

**A BROAD
OUTLINE OF VEDANTA**

Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series



SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

BY D. B. GANGOLLI

**ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARAYALAYA
BANGALORE**

1989

A BROAD OUTLINE OF VEDANTA

Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series



SWAMI SATCHIDANANDENDRA SARASWATI

D.B. GANGOLLI

**ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARAYALAYA
BANGALORE**

1989

Foreword

This is the second of a series of small books under the head -- "Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti" or "The Enlightening Words of Satchidaananda". All these booklets contain a free transliteration of 'the enlightening and immortal words and teaching's of Shri Satchidaanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, of revered memory, found in his numerous Kannada books. Those readers who do not have the facility and advantage of reading and understanding books in the Kannada language will be immensely benefited by these English publications written in simple language and style.

This small plan of publishing these 'gems of spiritual literature', unrivalled in their esoteric import and teachings of the highest order and based on the pristine pure original Bhashyas of Adi Shankara, was first mooted by Shri D.B. Gangolli, a devotee and admirer of Swamiji. He had brought out the first of the series entitled - "The Relevance of Vedanta in This Modern Age of Civilization" -- with the munificent financial help of Subharam Trust (Regd.).

It is an irony of our times that even that great Acharya's immaculate teachings of Atma Vidya or Self-Knowledge, purely based on the strength of the Upanishadic statements, their veracity based on Intuitive dialectics or ratiocination (called Anubhavaanga Tarka) and finally on the strength of the culmination or consummation of all those teachings in one's own Intuitive experience here and now, have been distorted beyond recognition and redemption.

The devoted and discerning seeker of the Ultimate Reality of Atman or the Self, of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss (Intuition), is sure to benefit a great deal by studying and cognizing the truths that are taught in these booklets which have adopted a well-planned sequential order of a spiritual theme so as to enable him to get rid of many a deep-rooted misconception that was hitherto proving to be a big stumbling block in his path of spiritual progress. It can be affirmed here that if the student honestly applies his mind and intellect and devotes all his efforts and energies with a high sense of purpose and perseverance, he will never fail to get the conviction and complete satisfaction accruing from this lofty pursuit.

We have great pleasure in publishing this book under the auspices of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Tyagarajanagar, Bangalore - 560 028 and are thankful to its author, Shri D.B. Gangolli, for making over to us the copyright of this book. We hope that those who are sincerely interested in and devoted to the pursuit of a genuine spiritual path will avail themselves of this opportunity.

Bangalore - 28,
January 1, 1989.

K. G. Subraya Sharma, M.A.,
Secretary, Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya,
and Editor, Shankara Bhaskara,
Tyagarajanagar, Bangalore - 560 028.

Price : Rs.5.00

Copyright © 1989 by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Typeset and Design by Artintel, Bangalore.

Printed at Lotus Printers, Bangalore.

A BROAD OUTLINE OF VEDANTA

1. Brahma Vidya means to know Brahman, the Ultimate Reality. To know the real essential nature of Brahman alone is the ultimate goal of human existence or life; this alone is the greatest among all the things wanted or desired by man. If Brahman is cognized, all the miseries and calamities which man suffers from in this life are completely mitigated (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1; Bhashya portion 18).

2. Brahman means that entity which exists eternally, absolutely pure, in the essential nature of Pure Consciousness, endowed with an essence of Being which is not susceptible or vulnerable to any subjugation or bondage whatsoever. There is no object or thing that is not known by this Reality or entity; It knows everything; there is no force or energy that is not to be found in this entity, all kinds of forces or energies (of the empirical sphere) belong to this entity alone (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1; Bhashya portion 19).

3. In this World or Prapancha that is before us there are various kinds of substances or objects having different names and different forms, which are being perceived; there are innumerable Jeevas or souls who are performing different actions and functions and are experiencing their results or fruits; with regard to the actions or Karmas performed by the Jeevas there is a rigid law of nature stipulating that for a particular action done in a particular place and at a particular time, by virtue of a particular cause alone the fruit or result should accrue. Who formulated this rigid law and how? -- This question cannot even be imagined by the mind. The substratum for such a world like this to appear or manifest and then disappear is Itself Brahman, the Ultimate Reality. (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-2; Bhashya portion 24).

4. This Brahman is not an entity which is not seen by any one and existing somewhere. It is indeed our essential nature of Being alone. Our real nature or core of Being or existence is called **Atman**. Thus because **our Atman alone is Brahman**, the knowledge of Atman (Atma Vidya) itself is the knowledge of Brahman or Brahma Vidya. If Atman or our Self is known or cognized, then it amounts to our knowing or cognizing Brahman alone. (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1; Bhashya portion 19; Maandukya Upanishad 2).

5. If a person who is suffering a great deal because of an illness gets cured from it, he regains his healthy state, is it not? Similarly, when we human beings, who are experiencing the miseries of this Samsara or mortal existence passing from one birth to another, attain the knowledge that our Atman or Self is Brahman alone and this Atman is Pure Consciousness which exists eternally, is pure and is not in the least vulnerable to be subjugated by

the bondage of mundane existence or Samsaara, then all our miseries disappear and our innate nature of Being is regained. **This alone is the benefit accruing from Brahma Vidya or the Knowledge of Brahman, the Ultimate Reality.** (Maandukya Upanishad 1, Bhashya portion 2).

6. We superimpose or misconceive happiness and misery, which are not there at all in our Atman or Self, upon our essential nature of the Self and then further misconceive that the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the ego or 'I'-notion -- all these are tagged on or appended to Atman or the Self. To do so is itself **Avidya or Ignorance**. To determine that our Atman or Self is eternally pure, that He does not have even the least contact or relationship with any other thing or entity and further that such a contact to exist is an improbability -- is **Vidya or Knowledge** (Adhyaasa Bhashya 4).

7. Everyone knows that --'I exist'; no one can ever get to know that -- 'I do not exist'. We should cognize or know the real essence of Being of this entity of 'I'. This essence of Being Itself means -- **Atman alone is Brahman**. **Therefore, there is no cause whatever for the doubt that -- "Whether the entity called Brahman exists or not ?"** (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1, Bhashya portion 19).

8. Although no one entertains any doubt whatsoever with regard to the existence of the entity of 'I', each one has a different knowledge as to 'what that entity of 'I' is ?' Some think that in our body there exists a quality of knowledge of the nature or form of Consciousness or **Chaitanya** and the body that is endowed with that Consciousness alone is our Atman or Self. Some others believe that this Consciousness exists in the senses and therefore the conglomeration of these senses alone is our Self. Yet some others think that the mind to which the entire external world is perceptible is our Self. Some others say that the flow of thoughts goes on in our mind alone and that alone is our Self. Others have opined that the entity of Atman or Self Itself does not really exist. It is the belief of some others that apart from the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect -- there exists a **Jeeva** or soul and to be performing his actions and experiencing their fruits all along is his real essential nature. Although the fact that for a Jeeva or soul both happiness and misery accrue is certain, in reality he does not perform any Karma or action at all -- this is the opinion of some other people. Still some others opine that apart from this transmigratory Jeeva or soul there exists another Atman called Ishwara or Lord and He alone is omniscient (**Sarvajna**) and omnipotent (**Sarvashakta**). But yet others say that this Ishwara or Lord who is omniscient and omnipotent is Himself our Atman or Self.

(1) Does the essential nature of Being or this entity which appears or manifests thus as 'I' exist or not ? (2) If it does exist, is it one among the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect or the ego, or is it different? (3) If it is different from all these, is it enjoying or experiencing happiness and misery or not ? (4) If it is experiencing them, is it performing Karma or actions and then experiencing their fruits or is it just arbitrarily, without proper or just cause experiencing happiness and misery ? (5) If it is to be assumed that this 'I' is experiencing happiness and misery, is there a '**Paramaatman**' or Supreme Self who does not have even the least contact or relationship with happiness and misery existing or not? (6) If He exists, what is the relationship between **Jeevaatman** or the soul and **Paramatman** or the Supreme Self or Lord? -- These six doubts are likely to occur to all thinkers. If these doubts are not cleared and if any one opinion is entertained and we act according to that fallacious belief or opinion, then whatever progressive status that is to be attained will not accrue; on the other hand, unexpected calamities or hazards will confront us. **Therefore, it is very important and necessary to enquire about the entity of Atman or Self** (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1; Bhashya portion 20).

9. "Although it is true that people are transacting in their day-to-day life as 'I', 'I', there does not exist at all a real entity like 'I'. In the same way, the external world which appears to us does so in our day-to-day dealings alone, but if deeply deliberated upon it cannot be sustained with the help of any evidence or proof that the world has any essential nature of Being or existence at all. Therefore, the dealings of the type -- **Jeevas** or souls, **Jagat** or the world, **Ishwara** or the Lord -- are all a mere delusion. By virtue of that latent impression alone, people repeatedly imagine and keep on saying that there exists a world; there are many Jeevas or souls and there exists an Ishwara or the Supreme Lord -- that's all, and not that in reality there exists any entity whatsoever. Without being in consonance with reason or logical devices, merely to manifest or appear is the hallmark of the world". Thus some protagonists were saying, and they are called **Shoonyavaadins** or proponents of the theory that everything is essenceless.

This theory is opposed to the experiences of the people in general. If there does not exist any real entity at all, what is it that manifests itself in all such ways? If it is proper to believe that because what appears is appearing, it is real -- then what is the cause or reason to say that it is a delusion? Much more than saying that -- "Because the world that appears does not comply with reason or logical devices, it is a delusion" -- is it not better to say or

argue that -- "Because our reasoning is not in consonance with what is seen in everyone's experience, the reasoning itself should be wrong?" Therefore, **Shoonyaavaada is a theory opposed to empirical means of knowledge.** Because no one can have belief in this at all, there is no need to refute it also. (Sutra Bhashya 2-2-31; Bhashya portion 64).

10. Saying that our Atman or Self Himself does not exist cannot be sustained; for, one who tries to assert that his Self does not exist, that person's essential nature of Being Itself is Atman or the Self (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4). **Atman or the Self is not an entity which is to be established afresh with the aid of another means or instrument of knowledge or cognition. He is ever self-established only.**

That entity with the aid of which we know or perceive -- that is called **Pramaana** or a means of knowledge or cognition. That which is known or perceived by us -- that is called **Prameya** or the known or cognized object. **Before the transaction or dealing of the type -- "This is a Pramaana or means of knowledge or cognition" and "This is a Prameya or an object known or cognized" -- it desiderates unquestionably the Self or Atman (of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness).** For, Atman or the Self knows the Prameya or objects by means of Pramaana or the means of knowledge or cognition. If it is said that the knower who knows the objects through the proper or valid means of knowledge does not exist, the empirical dealings of using the means of knowledge in order to know or cognize the objects will have themselves become false. Even if it is persisted that stand also is acceptable, then it amounts to saying that Shoonyaavaada or the theory of essencelessness is contrary to everyone's experience; for, even to determine that everything is essenceless Atman or the Self of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness is required (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-7; Bhashya portion 99).

11. There are two types of means of knowledge or cognition (**Pramaanas**). What the general run of people use as their means or cognition in general or their day-to-day dealings like perception (**Pratyaksha**), inference (**Anumaana**) etc. are the empirical means of cognition or **Loukika Pramaanas**; that scientific treatise or **Shaastra** which indicates or teaches the phenomena or things which are not within the ken or realm of the empirical means of cognition is a metaphysical means of cognition or **Aloukika Pramaana**. All the objects or phenomena which are within the purview of these two kinds of means of cognition are called objects of cognition or **Prameya**. But **Atman or the Self is unobjectifiable or imperceptible or**

Aprameya - the knowledgeable people say. That means, Atman or the Self cannot be objectified or perceived by any empirical means of cognition, because He does not desiderate any such means; on the other hand, He Himself invests or imbues the whole gamut of empirical dealings with life force or dynamism, and that he is **Swataha Siddha** or **self-established**. That means, **without desiderating any means of cognition He is by Himself Intimately well-known, i.e. His essential nature of Being can be Intuited as one's own innate immediate, and not mediate, core of existence as Pure Consciousness which is self-illuminating.** (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-7; Bhashya portion 99; Geeta 2-18, Bhashya portion 29).

12. Some people are of the opinion that Atman or the Self exists apart from the body and that when the body exists only the Knowledge or Consciousness appears and hence Consciousness is a distinctive quality or function of the body. This is not proper. For, the body is an object to Knowledge or Consciousness. That which illumines is called **Vishayi or the Witness or subject**. That which the subject or the Witness objectifies or illumines is called **Vishaya or the object** or the witnessed thing. Because Consciousness knows the body, the senses etc. Consciousness is the Vishayi or the subject or Witness, and the body, the senses etc. are the Vishaya or the objects or the witnessed things. The Vishayi or the witnessing Consciousness cannot be the distinctive quality or faculty of the Vishaya or the witnessed object; the lamp is not the distinctive quality of a pot which the former illumines or shows up. Neither do the distinctive qualities or faculties which exist in the body 'know' their own respective essential natures nor does one distinctive quality (**Dharma**) know another; Consciousness knows not only the body but also all its distinctive faculties. For this reason too, Consciousness is not the distinctive quality or faculty of the body. Besides there is no rule or regulation that only when there is a body there arises Consciousness; in the dream, though this present waking body does not exist, (even so) Consciousness is produced therein, and this fact is known to everyone. Therefore, **Consciousness is different indeed from the body.** Consciousness Itself is also called **Chaitanya or Pure Consciousness**. This alone is Atman or the Self. (Sutra Bhashya 3-3-54; Bhashya portion 418).

13. Because Atman or the Self (of the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Consciousness) is Himself knowing or illumining the senses, the mind etc., the statement or argument of those who say that - "The distinctive faculty or quality of the senses, the mind etc. which are themselves the witnessed objects to Atman or Pure Consciousness is itself Atman or the Self" - is con-

trary to universal experience. In the empirical dealing of the type - "I am smelling this thing" - the one who knows or experiences the smell is Atman or the Self of the nature of Consciousness or Knowledge and the sense perception in the organ of nose is the means or instrument of knowledge to know or experience 'smell' The Kartru or agent of action should be different from the means of action, or Karma, is it not? The sense perceptions or faculties (Indriyas) implicit in the sense organs of eyes, ears etc. are the means of knowledge (Karanas) which enable us to know or experience the respective objects of knowledge or experience and with their aid one who knows is Himself Atman or the Self. Therefore, **Atman or the Self is different indeed from the Indriyas or the sense perception etc.** (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-18; Bhashya portion 124).

14. Just as He is different from the body and the Indriyas or sense perceptions, Atman or the Self is different indeed from the mind too. In deep sleep there does not exist a body, nor the sense perceptions and the mind (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-9; Bhashya portion 85; 2-3-40, Bh. por.152). "Because there does not exist any knowledge or Consciousness whatsoever, we should say that Atman of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness also does not exist, is it not? - if this argument is forwarded, then the answer to this is: In deep sleep, because there is no second thing or entity existing other than Atman or the Self of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness, there is no distinctive knowledge or consciousness alone, and not because there did not exist the Self or Pure Consciousness (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-3-23). Because the knowledge or consciousness of 'I'-ness too does not exist then (i.e. in deep sleep) it looks that the statement -- "Atman or the Self also does not exist" - is itself the proper or correct one ! To this argument the answer is: The statement to the effect - "In deep sleep nothing whatsoever appears" - also is based on an Intuitive experience alone. That Intuitive experience alone is Atman or the Self of the essential nature of Chaitanya or Pure Consciousness. 'I' and 'this' - these kinds of knowledge are called '**Vishesh Jnaana**' or distinctive knowledge; this knowledge appears only when things other than Atman or the Self are there. Therefore, from the experience to the effect - "In deep sleep I did not know anything whatsoever" - it becomes established that then, i.e. in deep sleep, there did not exist a second thing. Otherwise, if one persists in saying that - "In deep sleep I myself did not exist" - then it amounts to saying that there does not exist a state called 'deep sleep'; this becomes contrary to universal, or everyone's, experience. Therefore, it will have to be determined from the experience of deep sleep that **Atman or the Self is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness or**

Chaitanya, quite different from the body, the sense perceptions, the mind, the intellect and the ego. (Upadesha Sahasri prose 2, Bhashya 56)

15. Is Atman or the Self of the nature of Kartru (the agent of action) and Bhoktru (the enjoyer), or not? Performing action, obtaining or procuring their fruits and then enjoying or experiencing them is the nature of our Atman, is it not? To this question there are two answers: From one viewpoint, both Kartrutwa (agentship of action) and Bhoktrutwa (enjoyership) are there for Atman; from another viewpoint, they are not there for Him at all. Only when a man is using implements like chisel, hammer, saw etc. he is called a carpenter; otherwise he remains like all others as man only. Similarly, in waking and dream when Atman or the Self is conjoined with the body, the sense perceptions etc. He has Kartrutwa (agentship of action) and Bhoktrutwa (enjoyership); in deep sleep because there does not exist any instruments or means of knowledge or cognition, then Atman is neither a Kartru nor a Bhoktru. On the whole if it is keenly observed, it should be said that performing an action and then enjoying or experiencing its fruit does not pertain to or is applicable to the essential nature of Atman (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-40; Bhashya portion 152).

16. When in the Self there exists agentship or doership i.e. Kartrutwa, are we ourselves performing the actions or does a Parameshwara (Supreme Lord) who prompts us to perform actions exist separately? When we enjoy or experience the fruits of action, does the fruit accrue from the action itself or does (a Lord) Ishwara who dispenses the fruits exist? In this manner a doubt may arise. Such (a Lord) Ishwara does exist; one who misconceives the body, the senses etc. to be his Self and suffering from the cataract called Avidya (Ignorance) who cannot see anything in front of him (i.e. one who is deluded) is the Jeeva or soul; being the presiding deity for the actions of the souls (Jeevas) one who resides in all creatures (as their very essence of Being) and who exists as the Witness (Saakshi) as well as of the essential nature of (Pure Consciousness) Chaitanya Roopa is Ishwara. The religious acts of merit (Dharma) and the acts of demerit (Adharma) which the Jeeva or soul performs as also their respective fruits accruing - all these take place by the grace of (the Lord) Ishwara alone (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-41,42; Bhashya portion 155; 3-2-38, Bhashya portion 314; Geeta 13-22, Bhashya portion 273; Mundaka Upanishad 3-1-1, Bhashya portion 91).

17. What is the relationship between Jeeva or the soul who performs Karma (actions) and experiences their fruits and Ishwara (the Lord)? To this ques-

tion the answer is: Jeeva (the soul) is himself Ishwara (the Lord). As long as we, the Jeevas or souls, misconceive the body, the senses etc. as ourselves of the essential nature of our Self, Ishwara (the Lord) remains separate from us. If the reality is known or cognized, then there does not exist **Jeewatwa** (soulhood) at all. For, **Ishwara (the Lord) is ever our (Supreme Self) Paramaatman, that means, our essential nature of Being or Pure Existence which is the Ultimate Reality.** (Geeta 13-2, Bhashya portion 216; 13-22, Bhashya portion 273; 15-19, Bhashya portion 382; Sutra Bhashya 1-1-6, 1-3-19, Bhashya portions 75, 274).

18, With regard to the fact or topic that Jeeva (the soul) is really **Parmaatman** (the Supreme Self), many doubts will arise. Jeeva keeps on getting born and dying; is it proper to say that such a Jeeva is Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) who exists devoid of birth and death? - This is the first doubt.

But if observed keenly Jeeva really does not get born, nor does he die. The body gets born and it alone dies. Merely because a man discards an old garment or apparel and wears a new one, does he become different? No. Similarly, if the body gets born it does not amount to the Jeeva getting born, nor if the body fails or dies it amounts to the Jeeva dying. (Geeta 2-22, Bhashya portion 44; Sutra Bhashya 2-3-16, Bhashya portion 118; 2-3-17, Bhashya portion 121).

19. The body, the senses, the vital breath (Praana), the mind, the intellect and the ego or ('I' notion) - all these are the adjuncts of, or things that get tagged on to, the Jeeva. It being so, how can he (Jeeva) at all be Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) who is devoid of any body whatsoever? - This is the second doubt.

If properly observed, there is no evidence or means of proving or establishing the fact that Jeeva possesses the body, the senses etc. The body, the senses etc. - all these are objects of cognition (Vishaya) and he is the subjective principle or the cognizer (Vishayi). To conceive or know that in oneself who is the cognizer there exists any relationship of the objects of cognition will not be reasonable or justifiable. An earthen pot becomes an object of cognition to our Consciousness, is it not? Then, we do not take it or conceive that the earthen pot itself is our essential nature of Being, nor do we conceive that the earthen pot is related to us. Similarly, there is no means of proving or establishing that the body, the senses etc. belong to us. In the scriptural texts it is also enunciated that **Atma or the Self is bodyless or devoid of a body.** (Katha Upanishad 1-2-22, Bhashya portion 78;

Geeta 13-13, Bhashya portion 254; Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4, Bhashya portion 58).

20. To conceive or believe that Jeevaatman (the soul) possesses the body, the senses etc. quite naturally is also wrong only, for in the dream these very phenomena like body, senses etc. are not there at all. Therein (i.e. in the dream) the transactions are carried on through an illusory body, illusory senses etc. alone. Because it is not possible to show any difference whatsoever between the waking and the dream, and further because it is not possible at all to cognize distinctly by differentiating in the manner - "This is waking, this is dream" - the body, the senses of the waking are also illusory alone. **It is not possible at all to assert that there exists any relationship between these illusory body, senses etc. and Atman or the Self.** (Sutra Bhashya 3-2-3, Bhashya portion 256; Maandukya Kaarika 2-4, Bhashya portion 81; Katha Upanishad 2-5-11, Bhashya portion 148).

21. There are many Jeevas; all of them have accepted that they have a body, senses etc. Merely on the ground of one Jeeva knowing that in his dream he had illusory body, senses (Maayika) etc. how can it at all be said that the body, senses etc. of the waking which everyone has accepted do not exist? How can the Jeevas, who are many, be Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) who is one? -This is the third doubt.

But in the dream too, just as in the waking, it appears as if there exist many Jeevas who are agents of action (Kartru), enjoyers (Bhoktru) and all of them together appear to be carrying on transactions mutually! Just because of this, do we reckon that the Jeevas and their bodies, senses etc. which appear therein are real? No. In the same manner alone, we should discern with regard to the many Jeevas as well as their body, senses etc. in the waking. **Just as in the dream although there exists one Atman or the Self alone it appears as though there are many, in the waking too we must discern that it appears in the same manner.** (Sutra Bhashya 2-1-28, Bhashya portion 465; Maandukya Kaarika 4-37, Bhashya portion 278).

22. At least the relationship of the illusory body, senses etc. is there invariably to the Jeeva, is it not? To this question, the answer is: That too is not the innate nature of Atman or the Self. **Atman or the Self existing in His natural state of Pure Being-Consciousness (Brahma Sthiti), completely having given up any relationship with the body, senses etc. is therein the experience of everyone of us in deep sleep; besides, even through efforts when one attains Samaadhi this essential nature of Pure Being-Conscious-**

ness(of Brahman) can be Intuitively experienced - this fact is mentioned in the scriptural texts (Shaastras). (Sutra Bhashya 3-2-7, Bhashya portion 270; 3-2-24, Bhashya portion 299).

23. Either in deep sleep or in Samaadhi there is no knowledge of the kind "I am Brahman"; immediately on waking up it appears in the manner - "To me nothing was known (i.e. in the deep sleep)". Therefore, it amounts to saying that either in deep sleep or in Samaadhi Jeeva has Avidya (ignorance) alone. How can such a Jeeva be the all-knowing (Sarvajna) Brahman? - This is the fourth doubt.

But for not having the knowledge of the type -- "I am such and such a person" in deep sleep the cause or reason is the non-dual existence of the real Self (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness) alone and not the existence of Ajnaana (ignorance); for, the statement - "I did not know anything at all" - means a second thing did not appear only and not that one's essential nature of Pure Consciousness also did not exist. It is true indeed that in deep sleep the distinctive knowledge of the type -- "This is such and such a thing" -- does not exist; but then the absence of the senses alone is the cause for the distinctive knowledge not occurring and not the absence of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness of Atman or the Self. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-3-21, 4-3-23).

24. The Jeeva's relationship with the body, the senses etc. is in the waking and in the dream, but not in the deep sleep. Thus one who keeps on having and giving up relationship with the body, the senses etc. -- can he be called a Mukta or a liberated one? -- This is the fifth doubt.

It has been previously stated that the body, the senses etc. do not exist at all from the absolute viewpoint; that they appear as though they exist both in the waking and in the dream, and that Atman or the Self is observing all the states of Consciousness as the Witness (Saakshi). Because the Pure Consciousness of Atman or the Self exists in one and the same nature or form without ever getting changed and because by the association of the illusory body, senses etc. no changes whatsoever of increase or decrease are observed in the Pure Consciousness of Atman or the Self, to say that -- "Atman or the Self is Nitya Mukta (eternally liberated)" -- there does not exist any hindrance or objection whatsoever. - (Maandukya Upanishad 7; Kaarika 2-32, Bhashya portion 115).

25. Jeeva is stated to be a part of Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) in the scriptures, is it not? Transgressing the authority of the scriptures can it be

reckoned that Jeeva himself is Paramaatman (the Supreme Self)? -- This is the sixth doubt.

But because the scriptures too are means of knowledge (**Pramaana**) just like perception, inference etc. they invariably maintain their nature of being the valid means of knowledge or cognition. The valid means of cognition or knowledge (**Pramaana**) are the instruments which indicate or signify an existing thing as it is; that instrument or means without which we cannot know or cognize a particular thing -- that means or instrument alone is said to be that thing's **Pramaana** (valid means of cognition). A **Pramaana** (means of cognition) denotes what exists alone but it does not create what does not exist. The scriptural texts (**Shaastras**) are the **Pramaana** in respect of the Self or Atman. These scriptures will be valid means only if they signify without creating in us any doubt, (**Ajnaana**) ignorance or misconception with regard to Atman or the Self, and if they tell us contrary to our experience then they will never become the valid means. **That our Atman or Self is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness or Being of Brahman or the Ultimate Reality is also established on the strength of Intuitive experience; that Atman or the Self alone is Brahman or the Ultimate Reality is also stated in the scriptures. No one will ever give any validity as being the right means of cognition whatsoever to any statement or sentence which is contrary to experience.** (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-1-20, Bhashya portion 315; Geeta 18-66, Bhashya portion 600).

26. If so, it has been stated both in the **Shrutis (Upanishads)** and the **Smritis (Geeta and such other works)** by Rishis or sages based on the scriptural texts that Jeeva or the soul is a part of Paramaatman (the Supreme Self); what will be the fate of such statements? -- such a question may be raised. By the statement -- "Jeeva is a part of Paramaatman" -- it is meant that -- "Just as the reflection of the Sun (in a bucket of water) is said to be a part of the Sun; just as the sparks emanating from red hot coal are said to be parts of that fire in the coal and just as the space within a pot is a part of the open space" -- in the same sense the Jeeva is a 'part' of Paramaatman (i.e. Jeeva is of the essential nature of Pure Consciousness of Paramaatman). Just as in the case - though the reflections are many in number the central source for the reflection is one and one only, similarly in the case - apparently though the Jeevas are many their true central source or Atman (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness) is one and one only; Jeevas and Brahman (the Ultimate Reality) are Pure Consciousness (**Chaitanya**) alone. Although there are empirical transactions of many spaces like the pot

space, the house space etc. In reality space is one and one only; similarly, although there is an empirical dealing of the type -- "Jeevas are many" -- (in reality) their essential nature of Being, viz. Brahman, is one and one only. To denote in this manner alone is the purport of the sentences mentioning 'parts'. (Sutra Bhashya 2-3-43, Bhashya portion 158; 2-3-50, Bhashya portion 168; 3-2-18, Bhashya portion 285; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-1-20, Bhashya portion 316; Maandukya Kaarika 3-3,7, Bhashya portions 132, 142).

27. If for the statements of the type -- "Jeeva is a part of Paramaatman" -- their literary meaning is taken or assumed, what is wrong? To this question the answer is: Then in that case, to the word - 'part' - any one of the meanings like a limb or organ of a body, mutation or change, power and a state will have to be given or assumed. If it is assumed that in Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) i.e. the Ultimate Reality, there are many parts and that each part is a Jeeva then it will have to be stated that just as when these limbs or organs of the body are integrated or conglomerated only the whole or the integrated body will exist and as soon as these limbs or organs get disintegrated it will be destroyed, similarly Paramaatman will get destroyed. This is not an acceptable statement. Therefore, **Jeeva is not a limb or organ of Paramaatman**. In the same manner, if Jeeva is said to be a mutation or change of Paramaatman -- just as clay has changed and has become an earthen pot -- it will amount to saying that Paramaatman has changed or transformed Himself into Jeeva. Even then, it is tantamount to accepting destruction to Paramaatman. Therefore, **Jeeva is not a mutation or transformation of Atman or the Self too**. Because it is not proper or reasonable to say that the omnipotent Ishwara (the Lord) is subject to bondage, **it cannot be accepted that Jeeva is a power of Ishwara (the Lord)**. Because the statement that -- "In the beginning Paramaatman, having been very pure and clean, devoid of misery, later on got entangled in Samsaara (transmigratory nature of getting repeated births and deaths) which is impure and full of misery" -- is also not acceptable, **it does not suit to say that Jeeva is a state of Paramaatman**. Therefore, for the statement -- "Jeeva is a part of Paramaatman" -- the literary meaning cannot be taken at all. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 3-8-12, Bhashya portion 94)

28. "This should be performed or done"; "This should not be done" -- in this manner **Karmas** (religious actions or duties) are stipulated in the scriptural texts with a view to cleansing the mind (**Antahkarana** or the inner instrument) of the Jeeva; in order to obtain the grace of Ishwara, the Lord,

Upaasanas (meditations) have been stipulated; to help attain Liberation or Emancipation (**Moaksha**), **Jnaana** (Self-Knowledge) has been propounded, If jeeva is himself Brahman, all these disciplines and purificatory practices will become worthless or useless, is it not? -- This is the seventh doubt.

To this the solution is: **Because in the scriptural texts Self-Knowledge or Jnaana has been propounded or taught for attaining (Liberation) Moaksha, it becomes established that all bondage is caused by (ignorance) Ajnaana alone;** for, removing ignorance alone is the function of Knowledge, and not to create afresh what does not exist; to the ignorant people who have misconceived that they are the body, the senses etc. alone (i.e. who have Innate identification with their body, senses etc.), merely because in the scriptural texts religious actions or meditations have been stipulated there cannot be any hindrance or objection whatsoever to the teaching propounded from the Absolute or Transcendental viewpoint to the effect -- "Atman is Brahman". (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4; Bhashya portion 51; 2-3-48, Bhashya portion 164,165; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-1-20, Bhashya portion 323).

29. Let it be that Karmas (the religious duties or actions) have been stipulated by virtue of the relationship with the body, the senses etc. alone. Even so, the body, the senses etc. do exist indeed. It is not possible to avoid them at all. Therefore, there is no stratagem or logical device to destroy (the ignorance) Ajnaana which is born out of the relationship with the body, the senses etc., is it not? To this question too there is an answer: The body, the senses etc. really do not exist. If it is properly and deeply deliberated upon, we are in fact transacting Atman or the Self alone as the body, the senses etc., but there is no other authentic or authoritative evidence for the body, the senses etc. to exist separately by themselves and this truth will be known or discerned. Either in the waking or the dream the various things are seen as objects to the Pure Consciousness (**Chaitanya**) and they, being in Its control alone, appear. But being dissociated from Pure Consciousness, any object whatsoever independently appearing to us-we do not know at all. Just as the Sun is illumining the whole universe, Pure Consciousness of the Self or Atman alone is illumining the body, the senses etc. and all such phenomena. In states like deep sleep and **Samaadhi** (trance) etc. the body, the senses etc. do not exist. Therefore, **the body, the senses etc. as well as their relationship and the resultant Samsaara (transmigratory life of repeated births and deaths) -- all these do not exist in Atman or the Self in the ultimate analysis or in reality.** (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-4-7

Bhashya portion 361; Geeta 13-33, Bhashya portion 299; 18-50, Bhashya portion 556; 18-66, Bhashya portion 598).

30. It has been stated in the scriptural texts that one should meditate upon Brahman or the Ultimate Reality; that in It (i.e. Brahman) all the Karmas (religious duties or actions), all the desires, all the fragrances, all the tastes and many more qualities exist. If the Jeeva who meditates is himself Brahman, it amounts to saying that one should meditate upon oneself, is it not? Because in the Jeeva or soul no qualities whatsoever of Brahman seem to exist, it amounts to the scriptural texts losing all their validity or credibility, is it not? What about this predicament? - This is the eighth doubt.

It has been previously itself indicated that meditations have been stipulated in the scriptural texts for the sake of ignorant people who are incapable of deliberating upon the Self or Atman (as one's own essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness) and who are also desirous of various kinds of perceptible and imperceptible fruits. It is very clearly stated or enunciated in the scriptural texts that -- "That which we meditate upon is not Brahman or the Ultimate Reality" -- and that -- "Pure Consciousness (Chaitanya) alone which objectifies the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect is Brahman or the Ultimate Reality". Therefore, the scriptural texts do not have the purport of teaching the essential form of Brahman as projected or described in the meditations; there, in those contexts, the qualities of the adjuncts (Upaadhis) alone have been stated as the qualities of Brahman; because all the adjuncts are superimposed on or conceived in Brahman or the Ultimate Reality of Pure Being-Consciousness, it should be discerned that the statement -- "They are the qualities of Brahman" -- is made just as a formality or for name's sake. (Sutra Bhashya 3-2-14, 15, Bhashya portion 281; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 1-4-10, Bhashya portion 82).

31. It is stated in the scriptural texts that Brahman is the cause for the birth, the sustenance and the dissolution of the entire universe and that Brahman is omniscient (Sarvajna) and omnipotent (Sarvashakta). The world or universe is not born out of the Jeeva; there are so many things that are not known to the Jeeva; there are many actions or functions which the Jeeva cannot perform at all. This being so, is it proper to assert that the Jeeva alone is Brahman? -- This is the ninth doubt.

To this doubt the solution is: The worlds that appear in the waking and in the dream can appear only within their respective states alone; then (i.e. in those respective states) the worlds appear to be within the control of the

Pure Consciousness of Atman or the Self alone. In deep sleep there does not exist any world whatsoever; it gets dissolved in Atman alone. Therefore, it is tantamount to saying that the world sprouting and spreading out, manifests and then submerges in Atman alone. For this reason, it amounts to saying that the power of creating all the worlds exists in Atman. Because the whole world exists as an object alone to the Pure Consciousness of Atman, it amounts to saying that Atman is omniscient.

But even the statement to the effect that - "Brahman is the cause for the world, is omniscient as well as omnipotent" - is made from the viewpoint of Ajnaana or (ignorance) alone, but not from the viewpoint of Reality; for, apart from Brahman no other entity exists -- this alone is the truth. (Maandukya Upanishad 1-6, Bhashya portion 29; Sutra Bhashya 2-1-14, Bhashya portion 434; 2-1-7, Bhashya portion 420).

32. If Brahman alone is the real entity, it amounts to saying that those who say that Brahman should be known do not exist separately; perception, inference etc. -- all these valid means of cognition are rendered as not real means of cognition; the religious duties or actions and meditations stipulated in the scriptural texts become futile; because the disciple who studies the Knowledge about Brahman (Brahma Vidya) or the preceptor who teaches it are really not existing, the scriptural texts teaching Self-Knowledge too become futile. Thus, to render the whole gamut of empirical transactions into a big zero -- is it reasonable ? -- This is the tenth doubt.

But, first of all, for the doubt of the type -- "If Brahman alone is real" --in which an 'if' is used, itself there is no cause or room; for, it is established on the strength of our reasoning and experience that Brahman alone is the really existing entity and that alone is our Atman or Self of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness. Perception, inference etc. -- these valid means of cognition belong to the empirical dealings carried on within the state of waking; they do not indicate anything whatsoever with regard to Brahman, the Ultimate Reality. Therefore, for them there is no harm at all; it has been stated at the beginning itself that the religious acts and meditations mentioned in the scriptural texts are meant for the ignorant people who have an innate identification of reality in actions and means of action. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-1-20, Bhashya portions 319, 324).

33. Although what is seen in the dream becomes falsified in the waking, in the dream those things exist in reality alone. In the same manner, from the standpoint of Jnanis (Liberated or Realized souls) there is no

bondage, no Liberation, no aspirant, no discipline, no seekers of Liberation; there is no creation, no sustenance and no dissolution of the world. To signify or teach this there is no need of the scriptural texts too. Then the scriptural texts are not scriptural texts; even so, from the standpoint of the ignorant people all these exist in reality. Therefore, whether they are religious acts or duties or scriptural texts or the knowledge about the Self - from the empirical standpoint they do not become futile; the empirical dealings of valid means of cognition and the objects of cognition also are real. (Sutra Bhashya 2-1-14, Bhashya portion 436; Maandukya Kaarika 2-32, Bhashya portion 113; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 2-1-20, Bhashya portion 326).

34. Both the valid means of cognition (Pramaana) and the scriptural texts (Shaastra) must be treated as absolutely real and not that they are true only from the standpoint of the ignorant people, and to say like that is not proper. In ignorance can they be real or valid means of cognition? -- This is the eleventh doubt.

To this the solution is: The valid means of cognition (Pramaana) are the mediate instruments to the experience which is real. Because the senses, the mind etc. are such mediate instruments of cognition they are themselves called the valid means of cognition (Pramaana). The senses are attached to and accompany the body. One who does not know or identify the body as 'I' and 'mine' cannot be a cognizer (Pramaatru). A cognizer or Pramaatru means one who desires to use the valid means of cognition and to know the reality of the object of cognition. But because for Atman or the Self (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness) neither the body nor the senses really exist, He cannot be truly (a cognizer) Pramaatru. Because of the fact that unless it is surmised or conceived that Atman or the Self of the innate nature of Pure Consciousness has relationship with the body, the senses etc. Atman cannot become Pramaatru (a cognizer) and further because of the fact that unless there is Pramaatru (a cognizer) transaction of using valid means of cognition Pramaana Vyavahaara cannot take place, the ignorance of conceiving or imagining the relationship of the body, the senses etc. is itself the basic foundation for all valid means of cognition. It being so, the statement that (the valid means of cognition) Pramaanas are real in the state of ignorance is not a vain pronouncement. (Adhyaasa Bhashya 5).

35. If the valid means of cognition like perception, inference etc. as well as the scriptural texts are given up or discarded, other means of knowing or

cognizing reality do not exist at all. Then how can the reality be known? Because even the scriptural texts, which are the valid means, are real as a result of ignorance, the knowledge called "**Brahma Vidya**" or "**Knowledge of Brahman, the Ultimate Reality**", will also become ignorance alone, is it not? Then how can that Brahma Vidya be believed to be true or proper? -- This is the twelfth doubt.

It has been previously itself mentioned that because Atman or the Self is self-established, to know Him there is no need for any kind of valid means of cognition whatsoever. If what is not Atman or the Self is conceived to be Atman, then the scriptural texts tell us in the manner -- "**That is not Atman**"; to that extent, the scriptural texts are the valid means of cognition. But because the scriptural texts teach us that the empirical transactions involving the valid means (Pramaana) and the objects of cognition (Prameya) also are themselves ignorance alone, once this knowledge or conviction arises even the scriptural texts also become means which are rendered invalid. From this there is no harm or damage done to their validity as the right means (of teaching the Ultimate Reality of Brahman or Atman). Thus **because the scriptural texts teach us that the empirical transaction of using the valid means of cognition to know the objects of cognition is itself born out of misconception, the nomenclature of "Antya Pramaana" or "the final valid means of cognition" given to the scriptural texts suits them.** (Sutra Bhashya 2-1-14, Bhashya portion 436; Geeta 2-18, Bhashya portion 29; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-4-20).

36. Instead of calling or stating all that is seen to be false in the manner -- "**Liberation, bondage are unreal; the empirical transaction of valid means of cognition is real only from the standpoint of Ajnaana (ignorance); the scriptural texts too are valid means from the standpoint of ignorance alone**" -- is not the argument of saying -- "**Perception, inference etc. are real; the scriptural texts too are the valid means; bondage, liberation etc. are real; if Jeevas or souls adopt the practices or disciplines as stipulated in the scriptural texts and gets rid of bondage they attain Liberation which is real**" -- itself better? -- This is the thirteenth doubt.

If bondage is real, that can never be removed by Knowledge. Whatever practice or discipline it may be, it can obtain a fruit which is attainable (Praapya Phala) only, but it cannot destroy a real entity or thing. Nor can it transform or change the essential nature of being (Paramaartha Swaropa) of a substance or an object. Nor can it make or produce that

which is obtained afresh or anew as eternal also. If this fact is kept in mind the innate identification or misconception that 'bondage must be real' will vanish into the thin air. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-4-6).

37. The argument or theory that - "Bondage which is real is to be cut asunder and Liberation is to be attained afresh" - cannot be sustained. For, apart from Paramaatman (the Supreme Self) a separate Jeeva or soul who is in the clutches of bondage does not exist at all. If it is contended that Jeeva is now really in bondage and thereafter attains the nature or state of Liberation, it will amount to saying that the Liberation got afresh will be non-eternal. It should not also be understood that after a particular refinement or purification of Atman or the Self, Liberation is attained. For, to bring about a good quality and to remove a blemish or fault goes by the name of 'Samskaara' (refinement). But there is no quality whatsoever which does not exist in Atman and which exists apart from Him; in Atman (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness) there does not at all exist any blemish or impurity whatsoever. Therefore, to say that - 'By virtue of Samskaara (refinement or purification) Liberation is attained' - is not proper. Even to think that Brahman exists in a particular place and we can attain It by going there is wrong only; for, as Brahman is all-pervading there is no question of attaining It afresh. (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4, Bhashya portion 49; Geeta 18-66, Bhashya portion 585; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-4-6).

38. Even if it is maintained or insisted upon that Liberation (Moaksha) is not attained through any practice or discipline, it has to be necessarily or invariably accepted that only after the attainment of Jnaana or Self-Knowledge this Liberation is attained. Therefore, it amounts to saying that Liberation is the effect of (the cause of) Jnaana (Knowledge) alone. If all effects are non-eternal, then Liberation which is the effect of Jnaana also will have to become non-eternal, is it not? -- This is the fifteenth doubt.

Liberation (Moaksha) is not caused by Jnaana (Self-Knowledge); already (ever) existing Liberation itself is known through Jnaana (Self-Knowledge). Proper or correct knowledge means the knowledge that signifies an existing entity alone, and not the one having the power or capacity of creating what is not existent. Therefore, because Liberation (Moaksha), being ever-existing, is known or cognized through Jnaana (Self-knowledge), it should be understood that the statement to the effect -- "Liberation is the effect of Self-Knowledge" -- is made as a formality or for name's sake alone. (Maandukya Upanishad 7, Bhashya

portion 39; Sutra Bhashya 1-4-4, Bhashya portion 47; Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 3-3-1).

39. If apart from Atman or the Self there is no separate Brahman, then it amounts to saying that Brahman Himself is a **Samsaaree** (transmigratory soul) ! What about this predicament? -- This is the sixteenth doubt.

The fact that Samsaara (transmigratory state of repeated births and deaths) does not exist to anyone -- this alone is the real philosophical teaching. Because it has been substantiated, by following (everyone's) experience, that Atman or the Self of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness is Brahman Itself, i.e. the Ultimate Reality, and that in Him there does not exist any **Samsaara** whatsoever, it will never be proper to say that Brahman is a '**Samsaaree**'. Therefore, to say that '**Samsaara exists**' is itself **Ajnaana** (ignorance). (Sutra Bhashya 1-2-8, Bhashya portion 162; Geeta 13-2, Bhashya portion 217).

40. In that case, because Atman has to have **Ajnaana** (ignorance), it amounts to saying that Brahman has **Ajnaana**, is it not? By knowing Brahman who has **Ajnaana** (ignorance), what benefit or purpose on earth are we to attain? -- This is the seventeenth doubt.

To this doubt the solution is: Atman or the Self knows **Avidya** (ignorance) by making it an object to His **Jnaana** (Pure Consciousness); therefore, it amounts to saying that **Ajnaana** (ignorance) is different from Atman or the Self indeed, and not that it, i.e. **Ajnaana**, is (an inherent quality) **Dharma** of Atman. Can it be said that in one who knows an earthen pot, the qualities of that earthen pot exist? It should not be said like that. In the same manner, **Avidya**, 'I' notion, intellect, mind etc. -- all these are called '**Anaatman**' or not-self; they are not Atman at all. In **Pure Consciousness (Chaitanya)** which is of the essential nature of **Pure Being of Atman** there does not exist any **Avidya** (ignorance) whatsoever. **Sushupti** (deep sleep), **Samaadhi** (trance) etc. -- by means of these experiences this essential nature of **Pure Being** can be cognized or Intuited. This fact has been previously mentioned too. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 4-4-6; Geeta 13-2, Bhashya portion 218).

41. In that case, it amounts to saying -- "No one has **Ajnaana** (ignorance)" and "No one has **Samsaara** too" -- is it not? Then, what purpose can be served by the scriptural texts at all? -- This is eighteenth doubt.

After it is known that no one has either Ajnaana (ignorance), Samsaara (the transmigratory state of repeated births and deaths) and that Atman

or the Self is of the essential nature of Nitya (eternal existence), Shuddha (pure existence), Buddha (omniscience), Mukta (liberated state), there is no other purpose whatsoever remaining to be served by the scriptural texts at all. Only for those who do not know this truth the scriptural texts are needed. (Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad 1-4-10, Bhashya portion 154; Sutra Bhashya 4-1-3, Bhashya portion 510).

42. What benefit can be achieved from such Brahma Vidya (the Knowledge of Brahman)? Even those who are called 'Brahma Jnanis' (Knowers of Brahman) are also, just like all others only, live as Samsaarees alone, is it not? -- This is the nineteenth doubt.

To say that -- "The Jnani or Realized Soul or Knower of Atman, who has intuitively known that Brahman Itself which is of the essential nature of eternally pure, omniscient and liberated state is His own Self also knows that he is a Samsaaree (a transmigratory soul) who performs a Karma (action) and enjoys its fruit" -- is a ridiculous statement. For, the person who has the misconception that the body, the senses etc. are himself alone suffers from the onslaught of miseries or calamities, one after another, like - (i) the desire that his body, the senses etc. should be healthy and comfortable; (ii) the hatred towards things which are inconvenient or uncomfortable to them; (iii) the fear that the body, the senses etc. may get destroyed or they may meet with some danger or harm; (iv) the attachment that somehow or other those should be protected. This is a fact known to all Samsaarees. In fact, the group of these miseries or calamities alone goes by the name of Samsaara. But for one who has known that the body, the senses etc. are not his Self, that they do not exist at all in reality and that his essential nature of Pure Being is eternal, is pure, is of the essential nature or Pure Consciousness, is devoid of any bondage whatsoever -- if it is said that to such a Jnani there exists Samsaara as described above -- can it be accepted? Therefore, the disappearance or mitigation of all kinds of calamities is one benefit accruing from Brahma Vidya (Knowledge of Brahman), the Ultimate Reality. To one who is a Jnani (a Realized Soul) there does not exist anything whatsoever that is to be obtained for his own sake; nor does there exist anything whatsoever that is to be discarded or given up. By this he, unlike others, is not afraid of anything and remains peaceful. This supreme peace is another benefit accruing from Brahman Vidya. (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4; Bhashya portion 57; Geeta 3-17, Bhashya portion 174; 3-18, Bhashya portion 175).

43. This Brahma Jnaana (knowledge of Brahman) is not attained by all people, is it not? If this alone is the real Knowledge, why does it not appear so invariably to all people? Why are the people discussing about this topic? -- This is the twentieth doubt.

It is true that this Knowledge does not accrue to all the people. For this, their not aspiring to attain It as a necessity alone is the cause. **Giving up false pride; practising spiritual disciplines like Shama (control over the mind), Dama (control over the senses), Uparati (introverted mind), Titiksha (tolerance irrespective of pleasure or pain), Shraddha (one-pointed dedication) and Samaadhaana (equipoise or tranquillity); as stated in the Vedantic texts, acquiring the guidance of preceptors or Gurus who are Brahma Nishthas (those who are established in the Ultimate Reality of Brahman), if one discriminates about that instruction alone then surely the knowledge of Brahman or Atman is attained.** (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-1, Bhashya portion 13; Geeta 2-21, Bhashya portion 40; 18-50, Bhashya portion 557).

44. Just as by Brahma Jnaana our empirical knowledge is reckoned to be wrong, why should it not be reckoned that by means of another knowledge stronger than Brahma Jnaana (Self-Knowledge) the latter is also reckoned to be wrong alone? How can it be determined that this alone is the correct or proper Knowledge? -- This is the twenty-first doubt.

"Atman alone is the Absolute Reality" -- this alone is Brahma Jnaana. Because once the Brahma Jnaana (Self-Knowledge) is attained there does not exist a second thing or entity at all which can destroy It, for the doubt that -- "There may be a second knowledge that can arise which will falsify Brahma Jnaana" -- there is no scope at all. This alone, i.e. Brahma Jnaana, is the final Knowledge. Beyond this neither doubt nor perceptual knowledge (**Pramaana Jnaana**) arise. (Maandukya Kaarika 1-18, Bhashya portion 57; Sutra Bhashya 2-1-14, Bhashya portion 438).

45. All the protagonists of various schools of philosophy are showing by using various types of reasoning or strategies that their respective teachings or doctrines alone are proper; they are exemplifying the scriptural statements. It being so, how can it be said that those philosophical teachings are not proper? -- This is the last twenty-second doubt.

Many things which the remaining schools of philosophy propound are mere conceptions without the support of any reasoning and valid means. People have merely to believe those philosophers alone, but it is not possible for

their teachings to be established to be within anybody's experience in this world. Because those philosophers are saying that (the Emancipation or Liberation) Mukti or Moaksha, which they are propounding to be the supreme benefit, is one which will accrue in distant time and in a world beyond after people die - even that aspect also is to be believed alone and not that it is possible to be experienced here and now. It is true that some among the things that they say are likely to be within the ken of experience; but they are likely to appear only if the experience of the waking state, which is one part of everyone's totality of experience (i.e. all the three states), is taken into the reckoning. Vedanta Philosophy which propounds the essential nature of Pure Being of Brahmaatman is not like that. Vedanta Philosophy teaches that here itself as soon as Jnaana (Self-Knowledge) is attained (the materialization) Saakshaatkaara or Intuitive experience of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness of Atman or the Self accrues. **The Siddhaanta or Philosophical Truth which is a matter that can be experienced now only which this school of philosophy has undertaken to propound can be experienced (Intuited) by all.** Taking into account all the experiences here like waking, dream and deep sleep and examining them, one can cognize or Intuit as to which that entity which is absolute and real is. This is not opposed to any reasoning or strategem or any philosophical text. Thus in the Vedantic philosophy there is a greatness much more than in all other schools of philosophy. (Sutra Bhashya 1-1-4, Bhashya portion 216; Maandukya Kaarika 4-2, Bhashya portion 54).

46. Because this Brahma Vidya (Knowledge of Brahman) is thus a Knowledge which has greater benefits than all other knowledges, Jijnaasus or aspirants, seekers who are wise and desirous of Liberation look upon this alone with veneration. **By means of this Knowledge if the essential nature of Pure Being of Brahmaatman is cognized or Intuited, then (i) all doubts are dissolved; (ii) the impediment of desires which is caused by misconceptions lurking in one's heart gives up its hold or sway; (iii) whether to obtain anything whatsoever or whether to avoid anything whatsoever – there do not exist any functions or actions whatsoever to be performed once again.** (Mundaka Upanishad 2-2-9, Bhashya portion 83; Mundaka Upanishad 3-2-9, Bhashya portion 123).

OM TAT SAT

