the objects. The objects are subject to arrival and departure but the light is not. The objects are changing but the light is changeless. The objects have form and colors but the light is formless and colorless. The objects are subject to division but the light is an indivisible principle. The objects can be contaminated by the dust in the room, but the light is not contaminated. Thus light is focussed on and its unique features are comprehended. The features can be summarized thus: Light is not a part, product or property of any object. Light is an independent entity that pervades and illumines the object. Light is not limited by the boundaries of the object. Light continues to exist even after the object is removed. The existing light is not accessible because of the absence of the reflecting medium. This is light *samādhi*.

The same practice is applied internally. In the place of the room, there is the mind. *Vṛttis* or thoughts, such as desire, anger, etc., that arise in the mind and fall like the waves in the ocean are similar to the people and the objects in the light *samādhi* example. These thoughts are insentient by themselves and they are known because of something other than the thoughts, which is the consciousness principle, the *sākṣītattvam*. The first stage in this *samādhi* is paying attention to that consciousness principle. Then the thoughts and consciousness should be differentiated. Thoughts come and go, consciousness does not come and go. Thoughts do not pervade the whole mind, they are only waves in the mind, but consciousness pervades everywhere. Thoughts have form such as pot-thought, etc., whereas consciousness is formless. Thoughts are divisible and consciousness is indivisible. Finally and more importantly, the nature of the thought, the impurities of the thought do not belong to consciousness. Consciousness is without attributes. Thus I focus on the *sākṣī caitanyam* and its nature. Between the example, light, and *caitanyam* there is only one important difference. Light happens to be an object other than me, whereas consciousness is not an object. While meditating on consciousness I should not objectify that formless consciousness. This illumining consciousness should not be objectified because that consciousness is 'I am'. Then the meditation should be in the form of 'I am illumining every thought; even after every thought goes, I continue during the absence of thoughts because that blank mind is known to me'. **First focus on thought, then come to *sākṣī*, then to 'I'**. Only when the meditation becomes 'I-meditation', *nididhyāsanam* reaches completion. The phrase '*cidānandarūpaḥ śivo'ham śivo'ham*' in the *Nirvāṇaśaṭkam* verse is an excellent *sākṣī* meditation phrase. From 'I' the consciousness in my mind, I should go to 'I' the consciousness in all the minds. Then the meditation should progress in the form of, 'I am not in all the minds but all the minds are resting in me'. Like space I accommodate everything. Thus from the light example, I come to the space example. I look at all the Vedāntic teachings and in the place of Brahman, *ātmā*, *sākṣī*, etc., I use the word 'I'. This is the main feature of *nididhyāsanam* and only then *ahaṅkāra* will get weakened.

There are many objects present in the mind in the form of thoughts, *vṛttis*, for example, desire, anger, etc. A list of thoughts as examples were mentioned in verse 4. In the very same mind, there is present the consciousness principle as the illuminator of all those *vṛttis*. Just like there is no distance between the hand and the light, there is no distance between the *vṛttis* and the illuminating consciousness. When they

are thus together, the changing *vṛttis* get the attention and not the changeless consciousness. That consciousness, *ātmā*, is always present, but I have not paid attention to it. Vedānta is drawing my attention to that already evident consciousness. I should focus on that *sākṣī caitanyam*. Focussing upon the *sākṣī* is nothing but entertaining thoughts regarding *sākṣī*. The mind functions only through entertaining thoughts. Entertaining thoughts such as ‘the *sākṣī* is in the mind, and the *sākṣī* is the illuminator’ is the meditation or focussing on the *sākṣī*. This meditation in which I entertain thoughts regarding the *sākṣī* is called *antara-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*.

### Verse 25

*asaṅgaḥsaccidānandaḥ svaprabho dvaitavarjitaḥ |*  
*asmīti śabdaviddho'yaṃ samādhiḥ savikalpakaḥ || 25 ||*

We are entering the second form of meditation, *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. What is the difference between the first one and the second one? In the first one, I focus on the *caitanyam* as the *sākṣī* of the thought. I make use of the thought as an aid to come to the *caitanyam*, just as in the example, the hand was used as an aid to bring my attention to the imperceptible light. The thought is the reflecting medium for the *caitanyam*. Repeated practice of bringing the attention away from the thoughts to consciousness by which the thoughts are experienced, the mind will gain the capacity to remain with the consciousness principle without being distracted by the thoughts. Having established the mind in *sākṣī*, the various other aspects of the *sākṣī* are dwelled upon, the final feature being that that *caitanyam* is ‘I am’. What are the features that I should dwell upon? From the Upaniṣads I can draw any number of features. Generally it is suggested that one should take a word from the Upaniṣads, *Bhagavad Gītā* or a *prakaraṇa grantha* to dwell upon. In each session of *nididhyāsanam*, a different word can be used. Since the words from the Upaniṣads are used to dwell on the *sākṣī*, this meditation is called *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. **Thoughts are used in the first *samādhi* to arrive at the *sākṣī*. In this *samādhi*, the features of the *sākṣī* are focussed on.** It is like meditating upon the light without the help of the hand.

The first very powerful word, ‘*asaṅga*, unattached’, used in this verse is taken from the *svayam jyoti brāhmaṇam* of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. That word means that I do not have any relationship with anything in the creation. The notions of ‘I’ and ‘mine’ are delusions that cause sorrow. We are always disturbed by one relationship or another. One should become a mental renunciate. I, this *sākṣī*, am pure existence that is all-pervading, pure consciousness, and the very *ānanda* that comes in the mind in the reflected form. My reflection alone is all the pleasures of the world. All the experiential pleasures are my own reflection in the mind and do not come from outside. This has to be repeatedly asserted in the meditation because running after *ānanda* outside is one form of *samsāra*. I, the *ānanda*, am not an experiential pleasure because I, the *ānanda*, am permanently present. The experiential pleasures are impermanent and are reflections of I, the *ānanda*. I am the non-experienceable permanent pleasure and my reflection in the mind is the temporary pleasure. Consciousness is experienced in all the states of the mind without any effort and a special state is not needed for that experience and so I am self-evident. I

am without a second thing, I am non-dual. I am the *sākṣī* of the mind and the thoughts are the witnessed object, *sākṣyam*. The very fact that I claim that I am the *sākṣī* presupposes the presence of *sākṣyam*. Thus there are two entities and so a doubt may arise as to how it can be said that I am non-dual. This non-dual nature can be assimilated only when it is known that *drśyam* is experienced and it is *mithyā*. The meditator should have thoroughly assimilated the teaching of the *mithyā* nature of the experienced world and objects taught in the 2nd chapter of the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Experience of the appearing object is not the proof of reality of the existence of the object. The dream is experienced and appears to be real but it is *mithyā*. Similarly the world is experienced and appears to be real but it is *mithyā*. *Drśyamsākṣyam* is *mithyā* and *drk sākṣī* is *satyaṃ*. In the meditation, *sākṣī* should be replaced by *aham*, I. ‘I am *satyaṃ* and the world is *mithyā*’ should be meditated upon. If I and the world have the same order of reality, the world can adversely affect me. Only when the world is clearly known to be *mithyā*, the fear of the world, and the most important aspect of the world, time, with its capacity to bring about changes and modifications, will go. The *mithyā* world is as good as non-existent. These sample *Upaniṣadic* statements should be remembered in the meditation and their meanings as my description should be dwelled upon. Long meditation on “I am relation-less, self-evident, non-dual pure existence, pure consciousness, and pure fullness” should be done. Thoughts are very much present in this Vedāntic meditation. Stopping thoughts is Yogic meditation and entertaining Vedāntic thoughts is Vedāntic meditation. This is *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*, an internal meditation connected with Vedāntic words.

## Verse 26

*svānubhūtirasāvesāddrśyaśabdāvupekṣya tu |*

*nirvikalpaḥ samādhiḥ syānnivāsthitadīpavat || 26||*

The *antara-nirvikalpa-samādhi* is described. When I entertain these Vedāntic thoughts, all of which point to the *vṛtti* ‘I am Brahman’, that thought is called *ātmākāra-vṛtti*, *brahmākāra-vṛtti* or *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. In the initial two stages of *savikalpa-samādhi*, these thoughts are entertained by me deliberately. I exist as a meditator in these two stages. I am very much present and my will and effort are required. When a thought is entertained for some time, the mind itself gets into a groove. It is like a bike, after being pedaled for a while, goes on its own due to the gained momentum. The mind has the capacity to register what it has been doing and repeat. For example, even after working on trying to remember a name for a while unsuccessfully and giving up the conscious effort, the mind will keep working on that effort. Later that name comes up in the mind for no reason at all. The mind has that certain unique capacity and when that process happens, it is called *sūkṣma-vṛtti*. It is a thought process happening in the sub-conscious mind. In the mind, there are always *sthūla-vṛtti* in which *ahaṅkāra* and will are involved, and *sūkṣma-vṛtti*. To give an example, there is no other person sitting next to me on the stage now. Your mind also has seen only one person. The mind has registered the absence of the second person even

without any deliberate attempt. If asked later whether someone else other than me was there on the stage, the answer will be no. This answer is given because the mind has the capacity to register thoughts, *vṛttis* without the intervention of will or *ahaṅkāra*.

In meditation, *ahaṅkāra* puts the Vedāntic thoughts in the mind and dwells upon them sufficiently creating a momentum and thereafter *ahaṅkāra* and will are not required for the thought to continue. The thought continues without any effort of the meditator. That *vṛtti* in the subconscious mind is called *sūkṣma-akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti*. When the *ahaṅkāra* is not prominent, the duality also is not prominent. As in the deep sleep state, in which duality is not experienced because *ahaṅkāra* is dormant, in this condition also, the *vṛtti* continues, and the *ahaṅkāra* is not active. It seems to be similar to deep sleep, but it is not. In sleep, ignorance is present, but in this meditation, though *ahaṅkāra* is not prominent, the *vṛtti*, ‘I am Brahman’ is present. This is *nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

## **DDV-14 = 26 to 28**

### **Verse 26**

*svānubhūtirasāveśāddṛśyaśabdāvupekṣya tu |*  
*nirvikalpaḥ samādhiḥ syānnivāsthitadīpavat || 26||*

In these verses beginning from the 22nd verse, the author is dealing with the topic of *nididhyāsanam* in the form of *samādhi-abhyāsa*. He introduced six types of *samādhi*, three internal and three external. Having introduced the six *samādhis*, the author then explains them. He described *antara-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi* in verse 24, and *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi* in verse 25. In this verse 26, the *antara-nirvikalpa-samādhi* is described. Since this meditation is connected with the internal condition of the mind, in the first stage, the meditator focusses his attention on the thoughts occurring in the mind. The word *dṛśyam* refers to the thoughts, because thoughts are objects of experience. The thoughts are illumined by the consciousness principle, which is called *dṛk*, the *caitanya*. Thereafter he appreciates the fact that every thought is experienced because the *caitanya* spreads over the thought just as every object is experienced outside because the light spreads over the

objects. The thought by itself is not experienceable because the thought is inert by itself. This inert *vr̥tti* is appearing sentient and experienceable because of the *caitanya*. This *caitanya* is not physically separable from the thought. Attention should be shifted from the thought part to the *caitanya* part. When the *caitanya* is understood as an independent entity, it is called *sākṣī caitanya*. Thus when I take a thought and appreciate the consciousness as *sākṣī caitanya*, it is called *dr̥śya-anuviddha*, thought-connected-consciousness-meditation, meditation upon the consciousness, which is connected to the thought as the illuminator of the thought. This shifting of attention is *samādhi* number 1. After focussing on the *sākṣī*, the second *samādhi* is dwelling on the nature of the *sākṣī*. The features or characteristics of the *sākṣī caitanya* such as *asaṅga*, *sat-cit-ānanda*, etc., are focussed upon. While focussing thus, it is very important to not objectify the *sākṣī*, but to say that the illumining consciousness is ‘I am’. Only then it becomes *aparokṣa-vr̥tti*, the *vr̥tti* by which I claim the *sākṣī* as myself. Then *sākṣī* is replaced by *aham*. I am the illuminator of the thoughts. Thoughts arrive and depart, I do not. Thoughts are divided and I am not. Thoughts are confined to the mind but I am not confined to this mind alone but I am the *sākṣī* behind all the minds as Kṛṣṇa says in the *Bhagavad Gītā*: “*Arjuna! May you know Me as the knower of the body in all the bodies*” (13:2). Thus I am whole, indivisible, full, relation-less, etc. All the words from the scriptures are taken and associated with I, the illuminator of the thoughts. Since I use the Vedāntic words in this meditation, it is *śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*.

In the first two stages, when I am invoking the witness-awareness, claiming myself to be the witness-awareness, and dwelling upon my real nature, my will and deliberate attempt are involved. Therefore, *ahāṅkāra*, the meditator is active. The active *ahāṅkāra* is the subject and the subject-object division is present. I am the meditator and the *sākṣī svarūpam* is the meditated upon. This subject-object division is prominent. This is required because the thought does not naturally happen but my will and effort are required. The author says that when the meditator has deliberately entertained a thought for sometime, a momentum is caused and the mind registers the thought. The mind then dwells on the thought by itself. This capacity of the sub-conscious mind to stay or continue with a thought without requiring the will and effort is called *sūkṣma-vr̥tti-anuvr̥tti*. Many of our problems continue like this in our sub-conscious mind all the time in parallel with the conscious activity of the mind. When deliberate mental activity stops, these *vr̥ttis* surface to the conscious mind. This capacity of the sub-conscious mind is made use of to our advantage in this meditation involving the *akhaṅḍākāra-vr̥tti*. When the sub-conscious mind takes over this meditation, *ahāṅkāra* is not required and so it becomes less prominent. The *vr̥tti* will continue as in the deep sleep state. When the *vr̥tti* continues in the sub-conscious mind, the *tripuṭi*, the subject-object division is not prominent. In deep sleep, the *ajñāna-vr̥tti* in the form of ‘I am in a blank condition, I do not experience anything’ is present, but *ahāṅkāra* is not prominent and the subject-object division is not present. In *nirvikalpa-samādhi*, as in deep sleep, the sub-conscious thought continues without *tripuṭi*. In deep sleep, the subconscious thought is *ajñāna-vr̥tti*, whereas in *nirvikalpa-samādhi*, the thought is *jñāna-vr̥tti*.

When the inclination for the continuation of the *akhaṅḍākāra-vr̥tti* (self-awareness) takes possession of the mind, i.e., when the mind is in the grip of the Vedāntic thought, the mind does not require the assistance of the thought or the Vedāntic words. Previously the thought was made use of to come to

consciousness and then Vedāntic words were used to focus on the *sākṣī*. Self-awareness continues in the form of the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* without the subject-object division. Such a condition is called *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. *Vikalpa* means division in the form of *pramāta-pramāṇam-prameyam*. *Nirvikalpa* means the division-less state of mind exactly similar to the deep sleep state. I am not aware that I am entertaining the *vṛtti*. Thought continues without my awareness. This undistracted thought-flow is compared to a flame of light which is kept in an enclosure, which is not affected by wind. Such a flame does not flicker. Similarly the mind in *nirvikalpa-samādhi* remains in an undistracted thought flow.

Kṛṣṇa talks about this *samādhi* in the 6th chapter of the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Vidyāraṇya also talks about this *samādhi* in the first chapter of *Pañcadaśī*. Thereafter, Vidyāraṇya adds a note. In *nirvikalpa-samādhi*, the meditator is not aware that he is entertaining the ‘I am Brahman’ *vṛtti* because the will is resolved, the effort is not present. It is a blank state like deep sleep. Vidyāraṇya raises the question of how does one know that the *vṛtti* was present or not. Why can it not be said that the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* is a thought-free state? The first answer is that there is no thought-free state. Even assuming that the *samādhi* state is thought-free, it is a useless state of mind because there is no knowledge. Thought-free state of mind is not valued in Vedānta. The *nirvikalpa-samādhi* that Vedānta talks about is an *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti-anuvṛtti* state. How does one know that that *vṛtti* or thought is present in *nirvikalpa-samādhi*? Vidyāraṇya says that the situation is very similar to the deep sleep condition. After waking up from sleep, one says that he did not experience anything in sleep. For that statement to be made that experience of the non-experience of things must be registered in the mind, which is a thought. Experience of the non-experience of things must be registered in the mind in sleep, which is called *asūkṣma-vṛtti*. That is why one is able to recollect the experience of the non-experience upon waking up. That recollection is the proof of the presence of *vṛtti* or thought in sleep. Similarly the recollection of the ‘I am Brahman’ *vṛtti* after one comes out of *samādhi* proves the presence of that *vṛtti* in *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. Vidyāraṇya says in the 1st chapter of *Pañcadaśī*,

*vṛttayastu tadānīmajñātā apyātmagocarāḥ |*  
*smaraṇādanumīyante vyutthitasya samutthitāt || 56 ||*

The continuation of the thought-flow in *nirvikalpa-samādhi* is not known at the time of *samādhi* but it is inferred from the recollection later. Thus the thoughts are present in subtle form in *nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

### **Verse 27**

*hṛdīva bāhyadeśe'pi yasmin kasmimśca vastuni |*  
*samādhirādyah sanmātrānnāmarūpapṛthakkṛtiḥ || 27 ||*

With the previous verse the first three *samādhis* are over. All these are internal meditations focussing on the *sākṣī caitanyam* obtained in my mind. Focussing on the witness-consciousness has to be necessarily internal because consciousness can be recognized only inside. One can never experience consciousness anywhere outside. When I am speaking, it seems that you are hearing, and hopefully understanding also.



I know that you are a conscious being but I am not experiencing the consciousness in you. My sense-organs are perceiving only the insentient body. I can only experience consciousness in my body and not in your body. Consciousness is everywhere but it is recognizable only in one's own body as is referred to in *Ātmabodha*:

*The ātmā does not shine in everything although it is all-pervading. It is manifest only in the inner equipment, the intellect, just as the reflection in a clean mirror. (17)*

Consciousness meditation can be practiced only internally. Hereafter, the three external *samādhis* will be discussed; *bāhya-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*, *bāhya-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi* and *bāhya-nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

In this verse, the author talks about the *bāhya-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. The methodology is the same. In the internal *samādhi*, the thought was first focussed on and from the thought, awareness present in the thought was arrived at and focussed on. Similarly, in this *samādhi*, any external object can be taken as an aid, and from the object, one has to go to *ātmā* or Brahman. It is suggested that it is better to take an object towards which one does not have like or dislike. It is like watching a movie concentrating on the screen. Take any object, like a clip. The clip has *asti*, *bhāti*, *priyaṃ*, *rūpam*, and *nāma*. *Nāma* and *rūpa* alone belong to the clip. When it is said that the clip is, the existence is present spread over the clip. Then shift the attention from the 'clip-ness' to the 'is-ness'. Thus you go to clip-connected existence and focus on existence. It is not possible to focus on consciousness here because consciousness is not manifest in the clip, but existence is very much manifested.

As one practices within the mind in the internal *samādhi*, in the external world also, one should practice the *samādhi* taking the help of any external object because there is existence in every object. The pure existence, 'is-ness', should be separated from the name and form by the intellect. Existence is not a part, property or a product of the clip. Understanding in this way is called *dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. After separating the *nāma-rūpa* thus, pure existence should be focussed on. This is an open-eye meditation. *Sat*, the pure existence, is the screen and all the happenings of life is only a shadow movie on that screen.

### **Verse 28**

***akhaṇḍaikarasaṃ vastu saccidānandalakṣaṇam |***

***ityavicchinacinteyaṃ samādhirmadhyamo bhavet || 28||***

The first stage is the segregation of existence from the *nāma-rūpa* and shifting the attention to the existence. Thereafter attention should be focussed on the various characteristics or features of existence. Existence is not a part, product or property of the object, and is not limited to the object only. The object has boundary but existence goes beyond. Beyond the object, existence may not be perceived not because it is not present, but because there may not be a medium to manifest it. Existence is all-pervading. The

objects can be counted but existence cannot be counted because there is only one undivided existence, as *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* states: “*In the beginning, my dear, this universe was Being (Sat) alone, one only without a second.*” (6.2.1). Pure existence is one indivisible whole. Some of the features of pure existence like all-pervasiveness, indivisibility, all-supporting, relation-less, etc., should be dwelled upon. For this, words from the *Upaniṣads* are used and so this second *samādhi* is called *śabda-anuviddha*, connected with words. The pure existence is indivisible, one and whole and it is part-less. The objects of the world have parts but pure existence does not have parts just as space does not have parts. Spatial directions like east, west, etc., are arbitrarily assigned with reference to the sunrise and sunset and are not absolute.

## **DDV-15 = 28 and 29**

### **Verse 28**

*akhaṇḍaikarasam vastu saccidānandalakṣaṇam |*

*ityavicchinnacinteyam samādhirmadhyamo bhavet || 28||*

In these verses beginning from the 22nd verse, the author is dealing with the topic of *nididhyāsanam* or Vedāntic meditation in the form of six-fold *samādhi-abhyāsa*. Of these six types of *samādhi*, three are internal and three are external. In the internal *samādhi*, the discipline practiced by the meditator is separating the thought and the consciousness. Thought-consciousness separation is practiced because every thought we experience internally is a mixture of *caitanyam* and *antaḥkaraṇa-vṛtti*. Because of *caitanyam* alone, the thought is experienced. A thought cannot be experienced by itself. In the first stage we take the thought and consciousness together and shift our attention from the thought to the consciousness part, which is called *dr̥śya-anuviddha-samādhi*. Having shifted the attention to the consciousness we dwell upon the various features of this consciousness. Each feature is remembered with the help of a *śāstra vākya*. That the consciousness is relation-less, eternal, all-pervading, or pure,

etc., is taken and seen as the nature of consciousness. Shifting the attention to *caitanya* is *dr̥śya-anuviddham* and dwelling on the *caitanya* with the help of the *Upaniṣadic* words is *śabda-anuviddham*. It is called *śabda-anuviddha* because *śabda* here refers to not sound but the *Upaniṣadic* words. Since we are segregating thought and consciousness and since thoughts are available only internally, it is called *antara-samādhi*, internal meditation. Then the author talked about the culmination of this *samādhi-abhyāsa*, which is nothing but total absorption in that thought without requiring our conscious effort. Because the thought continues in the sub-conscious mind, that state is called *nirvikalpa avasthā* because the conscious mind is non-operational. In that state, the ego or 'I' is dormant because ego operation requires a conscious deliberate mind. Thus the internal mediation leads to the internal *samādhi*, which is called *antara-nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

After talking about internal meditation, the author has now come to external meditation. In internal meditation, I am separating thought and consciousness whereas in external meditation, I am separating an object and existence. In the internal meditation, it is thought and consciousness and in the external version, it is object and existence. Taking the clip example, internally, there is clip thought and consciousness, whereas externally, the clip object is present along with 'is-ness' or existence. Here also, my first attempt is shifting the attention from the clip to the existence, which is called *dr̥śya-anuviddha-samādhi*. This shifting is so-called because for this shift, I am making use of an object as a stepping-stone. Once the attention is shifted to existence, I dwell upon that existence by seeing the various features of that existence. To dwell upon these features, I make use of the *śāstra* words. Since *śāstric* words are used for dwelling upon the existence, it is called *śabda-anuviddha-samādhi*. The difference between the previous and the present *śabda-anuviddha-samādhi* is that in the previous one words are associated with *caitanya* inside and now the words are associated with existence outside. Existence is only one and indivisible. Even when the whole world is resolved, existence will continue. The *nāma-rūpa* universe arises in the existence canvas, exists in it and resolves into it. Thus I deliberately entertain existence-centered thoughts.

In this meditation, I have to come to one point, which is very important. In internal meditation, we talk about consciousness and in external meditation, we talk about existence. When one practices both the internal and external meditations, a misconception may come. It may be concluded that there is one truth inside, *cit* and another truth outside, *sat*. *Sat* and *cit* may be thought to be different. After dwelling upon existence in the external meditation, I have to tell myself that I am that existence who is in the form of *sākṣī* in every thought. The existence outside is non-different from the consciousness inside. I, who obtain as consciousness inside, am the one who obtain as existence outside. There is no difference between *sat* and *cit*. The difference is only in name and there is no difference in the essential nature. There should be this continuous thought-flow without any distraction. This is *bāhya-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*.

### Verse 29

*stabhībhāvorasāsvādātṛṭyaḥ pūrvavanmataḥ |*

***etaiḥ samādhīḥ ṣaḍbhirnayet kālaṃ nirantaram* || 29||**

What is *nirvikalpa-samādhi*? When the conscious mind deliberately entertains this thought-flow regarding existence and also sees the identity with that existence, as “I am existence”, the sub-conscious mind also picks up the same thought. Then the sub-conscious mind continuously entertains that thought. The conscious effort or the will of the meditator is not required. Exactly as worry happens without our will, *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* also happens without the meditator’s will or effort. This leads to the *nirvikalpa* state in which the subject-object division is not felt because the conscious mind is not prominent. The division is not absent, however. To feel the division, conscious mind is required. Naturally the thought that is happening in the sub-conscious mind is called *sūkṣma-vṛtti*. We are never aware of that *vṛtti* when it is happening. In sleep also, there is a *nirvikalpaka* state in which the subject-object division is not felt but *vṛttis* such as “I am not experiencing anything, there is a blankness’ are in the mind. These *vṛttis* are *sūkṣma*, subtle in nature called *kāraṇa-śarīra-vṛtti*, *avidyā-vṛtti*, sub-conscious *vṛtti*, etc. How does one know that *vṛtti* is present in sleep? After waking up, I am able to recollect that I did not have any experience in sleep. Absence of experience is a form of experience and that experience is registered in the sub-conscious mind in a *vṛtti* form in the *nirvikalpaka* deep sleep state. Similarly in the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* also, the thoughts are registered in the mind and recollected later, even though the *vṛttis* are not recognized at the time of *samādhi*. *Nirvikalpa-samādhi* is a state of absorption in which Vedāntic thoughts continue in subtle form. As in the internal meditation, in the external meditation also, the culmination is the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* after the two *savikalpa-samādhi*. The natural absorption of the mind on the *akhaṇḍākāra-vṛtti* takes place because of the enjoyment of Vedāntic meditation.

The words *rasāsvāda* and *stabdhībhāva* are used in some other contexts also in a totally different meaning. In *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, when Vedāntic meditation is talked about, *rasāsvāda*, experiencing the *ānanda* in meditation, is given as an obstacle to meditation. In this verse, the author says that the absorption is caused because of the enjoyment of *ānanda*. *Ānanda* is the cause for *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. Which one is correct? Both are correct. The word *rasa* has two different meanings. *Ānanda* is divided into two. One is called *pratibimba-ānanda*, the reflected *ānanda*, the experiential pleasure, which happens in the mind as a result of quietude in meditation. Thus this reflected *ānanda* is gone once the meditation is over. This reflected joy can be a bondage if one gets addicted to it. For this reason, Gauḍapāda criticizes this *rasāsvāda* in *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Here in this verse the *rasa* that is talked about is not the reflected *ānanda*, but it is the original *ānanda*, which is not an object of experience. This original *ānanda* is my very own nature that is always present and which I need to claim. The original *ānanda* never changes irrespective of the conditions of the mind that produce varying degrees of experiential *ānanda*. This claiming the original *ānanda*, *atmānanda*, is called *rasāsvāda* in this verse.

The word *stabdhībhāva* and its synonym, *kaṣāya* are used in *Vedāntasāra* and *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* respectively as an obstacle to meditation. In this verse the same word is used as favorable for meditation. In *Vedāntasāra* and *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, the word *stabdhībhāva* is used to indicate the stunning or immobilization of the mind because of impurities in the sub-conscious mind and this results in the inability to concentrate in *Vedāntic* meditation. In this state, there are no *ātma* or *anātmavṛttis* and the

mind is stunned. So this state is pointed out as an obstacle for meditation in *Vedāntasāra* and *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. In this verse, *stabdhibhāva* means the absorption of the mind in *Vedāntic* thoughts alone while remaining immobilized or not getting distracted with respect to worldly thoughts.

With this verse, the author concludes the description of all the six *samādhi-abhyāsa*. Then the author advises that one should be engaged in this *samādhi-abhyāsa* continuously until it becomes *sahaja-samādhi* meaning that these *Vedāntic* thoughts are behind me all the time in and through all the worldly transactions. *Ahāṅkāra* is only a role that I put on in life. Life is a play enacted and managed by *Īśvara* according to my *karma*. I should do what my various roles demand at the appropriate time in the appropriate manner. This way of living should become natural to me and when it becomes natural thus it is called *sahaja-samādhi*. Kṛṣṇa describes this state in the *Bhagavad Gītā*:

*The one who is together, who knows the truth, thinks, 'I do not do anything at all,' even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, walking, sleeping, breathing, talking, releasing, grasping, opening and closing the eyes, (the person) knowing (full well that) the organs are engaged in their objects. (5:8,9)*

After this establishment in my nature, I do not require *nididhyāsanam* as *asādhana* because I am no more a *sādhaka*.

We need to look at one or two points and that will be dealt with in the next class.

## **DDV-16 = 29 to 31**

### **Verse 29**

*stabdhibhāvorasāsvādātṭṛīyaḥ pūrvavanmataḥ |  
etaiḥ samādhībhiḥ śaḍbhirnayet kālaṃ nirantaram || 29||*

In the internal meditation, both *dr̥śya-anuviddha* and *śabda-anuviddha* lead to *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. Similarly, in the case of external meditation also, *dr̥śya-anuviddha* and *śabda-anuviddha* lead to *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. The *nirvikalpa-samādhi* is the common consequence for both the internal and external meditations. After the enumeration and definition of all the six *samadhis*, the author concluded that a seeker should practice this six-fold *samādhi* constantly and regularly.

A few important corollaries should be looked at. Of the six *samadhis*, four are deliberately practiced by the seeker, the two-fold internal *savikala-samādhi* and the two-fold external *savikalpa-samādhi* with the help of the *Vedāntic* teaching, dwelling on the consciousness inside or the existence outside. *Nirvikalpa-*

*samādhi* cannot be deliberately practiced but it is only a consequence of *savikalpa-samādhi-abhyāsa*. When a person practices the meditation for some time, that thought-pattern gets into the sub-conscious mind. Then the will recedes or withdrawn and even after the will subsides the *vṛtti* continues. This continuation of the *vṛtti* without the effort of the meditator is called *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. Since no will is involved in *nirvikalpa-samādhi* it is not dependent on the desire of the meditator but it is only a possible consequence. This *samādhi* is not something that the meditator can directly work for. We can work for only *savikalpa-samādhi*. *Nirvikalpa-samādhi* is not dependent on the will or the desire of the meditator. Many factors are involved in *nirvikalpa-samādhi*. In *Pañcadaśī*, Vidyāranya says that *nirvikalpa-samādhi* also depends on the meditator's *karma*. Of the several factors involved in the occurrence of *nirvikalpa-samādhi*, some are in our hands, like *saṃskāra*, *abhyāsa*, etc., and others like prior-birth karma are not in our hands. Thus *nirvikalpa-samādhi* is a only possible consequence of *savikalpa-samādhi*.

The second point is whether *nirvikalpa-samādhi* is a compulsory necessity for knowledge and liberation. The answer is a clear and absolute no. Knowledge does not come from meditation or *samādhi* whether it is *savikalpa* or *nirvikalpa*. Knowledge is born out of a *pramāṇam*, an appropriate instrument of knowledge. Meditation and *samādhi* are not in the list of six such *pramāṇams*. Spiritual knowledge arises only from *śāstra vākyaṃ*, especially *mahāvākya-vicāra* done with the help of the guru. *Śāstraśravaṇam* alone generates this knowledge. If one says that *śravaṇam* gives only book knowledge but what is needed is direct knowledge, enlightenment, or realization, Vidyāranya says in *Pañcadaśī* that the liberating direct knowledge has to arise out of *mahāvākya śravaṇam* or *vicāra* only. As long as I feel that I do not have direct knowledge, what I require is improved *śravaṇam* or *mahāvākya-vicāra*. My *śravaṇam* is incomplete as long as I feel that I do not have this direct knowledge. Until such time when I have the direct knowledge, any other *sādhana* including *nididhyāsanam* is only for getting the mind ready for improved *śravaṇam*. As long as I do not have direct knowledge, any amount of *samādhi-abhyāsa* I do, I should use it for coming back to *śravaṇam*, and ultimately realization has to take place only in proper *mahāvākya-vicāra*. Clear understanding of *mahāvākyaṃ* is self-realization. Clear understanding includes the clear understanding that there is no self-realization other than the clear understanding of *mahāvākyaṃ*.

Vidyāranya emphasizes this point in *Pañcadaśī*. He talks about *nirvikalpa-samādhi* and thereafter he says that this practice of *nirvikalpa-samādhi* does not produce knowledge but it equips a person for better *śravaṇam*. The intellect could not listen clearly because of certain obstacles and *samādhi-abhyāsa* including the *nirvikalpa-samādhi* will only refine the intellect for better *śravaṇam* by getting rid of the obstacles as stated in the 1st chapter of *Pañcadaśī*.

*amunā vāsanā jale niśṣeṣam pravilāpīte |*  
*samūlon mūlīte puṇya pāpākhye karma sañcaye || 61 ||*

By various *sādhana*s including meditation the intellect gets better, and with the better intellect the seeker has to come back to *śravaṇam*, and when the intellect gets clear, the very same *mahāvākyaṃ*, which was

improperly heard before will be heard more clearly. That improved *śravaṇam* will give direct knowledge as stated in the 1st chapter of *Pañcadaśī*.

*vākyamapratibaddham sat prākparokṣāvabhāsate |  
karāmalakavadbodhamaparokṣam prasūyate || 62 ||*

Vidyāranya concludes in the first chapter of *Pañcadaśī* as follows.

*aparokṣātmavijñānam śābdaṁ deśikapūrvakam |  
saṁsāra-kāraṇā-jñāna tamasaś caṇḍa bhāskaraha || 64 ||*

With the help of the *guru* and *mahāvākya*, one has to continue the *śravaṇam* and *śravaṇam* alone gives *ātmavijñānam*. *Nirvikalpa-samādhi* is not compulsory for liberating direct knowledge but proper *śravaṇam* is. In the 9th chapter of *Pañcadaśī*, Vidyāranya says that throughout life if one feels that he has done a lot of *śravaṇam* but only have book knowledge, he should continue *śravaṇam* in the next birth. *Samādhi-abhyāsa* is one method of clearing the intellect for better *śravaṇam*. *Nirvikalpa-samādhi* may happen or not during that *abhyāsa*, but the liberating knowledge does not depend on that. A person should do the *samādhi-abhyāsa* and *śravaṇam*, and *śravaṇam* will ultimately give the knowledge.

### Verse 30

*dehābhimāne galite vijñāte paramātmani |  
yatra yatra mano yāti tatra tatra samādhayaḥ || 30 ||*

As a result of this repeated cyclic *sādhana* of *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsana-abhyāsa*, of which *śravaṇam* is the primary *sādhana*, I clearly understand the *mahāvākya* meaning that I am Brahman. Brahman is not a far away entity that needs to be experienced later but it is the *caitanya* that is directly experienced all the time. Vedānta is talking about me, the ever available *caitanya*, which was, is and ever will be Brahman. If a question, ‘Is Brahman not limited by the body now and should the body not go away for Brahman to become limitless?’ arises in the mind of the seeker, it indicates that *śravaṇam* is incomplete. Space can never be limited by the presence of the pot or the absence of the pot. Space is always indivisible and limitless and I, the *caitanya*, am ever indivisible and limitless whether the body is present or not. This clear understanding is important. As the understanding that I am not the body with consciousness but I am the consciousness with an incidental body becomes clearer and clearer, I claim the *ātmā* more and begin to disclaim the body. It is like going towards one wall in a room necessarily

means going away from the opposite wall. Establishment in *ātmā* presupposes giving up the identification with the body. As *ātmā* is claimed more, the notion that I am the body drops. That notion existed because of ignorance, and as the ignorance goes away, the body identification goes. This must be clearly understood.

Body identification is of two types. One is the *sāmānya* identification, which is caused by the *prārabdha-karma* due to which I am associated with this body-mind complex. Therefore, I experience the bodily conditions like hunger, thirst, old age, disease, pain, etc., These biological experiences including pleasure, pain, etc., are caused by *prārabdha-karma* and so they will not go away. Establishment in self-knowledge will not make these experiences disappear. The biological experiences will continue as long as the *prārabdha-karma* lasts. The second is the *viśeṣa* identification in the form of the intellectual conclusion or notion that is born of ignorance. That ignorance gives rise to the notions that I am the physical body, the birth of the body is my birth, the death of the body is my death, death is the end of this life, etc. These intellectual notions cause *saṃsāra*. Vedānta will destroy this intellectual conclusion. Emotional problems born out of the wrong intellectual conclusion will not be present. A baby feels and cries from physical pain but does not have the emotional worries associated with the bodily condition. Similarly a *jñāni* will go through biological pleasures or pain but like a baby the *jñāni* does not have worries caused by the body-identification. Thus the *jñāni's* dis-identification with the body is at the cognitive level and not the physical level. When the understanding is very clear thus, no more *sādhana* is required for the *jñāni*. But the *jñāni* may choose to do the *sādhanas*. The *jñāni*, whose understanding is clear, is in *sahaja-samādhi*, which means that he remembers the teaching all the time. This constant remembrance is natural to him. This state is called *sahaja-samādhi*, *ātmaniṣṭha*, *sthitaprajña*, *brāhmisthiti*, etc. Whatever ups and downs are caused by *prārabdha*, he remembers the fact that *brahma satyaṃ jagan mithyā aham brahmaiva nāpara*. Wherever his mind goes, whatever be the experience, he is in either internal or external *samādhi*. Every perception is a *samādhi*. He does not lose sight of *sat* in the external perceptions and *cit* in the internal perceptions, with the understanding that he is that limitless *sat* and *cit*.

### **Verse 31**

***bhidyate hṛdayagranthiśchidyante sarvasaṃśayāḥ |***  
***kṣīyante cāsya karmāṇi tasmin drṣṭe parāvare || 31 ||***

The benefit of this establishment in knowledge is given in this verse. The author quotes a verse from the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* and in fact this verse is the same as verse 2.2.9 of *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*. With the clear understanding that Brahman alone appears in the form of both the *kāraṇa Īśvara* and the *kāryajīva*, the knot, the ignorance or desire in the mind that binds one to the body, goes away. All doubts are destroyed in the wake of this understanding. All the results of actions in the form of *puṇyam* and *pāpam* are also destroyed. *Saṅcīta* is destroyed and *āgāmi* is avoided. *Jñāni's* actions do not produce *puṇyam* or *pāpam*. *Prārabdha-karma* is present but the *jñāni's* standpoint towards them is from the *ātmā* angle and



so he does not give over-importance to them with the result that they are as good as destroyed. It is similar to how the presence of the stars is not noticed when the sun is shining brightly.

### **DDV-17 = 32 and 33**

#### **Verse 31**

*bhidyate hrdayagranthiśchidyante sarvasaṃśayāḥ |  
kṣīyante cāśya karmāṇi tasmin dr̥ṣṭe parāvare || 31 ||*

With this 31st verse, the first part of *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ* is over. The author has talked about all aspects of the Vedāntic teaching concluding in the 31st verse. He talked about the problem of *saṃsāra* as the non-discrimination between the real and the unreal. At the subjective level, it is the non-discrimination between the real seer and the unreal seen, the seer-seen non-discrimination. At the objective level the non-discrimination is between the real Brahman and the unreal name and form universe. At the subjective level the real is called *cit*, the consciousness and at the objective level, the real is called *sat*, the existence. This non-discrimination is the cause of *saṃsāra* and therefore the solution is

discrimination or separation. I have to separate the I, the *cit*, from the body-mind complex through understanding and at the objective level, I should understand the *sat*, the reality, which is in and through all the name and form universe. Not only should I separate the *cit* and *sat* thus, most importantly I should understand that the *cit* inside alone is the *sat* outside. *Sat* and *cit* are two different words but they refer to one and the same Brahman or Ātman. I, the *sat-cit ātmā*, am *satyaṃ* and the body-mind complex as well as the world outside are both *mithyā*. This discrimination is the solution. Thereafter the author said that it is not enough if we do the discrimination, but it has to be assimilated also so that our habitual identification with the body goes away. Any habit has to gradually go away. Removal of any addiction is tough and ego-addiction is the worst form of addiction. If it is said that *mokṣa* means dropping the ego-addiction, people will generally opt for dropping *mokṣa* because individuality is loved by everyone. Negation of individuality appears like committing suicide. Once it is understood that individuality is another name for mortality and insecurity, it will seem worthwhile to learn how to drop the individuality. Withdrawal from the strong addiction to *ahaṅkāra* is difficult and long *nididhyāsanam* is required to remove the habitual identification. As a part of *nididhyāsanam*, six types of *samādhi-abhyāsa* are prescribed, and as a result, one obtains both *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti*. This benefit was presented in the 31st verse by quoting the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* verse. Thus, the *saṃsāra* problem, the solution, and the benefit were talked about.

Actually at this point, the teaching of the text is over. In some versions, the text itself ends with the 31st verse. In the version of the text that we are studying, some more verses are given. Those verses form the summary of the teaching. These verses can be treated as a separate Vedāntic text also because these verses can exist independently without connection to the previous portion.

## Verse 32

*avacchinnaścidābhāsastrīyaḥ svapnakalpitah |*

*vijñeyastrividho jīvastatrādyah pāramāthikah || 32||*

The author takes a new, unique and creative approach to Vedāntic teaching. In the previous portion, he talked about three *drk* and three *drśya*. In this portion, the author talks about three *jīvas* within one individual himself. Every individual is a combination of three *jīvas*. When we use the word I, it can refer to any of these three *jīvas* according to context. If we understand the context clearly we will have no problem. Three names are given. The first is called *pāramāthika-jīva*, the second is *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the third is *prātibhāsika-jīva*. Of them the first one, *pāramāthika-jīva*, is the name of the original consciousness (OC) obtaining in the individual. The other two, *vyāvahārika-jīva* and *prātibhāsika-jīva* are *cidābhāsa 1* and *cidābhāsa 2*, two types of reflected consciousnesses. One OC and two RC are the three *jīvas*.

The original consciousness, which exists independently, is *pāramārthika-jīva*, the *satyaṃ*. Its existence does not depend on the body and the mind. Even after the destruction of the body-mind complex and even the whole universe, that original consciousness will continue to exist, but that consciousness is not available for transaction because the medium for its manifestation is not present. Reflected consciousness alone is experienced like the reflected light. *Pāramārthika-jīva* is the meaning number 1 of the word 'I'. When a *jñāni* says, 'I am Brahman', the 'I' refers to the original consciousness.

The second *jīva* is the very same original consciousness which is reflected or manifested in the body-mind complex as *cidābhāsa*, life or sentiency in the body, which is the localized consciousness. It is localized because the reflection is available only within the reflecting medium. It is this consciousness which is available for transaction. It is the RC and not the OC that senses the sensations of the body and the surrounding. A table does not have reflected consciousness and so is not sentient even though OC is in it also. This *cidābhāsa* that obtains in the *vyāvahārika* body-mind complex and experiences the *vyāvahārika* universe in the waking state is the second *jīva*. This RC1 is called the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. As long as the mind is active, the *vyāvahārika-jīva* is available.

When a person is in dream, a fresh dream body-mind-sense complex is created by *nidrā-śakti* to experience the dream. The projected mind obtaining in dream does not know that it is dreaming. A *cidābhāsa* is formed in the dream mind also and that *cidābhāsa* obtaining in the *prātibhāsika* body-mind complex projected by the waker's mind is called *prātibhāsika-jīva*. This *jīva* experiences the projected dream world. As long as the projected *prātibhāsika* body-mind is present, this *jīva* is available. When the person wakes up, the *prātibhāsika* body-mind, and the corresponding *jīva* and the dream universe are resolved into the waker. Similarly when the *vyāvahārika* mind is resolved in deep sleep, the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika* universe are resolved.

However, the *pāramārthika-jīva* never resolves. That *pāramārthika-jīva* is the *advaitam* Brahman and it ever is. The teaching of Vedānta is that instead of claiming the *vyāvahārika-jīva* or the *prātibhāsika-jīva* as 'I', I should learn to claim the *pāramārthika-jīva* as 'I'. After claiming thus, I can play the roles of the other two *jīvas* and need not try to get rid of them. Only the understanding that those *jīvas* are only roles is needed. Playing the roles with this knowledge, the roles will not create *samsāra*. Such a *jñāni* who plays the roles without allowing the roles to cause *samsāra* is called a *jīvanmukta*. He will play the roles appropriately and to the fullest but the roles will not bind him because he has the background awareness that he is really *pāramārthika-jīva*. Thus *pāramārthika-jīva* is the OC, the *vyāvahārika-jīva* is the RC obtaining in the waking state and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* is the RC obtaining in the dream state. Every *jīva* is a composite individual consisting of these three *jīvas*. When the word 'I' is used it can refer to any one of them. One should be aware of which *jīva* is referred to when. Of these three, the original consciousness is absolute reality.

### **Verse 33**

*avacchedaḥ kalpitaḥ syādavacchedyaṃ tu vāstavam |*  
*tasmin jīvatvamāropābrahmatvaṃ tu svabhāvataḥ || 33||*

Here the author talks about the nature of the *pāramārthika-jīva*, the consciousness enclosed within the body. The enclosed consciousness is seemingly limited by the body but really not limited and it is all-pervading. As an example, the pot-space is seemingly limited by the pot but is not really limited. The space seems to be obtained in the pot but the truth is that the pot is in the indivisible space but the space is not in the pot. Similarly consciousness is not in the body but there is one indivisible all-pervading consciousness in which all the bodies exist. The body does not enclose or limit consciousness. Consciousness is of a higher order of reality and the body is of a lower order of reality. The unreal body can never limit the real consciousness. The enclosure body is *mithyā*, a lower order of reality but the enclosed consciousness is *satyaṃ*. Since the enclosure is unreal it can never limit the consciousness and therefore the limitation of consciousness is a seeming limitation. Limitation is falsely attributed to that enclosed consciousness which is really limitless. It looks as though I am the consciousness located in the body but I am everywhere.

## **DDV-18 = 34 to 38**

### **Verse 33**

*avacchedaḥ kalpitaḥ syādavacchedyaṃ tu vāstavam |*  
*tasmin jīvatvamāropābrahmatvaṃ tu svabhāvataḥ || 33||*

From the 32nd verse up to the 46th verse, the author is summarizing the entire Vedāntic teaching in a different manner. Previously he talked about three types of seers and now he is talking about three types of *jīvas*, *pāramārthika-jīva*, *vyāvahārika-jīva* and *prātibhāsika-jīva*. *Pāramārthika-jīva* is the original consciousness which obtains in the body-mind complex like the space obtaining in a pot. This *jīva* is called the OC and it is called *pāramārthika* because it is *pāramārthikasatyaṃ*. This enclosed

consciousness seems to be limited by the enclosure body-mind complex but the limitation is only a seeming limitation just as space cannot be limited or divided by anything. The body-mind complex belongs to a lesser order of reality and therefore it cannot limit the OC which is a higher order of reality. The enclosed consciousness is originally nothing but Brahman. The very same consciousness reflected in the mind has limitation. This reflected consciousness which is called *cidābhāsa* has a limitation because the reflection can be located only within the reflecting medium. Here the author says that because of the proximity of the original consciousness and the reflected consciousness, we commit the mistake of falsely transferring the limitation of the reflected consciousness to the original consciousness. Therefore, *pāramārthika-jīva* is given a limitation that it does not have and this limitation alone is called *jīvatvam* or mortality. The *jīvatvam* of the RC is falsely given to the OC, the *pāramārthika-jīva*. Similarly the *cidābhāsa* of the waker, the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, projects a dream individual, which is *cidābhāsa 2*. This RC belonging to the dream body-mind is called *prātibhāsika-jīva* that experiences the dream world. Thus there are three layers. The first is the OC called *pāramārthika-jīva* which does not have any universe. Upon the OC is the RC *vyāvahārika-jīva* associated with the waker's body-mind complex which experiences the waker's universe. This *vyāvahārika-jīva* through the *vyāvahārika* body experiences the *vyāvahārika* universe. This is the second layer. When this *vyāvahārika-jīva* dreams, a second RC is obtained and this *prātibhāsika-jīva* experiences the dream universe through a dream body. However, the *pāramārthika-jīva* is not associated with any body and is not associated with any universe. There is no duality but only *advaitam*. In the deep sleep state, both the *vyāvahārika* and *prātibhāsika* bodies are resolved and the respective universes are not experienced. In this state we are in our own original nature, the *pāramārthika-jīva*, but we do not know it. But the *śāstra* teaches that we are neither the *vyāvahārika-jīva* nor the *prātibhāsika-jīva* but the *pāramārthika-jīva*. When a *jñāni* says, 'I am Brahman' the 'I' refers to the *pāramārthika-jīva*. When is the *jñāni* Brahman? That is answered in the next verse.

### **Verse 34**

***avacchinnasya jīvasya pūrṇena brahmaṇaikatām |***

***tattvamasyādivākyaṇi jagurnetarajīvayoḥ || 34||***

I am the limitless original consciousness and when the mind comes and the reflection is formed, that reflection is a limited temporary entity. If the mind is not present, the reflection will be absent but I, the original will continue. That original consciousness cannot be seen just as our original face cannot be seen. However, the existence of the original consciousness cannot be doubted just like the existence of the original face cannot be doubted even though it cannot be seen. How do I know that the OC exists? Since I cannot see my original consciousness and all the instruments of knowledge are meant to see matter, the only instrument which can talk about me, the OC is *mahāvākya śāstra pramāṇam*. Such

*vākyas* like ‘*tat tvam asi*’ reveal the oneness of the *pāramārthika-jīva* with the infinite Brahman. I am normally not able to accept the *śāstric* teaching because when I use the word ‘I’, I either take myself as *prātibhāsika-jīva* or the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. But learning to look at the *vākya* from the viewpoint of the *pāramārthika-jīva*, the *vākya* of oneness will ring true. For the other two *jīvas*, this oneness with Brahman is not talked about by the *śāstra* because it does not exist.

### **Verse 35**

***brahmaṇyavasthitā māyā vikṣepāvṛtirūpiṇī |***

***āvṛtyakhaṇḍatām tasmin jagajjīvau prakalpayet || 35||***

The author has talked about the *pāramārthika-jīva* ‘I’ that is identical with the infinite Brahman. The author is now explaining how the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* arise from Brahman or me. Let us imagine a state in which the *vyāvahārika* and *prātibhāsika* universes are not present but the non-dual Brahman alone is present. In other words, I, the *pāramārthika-jīva*, alone am present. I, Brahman, have a special power called *māyā-śakti*. This *śakti* is two-fold. One is the projection power and the other is the concealing power. Using my projection power, I project a dream upon myself. What is that dream? This physical body and this physical universe are a dream projected by me, the *pāramārthika-jīva*. For the sake of experiencing the dream, I identify with the *vyāvahārika* body and the *vyāvahārika cidābhāsa* and become the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. Once the dream is entered into, the fact that the dream is a dream is forgotten. For the dreamer the dream is very real. A dreamer will never accept the dream as dream while in dream. The dreamer does not know the waker, his higher nature. Because of my concealing power, I, the *pāramārthika-jīva*, forget my *pāramārthika* status and this world projected by me gains a high degree of reality. I do all this with the help of my *māyā-śakti*. *Śāstras* teach that experiencing the dream is fine but understanding that it is only a dream is important. But most of us fail to do that because we refuse to wake up from the dream. Only waking up will show that the dream was only a dream.

### **Verse 36**

***jīvo dhīstacidābhāso bhavedbhoktā hi karmakṛt |***

***bhogyarūpamidaṃ sarvaṃ jagat syādbhūtabhautikam || 36||***

I, the *pāramārthika-jīva*, have forgotten my nature and I have come to this universe as a *vyāvahārika-jīva*. This universe is my own projection and it is my own bigger dream, a *vyāvahārika* dream. The confused *vyāvahārika-jīva* is none other than the consciousness reflected in the projected mind. This *jīva* is the doer in the body-mind complex and due to various actions performed, gathers *puṇyam* and *pāpam*. The doer *jīva* becomes the experiencer *jīva*. This continuing dream experience cannot be stopped except by waking up. As long as I refuse to wake up but keep doing a variety of actions, the cycle of action and

experience of results continues. For the *jīva*'s experience of pleasure and pain, the universe is the field consisting of the five elements and their products. The universe, the *jīva*'s body, and *cidābhāsa* are all within the dream of the *pāramārthika-jīva* and that *jīva* has chosen to identify with *cidābhāsa*, its inferior version.

### **Verse 37**

*anādikālamārabhya mokṣāt pūrvamidaṃ dvayam |*  
*vyāvahāre sthitaṃ tasmādubhayaṃ vyāvahārikam || 37||*

Here the author gives the reason why the *waker-jīva* is called the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. This *vyāvahārika-jīva*, the *cidābhāsa*, is involved in all the transactions. The *pāramārthika-jīva* is beyond all transactions similar to the waker being not involved in any of the dream transactions. The beginning of the *waker-jīva* and the waking universe in which the transactions are going on cannot be known just like the beginning of a dream cannot be ascertained. Even the dreamer cannot say for certain when the dream started. For a dreamer to do that, he must be the knower of the waker, which he is not. The waker cannot say when the dream started because for him the dream does not even exist. From beginning-less time, this *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika* universe continue to exist in transaction. Can this dream of transaction end? Until spiritual awakening, the *vyāvahārika-jīva* continues the transaction and therefore this *jīva* is called the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. The dream example is the best way to explain this unbelievable state of affairs. The waker projects the dream body-mind and the dream world, enters into it, forgets his higher waker nature and enters into dream transactions and experiences the results thereof. Learning from this example that happens every night, we can understand that the waking experience is also another kind of dream. The author deals with this topic in the next few verses.

## **DDV-19 = 38 to 41**

### **Verse 38**

*cidābhāsasthitā nidrā vikṣepāvṛtirūpiṇī |*  
*āvṛtya jīvajagatī pūrve nūtno tu kalpayet || 38||*

From the 32nd verse, the author is summarizing the Vedāntic teaching given in the first 31 verses once again in a different language by introducing three *jīvas*, *pāramārthika-jīva*, *vyāvahārika-jīva*, and *prātibhāsika-jīva*. He also introduces two fields of experience, *vyāvahārika-jagat* and the *prātibhāsika-*

*jagat*. *Vyāvahārika-jīva* is associated with the *vyāvahārika-jagat* and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* is associated with the *prātibhāsika-jagat*. *Pāramārthika-jīva* is not associated with any field of experience. The *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jagat* are available in the waking state. The *prātibhāsika-jīva* and the *prātibhāsika-jagat* are available in the dream state. The *pāramārthika-jīva* is the original consciousness, OC whereas the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* are in the form of *cidābhāsa*, the reflected consciousness. *Vyāvahārika-jīva* is the *vyāvahārika-cidābhāsa* associated with the waker's body experiencing the waking universe in the waking state. *Prātibhāsika-jīva* is the *prātibhāsika-cidābhāsa* associated with the dream body experiencing the dream universe in the dream state.

The author says that I, the *pāramārthika-jīva*, am projecting the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, the *jagat*, space and time. Since both are my own projections both of them are like dream only. The power that I have to project the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jagat* is called *māyā*. I now identify with the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and forget my *pāramārthika-jīva* nature. This is mistake 1. The second mistake is as follows. This *vyāvahārika-jīva-I* projects the *prātibhāsika-jīva* and *jagat* with the help of the individual *nidrā-śakti* and identify with the *prātibhāsika-jīva* in the dream state. Then the *prātibhāsika-jīva* forgets his higher nature due to the concealing power of *nidrā-śakti* and takes the projected dream to be real and experience the consequences. The dream's effects can be solved by waking up. If the waker's world, which is really a projection, disturbs the waker, the waker needs to wake up. The first waking-up is to get out of the dream *samsāra*. The second waking-up is to get out of the waking *samsāra*. Gauḍapādācārya refers to this in *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*:

*Having been ignorant of (Turīya) due to beginningless māyā, when the jīva awakens, then, he knows the non-dual (Turīya) which is unborn, dreamless, and sleepless. (1:16)*

Of these three *jīvas*, the author has talked about the *pāramārthika-jīva* in verses 32, 33, and 34 and the *vyāvahārika-jīva* in verses 35, 36 and 37. Now in verse 38, the *prātibhāsika-jīva* is described. The *pāramārthika-jīva* projects the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jīva* projects the *prātibhāsika jīva*. In the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, which is the consciousness reflected in the waker's body-mind complex, there is a power called *nidrā-śakti*. This power is very similar to *māyā-śakti* and has the projecting and the concealing capacities. With these powers of projection and concealment, the *nidrā-śakti* creates a new *dream-jīva* and the dream world and simultaneously covers the waker and his world. The *dream-jīva* is referred to as new in the verse to indicate that the *dream-jīva* is not aware that he is originally the waker. Thus both the waking *jīva-world* and the *dream-jīva-world* are my own projections in two layers.

### **Verse 39**

*pratītikāla evaite sthitatvāt prātibhāsike |*

*na hi svapnaprabuddhasya punaḥ svapne sthitistayoḥ || 39||*

The *waker-jīva* and the waking world are false projections just as the *dreamer-jīva* and the dream world are. They are all *mithyā*. This is described in great detail in the second chapter, *Vaitathyaprakaraṇam* of



*Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*. Here the author says that even though both the waking and dream are unreal, there is a gradation in that unreality. Because of this gradation alone, the waking is called *vyāvahārika* and the dream is called *prātibhāsika* even though both are projections. Why is dream called *prātibhāsikam*? Even though the waker's world is unreal, there is continuity for this waking world and thus the waking world has an empirical reality. It does not have absolute reality being a projection, but has transactional reality. However the dream does not have any continuity from one dream to another. The dream world exists only as long as it is experienced. When a particular dream is over, the world associated with it ceases to exist never to be retrieved. The dream does not have an empirical reality, objective reality, or a continuing reality and so cannot be called *vyāvahārikam*. When the dream is experienced, it is real for only the dreamer and so is called *prātibhāsikam*. Whatever has got temporary reality or existence during its appearance is called *prātibhāsikam*, subjective reality. After waking up from a dream, the same dream never continues while dreaming again. Thus a given dream has only a fleeting existence.

#### **Verse 40**

*prātibhāsikajīvo yastajjagat prātibhāsikam |*

*vāstavaṃ manyate'nyastu mithyeti vyāvahārikah || 40 ||*

The author says that in dream, the *prātibhāsika-jīva* refuses to accept the *prātibhāsika-jagat* as an unreal projection. To see it as an unreal projection the *jīva* has to wake up and gain the knowledge that he is the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. As a *vyāvahārika-jīva*, the dream is effortlessly seen to be *mithyā*. The same is true for the *vyāvahārika-jīva* with regard to the waking world, when he wakes up to his real nature as the *pāramārthika-jīva*. That is elaborated in the next verse.

#### **Verse 41**

*vyāvahārikajīvo yaḥ tajjagadvyāvahārikam |*

*satyaṃ pratyeti mithyeti manyate pāramārthikah || 41 ||*

The *waker-jīva* never accepts the waking world as unreal as long as he is ignorant of the higher 'I'. This *jīva* looks upon the waker's world as absolute reality even though it is another projection consisting of simple name and form without any substantiality of its own. However a *jñāni*, who claims that he is neither the *prātibhāsika-cidābhāsa* nor the *vyāvahārika-cidābhāsa* but is the *pāramārthika-jīva*, understands the whole *vyāvahārika-jagat* to be *mithyā*.

There is an important difference that needs to be noted. When I wake up from dream and understand that I am not the *dream-jīva* but I am the *waker-jīva*, the dream physically disappears. But when I wake up from this *vyāvahārika* dream through self-knowledge and claim that I am the *pāramārthika-jīva*, this world does not instantaneously disappear. The *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jagat* will continue to appear for some more time due to the power of *prārabdha karma*. One example that is given to

illustrate this is the blue sky continuing to appear even after the knowledge that there is no blue sky. Other example is the sunrise and sunset. Thus there are two types of unreality. One that physically disappears after knowledge and the other that continues to appear even after the knowledge that it is unreal. The sense-organs will continue to report the world as it is even after the world is known to be unreal, but the cognitive understanding of the unreal nature of the world remains. The *jñāni-jīva* knows that the waking world is *mithyā*.

### **DDV-20 = 42 to 46**

#### **Verse 41**

*vyāvahārikajīvo yaḥ tajjagadyāvahārikam |*  
*satyaṃ pratyeti mithyeti manyate pāramārthikaḥ || 41 ||*

The author is condensing the Vedāntic teaching in these verses beginning from the 32nd verse and in this summary, he introduces three *jīvas*, *prātibhāsika-jīva*, *vyāvahārika-jīva* and *pāramārthika-jīva*. *Prātibhāsika-jīva* is the *cidābhāsa* associated with the dream body and the sense-organs and when I identify with that, I am called *prātibhāsika-jīva* or the *dream-jīva*. *Vyāvahārika-jīva* is the *cidābhāsa* associated with the waking body and the sense-organs and when I am identified with that, I am called the *vyāvahārika-jīva* or the *waking-jīva*. *Pāramārthika-jīva* is the one who does not identify with *cidābhāsa 1*, the *dream-jīva* or the *cidābhāsa 2*, the *waking-jīva*, but identifies with *cit*, the original consciousness. This is possible only for a wise person who has woken up from being the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and claims identity with the original consciousness. He is called the *pāramārthika-jīva*. *Prātibhāsika-jīva* is in dream 1 and when he wakes up becomes the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. As *vyāvahārika-jīva* he is in dream 2 and when he wakes up from that, he is called the *pāramārthika-jīva*. For him identity with Brahman alone is real. The *prātibhāsika-jīva* looks upon the dream world as real whereas the *vyāvahārika-jīva* looks upon the dream world as unreal. *Vyāvahārika-jīva* looks upon the waking world as real whereas the *pāramārthika-jīva* looks upon the waking world as unreal. *Prātibhāsika-jīva* becomes the *vyāvahārika-jīva* by waking up. *Vyāvahārika-jīva* claims that he is the *pāramārthika-jīva* through wisdom. There is a difference in these two types of waking. When the *prātibhāsika-jīva* wakes up, the dream world becomes unreal and disappears from his experience. When I, the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, wake up and claim that I am the *pāramārthika-jīva*, the waking world becomes unreal but it does not disappear from my experience. The experience continues. This is called the *jīvanmukti*. It is as though the dreamer in dream knows that his experience is dream.

#### Verse 42

*pāramārthikajīvastu brahmaikyam pāramārthikam |  
pratyeti vīkṣate nānyad vīkṣate tvaṅṛtātmanā || 42||*

The *prātibhāsika-jīva* sees the dream world as real and when he wakes up and becomes the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, the dream world becomes unreal and the waking world seems real. When the *vyāvahārika-jīva* wakes up and recognizes that he is the *pāramārthika-jīva*, the waking world becomes unreal, and the oneness of the waker with Brahman is recognized. “I am Brahman” is a fact for that *jīva*. By constant *śravaṇam*, *mananam* and *nididhyāsanam* he retains that fact in the surface of the mind all the time. Gaining the knowledge is relatively easier but the problem is that the knowledge gained in the intellect at the time of *śravaṇam* does not help in life situations because the relative personality of the *jīva* as a father, mother, etc., is still prominent. Knowledge is not sufficient but establishment in the knowledge is required. The fact that one is the *pāramārthika-jīva* should be foremost in the mind. Even a wise person gets dragged into the status of *vyāvahārika-jīva* and so, long *śravaṇa-manana-nididhyāsanam* is required. *Sureśvarācārya* says that this is a life-long process. The one that is established as the *pāramārthika-jīva* will not invoke the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* beyond what is necessary for the carrying out the duties of those two *ahāṅkāra*. He plays the role that each situation demands well and effortlessly moves on to the next situation. Even as he transacts in these roles, he constantly remembers that they are *mithyā*. Once this is forgotten, the world will become *satyam*. The

world's capacity to bind the *jīva* is too powerful. In front of the *satya* world the *jīva* is overwhelmed. The world can be tackled only by seeing it to be *mithyā*. That is what a *pāramārthika-jīva* does. He is a *jīvanmukta jñāni*.

### Verse 43

*mādhuryadravaśaityāni nīradharmāstaraṅgake |*  
*anugamyātha tanniṣṭe phene'pyanugatā yathā || 43||*

Why is it said that the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* are *mithyā* and the *pāramārthika-jīva* alone is *satyam*? While it is easy to accept that the *dream-jīva* is *mithyā*, it is difficult to accept that the *waker-jīva* is also *mithyā*. The author says that the *pāramārthika-jīva* alone has its own *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*, whereas the *vyāvahārika-jīva* does not have these independently. The *pāramārthika-jīva* lends these to the *cidābhāsavyāvahārika-jīva*. What is borrowed, especially the borrowed *ānanda*, is not permanent which results in *saṃsāra* for the *vyāvahārika-jīva*. The *vyāvahārika-jīva* lends the *sat-cit-ānanda* that it has borrowed to the *prātibhāsika-jīva*. The author gives a brilliant example to explain this sequential borrowing of *sat-cit-ānanda*. Imagine a lake or an ocean. Upon the lake there is a wave. There is a bubble upon that wave. The attributes of the water are borrowed by the wave and are given to the bubble. In this example, water is the *pāramārthika-jīva*, the wave is the *vyāvahārika-jīva* and the bubble is the *prātibhāsika-jīva*. Water has three intrinsic attributes, unique taste, liquidity, and coolness to the touch. These three attributes of water pervade the wave. The small bubble on top of the wave also has these three attributes. Water does not give the three attributes directly to the bubble. Water lends the attributes to the wave and the wave in turn lends them to the bubble. Exactly as in this example, we are experiencing all the three attributes of the *pāramārthika-jīva*. We are the *pāramārthika-jīva* that is similar to the water. The *vyāvahārika-jīva* is like the temporary wave and the *prātibhāsika-jīva* is like a still more temporary bubble. The example is described in this verse and the teaching is explained in the next verse.

### Verse 44

*sākṣisthāḥsaccidānandāḥ sambandhādvvyāvahārike |*  
*taddvāreṇānugacchanti tathaiva prātibhāsike || 44||*

Similar to the example cited, I am the original 'water' who is the *sākṣī*, the *pāramārthika-jīva* and whose intrinsic nature is *sat-cit-ānanda*. I am always existent and I do not have birth or death. I claim immortality if I claim I am 'water'. If I claim I am the 'wave', the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, I have problems. The life conditions of the wave depend on the wind and not on itself. Similarly the life conditions of the *vyāvahārika-jīva* depend on *karma*. The situation is still worse if I claim I am the 'bubble', the *prātibhāsika-jīva*, which has a shorter life. It is unintelligent to claim the 'bubble' and the 'wave' statuses. Claiming the 'water' status is wise because the wind does not affect the water. Therefore I should claim I am the *pāramārthika-jīva* and not the *vyāvahārika-jīva* or the *prātibhāsika-jīva*. This

*pāramārthika-jīva* is called the *sākṣī* in this verse. I, the *sākṣī*, lend *sat-cit-ānanda* to the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, which is the temporary *cidābhāsa* associated with the temporary body, and through the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, the very same *sat-cit-ānanda* is given to the *prātibhāsika-jīva*. The waker's mind alone gives consciousness to the dream body.

### Verse 45

*laye phenasya taddharmā dravādyāḥ syustaraṅgake |*  
*tasyāpi vilaye nīre tiṣṭhantyeṭe yathā purā || 45 ||*

The author is now going in the reverse order. Previously he talked about the three attributes of the water that go to the wave and from the wave to the bubble. Suppose the bubble bursts or resolves. What happens to the three attributes, unique taste, liquidity, and coolness to the touch? The attributes are not destroyed when the bubble bursts because they are not the attributes of the bubble. The attributes remain with the wave. When the wave resolves, the attributes are not destroyed but remain with the water. The condition, i.e., the water, that is obtained in the wave and the bubble remains the same after the resolving of the wave and the bubble also. In the same way, when the *dream-jīva* resolves, the *sat-cit-ānanda* never gets destroyed but gets resolved into the *waker-jīva*. At the time of dissolution of all the waker *jīvas*, the *sat-cit-ānanda* is not destroyed but remain with the *sākṣī*, the *pāramārthika-jīva*. The author elaborates in the next verse.

### Verse 46

*prātibhāsikajīvasya laye syurvyāvahārike |*  
*tallaye saccidānandāḥ paryavasyanti sākṣiṇi || 46 ||*

When the *dream-jīva* resolves upon waking up from the dream, the *sat-cit-ānanda* that was present in the dream comes back to the *waker-jīva*. The 'I am' is common to all the *jīvas*, 'I' being the consciousness and 'am' being the existence. The 'I am' is *satyaṃ* and anything added to the 'I am' is *mithyā*. The *waker-jīva* is dissolved during three states. These three states are deep sleep and death, dissolution of the universe and *videhamukti*. At the time of deep sleep and death or total dissolution of the universe, which are temporary states, the *waker-jīva* is temporarily dissolved. Upon *videhamukti*, the *waker-jīva* is permanently dissolved and remains as the *sākṣī caitanyam*, one with Brahman. The *sākṣī* does not and cannot resolve. I, the *sākṣī*, am always present and in me alone the waves and bubbles of creation arise and fall. One should abide as the *sākṣī* and not get carried away by the various roles that come and go. Life, the play, goes on in me, the *sākṣī*. As the *jīva*, the various *mithyā* roles should be played to the fullest and in the appropriate manner, but *sākṣī*, which is *satyaṃ* and the true nature of the *jīva*, should never be forgotten. This is *ḍṛgḍṛśyavivekaḥ*.

## **DDV-21 = Summary**

This text called *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ* was written by Ādi Śaṅkarācārya. Some people claim that it was written by Vidyāraṇya Swāmī or Bhāratī Tirtha Swāmī. Whoever is the author of the text, it is a beautiful text summarizing the Vedāntic teaching. There are 46 verses in the text and the text can be divided into five topics. The first topic is from verses 1 to 5 enumerating the three types of seers or *dr̥k*. The second topic is from the 6th verse up to the 12th verse dealing with the formation and function of these three seers. The third topic is from the 13th verse up to the 21st verse, which is the main part of the text, and it deals with the cause of *samsāra* and its remedy. The fourth topic is from the 22nd verse up to the 31st verse, which describes the Vedāntic meditation and its benefit. Finally, from verses 32 to 46 the summarization of the whole teaching is given. The content of each topic is discussed below.

### **1. Enumeration of the Three Seers (1 - 5)**

From the standpoint of the world, the sense-organs can be called the seer. From the standpoint of the sense-organs, the mind can be called the seer. From the standpoint of the mind, the consciousness can be called the seer. The world is seen because of the sense-organs, sense-organs are known because of the mind and the mind is experienced because of consciousness. Thus there are three types of seers and correspondingly there are three types of seen also. Every seer presupposes a seen. If a list of seers and a list of seen are made, there will be three seen and three seers. The world is the seen 1, the sense-organs is the seen 2, and the mind is the seen 3. Sense-organs is seer 1, mind is seer 2 and consciousness is seer 3. The world occurs only in the seen list and does not occur in the seer list. Thus the world is the absolute seen because it is only an object perceived and never the subject. Consciousness is only in the seer list and it is not in the seen list. Thus consciousness is the absolute seer. However the sense-organs and the mind are in both the seer and the seen lists. Thus they are seen-seer. Sense-organs are the seer from the standpoint of the world and they are the seen from the standpoint of the mind. The mind is the seer from the standpoint of the sense-organs and it is the seen from the standpoint of the consciousness. Sense-organs are the relative seen-seer and the mind is also the relative seen-seer. Consciousness is the absolute seer. Thus there are totally four, one absolute seen, the world, two relative seen-seers, the sense-organs and the mind and one absolute seer, consciousness. Consciousness refers to the pure independent consciousness principle. Of these four, the text concentrates on only three. The absolute seen, the world, is not dealt with because it is not of importance to the subject matter of the text. The two relative seen-seers, the sense-organs and the mind are called the *dr̥śyam* in the title of the text. The absolute seer, consciousness, is called *dr̥k* in the text. Thus the text is called *Dṛgdr̥śyavivekaḥ*, a study of *dr̥śyam*, the two relative seen-seers, and *dr̥k*, the one absolute seer. The subject matter is introduced in the first five verses.

## **2. Formation and Function of the Three-fold Seer (6 - 12)**

To know the formation and function of the two relative seen-seers and the one absolute seer, the absolute seer is taken up first. How is the absolute seer formed? The absolute seer is never formed. It ever is. The function of the absolute seer is the illumination or objectification of its object, the mind. The mind alone is the object of the absolute seer. It illumines without undergoing any change, without any action, or without any will. By its mere presence it illumines. The illumination is not an action done by consciousness and so it does not have a beginning or an end. Since the illumination by consciousness is a non-action, consciousness is an eternal illuminator and it illumines the mind directly and not the world.

The mind is a relative seen-seer. It is seen or objectified by the absolute seer, consciousness and the mind is the illuminator of the sense-organs. How does the mind become the illuminator? The mind cannot be an illuminator by itself. It borrows consciousness from the absolute seer. With the borrowed consciousness it becomes a seer and thus it is a dependent seer. The mind's function is that it illumines the sense-organs, and for this illumination, the mind undergoes change in the form of thoughts. The mind is a relative, dependent, and changing illuminator and therefore only a temporary illuminator. During deep sleep, the mind cannot function as an illuminator.

Whatever was said about the mind above applies to the sense-organs also. They are relative seen-seers. They are the seen from the standpoint of the mind and the seers from the standpoint of the world. They become seers only by borrowing consciousness from the mind. With the borrowed consciousness, sense-organs become the illuminators of the world. They are changing and temporary illuminators. If the mind wanders away and does not back the sense-organs, the sense-organs cannot illumine any object, even if they are available and directed towards the object.

## **3. Cause of Samsāra and its Remedy (13 - 21)**

The relative seen-seer sense-organs and the relative seen-seer mind put together is called *ahaṅkāra*, which is the *dr̥śyam*. The absolute seer, consciousness, is called *sākṣī*, which is the *dr̥k*. Thus the author has consolidated the four entities enumerated at the start to three and then to two, *ahaṅkāra* (ego) and *sākṣī*. Every individual is a mixture of *ahaṅkāra* and *sākṣī*. *Ahaṅkāra* is a changing and finite principle. This *ahaṅkāra* alone is the doer-experiencer *saṃsāri*. It travels from *loka* to *loka*, is subject to *sañcita*, *āgāmi* and *prārabdha puṇya-pāpam* and has all the problems of life. *Ahaṅkāra* is never free from problems. *Ahaṅkāra* can never have permanent peace. Even *jñāni's ahaṅkāra* and *Bhagavān's ahaṅkāra*, when he incarnates, will have to go through ups and downs in life. *Ahaṅkāra* is an eternal *saṃsāri*. However, *sākṣī* is an eternal *asaṃsāri*. It never undergoes any change, never travels and is a non-doer and a non-experiencer. The individual is a mixture of the non-eternal *saṃsāri*, *ahaṅkāra* and the eternal *asaṃsāri*, *sākṣī*. There is no physical distance between these two. No *guru* can physically separate these two and show each one to the disciple. Even in *nirvikala-samādhi* there is no separation. In that *samādhi*, *ahaṅkāra* and *sākṣī* are together but the *ahaṅkāra* is in the dormant condition only. Whenever the word 'I' is used it refers to the mixture of the two because they are always together. Mere

*sākṣī* can never say, ‘I’ because it does not have the means to do that. Mere *ahaṅkāra* cannot say, ‘I’ because it cannot even exist by itself without the *sākṣī*. *Ahaṅkāra*’s existence is borrowed from the *sākṣī*. Why do we suffer from *saṃsāra*? It is because we have not understood that we are a mixture of *ahaṅkāra* and *sākṣī*. We are ignorant of the composition of the word ‘I’. There is self-ignorance but we are also identified with the *ahaṅkāra* part only as though it is the real ‘I’. Not only we are ignorant, but we also have false identification with *ahaṅkāra*. As *ahaṅkāra*, we are struggling. It is an ever losing battle because *ahaṅkāra* has to struggle with *puṇya-pāpam*, which are constantly fructifying. Even if we exhaust all the *prārabdha-karma* and die, we are not free because the cycle of birth and death continues due to *sañcita-karma*. The life conditions keep changing continuously contrary to our expectations. This *ahaṅkāra* can never escape from *saṃsāra* because it is an eternal *saṃsāri*. The cause of this problem is the self-ignorance as stated in verse 15.

***antardṛgdr̥śyayorbhedaṃ bahiṣca brahmasargayoḥ |***

***āvṛṇotyaparā śaktiḥ sā saṃsārasya kāraṇam || 15||***

Ignorance or *māyā* has the *āvaraṇa-śakti* and the *vikṣepa-śakti*. Because of *āvaraṇam*, we are ignorant of ourselves and because of *vikṣepa* we identify with the wrong component, *ahaṅkāra*. The author adds in verse 20 that the external world is also a mixture . The world is a mixture of existence and *nāma-rūpa*.

***asti bhāti priyaṃ rūpaṃ nāma cetyaṃśapañcakam |***

***ādyatrayaṃ brahmarūpaṃ jagadrūpaṃ tato dvayam || 20||***

With respect to the world also we make the mistake of going with the changing, dying, disintegrating and pain-causing *nāma-rūpa*. The ignorance and the wrong identification both internally and externally is caused by the *āvaraṇa-śakti* and *vikṣepa-śakti*. Subjectively, the wrong identification is with *ahaṅkāra* and objectively, the wrong identification is with the *nāma-rūpa*.

What is the remedy for this *saṃsāra*? If ignorance and the wrong identification are the problem, the remedy is knowledge and right identification. The knowledge is that first I should know the word ‘I’ has two components, *ahaṅkāra*, the lower ‘I’ and *sākṣī*, the higher ‘I’. This understanding is called *dr̥gdr̥śyavivekaḥ*. Having separated the two components, I should train my mind to claim the higher ‘I’ more and more. I am *sākṣī* and *ahaṅkāra* is an incidental lower part of me and it is only a temporary role. I should convert the *ahaṅkāra* into roles, life into a play and the world into a stage. Thereafter, I should play the roles in my life as the roles demand but claim the *sākṣī* as I. This claiming is the only solution. When I claim that I am the *sākṣī*, will I get *mokṣa*? I will not get *mokṣa* but I will understand that I am never a *saṃsāri*, but one who is eternally free. The struggle for *mokṣa* will thus end. Claiming the *sākṣī* is the aim of the Vedāntic study. Correspondingly in the objective level also, I should shift my emphasis from the *nāma-rūpa* to the pure existence, i.e., seeing Brahman everywhere. Thus consciousness inside and existence outside are one and the same. This is Vedānta *śravaṇa-mananam*.



#### **4. Vedāntic Meditation and its Benefit (22 - 31)**

The author talks about six types of meditation, three internal and three external. The first type of internal meditation is called the thought-meditation in which I observe my thoughts and try to pay attention to the consciousness which is in and through every thought. Thus both the thought and the consciousness are involved in this meditation. The second meditation is meditation upon the features of consciousness. This meditation is dwelling upon the consciousness alone, by bringing into the mind the different features of consciousness such as all-pervading, relation-less, one, free from subject-object difference, indivisible, eternal, *sat-cit-ānanda*, etc., with the help of the *Upaniṣadic* words. This second meditation is consciousness-meditation. The third meditation is not a separate meditation but absorption in consciousness-meditation. The first meditation is called *antara-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. The second meditation is called *antara-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. The third meditation is called *antara-nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

The second three are meditations corresponding to the external world. The fourth meditation is the object-meditation. This meditation is observing any object in the world and paying attention to the existence in that object. This common factor, the existence is the 'is-ness' of every object. The fifth meditation is focussing on the different features of existence with the help of the *Upaniṣadic* words, such as all-pervading, one, etc., This fifth meditation is existence-meditation. In the object-meditation, both the object and existence are involved. In the existence-meditation, I dwell on the existence alone inviting various features of existence into my mind. The sixth meditation is absorption in existence-meditation. The fourth meditation is called *bāhya-dṛśya-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi*. The fifth meditation is called *bāhya-śabda-anuviddha-savikalpa-samādhi* and the sixth meditation is called *bāhya-nirvikalpa-samādhi*.

Thus the six meditations are thought-meditation, consciousness-meditation, absorption in consciousness-meditation, object-meditation, existence-meditation and absorption in existence-meditation. The benefit of these meditations is that the knowledge gets well established in the mind resulting in *jīvanmukti* and later *videhamukti*.

#### **5. Summary of the Teaching (32 - 46)**

The author summarizes his own teaching in these verses. He divides the *ahañkāra* into two, from another angle. The earlier definition of the *ahañkāra* is that it is a mixture of the two relative seen-seers, sense-organs and the mind. In the later verses 32 to 46, the *ahañkāra* description is as follows. The sense-organs and the mind obtaining in dream, the *dream-ahañkāra*, is called the *prātibhāsika-jīva*. The *ahañkāra* obtaining in the waking state, the *waking-ahañkāra*, i.e., the mind and the sense-organs obtaining in the waking state, is called *vyāvahārika-jīva*. The *sākṣī* obtaining in all the states is called the *pāramārthika-jīva*. The author says that one should not identify with the *prātibhāsika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jīva*, which are both *mithyā* and *saṃsāris*, but identify with the *pāramārthika-jīva*. The

*jñāni* claims this *pāramārthika-jīva* as himself, when he says, ‘I am Brahman’. The *prātibhāsika-jīva* is compared to a bubble, the *vyāvahārika-jīva* to a wave and the *pāramārthika-jīva* to water. The bubble is unreal and dependent. The wave also is dependent. Both are dependent on water for their existence and water alone is independently existing. The bubble is *mithyā*, the wave is *mithyā* and water is *satyaṃ*. Both the *prātibhāsika-jīva* and the *vyāvahārika-jīva* are *mithyā* and the *pāramārthika-jīva* alone is *satyaṃ*. If a person claims this *pāramārthika-jīva* as himself through the statement ‘I am Brahman’, he has successfully studied the *Dr̥gdr̥śyavivekaḥ*. *Dr̥śyam* means the *prātibhāsika* and the *vyāvahārikajīvas* and *dr̥k* is the *pāramārthika-jīva*. This is what we should learn through Vedānta.



This book can be downloaded from the website  
[www.arshaavinash.in](http://www.arshaavinash.in)

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

To download the following

**Books On Pujya Swamiji**

Biography of Swami Dayananda Saraswati in English, Hindi and Tamil

**Books in English On Vedanta**

Books on Indian culture, Yoga, Gita, Upanisads, Brahma Sutra and Vedanta Texts

**Books in Tamil on Vedanta**

Books on Indian culture, Upanisads and Vedanta Texts

**Books on Sanskrit Grammar**

Books on Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi and Sanskrit Grammar for Vedanta Students

**Books on Sanskrit Texts**

Text Books in Sanskrit on Gita, Upanisads and Brahma Sutra with Sankara Bhasyam

**Books on Indian Culture**

Books in English on Yoga and Indian Culture

**Books for Youth**

Books in English on Yoga, Indian Culture & Self improvement

**Books on Holy Chant**

Books in English and Sanskrit on Holy Chant

**Articles**

Articles in English on Indian culture & Vedanta Texts

**PARTICIPATE IN ONLINE QUIZ**

Online Quiz on Gita, Upanisad and Brahma Sutra

Website of:



Arsha Avinash Foundation

104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, INDIA

Phone: + 91 9487373635

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

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