

the essential ādi shankara

BY D. B. GANGOLLI



PUBLISHED BY

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA

BANGALORE

*the essential
ādi shankara*

the essential vādi śhaṅkarā

BY D. B. GANGOLLI



PUBLISHED BY

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA

BANGALORE 1991

First Edition 1991

**Copyright 1991 by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
(All Rights Reserved)**

**Typeset by Verba Network Services
139, 8th Main, 12th Cross
Malleswaram, Bangalore - 560 003**

**Printed at St. Paul's Press
8th Mile, Tumkur Road
Nagasandra, Bangalore - 560 073**

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

We have great pleasure in publishing this English rendering of revered Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji's Kannada *magnum opus* — “*Shankara Vedanta Saara*” — for the benefit of those devotees who do not know that language. Coming in the wake of other English books like “The Salient Features of Shaankara Vedanta” and “The Science of Being” — both of them written by Shri Swamiji himself — and “The Magic Jewel of Intuition” — a transliteration of Swamiji's Kannada book, “*Paramaarthha Chintaamani*” by Shri D. B. Gangolli, an ardent devotee of Swamiji — this present work by Shri Gangolli is yet another *Vedantic* 'jewel' indeed of immense benefit to the true seeker of Self-Knowledge (*Aatma Jnaana*).

It is fairly well-known by now that any individual, who to study the numerous *Vedantic* texts by himself without the aid and guidance of a knowledgeable teacher well versed in the traditional methodology utilized by our ancient sages and seers, particularly that colossus of a spiritual preceptor, viz. Shri Shankara Bhagavatpaada, is more likely to get confused and confounded by the apparent contradictory teachings. This holds good even in the case of many scholars, intellectuals and anchorites. No wonder then that among the avowed followers of Shri Shankara themselves there seems to be a pronounced lack of unanimity and agreement in so far as the interpretation of the famous “*Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas*” is concerned. Most of the differences of opinion with regard to the true purport of the *Upanishadic* teachings are due to a total ignorance of that traditional (*Saampradaayic*) methodology of teaching as well as understanding. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration if it is stated here in this context that unless and until the genuine, dedicated seeker discerns this unique comprehensive methodology which runs in and through the fabric of the *Vedantic* lore, like its warp and woof, he will not be able to reconcile those apparent contradictions, nor will he be able to attain that abiding conviction and consummation of Self-Knowledge propounded in all the *Shrutis* and *Smritis*.

That unique, comprehensive methodology is based on “*Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaya*” or the maxim of Superimposition and Rescission. After a life-time research and selfless dedicated effort Shri Swamiji unearthed this singular, profound traditional methodology which was implicit in all the *Upanishadic* texts but not fully understood by the later commentators and teachers. He meticulously correlated and compiled relevant *Bhaashya* excerpts to substantiate his conclusions and endeavoured to focus the attention of all true seekers on its importance as well as its infallibility through most of his works. Incidentally, Shri Swamiji has drawn pointed attention of his followers

to rely totally on the extant works of the three *Saampradaayic* teachers, viz. Shri Gaudapaada, Shri Shankara and Shri Sureshwara, so as to be able to reconcile possible contradictions and conflicting theories.

Side by side with the tradition of Absolutism or Non-dualism (*Advaita*) which these great teachers have indelibly perpetrated in their works, there were other Monistic schools which claimed to represent the original *Upanishadic* teachings. Except for one honourable exception in Shri Sureshwara (a direct disciple of Shri Shankara) all other post-Shankara *Advaitins*, even while professing to explain Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas*, have succumbed either to the inference of the ancient Monists or to that of the later 'dualistic' Vedantins and thus lost sight of the only method which holds the master-key to the right understanding of the *Upanishadic* teaching.

It is our firm conviction that this English transliteration dealing with 26 important topics — several of them having given rise to raging controversies in high spiritual circles — is assuredly the first attempt of its kind and that it is sure to revolutionize many of the current notions regarding the true nature or purport of Shri Shankara's *Advaita Vedanta*. We have brought out this handy publication at a moderate price, despite the prohibitive printing and paper costs, so as to cater to the needs of a variety of students and seekers alike. This unique book contains in a nut-shell the most reliable and authentic information on Shankara's pristine pure *Advaita Vedanta*, pure and simple, purged of all later controversial and conceptual accretions, since it is based completely on the original *Bhaashyas* by that world teacher. By way of showing the contrast, it gives a critical account of the distinctive features of the sub-commentaries of the post-Shankara era and solves quite convincingly all doubts and objections raised by the present-day Vedantins.

We hope that this publication will be appreciated by all critical students of *Advaita Vedanta* and true seekers of Self-Knowledge.

Bangalore - 560 028
January 15, 1991

K. G. Subraya Sharma, M.A.
Secretary, Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Bangalore Branch, Thyagarajanagar,
Bangalore -560 028

Price: Rs.75

Quotations adduced are taken from the books indicated below and are English translations of:

1. Principal Upanishads with Commentaries of Shri Shankaraachaarya;
2. Brahma Sutra Bhashyam;
3. Bhagavadgeeta;
4. Upadesha Sahasri of Shri Shankaraachaarya — all these published by Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, and Shri Ramakrishna Math, Madras.

Quotations from Svetaashwatara and Jabaala Upanishads are from "The Principal Upanishads" by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, published by George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.

References

1. Eight Upanishads — Part I & II — By Swami Gambhirananda.
2. Chhaandogya Upanishad -do-
3. Bhagavadgeeta -do-
4. Brahma Sutra Bhashya -do-
5. Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad — By Swami Madhavananda
6. Upadesha Sahasri (A Thousand Teachings)
— By Swami Jagadananda

List of Abbreviations

Alt. Up.	—	Aitareya Upanishad.
Ait. Bh	—	Aitareya Bhashya.
Su. Bh.	—	Brahma Sutra Bhashya.
Br. Up	—	Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad.
Br. Bh.	—	Brihadaaranyaka Bhashya.
Ch. Up.	—	Chhandogya Upanishad.
Ch. Bh.	—	Chhandogya Bhashya.
Isa Up.	—	Isa Upanishad.
Isa Bh.	—	Isa Bhashya.
Jab. Up.	—	Jabala Upanishad.
Ka. Up.	—	Katha Upanishad.
Ka. Bh.	—	Katha Bhashya.

Ke. Up.	—	Kena Upanishad.
Ke. Bh.	—	Kena Bhashya.
Ma. Up.	—	Maandukya Upanishad.
Ma. Up. Bh.	—	Maandukya Upanishad Bhashya.
Ma. Ka.	—	Maandukya Kaarika.
Ma. Ka. Bh.	—	Maandukya Kaarika Bhashya.
Mu. Up.	—	Mundaka Upanishad.
Mu. Bh.	—	Mundaka Bhashya.
Pr. Up.	—	Prashna Upanishad.
Pr. Bh.	—	Prashna Bhashya.
Sve. Up.	—	Svetaaswhatara Upanishad.
Tai Up.	—	Taittiriya Upanishad.
Tai. Bh.	—	Taittiriya Bhashya.
Up. Sa. Pr.	—	Upadesha Sahasri Prose.
Up. Sa.	—	Upadesha Sahasri Poetry.

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
I. Introduction	1
II. Vedanta	6
III. The Salient Features of Shankara's Vedanta	11
IV. Adhyaasa or Misconception	17
V. Avidya	25
VI. Adhyaaroopa and Apavaada	33
VII. Dealings of Pramaana and Prameya	40
VIII. Tarka or Logic	51
IX. Vedanta Vaakya	57
X. Vaakyajanya Jnaana	67
XI. Saakshi	78
XII. Alman as the Cause of the Universe	87
XIII. Satkaaryavaada	94
XIV. Maayaa	105
XV. Brahman is Nimitta Kaarana	111
XVI. Scriptural Texts on Creation	118
XVII. The Methodology of Saamaanya and Vishesha	124
XVIII. The Distinctions of Jeeva and Ishwara	129
XIX. Deliberation on Panchakoasha	139
XX. Deliberation on Three States of Consciousness	146
XXI. Dealings of Bandha and Moaksha	155

XXII. Apra Brahman	163
XXIII. Upaasana or Meditation	171
XXIV. Saadhanas for Aatma Vjnaana	176
XXV. Mukti Saadhanas	187
XXVI. Utilization of Jnaana Saadhanas	192
XXVII. Jnaani's Sense of Fulfilment	203
XXVIII. Conclusions	218

PREFACE

There are innumerable books published in the name of Shri Adi Shankara but to an unbiased, discerning mind it becomes quite clear that they present and propound tenets which are fundamentally contradictory to one another, as also dogmatic or doctrinaire in content. It also becomes evident that even those eminent scholars, who profess and parade quite ostentatiously their erudition swearing by and in the name of Adi Shankara, are intriguingly popularising various but mutually contradictory methodologies and interpretations *inter se*. With the result, those inveterate opponents and critics of Shri Shankara, who are ever ready to pick holes in his *Advaita* (Non-dualistic) philosophy, are having a field day and an ample scope for criticizing and controverting the great *Achaarya's* teachings. It being so, the genuine seekers of the Ultimate Reality (viz. *Mumukshus*) get, more often than not, confused and confounded, unable to reckon as to what is the genuine methodology of teaching of Shri Adi Shankara.

It is accepted universally that the genuine works of Adi Shankara are his famous *Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas* which are his original commentaries on the triad of authoritative canonical sources, viz. the ten principal *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavadgeeta* and the *Vedanta Sootras* (popularly going by the name of *Brahma Sootras*), and these being extant in their original texts or forms with hardly any variations, there is no scope or possibility for any one to challenge their authenticity or authorship. But it will be a Herculean task, if at all, for the common people — why, even for many scholars — to study all these original *Bhaashyas* meticulously, sift and codify the great savant's genuine spiritual teachings of philosophy by themselves. Hence, this stupendous task has been attempted in this treatise with a good deal of success.

The first and foremost, as also an exclusive, feature of this treatise is to dissect and diligently analyse all those difficulties and anomalies which may apparently be met with by a seeker as he endeavours on his own to collate and confirm the teachings of the *Bhaashyas*, and to point out all those important aspects of those tenets to be remembered. The second, but equally valuable, feature of this book is an extraordinary attempt being made herein to codify Adi Shankara's teachings under 26 different topics or heads of burning interest to a true Vedantin and to give a big list of quotations or excerpts from these *Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas* so as to substantiate and justify the codified conclusions so drawn under each topic in all its wide range of aspects or perspectives. Perhaps, such an arduous attempt made with regard to so many topics — especially those which have given rise to a great number of controversies — being enumerated and elaborated upon in one single

book is the first of its kind, or at least unparalleled. Thus it will not be an exaggeration or a false claim if it is said that this treatise will provide a much-needed opportunity for seekers and scholars alike to ratiocinate and ruminate over a good many thought-provoking topics and tenets.

After having stated briefly the subject-matter of this treatise, its need in these present times and its special features, it would be in the fitness of things to remind ourselves about the time, the place of his birth and such other related aspects of history of this world-renowned philosopher-saint. But it is unfortunate that barring the fact of his place of birth to be Kaaladi in Kerala the other details of his life history have become topics of raging controversies, and this confusion is caused despite there being nearly 10 to 12 so-called "*Shankara Vijayas*", which are eulogies pertaining to the *Achaarya's* achievements and deeds and which contain mutually conflicting accounts or statements. None of these "*Shankara Vijayas*" is written by a contemporary of the *Achaarya*; besides, all of them differ on the main points and features from one another. Whether it was because his contemporaries did neither envisage nor cultivate a historical perspective or whether it was because the writers of his time attached all importance to his spiritual teachings alone (and perhaps thought that if his doctrines are discussed and disserted, it would amount to the best way of remembering and adoring him), except for the *Vedantic* texts that Adi Shankara authored and the post-Shankara commentaries and sub-commentaries on them we do not have any other clues to confirm the facts of his historical background. Hence we have to content ourselves with whatever spiritual teachings Adi Shankara has bequeathed to and bestowed upon us through his works, especially his *Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas*, and try sincerely to adapt and integrate, to whatever extent possible, our present way of life, and style of life to boot, in keeping with the innate and implicit ethos of his teachings so as to be worthy of being his followers or admirers.

There exists a deep-seated misconception in certain quarters that Shri Adi Shankara was the founder of *Advaita Vedanta* (*Non-dualism*). There is no dearth, however, of evidence to prove that he belonged to a line of traditional teachers (*Sampradaya*) of spiritual wisdom like Shri Gaudapaada, Shri Dravidaachaarya, Shri Brahmaanandi etc. Shri Shankara has quoted a verse in the *Taittiriya Bhaashya* which runs as: "*Yairime Gurubhihi Poorvam Padavaakyapramaanataha, Vyaakhyataaha Sarvavedaantaastaannilyam Pranatoasmayaham.*" This is a clincher. In the same manner, there are statements in his *Brihadaraanyaka* and *Brahma Sootra Bhaashyas* referring to them as "spiritual teachers who knew and belonged to the *Vedanta Sampradaya*." From this it will be evident that by the phrase

— “Shankara’s spiritual teachings” — it does not mean that they are his own instructions conceived or founded originally by him. It also implies that among the teachings of his predecessors belonging to this traditional line of preceptors these instructions found in Adi Shankara’s original *Bhaashyas* must necessarily exist at least in an implicit seed form, but which were later on made explicit by him to suit the needs and circumstances of his times. Thus, in a secondary sense if we say that these are ‘Shankara’s teachings’ it will not be improper. However, one salient feature about these matters we cannot afford to forget or neglect, and that is: Barring the *Kaarikas* of Shri Gaudapaadaachaarya, no other explanatory commentaries belonging to this particular *Sampradaaya* of *Advaita Vedanta* or sub-commentaries thereof are available now at all. Not only that, but also even the dissensions or criticisms by Vedantins belonging to an opposite camp are not available in their original forms whatsoever. Under the circumstances, it is tantamount to saying that all the genuine traditional *Vedantic* teachings up to the times of Adi Shankara have necessarily to be treated as coming down to us exclusively through his *Bhaashyas* alone. How far these spiritual precepts are true and relevant, especially in these modern times of civilization and unimaginable scientific advance, will have to be found out only after the aspirants test their veracity by adopting correctly the methodology that is enunciated and expounded in a highly profound, rational or scientific manner by these traditional teachers. One important fact, however, should never be lost sight of in this regard, and that is: Because the Ultimate, Absolute Reality (*Brahman, Atman*) that these teachers unanimously and unequivocally propounded is beyond the time-space-causation categories (why say more, beyond all empirical dealings), there is no scope or possibility whatsoever at any period of time, anywhere in any clime for any one to refute or controvert these truths (as they are immutable and Intuitive). In support of this affirmation Shri Gaudapaada’s *Kaarika* can be quoted: “*Asparshayoagoo Vai Naama Sarvasattwasukhoa Hitaha, Avivaadoo Aviruddhascha Deshilastam Namaamyaham.*”

We who live in the world of ‘Contemporary Thought’ can hardly afford to discard its parallelisms with the tendencies and theories of the thinking world of today. But any true students of philosophy who will take the trouble and pains to discern the common methodology and unity of purpose running in and through all the arguments and assertions in the present treatise will notice how very thought-provoking it would be for those who are genuinely interested in the tendencies, theories (nay, vagaries) of Contemporary philosophy. No wonder then that there are proponents who affirm that the *Upanishadic* philosophy propounds apparently doctrines of Absolute Monism, of Personalistic Idealism, of Pantheism, of Dualism, of Solipsism, of Self-Realization, of the difference between Intellectual and Intuitive

dealings, and so on, and all these doctrines have divided the philosophic world of today indeed.

With the stupendous advance of scientific knowledge and with the ever-increasing means for communication and interchange of thought forms or constructs the universe is indeed becoming closer and consolidated into a single stock, so to speak, and the majority of the Western philosophers cannot any more afford to look down upon the time-honoured systems of Indian spiritual (philosophical) science, particularly the *Vedantic* science. It can be asserted without any fear of being contradicted that the very same problems and predicaments which in the present times divide a Bradley from a Bosanquet, a Ward from a Royce, also divided the *Upanishadic* philosophers as in the case of the *Shad Darshanakaaras* of ancient times. Those very pyramidal depiction of the Ultimate Reality as on the basis of space and time with the qualitative emergence of Life and Mind and Deity in the course of evolution found in Western philosophy is to be found with a striking profound semblance of parallelism here in the *Vedantic* philosophy. In fact, the very acute analysis of the epistemology of Self-Consciousness, which we meet with in the *Upanishads*, can easily hold its own against any similar doctrine even of the most advanced thinker of today, thus nullifying, nay rebutting, once for all the influence of that ill-conceived and half-thought-out bluster of an early European writer on the *Upanishads* that — 'They are the work of a rude age, a deteriorated race, and a barbarous and unprogressive community.'

Suffice it to say that this treatise will surely bring to the notice of such irresponsible and chronically prejudiced critics — whether Western or Indian — 'the variety and wealth of *Upanishadic* ideas on every conceivable subject in the domain of philosophy', and then in that event this book would have fulfilled its *raison d'être*. In conclusion, if at all the present treatise points to any moral, 'it is the moral of the life of beatific vision' enjoyed at all times by the *Jnaani*, the Realized soul.

Now, a few points to be noted by the reader while going through this text. This being a free transliteration of the original Kannada book, entitled — "*Shankara Vedanta Saara*" by Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji, of Holenarsipur, of revered memory, it may contain many sentences which are long and involved desiderating some elucidation here and there; such explanatory remarks or notes have been given within brackets if only to facilitate the correct interpretation or understanding by the reader. Secondly, this treatise deals with a highly subtle, esoteric and profound subject needing an utmost degree of concentration of the mind on the part of the reader (who should be sincere and devoted, one expects, and not casual in his approach to the subject) and hence there may be many repetitions of sentences, phrases or technical Sanskrit terms with slight variations in their

connotations to suit the context in which they are used. But they are relentlessly repeated invariably with a view to helping the seeker (especially one who is too raw or immature for *Vedantic* dialectic) to cognize the real and correct import or purport only. For this reason alone, this (defect of) repetition may be condoned and construed to be rather an aid (nay, a virtue).

The English translations of the original Sanskrit excerpts of Shri Shankaraacharya's extant *Bhaashyas* (original) are selected from the books by reputed authors, mainly from the Ramakrishna Mission Order, and are given in the relevant Chapters and sections. The Chapters deal with many topics of *Vedantic* philosophy, and since several of them have given rise to controversies prevalent and kept alive in some circles, a diligent attempt has been made by the author to thrash out the discrepancies and the discordant notes to be found in the various interpretations (in vogue) in many present-day *Vedantic* texts by taking recourse to Adi Shankara's clarifications in his own original *Bhaashyas*. As a result, many a familiar and popular notion or conception held by even seasoned Vedantins may be rendered to be misconceptions, nay misrepresentations or misinterpretations of the original text. However, in such an event the reader should not have or harbour any bias, rancour or malice at heart and with an open mind (full of catholicity) should try to reckon the truth to his own benefit.

An attempt has been made to arrange the topics in a thematic sequential order to facilitate better understanding and appreciation of the genuine *Vedantic* teachings of Adi Shankara, to whose adoration and memory this volume has been dedicated by me. Equally I dedicate it to the memory of my spiritual guide and *Guru* but for whose grace I would not have undertaken such an arduous and ticklish task.

I am beholden to the Publishers, Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Bangalore Branch, Thyagarajanagar, Bangalore - 560 028, for giving me this opportunity to serve this great institution which is propagating pristine pure *Advaita Vedanta* of Adi Shankara for over two decades in the city. I am particularly grateful to Shri K. G. Subraya Sharma, M.A., the Karyalaya's enterprising and energetic Secretary, for his unstinted cooperation and encouragement in my work. I am greatly indebted to the Printers, Verba Network Services, Malleswaram, Bangalore - 560 003, who have left no stone unturned in bringing out this attractive edition. Last but not the least, I am grateful to all those others who have given me moral support and to the readers.

B1-5, Dattaprasad Co-operative Housing Society
10th Main Road, Malleswaram
Bangalore — 560 003

January 15, 1991

D. B. Gangolli

THE ESSENTIAL ADI SHANKARA

I. INTRODUCTION

1. It is proposed to present in this treatise the essentials of *Vedanta* (i.e. the Indian or Hindu philosophical science) which are acceptable to (or authenticated by) Shri Adi Shankara. In the Indian continent many Vedantins prior to and after that great saint have composed treatises on *Vedanta*. But even to this day the special and inimitable features of that great teacher's spiritual teachings have remained exclusively unique and unparalleled. His spiritual teachings of *Advaita Vedanta* philosophy are relevant, alive and vibrant; are even to this day providing thought-provoking concepts to the discerning seekers with regard to their well-being and all-round progress here in this life and hereafter.

Shri Shankaraachaarya, like the other ancient preceptors, has written his treatises acknowledging fully the validity and authority of the *Vedas*. His writings are, in fact, of the form or nature of commentaries on the *Upanishads*. But, he has stressed the fact that ***Vedanta* philosophy (as depicted or taught in the *Upanishads*) has expounded the Reality which can be Intuitively experienced (or to be short, Intuited) here and now (while living in this body)**. Shri Shankaraachaarya's extraordinary and exclusive opinion and teaching is: "That the Ultimate or Absolute Reality alone, which is in consonance with *Saarvatrika Poorna Anubhava* (universally acknowledged reason or dialectic and Intuitive experience) is taught or expounded in *Vedanta* philosophy". He has promised and pledged his word of honour that by virtue of Self-Knowledge or *Jnaana* vouched by the *Vedanta* philosophical science all the vicissitudes and ills of Man's transmigratory existence or *Samsara* will be completely rooted out; hence, everyone (irrespective of his or her religious faith, ideology, nationality or culture) may make a sincere and dedicated attempt to attain this Self-Knowledge. Besides, this eminent preceptor has the spiritual support of a prominent lineage of traditional teachers like Shri Gaudapaada, Shri Dravidaachaarya, Shri Brahmaanandi etc.; but Shri Shankara has nowhere in all his commentaries or treatises said that one should believe in any textual or literary meanings or interpretations on the mere strength or support of traditional tenets or concepts. On the other hand, he opines that — "If any school of philosophy, whatever or whichever it may be, is defective and opposed or contrary to one's Intuitive experience, then it is fit to be condemned or refuted; on the other hand, let it be any philosophical teaching, if it is indisputable and cannot be invalidated by whatever means and if it is

especially in consonance with universal or everyone's experience, then that spiritual teaching or exposition deserves to be respected, revered." Thus the essence of the Vedantic philosophy taught by this world teacher and which will be appreciated and approved by the present-day spiritual seekers in all its aspects will be presented in this small treatise. It is our firm and fond hope that those true seekers, who cannot by themselves understand or comprehend the subtle teachings by directly reading Shri Shankara's original treatises and commentaries or *Bhaashyas* in Sanskrit, will find this book fully trust-worthy and useful.

2. There exist already several *Prakarana Granthas* or his own treatises in which the Vedantic methodology of teaching by Shri Shankara is compiled. Among them some have become well-known as works by Shri Shankara himself; some others are compiled by the followers or commentators of Shri Shankara's original works. Because these books are written in Sanskrit language, there is no benefit accruing from them to those who do not know or understand that language. Even to those who know and understand Sanskrit these treatises are not likely to expound or teach beyond doubt Shri Shankara's pure Vedanta philosophy. For, they contain various methodologies which are mutually contradictory; some of them, written in a style bristling with bizarre and jarring dialectic, are beyond the ken of limited intellects. Many such books written so far in regional languages are translations of those books alone; they too are replete with these defects. Some other books, though they are written independently, are following the Sanskrit treatises virtually as their replicas. In any of these books there do not exist the important teachings culled out from Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas* or original commentaries. Especially, a singular treatise which elucidates and elaborates completely and comprehensively the principal or fundamental methodology which is the exclusive prerogative and feature of Shri Shankara's pristine pure Vedanta of Non-dualism (*Advaita Vedanta*) is not yet compiled in any language at all. In order to fill up this lacuna this treatise entitled — "The Essential Adi Shankara" — is composed.

3. In this treatise there are some teachings written in an orderly manner pertaining to different topics based on statements collected together from the original commentaries by Shri Shankara on the *Prasthaana Traya* or the three categories of texts (viz. the *Shruti Prasthaana* comprising the ten principal *Upanishads* — *Isha*, *Kena*, *Katha*, *Prashna*, *Mundaka*, *Maandookya*, *Aitareya*, *Taittiriya*, *Chhaandogya* and *Brihadaraanyaka*; the *Smriti Prasthaana* — *Bhagavadgeeta*; and the *Nyaaya Prasthaana* — the *Vedanta*

Meemaamsaa Sootras or popularly known as *Brahma Sootras*). The *Upanishads* are fundamentally the authoritative sources of the *Vedantic* philosophy; because they form one part of the *Vedas*, they are called *Shruti*. *Bhagavadgeeta* is a text contained in the epic called *Mahabhaarat* written by revered Veda Vyaasa in order to explain and elucidate the purport and teachings of the *Shrutis*; because this *Bhagavadgeeta* is written by remembering or memorising the teachings and purport of the *Shrutis*, that text is called *Smriti*; *Vedanta Meemaamsaa Sootras* (or the *Brahma Sootras*) is a text of the form of aphorisms written by Shri Baadaraayana in order to determine the spiritual teaching purported to be expounded in the *Upanishads* along with the concurrence of *Bhagavadgeeta* by means of and on the strength of *Yukti* or dialectic; hence, it is called *Nyaaya Prasthaana*. Because these three categories of texts, viz. *Shruti*, *Smriti* and *Nyaaya*, have ventured out in three different paths or approaches, each one adopting its own exclusive viewpoint or perspective, to depict the spiritual teaching of *Vedanta*, they are customarily termed "*Prasthaana Traya*", meaning three paths or approaches. In this book we have predominantly reckoned the commentaries of Shri Shankara on the *Prasthana Traya* alone as the valid or authoritative means to establish the validity or veracity of any spiritual teaching. The readers may determine or judge that teachings contrary to those found in these *Bhaashyas* — irrespective of the fact that they may be any texts or treatises by any great post-Shankara author — are not pure *Advaita Vedanta* of Adi Shankara.

4. In these days it is to be found, to a great extent, that those who teach *Vedanta* philosophy to the common run of people are doing so by mixing up alien methodologies of different *Darshanas* or schools of philosophy like *Saankhya*, *Yoga*, *Nyaaya*, *Vaisheshika* and *Poorva Meemaamsaa* etc. It is also a fact that Shri Shankara has at various places in his *Bhaashyas* written his opinions blending the paths or approaches of the remaining *Darshanas* in *Vedanta*. "*Paramatam Apratishiddham Anumatam Bhavati*" (*Sootra Bhaashya* 2-4-12). He has utilized the *Tantra Yukti* or pragmatic axiom of "What we have not refuted as not proper in the teachings of other schools of philosophy, that may be taken as acceptable to us to be true". Therefore, it is not at all wrong or improper if from the point of view of grasping or comprehending the essential purport, other reasonable methodologies are used. But discarding the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*, which is the prime purport of *Vedanta* philosophy, either to reckon the other philosophical texts alone to comprise wholly the genuine *Vedantic* philosophy or to acknowledge methodologies contrary to the *Vedantic* methodology can never be proper or justifiable. Hence, we will keep on pointing out here and there the dialectic methods of the other

schools of philosophy which are refuted or condemned in the *Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas*.

5. In order to explain the purport of Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas* there are *Vyaakhyaanas* or sub-commentaries. But those *Vyaakhyaanas* have employed methodologies which are contrary to the original *Bhaashyas*. *Vaartikas*, which are written by way of further explaining the *Bhaashyas* on the *Brihadaaranyaka* and the *Taittiriya Upanishads*, commentaries called *Panchapaadika* and *Bhaamati*, which are available with regard to *Vedanta Meemaamsaa Bhaashya* (of Shri Shankara) — are predominant among such *Vyaakhyaanas* or sub-commentaries. Because all these three *Vyaakhyaanas* are mutually contradictory, we have not taken them for consideration or examination here in this book. Those teachings which are not contrary to the methodology which we have acknowledged (in this treatise) may be accepted or grasped by the true seekers from the viewpoint of understanding or cognizing the essential purport, i.e. the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*, even from these *Vyaakhyaanas* and there cannot be any objection whatsoever in doing so. But in this treatise which we have compiled for the sake of those aspirants who wish to know the pristine pure *Vedanta* philosophy of Adi Shankara alone (totally based on his own original *Bhaashyas* on the *Prasthaana Traya*) we have purposefully kept out of consideration these *Vyaakhyaanas*.

6. Shri Shankara has used some *Paaribhaashika Shabdas* or technical terms, some *Drishtaantas* or illustrations as also some *Nyaayas* or axioms in his works. The present-day Vedantins have conceived, in addition to those terms, certain other technical terms; they have used those technical terms and illustrations which Shri Shankara has utilized in a different manner and with a different connotation, and they have, as a result, drawn different conclusions; either they have not taken into the reckoning his axioms as much as they deserved, or even if they have considered his axioms, they have conceived a different meaning or interpretation for them. In order to bring home this lapse on their part to the seekers we have used in this treatise, to a great extent, those very technical terms which Shri Shankara has utilized; not only we have mentioned the synonyms of those terms at several places but also wherever we felt it necessary we have briefly mentioned whatever different meanings have been conceived for those particular terms by the present-day Vedantins. Wherever necessary, we have also indicated how and in what aspect the illustrations (used by Shri Shankara in his original *Bhaashyas*) are correctly used and how they should not be utilized in a particular manner with a particular sense. Indicating briefly the relevant axioms, we have also brought home the necessity of remembering those axioms. By this method not only the seekers

become familiar with Shri Shankara's style of discrimination but also they will discern very clearly the immense value of his profound, sublime methodology. Besides, with the help of this type of deliberation the seekers can imagine that, although books are published in the name of Adi Shankara, in which such technical terms, illustrations and axioms are used with different meanings or interpretations — or apart from these, totally different terminology is used — in truth, all of them cannot be accepted as the works by that great world teacher.

7. In this book, for those sentences from Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas*, which are alluded to in the brief footnotes for the purpose of substantiation and authenticity, we have not given detailed explanations, for their purport is, to a large extent, implicit or is included in our main text. The complete meaning of those original Sanskrit sentences in the extant *Bhaashyas* can be grasped by those who have a smacking knowledge of Sanskrit, first by reading them and later on getting them fully explained by knowledgeable Vedantins; or, in the alternative, they can know from detailed English translations of these commentaries published by monks of the Shri Ramakrishna Mission, a list of which is given at the beginning in this treatise. It can be affirmed here that for all those who aspire to know the quintessence of Adi Shankara's pristine pure *Vedanta* the text in this book is sure to satiate all their curiosity and inquisitiveness beyond a shadow of doubt. Those students who wish to study exclusively (for academic purposes) the original *Bhaashyas* by Adi Shankara — if they do so under the tutelage and guidance of a preceptor and then contemplate, it can be assured that the prime teachings of the original commentator, viz. Adi Shankara, and their real purport will be discerned. Thereafter if they pursue their study by reading in a detailed and incisive manner it would amount to their studying the *Bhaashyas* in a '*Samaasa-Vyaasa Paddhati*' (method of studying first in a brief manner followed by a detailed and elaborate manner). This treatise will provide a greater help and guidance to those superior students or post-graduates who have a burning desire to reconcile all teachings of the *Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas* after scrutinizing all of them. Especially to '*Mumukshus*' (those desirous of attaining *Moaksha* or Self-Knowledge here and now in this very life), who have neither the time or scope of studying all the voluminous *Bhaashyas* nor the capacity to do so but who aspire to adopt an ascetic's, anchorite's way of life following the principal spiritual teachings as taught by Shri Shankara even in their daily routine for *Manana* (discriminative deliberation based on Intuitive reasoning or *Anubhavaanga Tarka*), a more helpful or valuable book than this one will not be available. Thus this small treatise has been compiled with a view to catering to the varied requirements of different classes of readers and seekers.

II. VEDANTA

8. The author of every text or treatise on philosophy should mention at the outset these three objectives, viz. *Abhideya* or the subject-matter of the text; *Sambandha* or its relevance and relationship; and *Prayojana* or its benefit or the purpose served by it. For, unless and until the subject-matter dealt with in the text, the benefit accruing from its knowledge and the relationship between the subject-matter and its benefit are known beforehand no one endeavours to study the text. The *Adhikaari* or qualified or fit person is one for whose sake the text has been written and recommended. There is a custom or convention of calling all these four aspects — viz. *Adhikaari*, *Abhideya* (or *Vishaya*), *Sambandha* and *Prayojana* — together *Anubandha Chatushtaya*. The *Upanishadic* lore as well as the philosophical or spiritual science in it that is expounded is called *Vedanta* by the knowledgeable scholars. Therefore, either with regard to the *Upanishadic* texts or with regard to the spiritual science of *Vedanta* expounded in it the *Anubandha Chatushtaya* has to be first of all explained as a matter of convention.

9. There are many *Vedantic* schools of philosophy. There are many people who have written commentaries on *Prasthaana Trayā*. In the southern parts of India nowadays commentaries by three preceptors, viz. Madhwa, Raamaanuja and Shankara, are in vogue. This treatise, which we have compiled, is the *Vedanta* philosophy in consonance or agreement with Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas*. The special features of this *Vedanta* have been already mentioned by us in section no. 1 briefly. Henceforth we will use the word "*Vedanta*" with reference to Shri Shankara's *Vedanta* alone. The text that we have now compiled has been given the name of — "The Essential Adi Shankara". Because it signifies the essentials of *Vedanta* philosophy approved by Adi Shankara and because it contains the very essence of *Vedanta* philosophical (or spiritual) science, which is "*Shankara*", meaning, that which bestows material or mundane prosperity upon *Jeevas* or souls, this treatise can be given the significant appellation of "The Essential Adi Shankara".

10. For *Vedanta* philosophy the *Abhideya* or subject-matter is *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality. Because *Brahma Vidya* or knowledge of *Brahman* destroys the bondage of *Samsaara* or transmigratory life or existence of those devotees who examine or deliberate upon It (*Brahma Vidya*) with dedication and discrimination and because it enables them to attain that *Brahmanhood* or what goes in spiritual parlance as Self-Knowledge or Self-Realization, this knowledge is called *Upanishad*. For this word — "*Upanishad*" — this alone is the principal meaning. In a secondary sense, the spiritual texts which are the means to know

Brahma Vidya are also called *Upanishads*. The statements in these *Upanishads* alone have been explained by Shri Shankara through his commentaries. Those statements alone are the prime or fundamental sources of authority and authenticity for the *Vedantic* deliberation. Either those *Upanishadic* statements or the *Bhaashya* sentences pertaining to those *Upanishadic* quotations alone we will go on mentioning at various places according to the context.

1. Mu. Bh. Intr. p. 81.

2. Ka. Bh. Intr. p. 95.

11. It becomes quite evident from the above description with regard to *Abhideya* alone that *Prayojana* or the benefit accruing from *Upanishad*, meaning *Brahma Vidya*, is the destruction of the root cause or the seed form of *Samsaara* like *Avidya* etc., as also the attainment of *Brahman*. *Brahman* is verily our *Atman* or Self alone; *Samsaara* (the transmigratory existence of the apparent form of the dualistic world) is appearing in that *Atman* because of *Avidya* (ignorance) alone. Therefore, it amounts to saying that, in a sequential order, the benefit accruing from *Vedanta Shaastra* or the scriptural (*Vedantic*) texts — because they teach or expound *Brahma Vidya* which removes *Avidya* — is verily to destroy the dualistic world which is of the apparent form of miseries and misfortunes of life and to help attain *Atman* or Self of the essential nature of *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality. Just as when a person, suffering from a disease, is cured of that disease, he is said to regain his health, similarly when by virtue of *Brahma Vidya* the calamities and miseries caused by *Avidya* are removed, the seeker is reinstated or re-established, so to speak, in his essential nature of *Atman*, which is *Advaita* or non-dual, and this regaining one's *Swasthataa* (one's own essential nature) alone is the paramount benefit accruing from *Vedanta Shaastra*. (*Swasthataa*, *Swaatmani* *Avasthaanam*, *Swaatma Pratishthaa*, *Swaroopavasthaanam* — all these are synonymous *Vedantic* terms).

3. Ma. Bh. Intr. pp. 176-177.

5. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 12.

4. Tai. Bh. Intr. p. 224.

12. Between *Brahma Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) and *Brahma Praapti* (attainment of *Brahmanhood*) which is of the nature of '*Swasthataa*' there exists a relationship of 'means' and 'end'; for, *Brahma Vidya* is *Saadhana* or the practical means, *Brahma Praapti* is *Saadhya* or the resultant fruit or goal, end. Between *Vedanta Shaastra* and *Brahma Vidya* there exists a relationship of the valid means of expounding the Reality (*Pratipaadaka*) and the end product of *Brahma Vidya* (*Pratipaadya*); for, *Shaastra* expounds *Brahma Vidya*, which is the *Pratipaadya* (that which is expounded). All this we have stated above.

If the *Sambandha* or relationship between *Jnaana Kaanda* (the part of the *Vedas* which contains the *Upanishads*) and the preceding portion of the *Vedas*, viz. *Karma Kaanda*, is discerned, it will be understood as to which new subject-matter or topic has been expounded in the *Upanishads*. *Karma Kaanda* portion is that which elucidates the stratagem or device of acquiring the desires which *Atman (Jeeva)* wishes to be fulfilled in other births or *Dehaantara*, as also getting rid of the undesirable things. This topic of *Vidya* and *Avidya* which are the causes for *Ishta Praapti* (acquisition of the desirable things) and *Anishtha Nivrutti* (getting rid of undesirable things) will be explained in due course (in sections 30, 31).

6. Tai. Bh. Intr. p. 223.

7. Br. Bh. Intr. pp. 4 & 5.

13. It becomes evident now that those who have got rid of *Avidya* and have an aspiration to get themselves established in the essential nature of *Atman* alone are the *Adhikaaris* (the qualified persons) to deliberate upon the teachings of this *Shaastra*. But because by merely wishing one does not obtain the benefits, the question that — “Endowed with which qualifications, will any one become an *Adhikaari* to know *Vedanta*?” — will have to be deliberated upon in detail. It is very clear that because the *Vedanta* Philosophy is contained in the *Upanishads* and these form a part of the *Vedas*, *Dwijas* (the twice-born i.e. Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas) alone who are qualified to study or learn the *Vedas* are the fit persons to attain *Brahma Vidya* through the study of the *Vedas*. It will be indicated in due course in this treatise that *Vedaadhyayana* (the systematic study of the *Vedas*), *Vedoakta Karmas* (performance of rituals mentioned in the *Vedas*) — all these become the cause or the means, in a sequential order and indirectly, for *Brahma Vidya*. Therefore, observing the *Dharmic* (religious) rituals or rites, disciplines stipulated for the *Varnas* (castes) and *Aashramas* (the four stages in one's life) also becomes a contributory or secondary cause for the qualification for *Brahma Vidya*. But it is known from *Puraanas* (Hindu mythological texts) that people like *Vidura*, *Dharmavyaadha*, *Maitreyi* etc. who did not have the knowledge of the *Vedas* through *Vedaadhyayana*, people like *Samvarta* etc. who could not observe the *Aashrama Dharmas* (disciplines pertaining to the four *Aashramas* or stages of *Brahmacharya*, *Gaarhastya*, *Vaanaprastha* and *Sannyasa*) also were *Jnaanins* (people who had attained Self-Knowledge or *Brahma Vidya*); in the *Mahabharata* it is stipulated that the people belonging to all four *Varnas* or castes should listen with devotion to the discourses on *Itihaasa* (historical texts) and *Puraanas* (mythological texts), which in truth teach the purport of the *Vedas* alone. In the historical texts it has been stated that *Samvarta* and some others, who were indifferent to the *Aashrama Karmas* (rituals pertaining to the four *Aashramas*) were

also great Yogis. On the basis of all these reasons it becomes evident that — (i) those who have undergone a spiritual course by *Vedaadhyayana* and have observed one's own respective *Varna* and *Aashrama Karmas* become *Adhikaaris* to attain *Tattwa Jnaana* (the Self-Knowledge) through the valid means of *Vedas*; (ii) though having had *Vedaadhyayana*, people like *Vidura* etc. who did not have the right for *Aashrama Dharmas*, also become *Adhikaris* for *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge expounded through the *Vedas*; (iii) people belonging to the fourth *Varna* viz. *Shoodras* etc., who do not have the right to study *Vedas*, become *Adhikaaris* for *Jnaana* through listening with devotion to *Itihaasa* and *Puraanas*; (iv) even those who do not have any right for *Aashrama Karmas* can attain *Brahma Vidya* through the study of texts written on *Vedanta* in various languages other than Sanskrit.

8. Su. Bh. 3-4-36. p. 793.

10. Su. Bh. 1-3-34. p. 230.

9. Su. Bh. 3-4-37. pp. 793-794.

11. Su. Bh. 1-3-38. p. 234.

14. *Adhyayana* of the *Vedas* is to possess *Yoagyata* (the capacity or qualification) necessary equally for the deliberations on *Karma* and *Brahman* (the Absolute, Ultimate Reality). The rudimentary physio-psychic excellences or capacities which are invariably needed for *Brahma Vichaara* (Intuitive deliberation on *Brahman*) are:

- i) Intuitive deliberation with regard to entities which are eternal and non-eternal (*Nitya-Anitya Vastu Viveka*);
- ii) Renunciation of enjoyment of fruits or pleasures either in this human birth or other worlds or births (*Iha-Amutra Artha Bhoaga Viraagaha*);
- iii) The human wealth of having attained or acquired the six purificatory disciplines of *Shama* or control over the mind; *Dama* or control over the senses; *Uparati* or introvertedness of the mind; *Titeeksha* or equipoise of the mind in the face of the pairs of opposites like happiness and misery, success and defeat, heat and cold etc.; *Shraddha* or one-pointed dedication towards attainment of Self-Knowledge and *Samaadhaana* or steadfastness and consummation of mental equipoise;
- iv) *Mumukshutwa* or burning desire for attaining *Moaksha* or Liberation from the Bondage of *Samsaara*. If these four basic disciplinary capacities have been achieved, then whether one has deliberated upon *Karmas* or not, one can carry on *Brahma Vichaara*; but if one does not possess the above four human excellences, he will not have the *Adhikaara* or spiritual qualification to carry out such *Brahma Vichaara* and thereby cognize or Intuit the Reality. For this reason alone, Shri Shankara has stressed in his *Bhaashyas* that “*Moaksha*, which is the fruit of *Brahma*

Jijnaasa (a burning desire to know or Intuit *Brahman*), can only be attained by *Brahma Vidya* alone which is endowed with *Karma Sannyasa* (total renunciation of *Karmas* or ritualistic actions); and that for mere *Jnaana* or Intuitive Knowledge of *Atman* people belonging to all the four *Aashramas* have *Adhikaara* or qualification”.

12. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 7.

14. Mu. Bh. Intr. p. 80.

13. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 9.

15. Nitya-Anitya Vastu Viveka — means: Discerning by distinguishing in the manner — “All the fruits of religious practices like *Karma* (scriptural rituals) and *Upaasana* (scriptural meditations) are *Anitya* (non-eternal), and further, *Moaksha* or Liberation of the nature of attainment of the Supreme Self alone is *Nitya* or eternal”. It is found in everyone’s experience in this world that what is done and obtained as a result of *Karma* is *Anitya*. In the same manner, what is done and obtained as a result in other worlds or other births too has to be invariably non-eternal only; therefore, the *Shrutis* (scriptures) are proclaiming that anything that is eternal cannot at all be attained by any religious means or practices which involve any action or deed whatsoever.

Ihaamutrartha Bhoaga Viraagaha — means: Getting disgusted or indifferent towards the enjoyment of objects or pleasures of this world or towards the enjoyment of the objects or pleasures of other worlds after realizing or recognizing the defects as well as the miseries in those enjoyments and thereby becoming disinterested in them or developing an apathy towards them.

Shama Damaadi Saadhana Sampat — means: Adopting a way of life in which the six disciplines, viz. *Shama*, *Dama*, *Uparati*, *Titeeksha*, *Shraddha* and *Samaadhaana* — mentioned in the previous section — so as to acquire human excellences.

Mumukshutwa — means: Entertaining an aspiration for attaining Liberation or Beatitude, i.e getting rid of *Samsaara Bandha* (the shackles of this transmigratory existence of repeated births and deaths). These will be further explained in the context of deliberations on *Saadhana* or spiritual practices.

15. Ch. Up. and Bh. 8-1-6. p. 582.

18. Ch. Up. 5-10-8. p. 375;

16. Mu. Up. 1-2-12. pp. 108 & 109.

Ch. Bh. 5-10-8. p. 376.

17. Ka. Up. 1-2-10. p. 135;

19. Br. Up. 4-4-23. p. 765.

Ka. Up. Bh. 1-2-10. pp. 135, 136.

III. THE SALIENT FEATURES OF SHANKARA'S VEDANTA

16. Although *Vedanta* philosophy has the four features like *Abhideya*, etc. and hence it is established that one should deliberate upon the *Vedanta* philosophical science, the question — “Why should the aspirant deliberate upon Adi Shankara's (*Advaita*) *Vedanta* philosophy alone?” — arises and the answer is: It has already been briefly mentioned in (section 1) as to what are the salient features of Shri Shankara's philosophy. Even so, here there is a need to discuss in some detail that topic. The readers may ask questions like: Prior to Shri Shankaraachaarya were there no Vedantins at all? Even today there are many, is it not? In examining Shri Shankara's *Vedanta* philosophy exclusively what extraordinary benefit accrues?

Except for the *Mandookya Kaarikas* by Shri Gaudapaadaachaarya, Shri Shankara's grand preceptor, no *Vedanta* treatises whatsoever, older than those *Kaarikas*, are fully available to us. In the post-Shankara period a treatise on *Advaita Vedanta* called “*Brahma Siddhi*”, written by a Vedantin by name Mandana Mishra, came to light some years ago. Now *Vedanta* methodologies propounded by some commentators like Raamaanuja and Madhwa, who have followed or adopted *Dvaita* philosophy, are also in vogue. But the extraordinary or special feature of the methodology of Vedantins who follow the traditional school of philosophy of Shri Shankara is the teaching that by the *Aatma Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge, which is born out of Intuiting the purport conveyed by the *Vedanta* sentences, the fruit of *Sadyoamukti* (Liberation from all shackles of *Samsaara*) can be attained here and now in this very life. All the rest of the Vedantins have interpreted the *Jnaana Kaanda* (the third part of the *Vedas* dealing with the Intuitive Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality) giving predominance to *Vidhi* (religious injunctions or stipulations). Nowadays even those Vedantins who profess to be the followers of Shri Shankaraachaarya blend or interpolate the methodologies of *Saankhya* or *Yoga* and such other schools of philosophy and somehow try to bring about a relationship between *Jnaana Kaanda* and *Vidhi*. All these *Vedantic* schools of philosophy, like the rest of the schools other than *Vedanta*, mutually oppose or contradict one another also; their own philosophies contain self-contradictions in their treatises themselves too. Besides, they do not propound the Ultimate Reality taking the *Vedanta* sentences alone as the authoritative sources or means. Shri Shankara has himself asserted in his *Maandookya Kaarika Bhaashya* that **his *Advaita Darshana* or philosophy of non-dual Reality does neither give any room or scope whatsoever for any *Vivaada* (dialectic debate or polemics) nor for any *Viroadha* (opposition or confrontation).**

17. If it is argued that the fact that the rest of the *Vedantic* schools of philosophy as well as the other *non-Vedantic* schools being mutually contradictory or opposed to one another is itself a defect in them, then because Shri Shankara's school of philosophy is opposed to all of them, it also is rendered defective or fallible alone. If it is argued that the fact that the methods adopted for explanation or elucidation of Shri Shankara's philosophy, among themselves, are contradictory to one another is itself a defect in them, then because the methodology that is expounded in this treatise also is opposed to all of them, it amounts to saying that in this methodology too there exists a defect only. It being so, how can it be determined or established that what is depicted here in this treatise alone is the genuine methodology of Shri Shankara or that it alone is infallible or without any defect whatsoever? — thus the aspirants may raise a doubt.

The solution for this doubt is: Having taken exclusively the *Bhaashyas* on the *Prasthaana Traya*, which are acknowledged by everyone to be genuine works by Shri Shankaraachaarya and to be the authoritative sources, and **having reconciled all the *Bhaashya* statements — to establish the *Vedantic* philosophy on the strength or support of those *Bhaashya* sentences alone** is an exclusive feature to be found in this treatise alone, and the discerning among the seekers can realize this truth. Therefore, the methodology and teachings expounded here in this treatise alone are the genuine and pristine pure *non-dual Advaita* philosophy of Shri Shankara. The rest of the commentaries are mutually contradictory, contain contradictory opinions within their own texts and finally they are opposed to the original *Bhaashyas* of Shri Shankara. Therefore, they do not by any means teach or propound the pristine pure methodology of Shri Shankara's *Advaita Vedanta* school of philosophy. This pure and highly rational, nay Intuitive, philosophical science of Shri Shankara, which does not countenance any opposition whatsoever from any quarter, determines and establishes the *non-dualism* of *Atman* or the Self by means of the *Shaastric* statements as well as valid discursive reasoning (*Yukti*), and for that reason alone it is the "*Samyagdarshana*" (genuine true philosophical science). Because they are opposed to both the scriptural texts or statements and *Yukti* and are having recourse to dialectic arguments which are contradictory to one another and further, because they have propounded the philosophy of dualism alone which gives full scope for *Raaga* (attachment or liking) and *Dwesha* (hatred, dislike) etc. — the rest of the philosophies are "*Mithyaadarshanas*" (misconceived, untrue philosophical systems). Besides, dualism (*Dvaita*) is superimposed upon, or misconceived in, the substratum of *non-dualism* (*Advaita*). **Because *Advaita* is *Akalpita* or beyond misconception, it is *Parama* or the Supreme, Ultimate Reality.** Because such an *Advaita* (non-dual

Reality) is expounded also, Shri Shankara's philosophy is a "Samyagdarshana". This fact has been clarified by Shri Shankara in his *Bhaashya* on Shri Gaudapaada's *Maandookya Kaarikas* 3-17, 18. Because all the methodologies, which the present-day Vedantins are adopting or accepting, are either directly or indirectly, in the ultimate analysis, culminating in *Dvaita* (the empirical region of duality) alone, their philosophies are all untrue or misconceived *Darshanas* (systems of philosophy) indeed. Because the exclusive methodology that we have elucidated in this treatise is revealing a philosophical science of *Advaita* or *non-dualism* (the science of the Ultimate, Absolute Reality without a second), which is infallible and impeccable, seekers who are desirous of *Shreyas* (spiritual solace or enlightenment) should reverentially follow this philosophical science alone. This candid, frank assertion has not been made by us in this context with any trace of hankering for name, fame, material gain or adoration; nor we have said so out of any jealousy or animosity towards any one. We have written this treatise solely for the purpose of disseminating the truth to seekers devoted and dedicated to the realization of the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*.

2. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-17. p. 291.

3. Ma. Ka. 3-18. pp. 292-293.

18. The preceptors of other schools of philosophy also have followed the *Shaastra*. But they have not predominantly trusted the *Shaastra* alone; they have, in addition, believed in extra-ordinary logical or dialectical devices needed for their respective philosophical systems or teachings. Besides, because they fundamentally trust their own respective logic or dialectical system alone and strain or stretch the scriptural texts or statements so as to suit their systems or teachings, in their schools of philosophy logic is given the pride of place or importance. Therefore, they are *Taarkikas* (logicians) and not Vedantins. **But, in Shri Shankara's Advaita Vedanta philosophy — for Brahman, who is Abhideya or the named entity which is the subject-matter, Shaastra or the Upanishadic lore alone is the Pramaana or the valid, authentic, authoritative means or source.** Shri Shankara's dictum that — "Shaastra alone is the valid means or authoritative source to signify *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality" — is in consonance with the aphorism or *Sootra*, viz. "*Shaastra Yoanitwaal*" — (*Brahma Sootra* 1-1-3) — of the *Vedanta Meemaamsaa Sootras*. For this reason alone, Shri Shankara's is the true or genuine *Vedanta* Philosophy. *Shaastra*, *Veda*, *Shruti*, *Vedanta*, *Upanishad*, *Aagama* — all these are synonyms.

4. Su. Bh. 1-1-3. p. 18.

5. Su. Bh. 2-1-11. p. 322.

19. Those very *Shaastras* alone which Shri Shankara had believed in or trusted were relied upon as the valid means or authoritative sources

by the Vedantins prior to Shri Shankara for expounding their philosophical systems or teachings. It being so, what greatness or profundity can there be in saying that Shri Shankara alone has adhered to the validity or authority of the *Shaastras*? — Thus some people may think.

Like the others Shri Shankara has not relied upon the validity or authority of the *Shaastras* merely based on belief or faith. The *Poorva Meemaamsakas* (Jaimini's school of philosophy) have believed the *Vedic* statements contained in the *Karma Kaanda* to be valid or authoritative, because therein there do not exist any empirical valid means which contradict or refute what is stated in those *Vedic* sentences and secondly, because (they assert) the *Vedas* or scriptures are "*Apourusheya*" (works not of human origin) at all. The opinion of the other Vedantins is that the validity or authoritativeness of the *Jnaana Kaanda* sentences too is similar to this belief alone. But Shri Shankara opines that: The doubt — "Whether the result or fruit of *Karma* or any ritual, mentioned in the *Karma Kaanda* sentences, actually or in reality accrues or not?" — may arise indeed. For, that fruit is "*Paroaksha*" (invisible, out of or beyond the range of sight). But **because the fruit born out of the *Vedanta* sentences (to be found in the *Jnaana Kaanda* portions) culminates in one's Intuitive experience (here and now),** there is no scope or room for such a doubt to arise in their case at all. Shri Shankara has emphasized this point. The special feature of the validity of the sentences which is acknowledged in this methodology is: In the case of *Dharma Jijnaasa* (the pursuit of knowing religious truths) merely the *Shaastra* etc. alone are the valid means; but **in the case of the pursuit of knowing *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality not only the *Shrutis* etc. but also *Anubhava* or Intuitive experience etc. are the valid means according to the context or circumstances.**

6. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 15-16.

7. Su. Bh. 3-3-32. p. 705.

20. "The Vedantins belonging to the other schools also reckon the *Shaastras* as the valid means or authoritative sources and refute the teachings of Shri Shankara. Even the proponents of *Vyaakhyaana Prasthaana* or the later post-Shankara commentaries too, having acknowledged the validity, authority and authenticity of *Shaastras* alone, propound their respective philosophical systems and refute the teachings of other schools of philosophy. Therefore, the methodology that is expounded in this treatise will be one among many *Vedantic* methodologies alone and hence it cannot claim to have any exclusive distinction which is not to be found in any of them" — Thus one may jump to a conclusion. But, because the *Vedantic* discrimination culminates in one's Intuitive experience, to those who keep in mind what we have stated above the fact of this opinion being improper or

unjustifiable becomes quite evident and clear. For, there may be as many methodologies as one may desire which determine the purport of the *Vedantic* lore by imagining or conjecturing the special characteristics like *Upakrama* (the proposition at the commencement) and *Upasamhaara* (conclusive assertion at the end) etc.; but, because Intuitive experience is universal and common and the same to every one, there is no possibility whatsoever for more than one methodology to exist in so far as the question of determining or establishing the entity (here in this present context, the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*), which is in consonance with every human being's Intuitive experience, is concerned. *Vedanta Shaastra* or the *Upanishadic* lore predominantly expounds the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*, which is a "*Bhoota Vastu*" (eternally, perennially existing Reality); it is not possible to misconceive or to conjecture in the manner — "A *Vastu* or existing entity is like this as well as it is like that too; it is surely existing, as also it is not at all existing". We do not mean in the least by this to say that the viewpoints or aspects which are adopted or followed to determine or establish the Reality cannot be many; but — 'to conceive or believe that the different discriminative methods which are contrary to one another to be, in this sense, genuine viewpoints of different types' — it will never be possible at all. **Because even if a hundred statements assert quite contrary to everyone's experience, in the manner — "Fire is cold; there is no light in it" — they cannot be acknowledged as valid or true, between the other unique methodologies which are based on the mere premise of the absolute validity or authority of *Shaastras* alone, on the one hand, and the unique methodology that is adopted in and through Shri Shankara's *Bhaashyas* to expound the Ultimate Reality enunciated in the *Shaastras* or *Upanishads* so as to be in consonance with "*Anubhava*" (everyone's Intuitive experience), on the other hand, there exists a very great difference.**

8. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 17.

10. G. Bh. 18-66. p. 758.

9. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 16.

21. Some people have a doubt of the type — "Experience (*Anubhava*) too may vary from one person to another (to wit, it may be of a different type to each person). Therefore, how will it be proper or justifiable if we interpret the *Shruti* sentences reconciling them with our individualistic experience?" But we have not called here in this context the experience of delusion or the extra-ordinary or abnormal experiences of a particular individual obtained as a result of his *Yoga* practices or the mystic powers that one has obtained by witchcraft or chanting some *Mantras* or hymns etc. — by the name of "*Anubhava*". The *Saarvatrika Anubhava* (the universal or every human being's Intuitive experience) alone, which is not confined to, or restricted by, time, space and

causation categories, is truly, in the ultimate analysis, the real *Anubhava* (Intuitive experience). That thing in the essential nature of Being of which (i.e. in its *Swaroopa*) there is ever or eternally no change, increase or decrease whatsoever and which exists ever in one and the same form or nature — that thing alone is the Ultimate Reality or *Paramaārtha*, Truth or *Satyam*. The Knowledge or Intuition of such a Reality alone is called *Samyajjnaana* or *Samyagdarshana* (the true knowledge or the genuine spiritual science). Because *Vedānta Darshana* (the spiritual science of *Vedānta*) teaches the Intuitive Knowledge of *Brahman* in consonance with “*Anubhava*” (universal Intuitive experience), here in this spiritual science there is no scope whatsoever for any kind of difference or variance in everyone’s Intuitive experience.

11. Su. Bh. 2-1-11. p. 322.

13. Tai. Bh. 2-1. p. 291.

12. G. Bh. 2-16. pp. 51-52.

22. Just because the remaining schools of philosophy are mutually opposed, it will not be proper to assume that all of them are wrong. Why should it not be believed or reckoned that a particular school of philosophy among them is correct? It does not seem to be reasonable to assume that Shri Shankara’s *Vedāntic* philosophy alone is correct; for, it is a relevant doubt among some people that just as the staunch followers of Shri Shankara’s *Vedānta* had refuted the other philosophical schools — which in the past people had believed to be correct and these followers of Shri Shankara had shown them to be incorrect — in the same way, in the future also at any point of time some person may show that Shri Shankara’s *Vedānta* also is wrong or defective.

This doubt is not proper. For, among the schools of philosophy propounding duality alone to be real, not one of them can be said not to have an opposite camp or party. It is not possible at all to champion the cause of their own respective interests of the proponents of one particular school by merely refuting or solving the defects pointed out or levelled against their philosophy. We had indicated in the past (section 16) that the schools of philosophy, propounding duality to be real — being opposed to one another — give scope for *Raaga* and *Dwesha*; thereby they become *Mithyā Darshanās* (pseudo schools of philosophy). For the fact of all those schools being wrong or defective, the only reason of any other school being opposed to them is not the root cause. All of them by their very nature alone are philosophies born out of misconceptions (*Adhyāsa*). For, they are not born out of, or based on, the support of *Poorna Anubhava* (the comprehensive, consummate Intuitive experience or Pure Consciousness). Anybody can doubt in the manner — “Why should not a philosophy, which depicts or

propounds the experience of objects or phenomena which are within the purview of one's perception, be formulated?" But that is not possible; for, the philosophical science (*Darshana*) of *Advaita* or *non-dualism* engenders, or rather culminates in, the Intuitive experience of the type — "The Ultimate Reality (*Paramaarthata*) is *Atman* alone; apart from It there is no second thing or phenomenon existing". Because once this Intuitive experience is attained, there is no duality whatsoever, there is no possibility whatever of another school of philosophy falsifying or invalidating this philosophical science, much less the Reality. **If one acknowledges the unity (or rather non-duality) of *Atman* or the Self, it is tantamount to accepting *Advaita* alone as the Ultimate Reality; there is no plausibility whatsoever to point out any defect in *Advaita Tattwa* (the non-dual Reality), the one without a second to It.** For, then it is also accepted that the duality or second phenomenon of defect too does not exist. Therefore, our assertion (section 16) that this philosophical science is without or beyond any disputation or discursive logic is quite reasonable and proper. The knower of this philosophical science of the *Vedas* (*Vedanta*), gives up the defect of duality, which is the root cause for disputation or argument, as belonging to the lot of the respective proponent and remains blissful. Even his act of refutation of other schools of philosophy is born out of a need of explaining or showing their essencelessness (or being devoid of truth) rather than out of any addiction or craze for disputation or dialectics like them.

14. Pra. Bh. 6-3. p. 494.

15. Pra. Bh. 6-3. pp. 497-498.

IV. ADHYAASA OR MISCONCEPTION

23. The essence of the spiritual teachings of *Vedanta* philosophy is this much: "**All this is *Brahman* alone; our *Atman* is *Brahman* alone**" — (*Maandookya Upanishad Mantra 2*). In *Brahman* there does not exist any world of duality whatsoever. The Sanskrit word '*Brahman*' means "huge, big". The truth that our *Atman* is an impartible entity or ever-existent Reality, devoid of any world of duality whatsoever — is realized (Intuited) when we see with insight according to the *Shaastra Drishti* (scriptural viewpoint) — (*Sootra Bhaashya 1-1-30*). But if we view from our present standpoint (called *Loukika*, *Avidya* or *Adhyaaroopa Drishti*), it appears in the dual, divided form of "I" and "*Prapancha*" (the external world); it also appears as if there exist many *Atmans* or selves in the world and as if those *Atmans* are endowed with *Raaga* (attachment) and *Dwesha* (hatred) towards things external to them and are experiencing *Duhkha* (misery) concomitant with transmigratory life (*Samsaara*). This our viewpoint or *Drishti* is called

by Vedantins — *Avidya Drishti* (the viewpoint of misconception). *Shaastra Drishti*, *Aarsha Darshana*, *Tattwadarshi Drishti*, *Vidwad Drishti* — all these are synonyms; *Loaka Drishti* (*Sootra Bhaashya* 2-2-3), *Vyaavahaarika Drishti*, *Swaabhaavika Drishti*, *Avidya Drishti* — all these are also synonyms.

1. Ma. Up. 2. p. 181.

2. Su. Bh. Intr. p. 1.

24. All the miseries or calamities of *Samsaara* suffered by us are caused from the viewpoint of *Avidya* alone. All that is *Paramaarth*a (the Ultimate Reality), in the ultimate analysis, is nothing but our *Atman*, who is *Brahman*, meaning that which is impartible, indivisible and non-dual. **That in this *Brahman* the world comprising sentient and insentient divisions does not exist in the least — is the spiritual teaching of Vedanta Philosophy.** When we follow implicitly the spiritual directions or instructions of the *Shrutis* and the *Achaarya* (preceptor who knows the *Shaastraic* methodology or *Aagama*, as also who is rooted or established in the Intuitive experience of *Atman*) and Intuit in our mind alone the truth that — “In this *Brahman* there does not exist, in the least, any variety or manifoldness” — then all our *Shoaka* (bemoanings) and *Moaha* (attachments) are got rid of. At that stage all the mortal desires imbedded in our hearts are driven away or they vanish, and here and now (while living in this very body) we attain *Brahma Praapti* and as a consequence we who were mortal will ourselves become immortal; all our doubts are cut asunder. Herefore there does not remain or persist any particular mundane objective or ambition for us to be fulfilled or achieved by performing any particular action, deed; we become one of those who are *Krita-Krityas* (people who have attained all that is to be attained in this human life spiritually). Thus the *Upanishads* are proclaiming. At the same time the *Shrutis* (*Upanishads*) criticise, belittle the *Avidya Drishti* by statements like — “That person who persists in having or exercising the *Avidya Drishti* alone which prompts him to perceive manifoldness or duality — which does not really exist in *Atman* — that person will get death after death incessantly.”

3. Ka. Up. Bh. 2-1-11. pp. 180-181.

5. Ka. Up. 2-3-14. p. 212.

4. Isa Up. & Bh. 7. pp. 13-14.

6. Mu. Up. 2-2-8. p. 138.

25. There are other schools of philosophy which have undertaken the task with the intention or purport of expounding the proper, correct knowledge to remove *Avidya* (ignorance). But the Vedantins affirm that what they propound as *Vidya* or correct knowledge and *Avidya* or wrong knowledge are both existing in the world of duality projected by *Avidya* (metaphysical ignorance). Just as the Vedantins have

deliberated upon the essential nature of this latter *Avidya*, none of the other schools of philosophy has done. The fact that — “*Avidya* means misconception, delusion or wrong knowledge of reckoning one thing as another” — is known to everyone. This misconception or delusion is caused by conceiving a characteristic feature or quality in a particular object or thing in which that characteristic feature or quality really does not exist. This wrong conception or misconception is called ‘*Adhyaasa*’. For example, to misconceive a sea-shell or nacre as silver and one moon to be two is *Avidya* of the form or nature of *Adhyaasa*. Several such *Adhyaasas* or misconceptions keep on occurring in our day-to-day life. But what the Vedantins say is: “Our *Atman* is the non-dual *Brahman*; there exists an *Avidya* which misconceives by way of *Adhyaasa* a world of duality that does not exist in the least, not even an iota of it, in this *Atman* or *Brahman*.” Not only does this *Avidya* superimpose on, or misconceive in, *Atman* this *Anaatman* (not-self) and its characteristic features or qualities but also it superimposes upon, or misconceives in, *Anaatman* or not-self *Atmatwa* (innate, utmost identification, meaning the *Anaatman* is reckoned to be, really our essential nature) and further the essential nature or characteristics of *Atman* is misconceived to be belonging to *Anaatman*. Because of this basic misconception and mutual superimposition alone the delusion of the divisions or distinctions of *Pramaatru* (cognizer), *Pramaana* (means of cognition) and *Prameya* (the cognized object) — these three categories are called in Vedantic parlance “*Triputi*” — is superimposed indeed; consequently, the *Anartha* (undesirable calamity) of *Samsaara* of the form or nature of *Kartrutwa* (doership, agentship of action) as also *Bhoktrutwa* (enjoyership) has been misconceived in *Atman*. All the *Upanishads* have the prime purport of teaching the *Aatmaikatwa Vidya* (Intuitive Knowledge of the Absolute, non-dual Reality of *Atman* or *Brahman*) through the path of total annihilation of this *Avidya*.

7. Adh. Bh. p. 5.

10. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

8. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

11. Adh. Bh. p. 6.

9. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

26. To some people it may appear that the *Adhyaasa* or misconception of the nature of mutual superimposition between *Atman* and *Anaatman* (i.e. the ‘I’ notion in everyone and its concomitant paraphernalia) is without the support of reasonable grounds. Although in our workaday world it is common knowledge that people misconceive silver in nacre and a human being in a wooden post, in those contexts or situations people have misconceived one *Jneya* (object) in another *Jneya* (both being things or percepts external to them). ‘*Jneya*’ means (technically) that phenomenon or percept which is the object for the *Jnaana* (knowledge, consciousness) of the *Jnaatru* (the knower or

cognizer). Because nacre and the wooden post etc. are the objects in front of us directly perceived through the senses, in them it may be possible to misconceive another external object. For, '*Adhyaasa*' means a delusion of misconceiving or wrongly knowing an object in front of us to be another. But *Atman* is neither a perceptible entity to be known through the senses nor an external object; (at best) He is a *Vishayi*, *Jnaatru* or cognizer, one who knows or perceives. How will it be possible to believe that the cognizing *Atman*, Himself having been deluded in the manner that He Himself is the object to be known or perceived, superimposes the special characteristics of that external object on Himself?

This objection is not proper. For, there is no rule of law whatsoever that people always superimpose another thing on a perceptible object alone. The ignorant people (without exercising their God-given discriminative faculty) superimpose on, or misconceive in, *Akaasha* (sky, which is formless and hence invisible to the eyes) an impurity in the manner — "The lower region or part of this sky is polluted or is impure". Moreover, there is neither any rule of law whatsoever that people always superimpose an object on another object alone. Misconceiving *Atman*, who is the *Vishayi* (subject) as also *Jnaatru* (knower), in the body and the characteristic features of the body in *Atman*, who is the subject, people express in the manner — "I am of a fair complexion; I am of a black complexion; I am an old aged person"; thus it is accepted by *Natyayaayikas* (protagonists of the *Nyaaya* school of philosophy) and such others that — 'People in general misconceive *Atman*, who is the subject, as the body, which is the object, and vice versa. Further, they mutually superimpose the characteristic features of each on the other.' Although the *Poorva Meemaamsakas* (who give predominance or importance to the ritualistic earlier parts of the *Vedas* and treat the end or later portions, called the *Upanishads*, of the *Vedas* as *Gouna* or of secondary importance) and such others say or opine that — 'To conceive the body, mind, the senses etc. as 'I' is *Gouna* alone and not a misconception — because no one, in general, is able to cognize the truth that the body and *Atman* are each different from the other — it should be accepted on all hands that this common belief or knowledge of the people in general is a misconception alone. Besides, because of the fact that *Atman* is *Aparoaksha* (of an innate Intuitive nature), He is well-known to every one as their very essence of Being; for this reason too there cannot be any objection whatsoever for the mutual superimposition between *Atman* (Self) and *Anaatman* (not-self). Therefore, the statement to the effect — "People in general superimpose mutually *Atman* and *Anaatman* and further misconceive the special characteristics of each in the other" — cannot become a fit target for any kind of objection whatsoever. *Adhyaasa*, *Adhyaaroopa*, *Viparyaasa*, *Bhraanti*, *Vipareeta Pratyaya*, *Anyathaa Jnaana*, *Mithyaa*

Jnaana — all these are *Paryaaya Shabdas* or synonyms alone (their meaning being superimposition or misconception).

12. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

13. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-52. p. 34.

14. G. Bh. 13-2. pp. 501-502.

15. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-54. pp. 35-36.

16. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 41-42.

17. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-60-61. p. 39.

18. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

27. If there is a thing in which another thing is misconceived, that latter thing does not really exist therein; it is just a false appearance. For example, the silver that appears in nacre or sea-shell; the snake that appears in the rope; the man appearing in the stump or post of wood; the pollution that appears in the sky — the fact that all these are absolutely, undoubtedly false or unreal is known to every one. If the Self (*Atman*) and the not-self (*Anaatman*) are mutually superimposed (misconceived), then both those things which are superimposed will have to be per force unreal alone. The statement that the body, the senses etc., which are the not-self are superimposed on *Atman* is contradictory to valid means like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*) etc. Therefore, some people may imagine that between the Self (*Atman*) and the body, the senses etc. (*Anaatman*) there might exist a particular relationship.

But this method of deliberation is not proper. For, the fact or truth that the body, the senses etc. exist in the Self is not to be cognized by valid means like perception, inference etc. Since no one has been able to cognize the Self and the not-self separately by the valid means of perception, inference etc., it is not possible at all even to imagine any kind of relationship between the two. Even in case we imagine that the body, the senses etc. and the Self are conjoined with each other, then also it becomes evident that an absolutely pure (unrelated) Self (*Atman*), who has observed or objectified and known the two things, i.e. the Self and the body, the senses etc., being conjoined together and who is not related to those two in any manner whatsoever, exists quite apart. Besides, the inferential statement or analogy that — “The conglomeration of the body, the senses, the mind etc. is functioning for the sake of the unrelated or absolute Self alone who is completely distinct from that conglomeration — just as the wall, the pillars, the beams, the tiles etc. which are conjoined with one another to form a house, but which are meant for the use of an owner who is not conjoined with them” — is also in consonance with reasoning or a logical device. There is no defect whatsoever if it is said that — “The not-self (*Anaatman*) which is imagined or misconceived in the Self (*Atman*) is unreal like the blue colour that is imagined or misconceived in the sky or empty space”. Though the Self who is imagined or misconceived in the not-self is unreal in that form, in His essential nature of Pure Being He is real

indeed. Therefore, it becomes evident or established that the superimposition (*Adhyaasa*) which we have mentioned earlier is nothing but the knowledge (*Jnaana*) which is a mixture or blending of the two things, namely, the really existing Self (*Atman*) and the unreal, false appearance of not-selves (*Anaatman*) without discriminatively separating them. *Asat*, *Asatya*, *Anrita*, *Mithyaa*, *Vitatha*, *Mrishaa* — all these are the Sanskrit synonyms which indicate false appearance.

19. Adh. Bh. p. 1.

23. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-58. p. 38.

20. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-59. p. 39.

24. Ke. Up. 1-2. p. 41.

21. G. Bh. 13-26. pp. 555, 556.

25. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

22. Up Sa. Pr. 2-56. p. 37.

28. If it is accepted that all valid means of cognition (*Pramaanas*) are caused by *Adhyaasa* (delusion), then the distinction between valid means of cognition and the invalid means will have to be erased out completely. Besides, merely because Vedantins say that valid means of cognition are caused by *Adhyaasa*, one cannot believe it to be true. If this is true, then because the *Shaastras* too are a kind of valid means only, like the other valid means of perception (*Pratyaksha Pramaana*), inference (*Anumaana Pramaana*) etc., they too will have to be said to be caused by *Adhyaasa* only. Then in that event, it will be a matter of bravado or an exaggeration to say that — “Even what the irrefutable *Shaastra* teaches is untrue; further, those who perform the rituals or rites stipulated in the scriptures do not have a knowledge of an *Atman* apart from their body.” Therefore, how can wise, discriminating people accept at all *Vedanta* which negates or refutes valid means of cognition (*Pramaana*) themselves? Thus the protagonists of valid means of cognition or *Pramaanavaadins* may raise an objection.

But, Vedantins do not at all say that when one observes from the empirical viewpoint the dealings pertaining to the valid means of cognition and the cognized object (*Pramaana — Prameya Vyavahaara*) are not proper. In fact, Vedantins assert that just as the cognition of the type — “I am the body alone” — continues to be valid knowledge till the Intuitive cognition of the type — “Apart from the body there exists *Atman*” — which is born as a result of the instructions or teachings of *Shaastras*, in the same manner till the conviction (Intuitive experience) of the essential nature of *Atman* is attained, the empirical valid means like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*) etc. continue to be valid alone. Whichever or whatever valid means they may be, without being dependent upon the cognizer (i.e. one who uses them, the *Pramaatru*) they can never proceed towards their objects which are to be cognized (through them). But, without misconceiving in the manner — “I am the body; the senses are mine” — no one can ever become a cognizer (*Pramaatru*). Therefore, it is not possible for any one,

whosoever he may be, to negate or refute the fact of life that cognizership (*Pramaatrutwa*) has come into being through misconception (*Adhyaasa*) alone. Hence, the fact that — “When we observe from the Absolute or Transcendental viewpoint of *Atman* the dealings of valid means of cognition, as also their respective objects of cognition, both of which depend upon the cognizer — these empirical dealings are evidently products of *Adhyaasa* alone; that means, they are all a delusion alone” — is indisputable and irrefutable. Besides, between the empirical dealings of perception, inference etc. of man and the empirical (instinctive) dealings of perception, inference etc. of animals, birds and other creatures there does not exist any difference whatsoever. Both the kinds of behaviour of the type — (1) when the external sensations or percepts like the sound, the touch etc. seem to be congenial or desirable the innate proclivity of wanting those things which project those sensations or percepts, followed by the innate urge to proceed towards those things or objects; (2) if those things seem to be inconvenient or troublesome, then the innate urge to recede or shy away or avoid them — are, at the time of those dealings, quite natural and common to both human beings and the animals or other creatures. No one says that the animals or creatures etc. in general carry on their empirical dealings with a sense of discrimination or *Viveka*; hence, the empirical dealings of human beings also, which are carried out with the help of valid means (*Pramaana*) and the objects of cognition or perception (*Prameya*), akin to those of the animals or creatures, are verily prompted by a lack of discrimination (*Aviveka*) alone. Therefore, we can say without any doubt that those empirical dealings of human beings too are carried on because of *Adhyaasa* alone. Although the scriptural texts (and their teachings) are based on *Adhyaasa*, the special features that pertain to them and are profound in them will be explained in section 51. *Pramaana* means the instruments or media for proper, correct knowledge or cognition; *Prameya* is the object or thing known or cognized with the help of or through the *Pramaana*; *Pramaatru* means one who knows or cognizes through the *Pramaanas*; *Pramiti* means the proper, correct cognition accruing through the *Pramaanas*. When we use the terms like *Jnaana* (the valid means for cognitive knowledge), *Jneya* (the object or thing cognized), *Jnaatru* (one who knows or cognizes), *Jnapti* (the end result of cognition) — we do so without any restrictions whatsoever with regard to the veracity of the knowledge accruing in those circumstances. The nature of the empirical dealings of *Pramaana* and *Prameya* will be discussed in detail in Chapter VII (section 47).

26. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 44, 45.

28. Adh. Bh. pp. 4, 5.

27. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

29. In the Vedantic teachings of Shri Shankaraachaarya apart from the metaphysical *Avidya*, which is in reality the mutual

superimposition between *Atman* and *Anaatman*, there does not exist any other *Avidya* whatsoever. In order to get rid of, remove or root out this misconception (*Adhyaasa*) the steadfast knowledge backed up by complete conviction of the type — “In truth, the essential nature of *Atman* is verily the *non-dual Brahman* devoid of any distinctions or special characteristics whatsoever; on the other hand, *Anaatman*, being unreal, like the elephant created by *Maayaa* (magic), or like the objects seen in the dream, or like the celestial world seen in the sky, appears as though it is real” — by distinguishing and separating *Atman* and *Anaatman* (by a reasoning based on Intuitive experience alone) is needed. Thus to cognize Intuitively the essential nature of Reality by distinguishing between the real and the unreal is truly *Vidya*. There is a practice or convention of calling *Atman* ‘*Pratyagatman*’ (inner Self), *Kshetrajna* (the knower or indweller in the body) and the *Anaatman* the *Kshetra* (the dwelling place). Till one Intuitively cognizes by distinguishing between and separating *Kshetra* and *Kshetrajna* the mutual superimposition between them (*Adhyaasa*) exists in all human beings; it is never known as to when exactly this misconception began and when it will end. Because of this misconception alone the phenomena of *Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* are superimposed upon *Atman*. All the terms like *Avidya*, *Ajnaana*, *Mithyaajnaana*, *Anyathaajnaana*, *Mrishaajnaana*, *Vipareetajnaana*, *Mithyaapratyaya*, *Anavabodha*, *Apratibodha*, *Anavagama* — all these are synonymous terms given to *Adhyaasa*. All the synonymous terms pertaining to *Jnaana* like *Brahmavidya*, *Aatmavidya*, *Adhyaatmavidya*, *Aatmaikatwavidya*, *Brahmaatmaikatwavidya*, *Paramaatmavidya*, *Paramaatmavijnana* etc. are the names given to the Intuitive knowledge which determines the essential nature of *Atman*. If one remembers this difference between the essential natures of *Vidya* and *Avidya*, it will become evident that either the defects or imperfections of *Anaatman* and their characteristic features which the common people superimpose upon *Atman* because of *Avidya* of the nature of *Adhyaasa*, or, on the other hand, the excellences of *Atman* and His special qualities which the common people superimpose upon *Anaatman* — both these are not in the least related or attached to either *Atman*, who is the basis or substrate for this *Adhyaasa* or *Anaatman*. It also becomes quite clear that to know this truth Intuitively with full conviction alone is the destruction or complete rooting out of *Avidya*. **In fact, all the Upanishads have undertaken the supreme and profound task of teaching the seekers this *Aatmaikatwavidya* alone.**

29. Adh. Bh. 2. pp. 3, 4.

30. G. Bh. 12-26. p. 556.

31. Adh. Bh. p. 6.

32. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

33. Adh. Bh. p. 6.

34. Br. Bh. Intr. p. 7.

V. AVIDYA

30. Previously in section 25 we have stated that *Avidya* means the mutual superimposition between *Atman* and *Anaatman* alone, but the term '*Avidya*' is more comprehensive or pervasive in its connotation than the term '*Adhyaasa*'. For, by means of *Vidya* — that means, by the light of the Intuitive deliberation on *Atman* and *Anaatman* — whatever things or concepts are falsified and till the dawn of *Vidya* whatever things or concepts do not allow the real thing or entity to be cognized by covering it up or hiding it — all such concepts of the nature of ignorance (incomprehension) or darkness are fit to be called '*Avidya*'. Therefore, all steadfast concepts (*Pratyaya*) which misconceive an entity or give rise to doubts about it or which do not cognize the real entity are in this sense '*Avidya*' alone. Apart from this triad of *Avidya* no other kind of *Avidya* exists in this world. For example, to a person suffering from a certain defect in his eyes an object in front of him may not appear; that defect may blur his vision and give rise to a doubt as to what the object in front may be, or it may make that object appear quite differently and in a false manner. All these three kinds of *Avidya* disappear as soon as the basic defect in the eyes is got rid of and the correct knowledge of the object is gained; apart from correct knowledge or *Jnaana*, no other phenomenon whatsoever can remove these three aspects of *Avidya*. **Similarly, the three types of *Avidyas*, namely, *Agrahana* or non-conception, *Samshaya* or doubting and *Vipareeta Pratyaya* or misconception — pertaining to the essential nature of *Atman* are got rid of only by the *Aatmaikatwavidya* or the Intuitive, cognitive knowledge of the non-duality of *Atman*.** Some present-day Vedantins who are followers of *Vyaakhyaana Prasthaana* (methodologies adopted in recent commentaries called '*Vyaakhyaanas*') have imagined or conceived that apart from this triad of *Avidya* (mentioned above) there exists yet another '*Avidya*', called *Moolaavidya*. They have imagined that '*Moolaavidya*' is the material cause for the world and a part of it or a special feature as a state of consciousness, called '*Toolaavidya*', is the material cause for objects of appearance like the rope-snake etc. But the *Bhaashyakaara* or Shri Shankaraachaarya has not mentioned either of these at all; nor does it exist in anybody's experience in this world. Besides, this their theory is totally opposed to the *Vedantic* teachings.

1. G. Bh. 13-2. p. 502.

2. Isa. Up. 18. p. 29.

3. Br. Up. 1-4-10. p. 165.

4. Br. Up. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 451.

31. In our empirical state (i.e. while we are awake in this world) *Avidya* exists in everyone's experience indeed in the form — "I do not know that". Similarly, the *Avidya* of the form — "I do not know the

non-dual Atman” — also exists in everyone’s experience indeed. To those who have not carried out completely the (*Vedantic*) Intuitive deliberation the doubt of the type — “Whether the essential nature of Pure Being of *Atman* is like this or like that” — does exist. In our empirical day-to-day dealings too, because all human beings do have an innate identification to the effect that the body, the mind, the senses etc. are our *Atman*, *Adhyaasa* (misconception) of the nature or form of *Vipareetapratyaya* too exists invariably. Thus although *Avidya* exists in everyone’s experience itself, some people indulge in mischievous child-like pranks asking the question — “What is the proof or valid evidence for the existence of *Avidya*?” — but the fact that this trait (especially, in the case of the so-called philosophers or scholars of the present times) is a matter of ‘imbecility and ridicule’ is quite evident and clear. Because all empirical workaday dealings of *Pramaana* and *Prameya* are carried on through *Avidya* alone, with regard to the *Avidya* about *Atman* (of the form of *Adhyaasa*) that we are considering in the present context especially, if any one asks for any proof or valid evidence (*Pramaana*) it would be tantamount to an arrogant behaviour or foolhardiness, which need not be pointed out. Even so, some Vedantins too, like people who have ventured out to show darkness with the help of light, have undertaken the futile task of showing the valid evidence (*Pramaana*) for *Avidya*.

5. Adh. Bh. p. 6.

6. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

32. In our workaday world for misconceiving the sea-shell or nacre to be silver and one moon to be two, causes like a defect in the eyes and the object of perception being too far away exist; but some people ask the question — “What is the cause for the *Adhyaasa* between *Atman* and *Anaatman*?” Some people even ask in the manner — “With what material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) has *Avidya* arisen? Like the clay (which is the material cause) for the earthen pot, for this *Avidya* too is not a material cause needed?” But this question is absurd. For, Vedantins have neither accepted that the empirical categories or concepts of cause-effect are real, nor that the *Adhyaasa* superimposed on *Atman* (beyond the empirical concepts or categories of time, space and causation, or for that matter, all duality) is an effect (having a cause). *Atman* alone is the Ultimate Reality; all else, whatever it may be, is unreal, false appearance. This is the affirmation of Vedantins. **From this it amounts to saying that the concepts or categories of cause-effect are also unreal alone.** From the empirical viewpoint, *Adhyaasa* is verily beginningless and endless; for that reason too, asking or inquiring about a cause for this is not proper. The concept of cause-effect desiderates the concept of time; it is the opinion of the protagonists of cause-effect theory that the cause precedes the effect

(to wit, the cause exists first and the effect comes into existence later all in one time series). But Vedantins say or opine that time too is a misconception or a superimposed concept. This truth will become clear later on in section 105. Therefore, to conceive *Adhyaasa* to be an effect just like the earthen pot, pitcher etc. and then to ask as to what is the cause for that effect is not proper. When those people who misconceive or wrongly take the sea-shell or nacre to be silver come to know the truth, they say in the manner — “This thing is a sea-shell alone; I had misconceived (wrongly known it) to be something else” and *not that* they knew that at that time (of misconception) in reality a silver called ‘sea-shell-silver’ was born or was in existence. Hence, it has to be pointed out that those who have conceived that ‘*Toolaavidya*’ is a material cause for sea-shell-silver are under the spell of delusion. From this it will be evident that to ask as to what is the cause for *Adhyaasa* is not valid or proper. For, there is no rule of law whatsoever that for all kinds of delusion there should exist a cause; it is but natural for people who have not known an object or thing correctly to misconceive it. Not having Intuitively cognized *Atman* is itself the *Nimitta-Kaarana* or efficient cause. There is a practice of the Vedantins saying that *Adhyaasa* has arisen, or is caused by, this lack of Knowledge (or cognition) of our *Atman*. But while saying in that fashion we should never commit the blunder of understanding or reckoning that these two events take place in time and thereby have a relationship of cause and effect. When viewed from the standpoint of the Absolute or Ultimate Reality of our *Atman*, there does not at all exist an entity like *Avidya*; then, wherefrom can the categories or concepts of cause-effect enter into It? How can the sea-shell appear as silver? How can the delusion of a rope appearing as snake take place at all? — With regard to questions and topics of this nature there exists a great deal of discussion based on a dialectical method of argument called ‘*Khyaati Baadha Vichaara*’ in several present-day Vedantic treatises. Because there is no purpose served by or any benefit accruing from this discussion at all vis-a-vis the determination of the Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Vedanta*, we have given up this subject-matter which is purely an exercise — a brain-racking one at that — in futility.

7. Ma. Ka. 4-78. and Bh. 4-78.

pp. 383, 384.

8. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

9. Su. Bh. 4-1-5. p. 825

10. Adh. Bh. p. 1.

11. Su. Bh. 13-26. pp. 555, 556.

33. One should not take the literary meaning of our statement: “*Avidya* is of three kinds, viz. *Agrahana* (non-conception or incomprehension), *Anyathaagrahana* (misconception, wrong understanding) and *Samshaya* (doubting); further, between *Agrahana* and *Anyathaagrahana* there exists a *Nimitta* (cause) and *Naimittika* (being dependent upon a particular cause) relationship” — and formulate his

understanding or knowledge of the essential nature of *Avidya*. For, all concepts or categories like numbers, cause and effect etc. cannot be reckoned without *Pramaatrutwa* (the egoism, 'I' notion as the agent of cognition); previously in section 28 we have already stated (established) that *Pramaatrutwa* (cognizership) cannot come into being or reckoning without *Adhyaasa*. Therefore, just as in the empirical sphere or our workaday world when the sea-shell or nacre, which is perceived by the eyes, is misconceived as silver because of the hurdle or impediment of that misconception or wrong knowledge and this is understood or reckoned to be *Ajnaana* or a lack of correct knowledge, **similarly for *Agrahana* (non-conception), *Anyathaagrahana* (misconception) etc. pertaining to *Atman* the *Adhyaasa* alone of the form or nature of *Vipareetajnaana* (wrong knowledge) is the essential nature.** When *Jnaana* (Intuitive knowledge of the Self) negates or falsifies *Adhyaasa*, none of the phenomena like *Agrahana*, *Anyathaagrahana*, *Samshaya* exist whatsoever; because even the distinctions or differences of *Agrahana*, *Samshaya* and *Anyathaagrahana* are caused (arise) coeval or coexistent with *Pramaatrutwa* alone, which is superimposed upon or misconceived in *Atman*, **Shri Shankara is seen dealing with or treating, in and through his *Bhaashya* texts, *Adhyaasa* alone as *Avidya* (i.e. synonymous with *Avidya*) in a predominant sense or manner.**

12. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 139, 140.

34. It is customary for Vedantins to make empirical pronouncements like: As a result of *Avidya*, *Bandha* is caused and as a result of *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) *Moaksha* is caused. The purport behind this teaching is not that Liberation, which does not really exist at a particular moment or stage of life of a seeker, is attained afresh, or that a bondage, which really exists in the life of a seeker, is removed or mitigated. This fact will be elucidated in section 157 when '*Bandha Moaksha Vichaara*' or 'Deliberation on Bondage and Liberation' is taken up. The removal or destruction of *Avidya* alone is the destruction of Bondage and the attainment of *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) alone is attainment of *Moaksha* (Liberation); in spite of listening to the Vedantins' statement — "In truth, entities or phenomena like Bondage and Liberation do not at all exist" — some people opine that *Avidya* really exists, but eventually by virtue of *Vidya* it gets destroyed. This is an opinion formulated by some people without understanding or discerning the real purport and subtleties of the Vedantic teachings. For, *Avidya* and its effects are *Asat* or unreal; the Absolute or Ultimate core of Being or *Vidya* is *Sat* or Reality (as it is nothing but the essential nature of *Atman*, who is of the very essence of *Jnaana* or Pure Consciousness or Intuition). That which is *Asat* never exists; that which is real becoming non-existent is never plausible. Even so, assuming or accepting this distinction of *Vidya*

and *Avidya* — the latter which exists from the empirical viewpoint — for the purposes of spiritual teaching or instruction, Vedantins expound the teaching that — “All duality is nothing but *Avidya*”. What is the essential nature of *Avidya*? Though *Atman* is everything (*Sarvam*), *Avidya* shows *Atman* to be nothing (*Asarva*); although there does not exist any other entity or thing whatsoever, *Avidya* projects something as if it is really existing; thereafter, *Avidya* projects as if a desire for that other second thing is born; it further prompts an action to be undertaken to obtain or possess that object or thing projected by that desire; *Avidya* then gives rise to a result or fruit. All this is verily the prolific projections of *Avidya* alone. Although *Vidya* or Intuitive Knowledge is not to be necessarily born in the form of *Atman*, it is true that in the empirical sphere a mental concept of the form or nature of cognition to the effect that — ‘*Atman* (our Self) is of the essential nature of eternally Absolute, Pure Consciousness’ — is born; the fact that cognitive knowledge negates or removes *Avidya* — speaking from the empirical standpoint — is verily true. But from the Absolute viewpoint of the Self if it is observed (Intuitively) then the belief or concept that — **“In *Atman*, who is of the essential nature of eternally or absolutely Pure Consciousness, *Avidya* exists” — also is *Avidya* alone; the concept or belief that this *Avidya* is removed by means of *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) is also *Avidya* alone.** None of these beliefs or concepts is ‘absolutely’ true or real; the Absolute or Ultimate truth is that *Atman* is the non-dual *Brahman* alone, beyond all concepts.

13. G. 2-16. p. 50.

15. Up. Sa. 16-37. p. 169.

14. Br. Sa. 4-3-20. p. 659.

35. For those who remember the truth that — “Whether it be *Avidya* or its effects, neither of them exists whatsoever in reality” — the doubt of the type — “How does *Vidya* destroy *Avidya*?” — to arise there is no scope at all. Even if the seeker cognizes or discerns as to what exactly is the essential nature of *Vidya*, this doubt will not arise. For, in our empirical day-to-day experience the correct or true knowledge is called ‘*Vidya*’. As soon as that *Vidya* is born, *Avidya* gets sublated or negated, that means, one gets the conviction of the type — “What I had known in the past was not correct.” For example, when in poor light a person mistakes a rope lying on the ground to be a snake, with fear caused thereby he keeps running helter skelter; if another person tells the former in the manner — “Do not be afraid; this is not a snake, but a rope only” — then as a result of that knowledge gained through that sentence the first (deluded) person comes to know that the thing lying on the ground is a rope only and thereby gives up or gets rid of his fear as well as the consequent trembling or anxiety. Here in this context the knowledge born out of the sentence did not procure a non-existent rope, nor did it drive away an existent snake. It helped cognize an entity

as it is, an existent rope as a rope; that is all. Merely on that count the belief or concept that it was a snake was recognized to be a misconception or wrong knowledge. No change whatsoever occurred in the thing. Similarly, while there exists *Avidya* or when it is negated or removed, there does not occur any change whatsoever in the essential nature of *Atman* (the Self).

16. Su. Bh. 4-1-3. p. 821.

18. Su. Bh. 1-4-6. p. 257.

17. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 148.

36. Many people are under the delusion that Vedantins have accepted the philosophical teaching of non-duality but at the same time they have also accepted the 'existence' of *Avidya*. The real state of affairs is not like this at all. Because the common run of people are saying that they do not know *Advaita* (the non-dual Reality), they have by themselves accepted or admitted of the phenomenon of *Avidya*. From this empirical standpoint alone Vedantins say that they will teach *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) which sublates or negates *Avidya*. Therefore, to address the question of the type — "Who has this *Avidya*?" — to non-dualist Vedantins, is a ridiculous proposition. One who admits that — "I do not know *Atman* who is non-dual" — has necessarily to accept in the manner — "I have *Avidya*". Some people raise a doubt in the manner — "Because from the standpoint of non-dualists — 'I am *Ishwara* or the Lord Almighty' — who is omniscient alone, how at all can I have *Avidya*?" To that doubt the solution lies in the cognition of the fact that if one follows or adopts the standpoint of non-dualists, *Ishwara* alone is the Ultimate or Absolute Reality; then no one has *Avidya* at all. Even to those who doubt in the manner — "If *Atman* has *Avidya*, then how at all can one establish *Advaita* (non-duality) as the Ultimate Reality?" — this same solution can be provided. Because, when *Avidya* is accepted to exist, the empirical dealings of our workaday world are definitely accepted to exist and there is no cause or room for objecting or doubting the existence of duality in the manner — "If there exists *Avidya*...". When the true seeker has sublated or got rid of *Avidya* by means of *Vidya*, as there does not exist any empirical dealing of duality, even then there cannot arise or exist any doubt whatsoever.

19. G. Bh. 13-2. pp. 512, 513.

21. Su. Bh. 3-2-15. p. 613.

20. Su. Bh. 4-1-3. p. 821.

37. "What is the object for *Avidya*? Because *Atman* is non-dual (Reality), there does not exist anything whatsoever apart from Him. There is no possibility of one getting *Avidya*, or being ignorant, about oneself. Therefore, in the philosophical teaching of those Vedantins who do not at all accept that another thing (second thing to *Atman*) which

can be misconceived there is no meaning whatsoever to the phenomenon or concept of *Avidya*, is it not so?" — This objection too can be solved satisfactorily by the above explanation alone.

For, from the viewpoint of one who has the Intuitive or cognitive knowledge that — "*Atman* is non-dual Entity or Reality" — there does not exist any *Avidya* at all. Therefore, the question — "Who has this *Avidya*?" — cannot be put to those who observe from that viewpoint. On the other hand, one who has misconceived *Pramaatrutwa* (i.e. 'I' notion) in himself, he has per force to accept that he has *Avidya* with regard to *Brahman* (or *Atman*) who is his own essential nature of Pure Being. By virtue of that *Avidya* alone he is said to be 'a *Samsaaree*'. Otherwise, what was the need or occasion for the *Shaastras* to have taught or instructed *Brahmaavidya* or Self-Knowledge? Is it not true that despite the fact that one is *Brahman* alone he does not cognize It or is not aware of It and only to such a person (who is ignorant of his own Self being the very essential nature of Intuition) that *Shaastras* as well as the *Achaarya* (spiritual preceptor) should instruct or teach in the manner — "You are verily that *Brahman* (That thou art)"? The purport or hidden meaning of scriptural sentences like — "*Brahman* alone originally, or in the beginning, existed; It came to cognize or know Itself to be — 'I am *Brahman*' — and by virtue of that cognition It became everything" — (*Brihadaaranyaka* 1-4-10) — is this alone.

22. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 148.

23. Br. Up. & Bh. 1-4-10. p. 145;
pp. 156, 157.

38. If one accepts the teaching of *Advaita* (viz. *Atman* is the non-dual, Absolute or Ultimate Reality), there does not exist either any objection or solution whatsoever. For, both objections and their solutions exist only in the sphere of duality; even so, it is a mystery as to why people in general get some kind of a doubt or other (rather always some kind of a doubt raises its ugly head in their minds) whenever the word '*Advaita*' or 'non-duality' is pronounced in their presence. If it is true that our *Atman* is *Brahman* alone (i.e. the Ultimate Reality behind all creation), does it not mean the same whether we say — "I have *Avidya*" — or we say — "*Brahman* has *Avidya*"? Then, how come *Brahman* who is omniscient can have *Avidya* or ignorance? — This doubt is of the above category. From the standpoint of non-duality, that is — "*Atman* is *Brahman*" — no one, whosoever he may be, has any kind of *Avidya* whatsoever. Therefore, the purport of the teaching that — "*Brahman* does not have *Avidya*" — is a proper or correct one indeed: but at the same time the teaching or truth that — "Apart from *Brahman* no other conscious entity whatsoever exists" — also should not be forgotten. Further, it should be understood that those who follow the methodology of *Vyaakhyaana* (or later

commentators, i.e. some of the present-day Vedantins who have been adopting purely dialectic methods or arguments without the full backing or support of the all-comprehensive Intuitive experience or *Saakshi Anubhava*) and entertain the concept that — “*Jeeva* alone has *Avidya*; not *Brahman*” — have completely forgotten this above philosophical teaching. It is indeed for this unique purpose of reminding all of us about this fundamental truth of the non-dual Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman* alone that all *Upanishads* have undertaken their teachings or instructions.

24. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 149.

39. After solving yet another objection which the followers of other schools of philosophy may raise with regard to ‘*Avidya*’ mainly because they have not kept in mind the fundamental teachings of *Advaita* by the Vedantic science of spirituality, we will conclude this subject-matter here. “In the teachings of these ‘*Advaitins*’ who propound that no one, whosoever he may be, has *Avidya* at all there will be a serious defect or anomaly that the teachings of Pure Consciousness that is attained through, or by means of, the scriptural instructions too will become a matter of futility alone; further, even the teaching that *Ajnaana* is sublated or rooted out by *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge will become an invalid or unreasonable proposition. If in order to evade all these defects or lacunae one accepts the concept or theory of ‘*Avidya*’, then invariably one has to accept that this *Avidya* is attached to the non-dual *Brahman* alone.” This in essence is their objection indeed.

Although on the face of it (or apparently) this seems to be a very strong or indisputable objection, in truth (i.e. when deliberated upon from the standpoint of the Pure Consciousness or Intuitive experience, which is taught by all the scriptures using the method of Superimposition and Rescission or *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya*) this objection fizzles out without any real content like a damp squib, so to speak. For, what if for one who has Intuitively known or cognized in the manner — “No one has *Avidya* at all; I am verily the non-dual *Atman*” — the instructions or teachings of the scriptural texts become futile? Is it not true that only for the sake of those who have no knowledge of the Reality the scriptural teachings are meant? Prior to one getting the Intuitive Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or *Brahman* alone *Avidya* exists as also *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge), which sublates or roots out *Avidya*, exists. When it is seen from everyone’s experience that by means of *Vidya* the phenomenon of *Avidya* is sublated or removed, who can ever say that *Vidya* is futile? The objection of the type — “In the teaching or theory of the non-duality of *Atman*, the sublation or removal of *Avidya* does not fit in or is not feasible!” — is not proper or valid at all; for, everyone can in his own experience see or cognize (for himself and

by himself Intuitively) that by the Intuitive Knowledge of non-duality *Avidya* is sublated or removed. Especially to raise an objection of the type — “As per this spiritual science of *Advaita* it should not be or cannot be cognized Intuitively like that!” — is not at all proper or reasonable. For, to doubt in the manner — “It should not or cannot be experienced or cognized” — when actually in truth it is cognized or Intuitively experienced, it is not rational or logically convincing at all. The *Nyaaya* or axiom that — “*Na Hi Drishte Anupapannam Naama*” — (meaning, when it is actually cognized, there is no question whatsoever of negating that cognition) — provides a solution like a panacea for all these kinds of objections and doubts indeed.

25. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 150.

VI. ADHYAAROAPA (SUPERIMPOSITION) AND APAVAADA (RESCISSION) METHODOLOGY

40. *Atman* or *Brahman* that *Vedanta* expounds as the Ultimate Reality is devoid of all kinds of special features or characteristics. Therefore, it is not possible either to indicate (or signify) to others or to know by ourselves by means of any particular word *Atman* in Its essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss with certitude or conviction in the manner — “It is this alone”. It has to be signified per force by negating or sublating the features which truly do not belong to Its essential nature. It is stated (in the scriptures) that a disciple by name *Baashkali* requested his preceptor named *Baadhwaa* to instruct him about the essential nature of Being of *Brahman* and the latter taught him by means of silence (*Avachana*) alone. (Not being able to discern what his preceptor was intending to teach) *Baashkali* repeated the same question twice more. Then the preceptor, *Baadhwaa*, stated: “I have been teaching It to you all along, but you have not been grasping It at all. For, this *Atman* is ‘*Upashaanta*’ or an entity of the very essence of quietude; in Him there does not exist any special feature or characteristic whatsoever”. In the *Smriti* like *Geeta* also it is stated in a similar manner as: “It is not real, nor is It unreal”. In the epic *Bhaarata* it is mentioned that *Lord Naaraayana* who adorned or assumed the macrocosmic form of *Vishwaroopa* told *Naarada*, the devotee of *Vishnu* when the latter invoked Him, that — “My essential nature is not the one which you are perceiving now as endowed with the gross features or characteristics. What is being perceived by you is My *Maayaashrishti* or magical creation. See that you do not reckon that I am essentially of this form.” For that reason alone, in the *Shrutis* (*Upanishads*) *Brahman* has been taught by sublating or negating all the qualities or special features of *Anaatman* or not-self; it is also taught that — “**Apart from**

indicating **Brahman** in the manner — ‘It is not this, not that’ — there does not exist any other greater or better method of teaching”. The teaching that — “**Brahman** is devoid of all features or characteristics.” — is the most profound and principal teaching of **Vedanta**. *Nirvishesha*, *Nishprapancha*, *Nirguna*, *Nirdharmaka*, *Niraakaara*, *Nirvikalpaka*, *Nirupaadhika* — all these are synonymous terms.

1. Su. Bh. 3-2-17. p. 614.

2. Br. Up. 3-8-8. p. 517.

Br. Bh. 3-8-8. p. 519.

3. Mu. Up. 1-1-6. p. 89.

4. Br. Up. 2-3-6. p. 337.

Br. Bh. 2-3-6. p. 347.

41. Just because it has been taught in the *Shrutis* that — “*Atman* is ‘not this, not that’ ” — one should not reckon it to mean that the non-existence of the contra or the not-self, which has been negated or sublated, exists in *Brahman* or *Atman*; nor one should interpret it to mean that that contra (of *Brahman* or *Atman*) exists somewhere else (apart from and in space) away from *Brahman*. For instance, if it is stated that — “*Brahman* is *Adrishya* or that which cannot be seen or perceived” — it does not mean either that things like an earthen pot, pitcher etc. which are perceptible exist separately or that the non-existence of those things exists in *Brahman*. The repetition of the words — “*Neti, Neti*” or “Not this, not that” — has been employed here to indicate a pervasive meaning (*Veepsaartha*) or to imply a comprehensive outlook. The purport behind the *Shruti* statement is whatever the human mind can imagine or conceive *Brahman* to be, none of those concepts, whatsoever they may be, is *Brahman* at all. Otherwise, if by the statement — “Not this, not that” — the two things known by them are negated, the doubt of the type — “If *Brahman* is not this or that, what else can It be?” — may arise. When seen or observed from the viewpoint of the *Shaastras*, the teaching is — “*Brahman* is one and one alone, non-dual without a second”. In *Brahman*, neither the five primordial elements like *Prithvi* (earth), *Ap* (water), *Tejas* (fire), *Vaayu* (air) and *Aakaasha* (space) or their *Vaasanas* (latent, potential forms or impressions), nor their non-existence, exist. Even the *Vedic* statements of the type — “Such and such a thing does not exist in It; It is not such and such a thing” — which are negative in their import do not exist or pertain to It in the least.

5. Su. Bh. 3-2-22. p. 627.

6. Su. Bh. . 3-2-22. p. 627.

7. Su. Bh. 4-1-3. p. 821.

8. G. Bh. 13-12. p. 528, 529.

42. The moment it is stated that — “Such and such a feature or quality does not exist in *Brahman*” — it amounts to having accepted the fact that that particular quality or characteristic exists in reality somewhere else; for, no one ever negates any characteristic or quality

which does not exist anywhere at all. Whoever can contradict a statement of the type — “This boy is not the son of a barren woman”? If it is stated that — “One should cognize or know *Brahman*” — it invariably amounts to having accepted that in *Brahman* there exists ‘*Jneyatwa*’ (objectivity — meaning, the quality of *Brahman* being objectified); it also amounts to having accepted thereby that *Brahman* can be explained or described (to others) by means of a particular statement. In order to cognize *Brahman* one has to have per force the mind. Thus as there is no other go than to accept conditions like: (i) the existence of *Brahman*, (ii) Its characteristics or qualities which are separate from It, (iii) words or sentences needed to describe It, (iv) the preceptor who uses those words or sentences to describe It and (v) the valid means or instrument of our mind needed to cognize It — how will it be proper or reasonable to say that *Brahman* is devoid of qualities or characteristics? — This dilemma may be countenanced by *Jijnaasus* (seekers of the Ultimate Reality).

. Is there a way out of or solving this knotty problem? Yes, Vedantins utilize a *Nyaaya* (axiomatic theory) in order to signify *Brahman* devoid of all characteristics or qualities. That theory is called — “*Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya*” or “The methodology of Superimposition and Rescission”. The method of teaching adopted herein is: First select one particular *Vikalpa* (misconception) which the *Ajnaanis* (ignorant people) have superimposed upon or misconceived in *Atman* and show that, apart from or other than that particular misconception, there does not exist a more extraneous or grosser misconception; then sublimate the first acknowledged misconception too by means of accepting another (subtler) misconception.

In this methodology, that special feature which is taken wrongly (or misconceived) to exist in *Brahman* exclusively for the purpose of instruction is the *Adhyaaroopa* (the superimposition); that which is negated or sublated is the *Apavaada* (the rescission); that which falsifies or invalidates any misconception pertaining to any entity or thing, whatever it may be, and thereafter gives rise to the correct knowledge about that particular entity is itself the *Vaakya* or sentence. Just as in the case of a person who has wrongly known or understood the directions like east, west etc., by means of a sentence of the type — “This is not east, but west” — the *Jnaana* (correct knowledge) which is capable of sublating or falsifying the earlier wrong knowledge (misconception) is born, similarly in the case of a person who has wrongly cognized that his body, mind and senses etc. are his *Atman*, by virtue of a (scriptural) statement which signifies in the manner — “That essential nature of *Atman* alone art thou” — that Intuitive knowledge (*Jnaana*) which is capable of sublating or falsifying (the earlier or innate) misconception is invariably caused. Although in the statement of

the type — “Not this, not that ” — all the misconceptions which are likely to be superimposed upon *Brahman* are invariably sublated, first it appears as though the phenomena of the expressed meanings of the scriptural sentences (*Shabda Vaachyatwa*) and the objectivity of the mind (*Manoa Vishayatwa*) are accepted. But because both *Vaachyatwa* as also *Jneyatwa* are again misconceptions alone, this *Vaakya* (scriptural sentence) sublates or falsifies those features also. Not only this; because even the *Vaakyatwa* (the abstract phenomenon of this scriptural sentence denoting something is nothing but a misconception, finally the scriptural sentence gives up its *Vaakyatwa* and subsides (to culminate in the Intuitive experience or cognition of *Atman* as one's own innate Pure Being).

9. G. Bh. 13-13. p. 532.

11. G. Bh. 3-3-9. p. 658.

10. Ka. Bh. 2-1-11. p. 180.

43. “If both the *Shrutis* and the *Aachaarya* teach invariably by adopting or utilizing the method of *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada*, then does it not amount to saying that their statements too are based on *Avidya* (misconception) alone?” — In this manner it is not possible to doubt or raise an objection. For, between the *Adhyaaroopa* (superimposition) that the *Ajnaanis* or the common run of ignorant people have and the *Adhyaaroopa* (superimposition) that the *Shrutis* and the *Aachaarya* adopt (deliberately) there exists a very important, predominant difference. The common run of ignorant people who believe (misconceive) one thing to be another do not possess the correct or proper knowledge of the real thing. For example, when they perceive the brilliance of or the silvery brightness of nacre or sea-shell, they have invariably the wrong knowledge of the type — “This is silver indeed” — rooted in them; but after they thoroughly examine the object (lying before them) they get the conviction of the type — “This is not silver at all; in truth, it is nacre or a sea-shell alone” — and at the same time the former misconception of the type — “This is silver indeed” — is falsified or sublated. Even so, that thing may appear to them as before as if it is silver, but now having cognized in the manner — “The sea-shell or nacre itself is appearing as if it is really silver” — the discriminative knowledge of the distinctions like — the superimposed (misconceived) silver and the substratum of the sea-shell or nacre for that misconception — is ‘born’. However, the deliberate superimposition adopted by the scriptures or the spiritual preceptor is not caused by *Ajnaana* at all; in fact, it is deliberately adopted or utilized by them with full discriminative (Intuitive) knowledge. In support of this, yet another example can be given. The common run of ignorant (non-discriminative) people carry on their empirical or day-to-day dealings of the type — “The sky (space) is black; it is red etc.”; but the discriminative and knowledgeable people, though having fully realized

(cognized) that the sky never has any colour whatsoever, still transact in their daily life in the manner — “The sky is black, or it is red etc.” — adopting or following the viewpoint of others (i.e. ignorant, non-discriminative people). In both these transactions in reality the sky does not have any colour whatsoever. But especially the misconception that the common run of ignorant people have is not to be found in the least among the knowledgeable or the discriminative people. Therefore it is not proper or rational to say that just because the knowledgeable people carry on their day-to-day or empirical transactions by adopting the method of deliberate superimposition all their transactions are carried out *in toto* through, or on the basis of, ignorance alone.

12. Adh. Bh. p. 3.

13. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 306.

44. If the question — “Why does even the knowledgeable *Aachaarya* instruct utilizing this *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada* method?” — is raised, then the answer is: “Because here (in teaching *Brahma Vidya*) this unique, exclusive method alone is the proper or correct device for the purpose”. Even in the empirical or our workaday world this *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya* (method of superimposition and rescission) is being utilized by teachers in our educational systems. For example, all of us have seen the school teachers using some linear figures on a black board for the purport of teaching numericals or arithmetic, as also the teachers using paper, pen and ink and such other means to teach the alphabet etc. to their pupils. In this context the teachers do not at all have the ultimate intention or purport of instructing about those objects or means like paper, ink, pen or the linear figures themselves; nor do they teach that the paper, pen, ink etc. are themselves the numericals or arithmetic or the alphabet. In fact, through these means which they use as devices the teachers inculcate in the minds of their young pupils the subtle sense or knowledge of numbers or arithmetic as also the alphabet. In the same manner, utilizing the suitable or appropriate superimpositions which are helpful in enabling the pupils' intellect to grasp or discern, both the scriptures and the knowledgeable preceptor instruct about the essential metaphysical nature of *Atman*. For them the goal or final purport is only to instruct that Ultimate Reality of *Atman* and not to teach the reality of the superimpositions themselves which they had deliberately utilized as aids and devices for the prime purport of instructing about *Atman*.

However, between these illustrations (*Drishtaanta*) and illustrated (*Daarshtaantika*) there exists a subtle distinction. That is: In the alphabets, numericals etc. because there are special characteristics like sound, forms etc. projected by them, using them directly as the means, the subject-matter can be directly instructed, as it is, to highly qualified students or pupils. But in the case of the essential nature of

the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*, since It is devoid of any kind of special characteristic whatsoever, it is not possible at all to instruct the essential nature of *Atman* directly by any objective means or mediatory aids. Therefore, whatever ways in which it can be surmised that the common run of people are likely to misconceive the essential nature of their *Atman* or Self — each one of those ways will have to be invariably sublated or negated in the process of instructing the Ultimate Reality of *Atman*. Therefore, Vedantins have quite necessarily utilized this unique methodology suitably.

14. Br. Bh. 4-4-25. p. 770.

15. Br. Bh. 2-3-6. p. 346.

45. Because some *Upanishadic* statements like — “*Satyam Jnaanamantam Brahma*” — (*Taittiriya* 2—1) and “*Vijnaanamaanandam Brahma*” — (*Brihadaaranyaka* 3-9-28) — teach the Reality of *Brahman* through the means of injunctions (*Vidhimukhya*) alone, and scriptural statements of the type — “*Brahman* is not this, is not that” — do not signify the essential nature of *Brahman* in a direct manner, this latter method adopting devious or circumlocutory statements is of no benefit whatsoever. — Thus some seekers may feel or think. But even the methodology implicit in teaching *Brahman* through sentences like — “*Satyam Jnaanamantam Brahma*” — is also based on the axiomatic system of *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya* alone; in that context too, by superimposing upon the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* characteristics like name, form and action (*Naama Roopa Karma*) alone *Brahman* is signified or taught; while teaching the essential nature of *Brahman* itself, as It is, the method adopted will have to be per force negative in nature (i.e. the method of sublation of all kinds of special features or characteristics in the manner — “Not this, not that”). In due course (in section 66) we will indicate the *Vedantic* tenet of — “No word or sentence whatsoever can ever directly signify or teach the essential nature of *Brahman* as It is”. Thus if we do not accept that the *Upanishads* teach *Brahman* exclusively by sublating anything other than, or secondary to, *Brahman* — then because of the defect of having first said that *Brahman* cannot be known or perceived either by the mind or the speech and later on (flouting or contradicting this very stipulation) the scriptures start directly describing the essential nature of *Brahman*, the scriptures become false or invalid means for teaching the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* indeed.

16. Br. Bh. 2-3-6. pp. 345, 346.

46. It is not possible here to explain and to enumerate with full details all the various superimpositions which have been acknowledged and adopted in the *Upanishads* in order to teach the Transcendental Reality of *Brahman* utilizing the methodology of ‘Superimposition

and Rescission'. Even so, we will explain some of the important methods through the examples given in this book mainly for the purport of instruction and guidance to the true seekers. They will do well if on the basis of these examples given here they imagine similar methods by themselves. Some scriptures first superimpose on *Atman* objectivity (*Jneyatwa*) and then teach that nothing other than *Atman* is worth knowing as an object of knowledge; some scriptures first superimpose subjectivity or cognizership on *Atman* and then teach that *Atman* is not an entity to be objectified or perceived (*Aprameya*) at all. In some other scriptural statements *Aatmatwa* or most innateness is superimposed on *Atman* and cognizership or *Jnaatrutwa* is sublated; in yet other scriptural statements *Saakshitwa* or Witnesshood is superimposed on *Atman* and *Aatmatwa* or the most innateness also is negated or sublated. In some sentences *Brahmatwa* or infiniteness is first superimposed and later *Alpatwa* or finitude is sublated. In other sentences, in addition to *Brahmatwa* or infiniteness *Aatmatwa* or innateness is superimposed and *Paroakshatwa* or Imperceptibility (extraneousness) is sublated. In the same manner, the scriptures superimpose or accept tentatively *Vaakyagamyatwa* or the capability of being indicated by sentences and sublate the misconception of *Atman* being a *Prameya* or an object of cognition through the valid means of perception, inference etc. Other scriptures state on the basis of tentative superimposition that *Atman* is non—perceptible or beyond the ken of *Vaak* or speech and *Manas* or the mind, and then later on they sublate *Vishayatwa* or objectivity altogether. Similarly, superimposing tentatively *Jagat Kaaranatwa* or causation of the world on *Atman* they sublate the category of effect or *Kaaryatwa* altogether and thereafter sublate even the category of causation or *Kaaranatwa* also. Accepting first *Saamaanyatwa* or universality (generic characteristic), they then propound that the characteristic of particularity (*Visheshatwa*) is not different or apart from it; accepting *Asangatwa* or non-attachment, non—relatedness, the scriptures then sublate even *Saamaanyatwa* or generality also; depicting *Samsaaritwa* or transmigratory soulhood, the scriptures then propound or teach soulhood by distinguishing it from *Jadatwa* or grossness; superimposing *Upaasyatwa* or the category of being an object for meditation on *Atman*, the *Upanishads* then sublate or falsify *Samsaaritwa* or transmigratory soulhood; superimposing on *Atman* *Avasthaa Saakshitwa* or the position of the Witnessing Principle of the three states of Consciousness (i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep), they then sublate *Aparichhinnatwa* or distinctness, divisibility. Further, propounding *Atman* to be having *Tureeyatwa* or the fourth dimension beyond the three states of Consciousness, the *Upanishads* then sublate that *Saakshitwa* or Witnessing Principlehood also; teaching *Saadhakatwa* or practionership, seekership, they then sublate one's *Nitya Samsaaritwa* or being a permanent transmigratory soul,

and teaching or superimposing *Nitya Muktatwa* or being eternally enlightened or liberated state, they then sublimate even the *Saadhakatwa* or practionership, seekership. Thus in this manner by means of each one of such superimpositions one particular misconception is removed or falsified, and this process continues in and through the scriptural texts.

Although in the above description we have mentioned as to how by means of a particular superimposition a particular misconception is negated or sublated, **it is possible to utilize each one of the above superimpositions to sublimate several misconceptions at the same time; Vedantins have, in fact, used these superimpositions in that manner.** If the superimposition that — “*Atman* alone is to be known (*Jneya*)” — is utilized, it amounts to negating not only in the manner that — “Nothing else is there to be known” — but also indicating the truth (or teaching) that — “The *Ajnaana* pertaining to *Atman* alone is the cause for the false appearance of *Anaatman* or not-self; if *Atman* is cognized (Intuitively), then all that is *Anaatman* or not-self becomes known or cognized; if *Atman* is Intuitively cognized, the *Ajnaana* is perennially rooted out; if *Atman* is Intuitively cognized, the divisions or distinctions of *Jnaatru* (cognizer) and the *Jneya* (the cognized object) will not exist” — and such other spiritual truths are realized through these methods of superimposition and rescission. People who are adepts in this kind of Intuitive deliberations can easily conceive by themselves such methods of superimposition and rescission according to the contexts. For the sake of people with low and medium intellectual faculties or qualifications we will explain to some extent these methodologies in the following chapters.

VII. DEALINGS OF PRAMAANA (VALID MEANS) AND PRAMEYA (OBJECTS)

47. Vedantins have acknowledged the *Shrutis* or *Upanishads* alone as *Pramaana* to cognize *Paramaarth* (the Ultimate Reality) of *Brahman*, is it not? If the question — “What is that special feature to be found in the *Shrutis* which is not to be found in the other remaining *Pramaan*s?” — is not clearly understood and the proper answer to it found out, then there is no possibility of discerning that this acknowledgement is rational (or proper). Therefore, we will now present, for this purpose, before our readers a few deliberations pertaining to the validity of the *Shrutis* as *Pramaan*s for *Atman*.

Previously in section 28 it was propounded that all the dealings of *Pramaan*s and *Prameya* are in the sphere of *Avidya* of the nature or form of *Adhyaasa* (misconception) alone. In that case, it amounts to saying that *Shaastras* too proceed on the basis of, or through, *Avidya*

alone. Then, *Shaastras* which teach that the results or fruits of *Karmas* accrue in other worlds or celestial regions and other births or times, will become invalid means, indeed. Thereby, can it be said that one who wishes to attain such fruits engages himself in performing such rituals or rites without cognizing in the manner — “I have an innate nature of *Atman* which is quite different or apart from this my body”? Both these surmises are rendered irrational or improper. Therefore, for the sake of the *Karma Kaanda* (the ritualistic portion of the *Vedas*) remaining as the valid means, it will have to be *per force* acknowledged that the *Shaastra* which stipulates the rituals and their procedural details (*Karma Vidhaayaka*) is truly meant by way of injunctions for *Jnaan*is or Self-Realized souls alone. This sort of a doubt is likely to sprout out in the minds of people who lack intellectual understanding or wisdom.

We have already given the solution for this question in section 28. Now we will explain it in some detail. It is not our opinion at all that by means of the *Shaastras* we do not come to know the fact that apart from the body there exists an entity called *Atman*. But the portion of the *Shaastras* which deal with stipulations or injunctions pertaining to scriptural (*Vedic*) rituals or rites has not dealt with any deliberations whatsoever about the essential nature of *Atman*; for, if one wants to undertake any ritual (or even mundane, secular action) it is enough for him to have or possess the basic knowledge of the type — “I am a doer or an agent of action; I am an enjoyer” — which the common run of people possess quite naturally too. People who are qualified or who have the propensities to perform the *Vedic* rituals do so by virtue of their having the common knowledge or belief to the effect — “*Atman* has relationship with other worlds (after his release from, or death in, this present body)” — invariably and not by attaining or gaining the Intuitive cognition of the essential nature of *Atman* (*Aatmajnaana*) which is propounded in the *Vedantic* or *Upanishadic* lore. Besides, that *Aatmajnaana* is opposed or contradictory to any person undertaking (or performing) any scriptural or secular action (*Karma*). For, the innate belief of the type — “I am the enjoyer of the results or fruits of my actions” — is needed for *Karma*; but *Aatmajnaana* or Self-knowledge that is taught or propounded by *Vedantic* or *Upanishadic* lore is the Intuitive cognition of the truths like — ‘I am one who does not have hunger or thirst and such other defects whatsoever which are to be got rid of nor any desires to be fulfilled’. The concept of the type — “I belong to such and such a *Varna*; I belong to such and such an *Aashrama*; I am of such and such an age and I am qualified to perform such and such *Karma*” — is needed for performing any kind of *Karma*; but the *Vedantic Aatmajnaana* is the Intuitive cognition of the truths like — “There do not exist any castes like *Brahmana*, *Kshatriya*, *Vaishya* and *Shoodra* whatsoever, nor any *Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* whatsoever nor do I have any movements like coming and going etc. whatsoever”.

Therefore, to say or accept that *Karma*, which is stipulated for a person who has the misconception (*Adhyaasa*) of himself having *Varna* and *Aashrama* etc. and the *Jnaana* of the eternally Pure or Absolute *Atman*, which is devoid of any kind of misconception or superimposition whatsoever (*Adhyaasa*), co-exist is as much a contradictory statement as saying that darkness and light co-exist. For this reason alone, there is nothing wrong or improper in making the statement that — **“The portion of *Shaastra* pertaining to *Karma* or rituals and rites is a *Pramaana* only in the sphere of *Avidya*.”**

1. Adh. Bh. p. 5.

48. If the knowledge that is born out of a sentence in the *Karma Kaanda* is a mere misconception just like the misconception of the rope-snake, then in that case by the *Shruti* statement which gives rise to the unitary or non-dual *Vijnaana* of the Self the earlier misconception will invariably be sublated. Therefore, as these latter *Shrutis* are opposed to the scriptural statements found in the *Karma Kaanda* acknowledged as valid means (*Pramaana*), to say that *Shrutis* teach the unitary non-dual Self-knowledge is not proper. Besides, if it is acknowledged that the scriptures propound the Intuitive knowledge (*Jnaana*) of *Atman* who is non-dual and non-agent of any action, then since there is no scope for the distinctions of the type — spiritual instruction (*Upadesha*), the instructor or preceptor (*Upadeshtu*) and the subject-matter of instruction (*Upadeshya*) — the validity or authority of *Jnaana Kaanda* (the *Upanishadic* portion dealing exclusively with the essential nature of *Atman*) will be falsified or invalidated. Since all mundane or empirical dealings are carried out or prompted by *Avidya* alone, it will have to be accepted *per force* that even the dealing of treating the *Shrutis* as valid or authoritative means is based on or prompted by *Avidya* alone. Then in that event, each and every scriptural statement becomes invalid and loses its authority or sanctity. It is the opinion of some people that, instead of saying that — “The scriptural sentence which teaches non-duality or Absolutism of *Atman* loses its validity or authority in this manner and, in addition, deprives the sentences in the *Karma Kaanda* portion of the *Vedas* also of their validity and thereby rendering all mundane or empirical dealings unreal” — it is better to declare that — “The scriptural sentences which propound non-duality of *Atman* alone are invalid.”

But in this theory, or argument, there is no stuff. For, we have already explained and exemplified that all empirical dealings involving *Praamaanas* and *Prameya* are invariably based on, or prompted by, *Avidya* alone. Hence the fact that — “Just like the *Pramaana* of the portion of the scriptures pertaining to the injunctions and prohibitions, the *Pramaana* of that portion of the *Vedic* lore devoted to the knowledge

of the Self or Emancipation is also meant for the ignorant people only" — is quite acceptable to Vedantins indeed. But merely on this count to say that the validity (*Praamaanya*) of valid means (*Pramaanas*) themselves gets falsified is not proper or reasonable. For, in the first place the scriptural sentence pertaining to Self-knowledge undertakes the task of propounding the Intuitive knowledge of the unitary or *non-dual Atman* in order to remove or sublimate *Avidya*. Because the Self-knowledge (*Vidya*) sublimes *Samsaara* of the *Jeeva* caused by *Avidya*, in saying that the *Shaastras* which enable the seeker to gain *Vidya* which is the practical means to attain *Parama Purushaartha* (the prime goal of human existence) there is no contradiction whatsoever. The *Upanishadic* sentences do not at all teach that — "The non-duality of *Atman* is real as well as unreal." Neither do they preach that one should not perform *Karma* or *Vedic* rituals in order to fulfil one's desires and attain the relevant fruits, nor do they teach that one should not practise *Upaasana*. Therefore, the *Upanishadic* sentence is neither self-contradictory nor opposed to the scriptural statements which stipulate *Karmas* or *Vedic* rituals. On the other hand, the *Karma Kaanda* sentence — invariably based on the empirical or mundane belief that the ingredients of action like the agent of action, the valid means of action etc. which are projected by *Avidya* do exist — teaches the aspirants for *Moaksha* (*Mumukshus*) to perform *Nitya Karmas* (daily routine, rituals) for the purposes of getting rid of one's demerits and at the same time the *Karma Kaanda* sentence teaches, rather recommends to, such seekers of empirical or mundane fruits *Kaamyas* (*Karmas* (mundane actions) which help attain or fulfil one's desires. The *Karma Kaanda* sentence teaches or recommends those *Karmas* based on the principal reason that if *Paapa* (demerits of the heart or mental impurities) are sublated, *Jnaana* (Self-knowledge) accrues and at the same time the sublation of *Avidya* too is achieved. Thus, as that *Karma Kaanda* sentence too instructs a device to attain *Purushaartha*, that too becomes a valid or authoritative means (*Pramaana*) indeed. Since that *Karma Kaanda* sentence does not at all teach that the constituents of *Karma* (i.e. *Kaarakas*) are real in their essence, there does not exist any contradiction whatsoever between the *Karma Kaanda* and the *Jnaana Kaanda*. Now there is no need whatsoever to provide a solution or answer to the doubt — "When *Jnaana* propounds in a manner which culminates in *non-duality* (Absolute Reality), then the distinctions like *Upadesha*, *Upadeshtu* etc. do not exist at all". For, to those who have the Intuitive Knowledge of the *non-dual* or Absolute, Transcendental Self there does not exist any need for any spiritual instruction whatsoever; then in that event, what does it matter if *Upadesha* etc. are rendered unreal? In *Vedanta* utilizing the *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya* the distinctions of *Shaastra* (scriptures), *Shishya* (disciple) and *Guru* (preceptor) have been acknowledged exclusively for the purpose of

teaching the *Paramaarth*a (the Ultimate Reality) of *Atman*. In the case of those seekers who have kept in mind this fact there is no room for any doubt arising with regard to the validity or authority of the *Shaastra*.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2. Tai. Bh. 1-11. pp. 278, 279. | 6. Br. Bh. 5-1-1. pp. 807, 808. |
| 3. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 310. | 7. Ma. Ka. 1-18 and |
| 4. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. pp. 311, 312. | Bh. 1-18. p. 219. |
| 5. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 312. | 8. Bh. p. 4. |

49. The valid means like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*) etc. are common to both classes of people, viz. those who are interested in mundane or materialistic affairs and those who are interested in, or having faith or belief in, *Vedic* rituals and rites. The *Shrutis* are the valid means which are acknowledged only by the *Vaidikas* (people who have staunch faith in *Vedas*). If the *Shrutis* are accepted as *Pramaana*, then one has to accept the fact that common valid means like perception, inference etc. are not valid any more, and for this reason why not accept, on the contrary, that the *Shrutis* are themselves weak? — This kind of a doubt may arise in the minds of some sceptic people.

But this doubt is not rational. For, to say that — “The *Shrutis*, on the one hand, and *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc., on the other, are both valid means which are mutually contradictory” — is itself not proper, reasonable. Valid means invariably signify their respective but unique or exclusive objects; they are never contradictory to one another (to wit, they do not cross one another’s path or jurisdiction, so to speak). If through the ears sound alone is known and through the eyes form of an object alone is known, it is quite evident that what is heard through the ears is not denied or falsified to be so by the eyes. Valid means, like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc., can signify, or help cognize, sensations like *Shabda* (sound), *Sparsha* (touch) etc., but they do not at all signify that — “*Brahman*, which the *Shrutis* propound, is not *non-dual* or *Absolute*.” For, *Brahman* is not the subject-matter for the former set of valid means like perception, inference etc. As *Brahman* does not possess form, sound, etc., It is not perceptible; and because *Brahman* does not have any symbolic or special features etc., It is neither an object, or subject-matter, for conceptual means like *Anumaana* (inference), *Upamaana* (example, illustration) etc. To signify *Brahman*, *Shaastras* alone are the *Pramaana*. Just as *Dharma* cannot be known by any other means or sources than *Aagama* or *Shaastra* (i.e. the traditional scriptural texts and the implicit methods of teaching contained in them), similarly in the case of *Brahman* too the *Aagama* or *Shaastra* alone is the valid, authoritative means or source. In the above section 48 we have already pointed out that there is no contradiction whatsoever between the portions of *Shaastras* which propound *Dharma* (religious tenets)

and *Brahman* (the Ultimate Reality). We do not at all demand or stipulate that one should per force believe the scriptural statements propounding non-dual nature of *Brahman*; the fact that — “Because the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman* which the *Shaastras* propound is to be cognized invariably through Intuitive experience, the *Shrutis* are the valid, authoritative means or sources” — we have already mentioned long back in section 19 itself. Further, there is no scope for any one to doubt in the manner — “If the scriptures teach *non-duality* of *Brahman*, then there does not remain any subject-matter or object whatsoever for valid means like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumaana*) etc.” For, the scriptures themselves propound that the empirical means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. are things which concern only *Ajnaanis* (ignorant people), and that those empirical means of perception, inference etc. are not valid means for *Jnaanis* (people who have realized the Self); for this reason, just as the transactions of the dream state continue to be real till one gets awakened, similarly till the seeker gets the Intuitive Knowledge or experience of the identify of *Brahman* and *Atman* the empirical means of perception, inference etc. may also continue to be valid. This truth also has been indicated by us previously in section 28.

9. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 314.

11. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 314.

10. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. pp. 315, 316.

12. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p. 890.

50. Some others have raised a doubt of the type — “Because the *Shrutis* are the valid means perceptible to the *Avidya Drishti* (empirical viewpoint of ignorance) alone, they are untrue or unreal. How at all is it possible for the real Intuitive Knowledge of the *non-duality* or *identity* of *Brahman* and *Atman* to accrue, or to be attained, from the unreal *Vedantic* (scriptural) sentence? No one has ever seen any one having died because of his being bitten by a rope-snake; no one also has ever seen any purposes or uses like bathing, drinking etc. having been fulfilled by the water of the mirage!”

But by the ‘poison’ arising out of doubt death occurs; in the dream a person dying after being bitten by a snake and a person taking a bath and such other acts being carried out are well known to every one. One may question that — “Because that act or effect is taking place in a dream alone, that is also unreal, is it not?” Even those who say that action or effect is unreal will have to accept per force the fact that at least the knowledge of that effect that has been gained is real; for, even after one wakes up, that knowledge remains as it is, without being sublated or falsified. Previously in section 44, we have already exemplified that by conceptual or imaginary means of chalk, cardboard, lines etc. the real knowledge of alphabets, numbers, sentences etc. is gained. Therefore, by unreal devices or means the real knowledge can be attained. For that very reason alone, the *Shrutis* negate or sublate all

devices or superimpositions in the manner — “It is not this, not that” — because they are all unreal in the ultimate analysis.

13. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 330.

14. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-26. pp. 301, 302.

51. There is no scope for any one to doubt in the manner — “Despite being a product or projection of *Avidya*, how is it possible at all for the *Shrutis* to sublate or falsify *Avidya* itself? In case it is possible for the scriptures to sublate *Avidya*, then all the dealings of *Pramaana* and *Prameya* also will have to get sublated and hence the *Shrutis* will then become invalid, is it not?”

For the dealings of *Pramaana* and *Prameya* the very basis (substrate) is *Pramaatrutwa* (cognizership) alone. In fact, the goal of the *Shrutis* is to help sublate this *Pramaatrutwa* and thereby exclusively teach the real *non-dual* essence of Pure Being of *Atman*. We have already clarified in section 28 as to how the *Pramaatrutwa* is an effect (projection) of *Avidya*. To one who can cognize (Intuit) that *Pramaatrutwa* is not absolutely real the *Pramaanas* are not really *Pramaanas* at all, nor the *Prameya* are not really objects. Therefore, just as the valid means of the dream become invalid in the waking, when by virtue of the scriptural teaching the Intuitive experience (cognition) of the essential nature of *Atman* is attained, the scriptures too become themselves invalid indeed. Because the scriptural Intuitive knowledge sublates completely (or perennially) the validity of the empirical valid means of *Pramaanas*, the scriptures are called *Antya Pramaana* (the ultimate, final valid means). Although this *Antya Pramaana* finally sublates its own validity, even before the empirical dealings of *Pramaanas* are rendered invalid, the scriptures have completed or fulfilled their prime task or purport; thereafter even if they become invalid it does not matter at all (that is, it is of no consequence whatsoever from the standpoint of the *Jnaanis*). Suppose if another person in our dream roars in the manner — “All this is your dream alone” — and we get awakened as a result of that roaring; although that person’s boisterous statement belongs to our dream alone and so is invalid or false — to the extent his statement helped signify the dream as a dream, that statement amounts to be a *Pramaana* alone, is it not? In the same way alone we should discern the *Praamaanya* (validity) of the scriptures too. “How will it be after the *non-dual* Intuitive knowledge (Self-Knowledge) accrues owing to the valid means of the scriptures? What next? Why?” — such metaphysical questions, or the empirical doubts of the type — “Whether that Self-Knowledge is real in Itself or unreal; or whether any other knowledge can sublate or falsify this Self-Knowledge and thereby signify Its invalidity and can cause, or engender, in us any kind of indifference or disrespect since it is worthless” — remain to be solved.

15. G. Bh. 2-69. pp. 117, 118.

16. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 331, 332.

52. Even though Vedantins affirm that *Atman* is cognized (Intuited) through the valid means of the scriptures alone, one should not understand it in the manner that the Self can be cognized as an object or a percept (*Prameya*), just like an earthen pot, pitcher etc. For, if *Atman* is *Prameya*, He will have to be established on the strength of *Pramaanas*; then that *Atman* too, just like any other *Prameya*, will have to become per force a projection of *Avidya* alone, and for this reason the *Shoonyaavaada* (theory of essencelessness or *Nihilism*) propounding the tenet of the type — “Both *Atman* and *Anaatman* are verily false appearances and are essenceless” — alone, will become the final spiritual teaching. For this reason alone, in the *Shrutis* or the *Smritis* *Atman* has been described as *Aprameya* (not an object of cognition or not a percept). In the ultimate analysis, even for the *Shaastras* it is not possible to signify the essential nature of *Atman*, and one of the reasons for this is that *Atman* is devoid of all special features or characteristics. This fact we have already indicated in section 40. The other reason for *Atman* not being an object of cognition or percept is the truth that *Atman* is the essential nature of Pure or Absolute Being Itself of the person who seeks to know or cognize Him. Any *Pramaana* or valid means functions or is employed (utilized) for the purpose of cognizing or perceiving a *Prameya* but not for the purpose of cognizing (objectifying) the *Pramaatru* himself.

17. Br. Up. 4-4-20. p. 745.

19. G. Bh. 2-18. p. 57.

18. G. 2-18. p. 56.

53. Those people who cannot discern the essential natures of *Atman* and *Pramaanas* doubt in the manner — “If *Atman* is *Aprameya*, then how at all can the scriptures become the *Pramaanas* to help the seeker to cognize *Atman*? Is it not true that for any *Pramaana* to function there must be a relevant *Prameya*? Besides, if *Atman* is not an object of cognition at all, since *Atman* does not have any valid means of proof to establish His existence or Being any body can argue that *Atman* does not at all exist. After having affirmed that — ‘*Shaastras* alone are the *Pramaanaa*’ — and then at the same time to assert that — ‘He is *Aprameya*’ — is *Vyaahata* (an incongruous statement), meaning, a statement which is contradictory to itself.”

First, *Shrutis* are not said to be *Pramaanas* — not because they teach *Brahman* by objectifying It, but because *Brahman* is the seeker’s innermost *Atman* alone. The scriptures teach in the manner — “*Atman* is not an object of perception” — and then sublimate the distinctions of the kind of the knower, the known object and the means of knowledge. The *Shrutis* are valid or authoritative means only because they sublimate (rescind) all the special features or qualities which do not pertain or belong to *Atman* and, at the same time, teach the subsisting essential

nature of *Atman*. For the traditional aphorism of Dravidaachaarya, viz. "*Siddham Tu Nivartakatwaat*" — meaning, "As they (i.e. the scriptures) sublate or rescind those special features or qualities which do not pertain or belong to *Atman*, they are established or proved to be valid means" — this alone is the ultimate purport. We have also mentioned previously in section 51 that the scriptures are *Antyapramaana* or the final, decisive valid means, as also the fact that after the Self-Knowledge accrues from them the whole gamut of empirical dealings involving *Pramaanas* is falsified or sublated.

Further, for the doubt — "If *Atman* is not established by *Aagama* (the scriptures), then it amounts to saying that the existence of *Atman* Himself is not established or proved, is it not?" — especially to arise, there is no cause at all. For, in the case of empirical objects like *Aakaasha* (space), *Vaayu* (air) etc. they do not become self-established without desiderating valid means; they invariably need, nay demand, the valid means of *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. But *Atman* is self-established and hence there is no need for Him to be established with the aid or support of any *Pramaanas*. *Atman* means the essential nature of Pure Being of the *Pramaatru* himself; and for the *Pramaatru* the necessity of a *Pramaana* arises only in the matter of knowing a *Prameya*, but not in establishing himself. Because the cognizer is the substratum for the empirical dealings of *Pramaanas* and *Prameya* etc., he has to be invariably and necessarily established prior to those empirical dealings. It cannot be asserted that — "An object is established to exist only if it is done so through the *Pramaanas*, but not if it is self-established." **It is not possible for any one to deny *Atman*, who is self-established as also one's own essential nature of Pure Being Itself.** Just as fire cannot at all give up or avoid, despite its strenuous efforts, its intrinsic heat which is verily its essential nature of being, similarly no one can ever give up or get rid of one's own essential nature of *Atman*.

20. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 31.

22. Su. Bh. 2-3-7. p. 455.

21. G. Bh. 2-18. pp. 57, 58.

23. Ma. Ka. Bh. 2-32. pp. 260, 261.

54. From the standpoint of people who believe that the task or function of *Pramaanas* is only to signify things which are not known, the *Shrutis* which teach the Absolute or *non-dual* Reality (of *Brahman* or *Atman*) do not deserve to be called *Pramaanas*. For, the *Shrutis* do not at all teach the Absolute, *non-dual* Reality directly; they sublate features or qualities which do not at all pertain or belong to It, that is all. Therefore in their opinion it amounts to saying that there exists a great deal of difference between the empirical valid means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. and the *Shrutis*.

But if we discern with insight, it will be evident that any *Pramaana*, whatever it may be, sublates the ignorance about its *Prameya*, but it

never causes or creates any special characteristic whatsoever in the *Prameya*. If one is asked to cut asunder a piece of log into two parts, no one thinks that apart from dissociating the relationship between those parts or pieces there remains another function of cutting asunder the two parts. In fact, to cut asunder itself connotes breaking apart (a thing that is partible). Is it not? In the same way, if it is stated that *Pramaanas* signify their *Vishaya* (object) — it means that they remove the ignorance that exists with regard to the object of cognition alone and not in addition to it they perform yet another function or act of 'signifying' or 'making it known'. If considered from this viewpoint, it can be categorically stated that the real function of *Pramaanas*, whatever they may be, is to remove or sublimate ignorance alone; because the *Shrutis*, just like the rest of the *Pramaanas* (empirical valid means), sublimate the ignorance with regard to *Atman* (their subject-matter of cognition, Intuition), there is no room for any objection or difficulty whatsoever in reckoning them as *Pramaanas*.

24. Ma. Bh. 7. pp. 207, 208.

55. Many proponents of various philosophies (*Darshanakaaras*) have acknowledged that *Atman* is an object of cognition (*Vishaya*) alone for a *Pramaana*. Some among them opine that *Atman* is perceptible directly by the mind; some others think that He is known by the empirical means of *Anumaana*. By discerning the defect that exists in their theories the greatness and importance of the *Vedantic* (spiritual) teaching — "*Atman is Aprameya*" — will become clear. Therefore, we will explain this topic in some detail here.

Atman is the essential nature of the *Pramaatru* indeed; we have previously stated in sections 28 and 51 that *Pramaatrutwa* (cognizership) too is misconceived in, or superimposed upon, *Atman*. But even those who assert that — "*Atman* is perceptible to valid means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc." — have to accept invariably that *Atman* is *Pramaatru*, is it not? Even after accepting this fact to say that — "*We cognize Atman who is the Pramaatru by Pramaanas*" — will be opposed to the *Shrutis*, which clearly say — "*Atman is Amata* (that which cannot be conceived of by the mind); He is *Avijnaata* (one who cannot be known or cognized); to know or cognize Him (who is *Aprameya*) there are no *Pramaanas* whatsoever". Besides, there is no possibility of a *Pramaatru* who has a desire to know or cognize the *Pramaatru*, either himself or another. If it is himself, his *Pramitsaa* (desire to cognize) will, in that event, be a matter pertaining to a *Prameya* alone, and not something pertaining to himself. If it is another, then, in that event, to cognize that second *Pramaatru* yet another *Pramaatru* as also the desire to know this second one will have to be per force imagined and thereby there will be the defect of *regressus ad*

infinitum or *Anavastha Dosha*. Only after fulfilling pre-conditions like — (i) The *Pramaatru* should have a desire to cognize his *Prameya*; (ii) then he must have the *Smriti* (memory) of that object; (iii) he should make an effort to know; (iv) finally the fruition of that effort — alone the *Prameya* gets established, is it not? But in the case of *Atman* it is not possible even to imagine or conceive that only after He gets such a desire to know or cognize Himself and getting a memory about Himself etc. He becomes self-established; if it is imagined or surmised that another *Pramaatru* may, or can, know himself, then invariably one has to imagine or surmise the existence of yet a third *Pramaatru* and his having all those pre-conditions like desire, memory etc., and as it was pointed out above the defect of *regressus ad infinitum* will invariably attach itself.

Thus to imagine or surmise that it is possible to objectify or perceive *Atman* through empirical valid means of *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. and then cognize or know Him is contradictory to *Yukti* (logical devices) as also *Anubhava* (universal experience). If it is maintained that one can know or cognize oneself, then it will become necessary to cut asunder *Atman* into two parts, one being the cognizer part and the second the cognized part; or, in the alternative, we will have to imagine or conceive of many cognizers (*Pramaatrus*) who perceive mutually one another. Besides, just as it is ridiculous to say that one light is seen (or perceived) with the help or aid of the light of another, it will be similarly ridiculous to imagine or surmise that one *Atman* is cognized or perceived by another *Atman*. For, when the *Jnaana Swaroopa* (the essential nature of Pure Consciousness) or the *Jnaana Dharma* (the rudimentary faculty of knowing or Intuitive cognition) is common to both, where is the necessity of a desire to know each other at all? Therefore, the spiritual teaching of *Vedanta* that — “*Atman* is *Aprameya*” — is correct and proper.

25. Ait. Bh. 2-1. Intr. p. 47.

27. Ait. Bh. 1. Intr. pp. 48, 49.

26. Up. Sa. Pr. 90. p. 56.

56. Some people coerce Vedantins and question them in the manner — “Is *Atman* a *Pramaatru* or not? Is *Atman* the subject-matter for the *Shrutis* or not? Are *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* and such other *Vyaavahaaric Pramaanas* (empirical valid means of cognition) are accepted by you as such or not? For all these queries give any one definite and convincing answer?” But those people who keep in mind the *Vedantic* teaching that — “All empirical dealings are invariably based on the *Adhyaaroopa Drishti* (the empirical viewpoint of misconception or superimposition) and are *not real* in the absolute sense (i.e. they are not *Paramaarthas* or really real)” — will realize that there is no scope whatsoever for such kinds of doubts or questions to be

raised. For, it is proper (reasonable) to say that *Atman* is a *Pramaatru* from the *Vyaavahaaric* viewpoint alone; but if we go a little further deep and discern Intuitively, then *Pramaatrutwa* itself is *Aadhyaasika* (a product, projection of *Adhyaasa* or misconception) as we have previously stated in section 51. Till one realizes by virtue of the scriptural (spiritual) teaching of *Advaita Jnaana* (Intuitive knowledge of *Atman* as the *non-dual* Reality, one without a second), one is a *Pramaatru* cognizer and *Paramaatman* (the Absolute, Transcendental Reality of *Atman*) is *Prameya*, but on the dawn or attainment of *Jnaana* (Intuitive knowledge of *Atman*) — then what was previously reckoned, nay misconceived, as the *Pramaatru* (cognizer) is himself *Paramaatman* or the Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Atman*; thereafter the very empirical distinction of *Pramaatru* and *Prameya* will not subsist at all. This fact we have stated previously in section 51. *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. are valid means indeed till the dawn of *Jnaana*; but after the attainment of *Jnaana* those valid means also get sublated or falsified, just as the valid means of the dream state get falsified after one wakes up. All these empirical dealings exist only from the *Adhyaaroopa Drishti*; they do not exist in reality from the *Apavaada Drishti*. Several scriptural statements have to be reconciled in this manner applying the methodology of superimposition and rescission (*Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya*) alone.

28. G. Bh. 2-18. p. 57.

29. Adh. Bh. p. 4.

30. Ch. Up. 8-7-1. p. 618;
Br. Up. 4-5-15. p. 783.

31. Su. Bh. 1-1-5. Br. pp. 44, 45.

32. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 330.

33. Up. Sa. 18-95. p. 232.

VIII. TARKA OR LOGIC

57. The logicians cannot understand why the Vedantins — who propound that the desire to cognize the Reality of *Brahman* or *Brahmajijnaasa* culminates, i.e. it becomes consummate, in *Atmaanubhava* or Intuitive experience of the Self — assert that *Brahmajnaana* or Self-Knowledge is not attained by means of *Tarka* or logic (dialectics). It is also not possible for them (i.e. the logicians) to understand or reckon why Vedantins enhance the importance of *Shabda* or the spoken word, which signifies the empirical things or phenomena alone, beyond or above *Anubhava* or empirical experience. Here in this context we have to discern first of all as to what is meant by “*Anubhava*”, as also what is the function of *Shabda*. The logicians call the empirical knowledge gained through *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. as *Anubhava* or experience only. Although from the *Vyaavahaaric* or empirical viewpoint this too is proper alone, the *Brahmaanubhava*

or *Atmaanubhava* (Intuitive experience of *Brahman* or the Ultimate, Absolute Reality) is not attained through the empirical valid means of *Pratyaksha* (perception), *Anumaana* (inference) etc. This fact we have mentioned previously in section 49.

Now let us deliberate upon *Shabda* or word. The scriptural *Shabda* teaches *Dharma* or religious tenets or doctrines which are to be practised and which are plausible and practicable; it also propounds entities, realities like *Brahman*, *Atman* etc. which are *Siddha* or self-established (eternal). But *Saankhyans* (i.e. followers of the school of philosophy called *Saankhya*, founded by Kapila Rishi) ask the question — “If it is said that the scriptural word instructs us about *Dharma* or religious tenets alone which can be practised, we can accept it; but the ever-existing Reality or Entity should be known or signified by empirical means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. too, is it not?” That entity which exists for eternity is called by synonymous terms like *Bhoota Vastu*, *Parinishthita Vastu*, *Parinishpanna Vastu* etc. Because such an entity has per force to be perceptible to, or objectifiable by, other kinds of valid means or *Pramaanas*, in the event when one scriptural statement is contradictory to another scriptural statement, then it is conventional to interpret the weaker scriptural texts in subordination to, or with secondary importance to, the predominant, powerful scriptural texts; in the same manner, the *Saankhyans* are of the opinion that, if the *Shrutis* are opposed to the *Pramaanaantara* or other kinds of valid means, then in that event, that particular *Shruti* or scriptural statement must be invariably interpreted to suit that *Pramaana* alone. This opinion too is not proper. For, although *Brahman* is a *Bhoota Vastu*, It is not an object for any other kinds of valid means (to be found in the empirical region) or *Pramaanaantara* *Goachara*; because, It has no special characteristics like form, taste etc. Besides, it is not proper also to say that one *Pramaana* is opposed to or contradicts another *Pramaana*; this fact has already been mentioned in section 49. Therefore, just like *Dharma* or religious tenets or teachings, *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality of the Self too is a subject matter of teaching exclusively for the *Shrutis* alone.

It is the theory of logicians that — “*Tarka* or logic is useful in establishing or substantiating what is not perceptible or by comparison with what is perceptible or visible; therefore, *Tarka* is very near or close to *Anubhava* or perceptual, sensory experience.” But *Brahman* is to be cognized through or with the aid of the valid means (*Pramaana*) of *Shaastras* alone but not to be known or cognized through *Pratyaksha* *Pramaana*, at all. Therefore, neither *Anumaana* nor any other logical, dialectical device which closely follows or which is in consonance with the empirical valid means of *Pratyaksha* (perception) is of any utility or benefit here in this context. In fact, *Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality is *Achintya* or beyond the purview of the mental concepts. For this

reason alone, both *Shrutis* (*Upanishads*) and *Smritis* are propounding that even for the sages or Rishis like Kapila, Kanaada etc., who were *Siddhas* (highly evolved souls in spiritual matters) it was not possible to know or cognize this *Brahman* merely by means of empirical logic, dialectics (*Tarka*).

1. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 313,314.

3. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 314.

2. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 315.

58. It should not be misinterpreted in the manner that Vedantins never need any kind of *Tarka* whatsoever. In fact, *Shrutis* expound their principal teachings by analyzing the whole gamut of not-self or *Anaatman* using a particular but queer methodology and helping the seeker's mind to get merged, as it were, or equipoised, in the Intuitive experience Itself of *Atman*. This exclusive methodology of the scriptures is called *Aagama*. For the highest class of seekers or *Uttamaadhikaaris* merely listening to the scriptural sentence which teaches adopting this *Aagama* methodology is sufficient to attain the Intuitive experience of *Atman* (*Aatmaanubhava*). But in the case of those who are not capable of Intuiting the Reality of *Atman* merely on the strength of *Shravana* or listening to the scriptural statements, it is not wrong or improper to utilize the *Shrutis* seeking the help of Intuitive reason also. For this reason alone, the *Shrutis* say that in order to attain Self-Realization or *Aatmadarshana*, in addition to *Shravana*, *Manana* or ratiocination (Intuitive reasoning) too is necessary. It is mentioned in the *Upanishads* that a rich man, whom some thieves kidnapped blind-folded and left him behind in a far-off forest, reached his native *Gaandhaaradesha* by virtue of his following the instructions given by some guides as well as by dint of his own discerning or discriminative faculty; in the same manner, the spiritual seeker or aspirant should attain *Aatmajnaana* or Self-Knowledge with the help of the spiritual instructions of the *Aacharya* or preceptor as well as his own intellectual faculties of reasoning and discrimination. In this manner with the help of an illustration the scriptures have emphasized the need for *Tarka* or logic. Such a *Tarka* has been signified or depicted by the *Shrutis* themselves for the sake of attaining the Intuitive experience. But on this pretext the dry, futile logic or dialectics which is either not having the support of the *Shrutis* or is opposed to them cannot possibly be utilized to cognize or Intuit *Brahman*. For, the *Tarka* that human beings merely conjecture or formulate (using their intellectual faculties or capabilities) has no finality whatsoever; hence, it is not possible at all even to imagine about the Ultimate, Absolute Reality of *Atman* (which is the subject-matter or purport of the *Shrutis*) without the aid of the *Shrutis* themselves. If one proceeds on the basis of *Tarka* which human beings have imagined and formulated, the *Purushaartha* or the ultimate goal of human existence

(i.e. Self-Knowledge or Self-Realization) also cannot ever be attained. Especially in the matter of topics or phenomena which have been experienced by every one with the help of the scriptural instructions it is evidently not proper or reasonable to argue contrary to that universal experience. “*Na Hi Drishte(s)nupapannam Naama*” (There is nothing illogical or unreasonable pertaining to anything that is experienced or seen, perceived) — this *Nyaaya* or maxim, axiom we have already exemplified in section 39 for this reason only. *Kevala Tarka*, *Shushka Tarka*, *Niraagama Tarka* — all these are the names given to the *Tarka* or logic which is opposed to or contradictory to *Shrutis* and which is *Nishpramaanaka* or not based on any empirical valid means of cognition and which is *Anubhava Viruddha* or opposed to universal human experiences. *Tarka*, *Upapatti*, *Yukti* are synonymous terms. As far as it is concerning *Brahman* or *Atman*, even the empirical valid means of *Anumaana* are in the same position (or predicament) as *Tarka* alone, but they are not independent valid means of cognition at all; the logic that is in consonance with the Intuitive experience as taught by the *Shrutis* themselves is called *Shrutyanyagraheeta Tarka* or logic that is ‘blessed’ or approved by the scriptural texts; that logic which is not opposed to this *Shrutyanyagraheeta Tarka* is called *Shrutyaviroadhi Tarka* or *Shrutyanyukoola Tarka* or *Shrauta Tarka*.

4. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 15.

6. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 314.

5. Su. Bh. 2-1-11. p. 322.

59. Some disputants keep on exemplifying logical devices agreeable to their own whims and fancies to be in consonance with *Shrutis* or they explain away saying that those logical devices are such as to help the seekers to understand the subtle meaning of the *Shrutis*. But in order to decide or determine that such and such a logical device or argument alone is the one convenient or helpful, there is no dearth of means at all. As we have mentioned above the *Shrutis* themselves exemplify here and there these kinds of logical arguments indeed. Therefore, we should necessarily accept those logical devices. It may appear to any one that even the purport or opinion of those logical devices can be interpreted or described by each person in his own different manner. But if it is agreed upon that *Tarka* must invariably and necessarily be *Anubhavaanga* or in consonance with or subordinate to experience, then the distinction that exists between *Shushka Tarka* or dry, vain logic and *Shrauta Tarka* or logic that is used in the *Shrutis* will become very clear. That type of *Tarka* alone is called *Shrauta Tarka*. For, ***Paramaārtha* or the Ultimate, Absolute Reality should per force be of one and the same nature or form; It is not an entity which desiderates the categories of time, space and causation or which ever changes Its very nature or essence of Being. The Intuitive knowledge or *Jnaana* pertaining to that Reality alone is called *Samyajjnaana***

(the correct, real knowledge), because It is in consonance with *Saarvatrika Anubhava* or universal Intuitive experience (which never varies from person to person). Therefore, that *Tarka* which is exemplified in the *Shrutis* to help attain this Intuitive experience as also any other *Laukika Tarka* or empirical logic that we may formulate, or conceive of, to be in consonance with such *Tarka* are together called *Sattarka* (reasonable, genuine logic). Any *Tarka* which is acceptable to one faction only but which is opposed or not accepted by the other factions does not have any finality and hence it cannot be *Anubhavaanga Tarka*; because it is not *Anubhavaanga*, i.e. in consonance with, or subordinate to, *Anubhava* or Intuitive experience, it is invariably *Kutarka* or wrong, false logic.

7. Su. Bh. 2-1-11. pp. 322, 323.

10. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-17. p. 290.

8. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 314.

11. Tai. Bh. 3-4. p. 391.

9. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-11. p. 282.

12. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 315.

60. Vedantins do not maintain or assert that *Tarkas* or logical devices that are used by *Saankhyans* or *Vaisheshikas* and such other *Darshanakaaras* or by the present-day Vedantins or by people other than Vedantins or by *Vaidikas* — are always such which cannot be accepted or that they are not reasonable. To the extent their logical devices are helpful to, or in consonance with, the *Jnaana* or knowledge that accrues from the *Shrutis* we may utilize them indeed as secondary aids. For that reason only, the *Nyaaya* or axiom — “*Paramatam Apratishiddham Anumatam Bhavati*”, meaning “That opinion of others which is not refuted or contradicted becomes acceptable to us” — has been acknowledged in *Vedanta* and this fact has been previously mentioned in section 4. To the extent such acceptable logical devices are in keeping with *Shrauta Tarka* or are close to them, Vedantins invariably accept them.

13. Su. Bh. 2-1-3. p. 307.

15. Su. Bh. 1-4-28. p. 297.

14. Su. Bh. 2-1-3. pp. 306, 307.

16. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-99. p. 402.

61. Here in this context one important difference that exists between the *Darshanas* or schools of philosophy which have based their tenets or doctrines predominantly on *Tarka* and *Vedanta* philosophy becomes very clear. That is: The *Taarkikas* proceed or undertake to determine the essential nature of phenomena or categories like *Kaarana* (cause) and *Kaarya* (effect) on the strength of *Drishtaanta* or illustrations alone. Therefore, for them the illustration or example that is actually perceived before us is quite necessary. In fact, there is no scope for them even to budge a little hither or thither away from the illustration. On the other hand, Vedantins have taken as their paramount basis *Anubhava* or Intuitive experience which accrues from the valid means of *Shrutis*.

Because that Intuitive experience signifies or helps cognize an entity (*Vastu*) which is not at all perceptible or cognizable through empirical valid means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. even if *Anubhava* or Intuitive experience is not in consonance with any particular empirical illustration, there is no harm whatsoever. While using examples or illustrations Vedantins take up any one particular aspect or part alone of the illustration as the basis for comparison and then utilize those examples or illustrations, but they do not accept taking the illustration to be similar or identical in all aspects or matters (in order to drive home their point of view), and this important fact must necessarily be remembered. In truth, no one ever says that between the *Drishtaanta* or the illustration and *Daarshtraantika* or the illustrated there exists comparison or similarity in all aspects and respects; neither is it possible to assert in that manner. For, if such an identity or similarity exists between them, both entities become merged into one and hence the distinction or difference of the two in the forms of *Drishtaanta* and *Daarshtraantika* will itself become nullified or in other words that difference will not exist at all; it vanishes.

17. Su. Bh. 2-2-38. p. 436.

18. Su. Bh. 3-2-20. p. 616.

62. It is wrong to think that merely because an illustration has been utilized the establishment or determination of the reality or entity has been achieved. For, an illustration is useful only to clarify a topic or truth which is being currently enunciated. No one can ever establish that just because the water snake appears to be similar to a cobra, like the latter the water snake too is poisonous. Apart from this, if in the scriptures an illustration has been mentioned we can only deduce a purport or benefit that can accrue from that, but where that illustration cannot at all be compared or made applicable it will not be possible to do so. If it is a *Loukika Drishtaanta* or an empirical illustration, then that illustration should necessarily be interpreted or conceived to mean to be in consonance with universal acceptance. But, on the other hand, the illustration itself should never be distorted or twisted and be made controversial merely in order to prove or establish the veracity of a statement or opinion that is desired by us. For, it is never possible to determine or establish the reality of an object or a thing merely on the ground that we desire or like it to be so. If this truth is kept in mind, it becomes evidently clear that the *Tarka* or logic that is utilized by those who attempt to propound a teaching or doctrine which is contradictory to an empirical phenomenon by using scriptural illustrations or examples is *Kutarka* or vain, dry logic alone. For, then in that event the very basis or *rationale* behind the concepts of *Drishtaanta* and *Daarshtraantika* is totally vitiated. It is never possible to prove or establish that — “Fire is cold” or “The Sun is like the Moon, endowed

with cool rays" — by means of any illustration whatsoever. In the same manner, it also becomes evidently clear from this that not only the logic of those who endeavour to make anything that is acceptable to all human beings a matter of controversy by imagining or misconceiving invariably an aspect which is not to be found in the illustration at all is verily *Kutarka* or vain, dry logic, but also a matter of ridicule. For, if one can imagine or conceive anything that does not exist at all, then anybody can imagine or conceive anything that he wishes or fancies. The present-day Vedantins who argue in the manner — "While the people take (or believe) a rope to be a snake and a sea-shell or nacre to be silver out of delusion (*Bhraanti*) their knowledge or perception then in that context is not false or wrong but then, in reality, a kind of an appearance of a snake (i.e. *Praatibhaasika Sarpa*) is actually or really born as a result of *Avidya* (*Avidyaaparinaama*)" — are, in fact, using such *Kutarka* or dry, vain logic mentioned above.

19. Su. Bh. 2-2-10. p. 382.

23. Su. Bh. 2-2-17. p. 400.

20. Su. Bh. 3-2-20. p. 616.

24. Su. Bh. 4-1-5. p. 825.

21. Su. Bh. 2-3-50. p. 517.

25. Ma. Ka. Bh. 2-32. p. 257.

22. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 302.

IX. VEDANTA VAAKYA OR VEDANTIC SENTENCE

63. Previously in section 18 we have stated that in *Shaankara Vedanta* the fact that — "It has been acknowledged that *Shaastras* alone are the valid means or authoritative sources" — is a special feature. We have also previously in sections 47 - 56 given solutions too for some objections concerning the validity of *Shrutis* or the scriptures. But so far we have examined the *Shrutis* only from the predominant viewpoint of their being valid means. Now, we will begin to examine them from the predominant viewpoint of their being sentences. For, the prime or paramount teaching of this school of philosophy is: "*Brahmajnaana* or Self-Knowledge is gained from the conviction accruing from the deliberation on the meaning or purport of the *Vedanta Vaakyas* or the scriptural sentences."

1. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 15.

2. Ka. Bh. 1-2-9. p. 134.

64. During the times of *Adi Shankaraachaarya* there were *Meemaamsakas* (belonging to *Jaimini's Poorva Meemaamsaa* school of philosophy) who were totally including all the *Vedanta Vaakyas* or *Upanishadic* sentences in the *Vidhikaanda* or ritualistic portion of the *Vedas*, as also some Vedantins were following such *Meemaamsakas*. Even today there are Vedantins belonging to alien schools of *Vedanta* other than, or opposed to, *Adi Shankara's* school who maintain that

— “*Vedanta* stipulates in the form of injunctions *Upaasanas* or meditations alone pertaining to *Brahman* or *Atman*, but does not merely state about *Brahman* (in the form of sentences)”. All these are invariably the opponents to Adi Shankara's pristine pure *Vedanta*. Therefore, it is quite essential for the spiritual seekers to get all their objections in this regard solved completely. First of all, let us examine and deliberate upon the opinion of the *Meemaamsakas* that — “Because *Brahman* is ‘*Bhoota Vastu*’ or an existing entity, the *Shrutis* do not enunciate or propound It.”

The *rationale* behind the opinion of the *Meemaamsakas* is: “*Shaastras* may stipulate by way of injunctions *Dharma* or religious tenets or doctrines which are not perceptible to *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. But because *Brahman* is a *Bhoota Vastu*, It should be an object for *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc.; therefore, if the *Shaastras* enunciate or propound *Brahman*, which is a *Bhoota Vastu*, then it will be tantamount to *Anuvaada* or mere repetition of things already known (and hence they will become redundant). Besides, by mentioning such a thing no benefit will accrue nor any purpose served at all. For that reason alone, it has been stated that not only do the *Shaastras* invariably teach *Kriya* or rituals, religious rites but also that the scriptural sentences, which signify or teach *Vastu* or an entity — which is not a *Kriya* — become futile; for this reason alone, it has been determined in the *Meemaamsa Sootras* or aphorisms of the *Meemaamsa* school of philosophy that *Arthavaada* (tenets, doctrines of secondary importance) are valid means by virtue of their praising *Vidhis* or religious injunctions. Therefore, it should be reckoned that because the *Vedantic* sentences stipulate or mention the *Kartru* or the agent of action, the *Kriya* or the ritual, *Devata* or the deity who is to be invoked etc. they are the valid means.”

First of all, the opinion that the *Shaastras* should invariably enunciate or propound *Karmas* (rituals) alone pertains to a sentence belonging to the *Karma Kaanda*. Although *Brahman* is a *Bhoota Vastu* the truth that — “*Brahmaatman*, (the Ultimate Reality of the Self) alone is myself” — can never be cognized or Intuited without the help of the *Shaastras*. Further, because by cognizing *Brahmaatman* the difficulties like *Avidya* (ignorance), *Kaama* (desires), *Karma* (rituals) etc. are actually rooted out, there exists a perceptible benefit or utility. There is no restriction, regulation or stipulation that the *Vedantic* sentences should invariably instruct about rituals or actions alone. For, the *Shrutis* condemn *Kriya* or action, *Kaaraka* or instruments or means of action, as also the *Phala* or fruits, results of action. It is true that in the *Vedantic* sentences pertaining to *Upaasanas* there is mention about *Devas*, the ritual etc.; but because the *Brahma Vaakya* or *Vedantic* sentence, which pertains to the essential nature of *Brahman* and which

expounds unitary or non-dual existence of *Brahman*, sublates the entire gamut of knowledge of duality itself, it will not be proper to say that therein there exist either *Upaasana Vidhis* or stipulations, injunctions concerning meditations or *Devalas* etc. which were mentioned as accessories subordinate to those injunctions.

3. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 37.

4. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 22.

5. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 22.

6. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 21.

7. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 22.

8. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 22, 23.

65. Some people say that apart from sentences which stipulate either *Pravritti* (endeavour to achieve something desirable) or *Nivritti* (effort of receding from something undesirable) and objects which are accessories subordinate to these, there are no *Vedavaakyas* or scriptural sentences whatsoever which expound merely an existing entity or Reality (*Bhoota Vastu*). In the opinion of the *Meemaamsakas* even the *Jnaana Kaanda* (the *Vedic* portion devoted to Self-Knowledge) also expounds something remaining after the *Karmas* mentioned in the *Karma Kaanda* only. In the opinion of many others, although the *Shaastras* teach *Brahman*, they do not do so independently; on the other hand, they teach *Brahman* in subordination to the injunctions pertaining to meditations alone. In the *Jnaana Kaanda* also there are a few *Upaasana Vidhis*. For example: "*Aatmaa Vaa Are Drishtavyaha Shrootavyo Mantavyo Nidhidhyaasitavyaha*" — (*Brihadaraanyaka* 2-4-9) — meaning, "My dear, one should cognize *Atman*, listen to the descriptions and teachings about *Atman*, reason out or deliberate upon *Atman* and contemplate upon *Atman*"; "*Soa(s)nveshtavyaha Sa Vijjnaasitavyaha*" — (*Chhaandogya* 8-7-1) — meaning, "One should search out *Atman*, one should cognize, Intuit *Atman* alone"; "*Aatametyevoapaaseeta*" — (*Brihadaraanyaka* 1-4-7) — meaning, "One should meditate that his true Being is *Atman* alone" — all such statements are belonging to this kind of scriptural injunctions. It is their opinion that the *Brahma Vaakyas* or sentences pertaining to *Brahman* have the purport of signifying either *Brahman* which is to be meditated upon or those teachings devoid of injunctions about the *Swaroopa* or essential nature of Being of *Paramaatman*. They have understood (or interpreted) the scriptures to mean that just as the invisible *Svarga* or Heaven is to be attained by means of *Karma*, in the same way *Moaksha* or Emancipation which too is invisible is to be attained by means of *Maanasa Karma* or action at the mental or psychic level. Some people believe that by this kind of *Upaasana* even *Avidya* too is removed.

But this is not proper. It is not possible to say either that the *Parama Purusha* or the Supreme Being or Self, who is cognized through the *Upanishads* alone, does not exist or that He cannot be known or Intuited through the valid means of the *Vedas*. For, in the *Upanishads*

He has been stated to be our *Atman* or Self alone, devoid of all special characteristics. It is not possible to refute the existence of *Atman*; for, one who endeavours to refute in that manner is himself *Atman*. Because this *Atman* is called "*Aupanishad Purusha*", the fact that — "He is expounded predominantly in the *Upanishads* alone and not as subsidiary to any other *Vidhū*" — will become clear.

In many contexts there exist scriptural sentences which signify the unity or identity of *Brahman* and *Atman* and they end up there itself. Relating to them there do not exist any *Vidhis* whatsoever. Therefore, it becomes necessary to deduce that — "The real purport or goal for all *Upanishads* culminates in signifying or expounding the *Brahmaatma Swarupa* or the essential nature of *Brahman* or *Atman*." It is true that at certain places there exist scriptural sentences like — "*Aatmaa Vaa Are Drishtavyaha*" (mentioned above) — which appear like *Vidhis*. But that entity which has been pointed out to be cognized or Intuited in such contexts is our *Atman* alone. Therefore, it is not proper to say that therein it has been stipulated by way of an injunction that our *Atman* has to be cognized afresh. Because by means of scriptural sentences themselves which signify or help cognize the *Aatma Swarupa* (the essential nature of our Self) that entity (*Bhoota Vastu*) which is to be cognized becomes cognized invariably, thereafter there does not remain anything whatsoever which has to be stipulated by way of an injunction. Therefore, for the sake of those people who are extroverted and think in the manner — "I must achieve this; I must get rid of or avoid this" — and who without having attained the final goal of life are suffering the miseries of this transmigratory existence (*Samsaara*), inasmuch as they induce or prompt them to become introverted, the scriptural sentences seemingly to be of the form of injunctions *Vidhis* like — "*Aatmaa Vaa Are Drishtavyaha*" — etc. are useful in instructing or guiding them in the manner — "Oh, dear ones, do not look outside extrovertedly, but look within introvertedly at *Atman* alone." Thus that *Atman* alone, who if one has begun to discover within cannot be acquired afresh as desirable or cannot be discarded or got rid of as undesirable (i.e. neither *Upadeya* nor *Heya*, respectively) but who is the very core of Being indwelling in every one — the *Upanishadic* sentences describe in the manner — "This *Atman* alone is all this existing before us"; "Where everything becomes this *Atman* alone, there who can see what and with what.....?"; "This *Atman* is verily *Brahman* alone". Therefore, in the *Jnaana Kaanda* devoted to teaching Self-Knowledge it is not possible even to imagine that *Brahman* is taught as being subordinate to any injunction whatsoever.

9. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 36.

10. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 37.

11. Isa Up. Intr. p.3.

12. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 35, 36.

13. Br. Up. 1-4-7. p. 130.

66. Now any one may get a doubt of the type — “Whether the scriptural sentences pertain to the enunciation of the essential nature of *Brahman* (*Brahma Swaroopa*) or to the unitary Intuitive experience of the identification of *Brahman* and *Atman* (*Brahmaatmaikatwa*), they have per force to include a word signifying or indicating *Brahman*. For, as a sentence has invariably to signify the purport or meaning intended by the sentence in the form of the relationship between various objects or things, it becomes quite necessary for the various words that exist (or that are used) in the sentence to signify the relevant, respective objects or things they pertain to. Hence, it is impossible for a sentence pertaining to *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, to exist without comprising or containing a word signifying *Brahman*. But if *Brahman* is *Padavaachya* or an entity, phenomenon which is signified by a *Pada* or word, then there will be a danger of refutation or contradiction to the *Siddhaanta* or spiritual teaching that *Brahman* is *Nirvishesha* or devoid of all special characteristics. The teaching which we indicated previously in section 40, namely that — “It is not possible to signify *Brahman* by means of any *Shabda* or word whatsoever” — will have to be given up or discarded. Thus, how can we trust, believe this *Brahmavada* (theory pertaining to the Reality of *Brahman*) which is self-contradictory?”

Here the *Siddhaanta* or genuine spiritual teaching is that *Brahman* is not at all an object signified by any word whatsoever. For, in our workaday world too words like bullock, horse etc. by way of indicating species, words like cook, reader etc. by way of indicating the action involved, words like white, black etc. by way of indicating the quality or *Guna*, words like rich man, dairy owner etc. by way of indicating their respective relationships or possessions — all such words indicate or signify their respective objects or phenomena. But pertaining to *Brahman*, because there are no causes or pretexts like species, actions, *Gunas* etc. prompting the functioning or usage of words, *Brahman* is not an object for any word whatsoever. In fact, because *Brahman* is non-dual, unobjectifiable and the very essence of Being of everything — It cannot ever become an object indicated by any word whatsoever. Even the words like *Brahman*, *Atman* etc. cannot, in the ultimate analysis, signify *Brahman*, the metaphysical Absolute Reality. Even so, we must understand or discern that, by using the axiom of superimposition and rescission (i.e. *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaya*), the scriptures adopt some certain names, forms and functions by way of superimposition alone and utilize words like *Vijnaana*, *Aananda*, *Vijnaanaghana*, *Brahman*, *Atman* etc. to indicate *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality. By calling *Brahman* “*Satyam*” or real, the *Upanishads* have the prime purport of instructing the seekers that “It is not false”; by calling It “*Jnaanam*” (Consciousness) they propose to instruct that — “It is not *Jada* (insentient or inert)”. In the same manner, the word “*Brahman*”

is useful in indicating that the Ultimate Reality is not “*Alpa*” or small; but that word is not used to indicate or signify that in the Ultimate Reality “*Brahmatwa*” or “*Brahmanhood*” exists in the form of a *Dharma* or special feature, nature or quality. The word “*Atman*”, which signifies the *Pratyagatman* or the indwelling self endowed with a body, is itself utilized in accordance with the meaning connoted by the grammatical root (*Dhaatu*) to signify an entity or Reality beyond the body, the mind, the senses etc. The connotation of the word “*Atman*” in Sanskrit is: “That which is all-pervasive, that which grasps or assimilates everything, that which consumes or destroys everything, that which exists eternally”. It should, therefore, be discerned that this word “*Atman*” which is the nomenclature of the self (i.e. not-self) endowed with a body is utilized by the scriptures to teach “*Atman*” or the Self, of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss (i.e. the Absolute, Ultimate Reality which is non-dual, beyond time-space-causation categories) beyond the ken or purview of any word or nomenclature, as also the truth that He is not “*Anaatman*” or not-self. In the same manner, although in reality (i.e. in the ultimate analysis) *Brahman* is not an object or phenomenon capable of being indicated or signified by any word or nomenclature whatsoever, by virtue of the axiomatic *Adhyaaroopa* or deliberate superimposition *Brahman* can be invariably indicated by certain words indeed. Therefore, there is no cause or room for the doubt or objection of the type — “If *Brahman* is not the object for any sentence (*Vaachya*), then there cannot be any scriptural sentence pertaining to *Brahman*.”

14. G. Bh. 13-12. p. 530, 531.

15. Br. Bh. 2-3-6. p. 346.

16. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 11, 12.

17. Ait. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 20.

18. Ka. Bh. 2-1-1. p. 171.

19. Ch. Bh. 7-1-3. p. 508.

67. Now yet another doubt raises its head: “In the *Brahma Vaachya* or sentence pertaining to *Brahman* any one particular word necessarily should directly signify *Brahman*. Otherwise, there is no scope whatsoever for us to know *Brahman*’s essential nature from the sentence. If it is argued that in the sentence each one of the words signify *Brahman*, then the question — ‘When one single word is sufficient for the purpose, why at all is there any need for a sentence which is nothing but a form of a bunch or congregation of many words?’ will arise. Besides, a sentence should necessarily indicate the relationship that exists among various objects or things; is it not?”

If we deliberate upon, with deep insight, on this matter then it will be evident that an answer has already been provided in the above consideration regarding words. Even so, for the sake of examining clearly the nature of a sentence we will explain it in some detail. In the main, the sentences pertaining to *Brahman* are of two kinds. Some

sentences are of the type — “*Satyam Jnaanamantam Brahma*” — and are called *Laxana Vaakyas* or sentences which signify the essential nature of *Brahman*, the Absolute Reality. Sentences like — “*Tattwamasi*”, meaning “That thou art” — etc. are those which indicate or teach that our *Atman* is, in the absolute sense or from *Paramaarth* *Dristhi*, *Brahman* alone beyond all empirical dealings or categories.

In the first category of *Laxana Vaakyas* the special characteristics that are mentioned are not used in a predominant sense with the meanings connoted by them; therefore, *Brahman*, which is *Satyam* or real, purports to mean that *Brahman* is not *Asatya Brahman* or unreal *Brahman*; *Brahman*, of the nature of *Jnaanam*, purports to mean *Brahman* which is not of the nature of *Ajnaana* or ignorance; *Ananta Brahman* or endless, eternal *Brahman* purports to mean that *Brahman* which is not having any end or destruction. In this manner, these special features are not utilized to signify *Brahman* contrasting or separating It from another *Brahman*. In truth, *Brahman* is one and one only; there are not many *Brahmans* at all. Therefore, there is no necessity also of utilizing any special features or characteristics in order to distinguish or separate *Brahman* from another *Brahman* belonging to the same species (*Sajateeya Brahman*). “That which is *Satyam* or real is *Brahman*, that which is *Jnaanam* or conscious is *Brahman*, that which is *Anantam* or endless is *Brahman*” — this alone is the meaning or purport of the special features (being used in the sentence). The words like *Satyam*, *Jnaanam*, *Anantam* have not been used to signify any *Dharmas* or qualities like *Satyam*, *Jnaanam* and *Anantam*; in truth, those words teach *Brahman* in the manner — “*Brahman* is not *Anrita* or unreal; is not *Achetana* or insentient, inert; is not *Parichhinna* or divisible, partible” — through the method of negating the special features of the type of *Anritatwa* (unreality), *Achetanatwa* (insentience) etc. alone. Therefore, the spiritual teaching implicit here is that not a single word used in the *Laxana Vaakya* directly signifies *Brahman*. Because the words like *Satyam*, *Jnaanam* etc. are used one by the side of another, they imply that their *Vaachyaartha* or literary meaning should not be taken. For, by saying that — “*Brahman* is real or *Satyam*” — it is meant that It is not an unreal or a false effect. In that case, the doubt that — “It may be a cause like clay etc. which is inert or insentient” — is removed by the usage of the word “*Jnaanam*”. Because *Brahman* is *Jnaanam* or conscious, the doubt that — “*Brahman* may be born like the consciousness or knowledge of *Ghata* or earthen pot, and then in due course may get destroyed” — is removed by the word “*Anantam*” or endless, eternal. Because *Brahman*, being the essential nature itself of *Vijnaatru* or the knower, is eternally or perennially established, It is not an intellectual or mental concept (*Buddhi Vritti*), which is signified by the word “*Jnaana*” or knowledge; because *Brahman* does not have any special features or characteristics

whatsoever It is not an empirical phenomenon signified by the word “*Satyam*” or reality which connotes the empirical reality commonly understood by all people. In this manner, because these words like *Satyam*, *Jnaanam*, *Anantam* etc. conjointly help reject their respective literary meanings and become useful in signifying *Brahman*, which is verily our essential nature of Pure, Absolute, Transcendental Being-Consciousness-Bliss, through *Laxana* or implication, in a subtle sense, it becomes necessary for all such words to be there in a *Laxana Vaakyam* or scriptural sentence implying, subtly pointing out or signifying, *Brahman*. Further, the fact that, unlike a statement of the type — “*Neelam Utpalam*” — meaning, “A blue lotus or water-lily”, the *Laxana Vaakyam* does not signify the association or relationship among the various things or objects is established and for this reason the restriction or rule that a sentence should necessarily indicate the relationship among things or objects does not hold good; it is not proper to insist like that.

Now, let us examine the sentence — “*Tattvamasī*” meaning “That thou art” — of the second category. Here in this sentence the Sanskrit word “*Tat*”, meaning “That”, signifies that entity or Reality called *Brahman*, which is of the very essence of Intuitive experience devoid of any qualities or characteristics of *Samsara*. The word “*Twam*”, meaning “Thou” or “You”, signifies the *Chaitanya* or Pure Consciousness-Bliss which is our *Atman* or Self, the indweller innate in us, who is distinct, separate from the body, *Praana* or vital force, the mind, the intellect and *Ahamkaara* or the ‘I’ sense, ego. Because these two words are used in the scriptures together alone, their identity becomes evident. Otherwise, it would have amounted to saying that these words, viz. “*Tat*” and “*Twam*”, signify their respective literary meanings alone. In the sentence — “The horse is black” — the word “horse” gives up, or does not take into the reckoning, all the horses other than black-coloured horses and the word “Black” gives up, or does not take into the reckoning, all the objects or things which are not horses, and these implications are made possible by the proximity of the two words; in fact, from the sentence the knowledge with the meaning or purport of — “A black horse” — is engendered because of the knowledge of these two things separately or distinctly. In the same way, from the usage of the words “*Tat*” and “*Twam*” syntactically in proximity the Intuitive knowledge mentioned above is engendered and the listener (i.e. seeker) discerns the meaning of the word “*Tat*” to be his *Atman* or Self alone, as also the meaning of the word “*Twam*” to be *Brahman*, the metaphysical Absolute Reality, devoid of all misery, and by the usage of the verb “*Asī*”, meaning “art or are”(indicating the present tense and with the meaning “at present” in addition), the listener or seeker attains the cognitive or Intuitive Knowledge of the entity purported to be denoted by the sentence called (in *Vedantic* parlance) *Brahmaatma Ekatva Jnaana*

or the unitary or non-dual Intuitive Knowledge or cognition of the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman*, just as one becomes aware of and realizes the truth (getting rid of his folly or delusion) when he was told — “That tenth person is yourself”. For this reason, the scriptural sentence signifies the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman* without indicating the literary meaning of the form or nature of union or association (*Samsarga*) of various objects or empirical things. (The word “*Samsarga*” connotes two things being associated or united intimately). Therefore, in this context too all the various words have necessarily to be there in a sentence.

20. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. p. 291.

23. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. p. 297.

21. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. p. 291.

24. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. pp. 297, 298.

22. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. pp. 290, 291,
292, 293, 294.

25. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. p. 816.

68. Some people have raised the doubt that — “Each and every word in the scriptural sentence signifies *Brahman* through *Laksana*, i.e. in a subtle sense, alone is not realized in our workaday world. For example, in the sentence — ‘The village lies on river *Ganga*’ — the word ‘*Ganga*’ or ‘*Ganges*’ indicates by *Laksana* the bank of the said river. Even while communicating in this way there exists another word which is the name used for or which connotes the ‘bank’ of a river. But when there is no word whatsoever which is *Vaachaka* or name which signifies or connotes *Brahman*, how at all can any word signify *Brahman* even through *Laksana*, i.e. by way of implication or in a subtle sense?”

But for those people who keep in mind the Vedantic teaching that statements like — “*Brahman* is *Vaachya*”; “*Brahman* is *Laxya*” — (meaning, ‘*Brahman* is that object indicated by a word or a sentence’ and ‘*Brahman* is that entity signified by implication or in a subtle sense’, respectively) are made only from the viewpoint of superimposition (*Adhyaaroopa*), this doubt cannot present any difficulty whatsoever. The statement that — “*Brahman* is *Vaachya* or the object literally signified by such and such a word” — is meant only to instruct in the manner — “That *Vaachaka Shabda* or word literally used as *Brahman* cannot possibly signify the metaphysical entity *Brahman*.” The statement that — “That *Brahman* (named) is signified through *Laksana* or implicitly by words like *Satyam*, *Jnaanam* etc.” — is only to instruct by negation in the manner — “Neither is *Brahman* *Vaachya*, i.e. not an object which can be indicated literally by either a word or a sentence”. In fact, a word — whether it operates either by way of a name (*Abidhaa Vritti*) or by way of implied meaning (*Laksana Vritti*) — invariably signifies any one particular thing or object, which exists in the empirical world of duality with distinctions and which is capable of being an object or phenomenon for the mind and speech but other than

Atman; however, a word cannot at all signify the non-dual, metaphysical or Absolute *Atman* who is the “*Vishayi*” or the subjective Witnessing Principle in everyone. For that reason alone, the scriptures teach that — “*Brahman* is not an object at all either for any *Vaak* or speech (word) or *Manah* or the mind” — (which means, *Brahman* is the Absolute Intuitive experience, Pure Consciousness beyond the ken or purview of either the senses or the mind).

26. Up. Sa. 18-170 to 172.
pp. 254, 255.

27. G. Bh. 13-12. p. 531.

69. It is also the opinion of some people that — “The grammatical relation of words comprising a sentence invariably lies in indicating an action-oriented ritual alone; if there is no ritual stipulated (in the manner of an injunction) the words do not at all become a composite sentence.” If there is a ritual which can be practised or put into action, then the objects (mentioned as necessary accessories while performing rituals, rites etc.) become relevant as aids or accessories; the sentence too becomes a valid means or authoritative source. Otherwise, even if hundred words are conjoined in the manner — “This from that like this” — it does not become a composite (meaningful) sentence. Therefore, necessarily in a sentence there must be verbs like — “should be done”, “such and such a thing has to be done”, “such and such a thing has per force to be done”. Merely if there are words like *Paramaatman*, *Ishwara* etc. it does not become a sentence, nor does it become a *Pramaana*. If *Paramaatman* and *Ishwara* etc. are the meanings or phenomena signified by those words, then also, because they too have necessarily to become perceptible to some other valid means, the (scriptural) sentence becomes futile or purposeless. This is the rationale of these theorists or proponents.

This especially is not proper or reasonable at all. For, both in our workaday world or empirical transactions and in the scriptures there are many sentences being used which culminate (or exhaust their purport) in merely indicating the object. For example — “*Choadanaalaxanoa(s)rthoa Dharmaha*” — this aphorism of Jaimini (which if transliterated reads — “*Dharma* — the meaning of ritualistic features or characteristics” — without any usage of a predicate) is not in agreement with any *Kaarya Kriya* or action done or ritual performed; it merely states or defines the characteristics of *Dharma*, that is all. In the same manner, “*Sadeva Soamyedamagra Aaseedekameva Adviteeyam*” — (*Chhaandogya* 7-2-1) — meaning, “Oh son, this (i.e. the manifested world before us) in the past or beginning (i.e. before the creation) existed as the non-dual *Sat* or Reality (i.e. *Brahman*, alone); when it is quite evident or established to be a fact that the words used in all such scriptural sentences invariably become relevant and

meaningful in signifying the essential nature of *Brahman* alone, it is not reasonable or justifiable to imagine or conjecture that a sentence should necessarily signify the stipulatory injunctions pertaining to certain action-bound rituals. Even if we accept the stand that there should necessarily be a verb, predicate in a sentence, there is no room or cause for a rule of law laying down the condition that — “There should be necessarily a predicate which stipulates by way of injunctions any particular duties or rites.” Just as in the sentence — “*Asti Merurvachatushtayoapetaha*” — meaning, “There exists a mountain called *Meru* having four colours” — there is no objection against adding or assuming a predicate of the type — “*Asti*” or “exists”. In scriptural sentences like — “*Tattwamasi*” — (*Chhaandogya* 6-8-7) “*Aham Brahmaasmi*” — (*Brihadaaranyaka* 1-4-10) — the words or verbs like “is”, which denote an action do exist. Some *Vedic* sentences signify the prohibition or condemnation of a particular action; therein, although there is no teaching of any action in the form of a duty or responsibility, there exists a sentence indeed; besides, those sentences are having validity or they are treated as authoritative scriptural dictates or stipulations alone.

28. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 21, 22.

39. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 38.

29. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. pp. 48, 49.

31. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. p. 50.

X. VAAKYAJANYA JNAANA OR KNOWLEDGE BORN OUT OF A SENTENCE

70. It is necessary now to discern the difference between the knowledge that is born out of the *Karma Kaanda* sentence and the knowledge that is born out of the *Jnaana Kaanda* sentence. The *Karma Kaanda* sentences signify *Dharma*, which is within the jurisdiction or control of the person's dealings in the empirical sphere and which, after the completion of those dealings, helps attain *Svarga* and such other *Abhyudaya* or prosperity, accruing in the future period of time, whereas the *Jnaana Kaanda* sentences signify or teach *Brahman*, which is within the control of the *Vastu* or the real entity which exists eternally and is verily *Atman* or the Self of the seeker and which gives *Mukti* or Beatitude. In another aspect also these two kinds of knowledges are totally opposed to each other. After the knowledge of the *Karma* is gained, the tasks of procuring the respective implements or accessories needed for the *Karma* and performing the *Karma* remain separately. But after the attainment of *Brahma Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge nothing remains to be done or performed; as soon as that Self-Knowledge is attained, the Intuitive experience (Pure Consciousness) of being the *Sarvaatman* or the Self or essential nature of Being of everything, who is

neither the *Kartru* or agent of action nor the *Bhoktru* or the enjoyer of the fruit of action, is at once attained. Thus because the knowledge that is born out of the *Vedanta* sentence completely sublates *Ajnaana* or ignorance and produces supreme satisfaction or blissful contentment, those people who have this Self-Knowledge are called wise people, *Krita Krityas*, i.e. people who have achieved all that is to be achieved in life (in other words, those who have fulfilled the prime purport of human existence or who have attained the ultimate goal of life) in the *Bhagavadgeeta*.

1. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 8.

4. G. Bh. 2-21. p. 66.

2. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 17.

5. G. 15-20. p. 613.

3. Mu. Up. 1-1-6. p. 88.

71. In the *Jnaana Kaanda* too there exist a few *Vidhi Vaakyas* or sentences of injunctions. They do not become relevant to or fully in agreement with *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality. Those sentences stipulate *Upaasanas* or meditations of the form or nature of — *Saamoapaasana*, *Omkaara Upaasana*, *Samhita Upaasana*, *Brahma Upaasana* etc. We have already refuted the objection that — “The scriptural sentences which signify or teach the *Brahma Swaroopa* are subordinate to the sentences which teach *Brahma Upaasana*” — for the following reasons: 1. The *Brahma Vaakya* culminates in cognizing the Absolute non-dual Reality of *Brahman* (i.e. it helps attain the Intuitive experience of *Atman*); 2. In that *Brahman* there is no scope for any stipulation or injunction whatsoever (section 65); 3. The unitary or non-dual *Jnaana* or Intuitive experience that accrues from the scriptural (*Upanishadic*) sentences signifying the very essence of *Brahman* completely sublates or falsifies the knowledge of all duality (section 64); 4. The sentences like — “*Drishtavyaha*, *Shroatavyaha*, *Anveshtavyaha*” — etc. which are apparently like the injunctions but existing in a chapter devoted to teaching the essential nature of *Brahman*, in truth, do not teach *Upaasanas* but have the genuine purport of making or inducing the mind of the *Jijnaasu* or seeker to recede, turn away from *Anaatman* or not-Self and towards his own *Atman* — (section 65). Thus it has been conclusively proved, established that the *Brahma Vaakyas* are not at all subordinate to anything other than itself. If the Entity which is signified in the scriptural statement — “*Brahman* must be known or cognized” — is stated to be subordinate to some other duty or stipulated action, then it has to be accepted that by means of that particular duty or stipulated action one can attain *Moaksha* or Emancipation; then in that event, it amounts to saying that — “Among the various fruits of action themselves, which are different in their degrees or gradations from one another, this *Moaksha* too becomes one of them, and thereby it becomes *Anitya* or non-eternal.” This is not proper. Because the *Upaasana Vaakyas* are invariably concerning

actions of meditating, they cannot, by any means, become the predominant valid means to determine or establish the essential nature of *Brahman*, the Absolute Reality. In fact, they must be interpreted in such a manner that they do not contradict or oppose the purport of the predominant sentences which exist in the scriptures exclusively to signify or teach the essential nature of *Brahman* alone. On the other hand, any attempt especially to interpret the *Brahma Vaakyas* so as to be in agreement or in consonance with *Upaasana Vaakyas*, which are not to be found in the *Jnaana Prakarana* or chapter devoted to *Jnaana*, is not at all proper or reasonable. For this reason alone, the true seeker should discern that — “The sentences which signify that in *Brahman* there does not exist any special characteristic whatsoever are those which exclusively teach the essential nature of *Brahman*; further, although the remaining scriptural sentences have accepted certain special features, qualities or characteristics in *Brahman* purely from the viewpoint of *Adhyaaroopa* or superimposition, on that count there does not exist any danger or difficulty posed to the validity of the Absolute Being-Consciousness of *Brahman*.”

6. Su. Bh. 3-2-14. p. 612.

8. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 130.

7. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 28.

72. Some people argue out in the manner — “Merely by listening to the scriptural sentences no one has the chance of getting *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge. For, in the scriptures themselves it has been stated that there are many people who even after listening to the *Vedantic* sentences have not been able to get *Jnaana* (*Katha* 1-2-7). There is a convention of the *Vedantins* arguing in the manner that by listening to a sentence of the type — ‘This is not a snake, it is a rope’ — a knowledge which is capable of sublating, removing the fear or anxiety caused by misconception or delusion accrues and this is seen in the workaday world. But in the illustrated (*Daarshtraantika*), i.e. in the case of Self-Knowledge, that is not realized in that manner. Because it has been mentioned in the *Shrutis* themselves that after listening to the scriptural sentences the seeker should practise *Manana* or discrimination and *Nididhyaasana* or contemplation also, it has to be accepted that merely by listening to the scriptural sentences *Brahmaatma Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge) cannot be attained. Besides, no one can attempt either to attain Self-Knowledge or to listen to the scriptural sentences without the aid of the *Vidhis* or injunctions mentioned in the scriptures themselves. Therefore, for attaining Self-Knowledge a particular promoting or motivating means is quite necessary; the contention that — ‘Merely a *Vedantic* sentence which is of the nature of teaching or expounding the Reality is enough for attaining Self-Knowledge’ — is not proper.”

But when by virtue of listening to the scriptural sentence expounding the essential nature of *Atman* one actually attains *Jnaana*, to say or insist that for attaining Self-Knowledge *Vidhis* are necessary is never justifiable or proper. Those people who say or argue that for listening to the scriptural sentences there is a necessity of a *Vidhi* will be confronted by the defect of 'absence of reaching a finality' because they will have per force to imagine or postulate another *Vidhi Vaakya* for the listening to the earlier *Vidhi Vaakya* and so on. Apart from this, in the case of *Anaatman* or not-self it may be necessary for a *Pravartaka Pramaana* or promoting means to attain the knowledge of that entity or object other than oneself. But to say that there is a necessity for a *Pravartaka Pramaana* for the knowledge about oneself is never reasonable or justifiable. Just like *Shravana* or listening, the other two disciplines of *Manana* or ratiocination and *Nididhyaasana* or contemplation too have been taught for attaining Self-Knowledge (*Aatma Jnaana*) alone and not for involving the Self in any other duty or ritual remaining after the attainment of Self-Knowledge. The scriptural sentences found in the *Brahma Prakarana* or Chapter devoted for expounding the essential nature of *Brahman* of the type — "*Atman* should be seen; He should be listened to" — etc. are, in truth, not having the ultimate purport of stipulating by way of injunctions any *Jnaana* or knowledge whatsoever; they merely alert the seeker or beckon him to pay attention in the manner — "One should make an attempt to see (*Atman*), listen to (*Atman*), one should divert his attention towards Him (*Atman*)." Even in our day-to-day dealings words like — "Look", "Listen" — have only so much meaning, that is all. Therefore, in the *Vedic* literature too to reckon the same meanings will be quite in order and proper. Hence, the knowledges that accrue from *Shravana*, *Manana* etc. are not injunctions at all. To say that by listening to the *Brahma Vaakya* one does not attain *Jnaana* (Intuitive experience) is a statement smacking of bravado. The scriptural statement — "Even after listening to the scriptural sentences many people do not know or cognize (the Reality of *Atman*)" — has the genuine purport of saying that *Atman* can be known or cognized only after a great deal of strenuous effort. For, in the same context it has been further clarified that — "That person who expounds the essential nature of *Atman* is himself a wonderful person (i.e. such people are very few); one who understands or cognizes that Reality is himself a wise man". To the question (posed by the *Vedantins*) that — "Just as for the sentences found in the *Karma Kaanda* the knowledge to the effect that — 'There exist *Dharma* and *Adharma* and that the *Jeevaatman* or soul who is a *Kartu* has relationships with other worlds where he gets new bodies (in other words, he has a transmigratory existence)' — is obtained, in the same way for the sentences found in the *Jnaana Kaanda* why should not the knowledge to the effect that — "The same *Atman* is *Avikriya* or devoid of

all changes, mutations, *Akartru* or not an agent of any action whatsoever, *Eka* or non-dual entity' — etc. be attained — the *Karmavaadins* or proponents of *Karma* theory cannot at all give a satisfactory answer. Because *Vaakyatwa* or the abstract phenomenon of being a sentence is common to both the *Jnaana Kaanda* and the *Karma Kaanda Vaakyas*, both kinds of sentences should necessarily give rise to knowledge (of their respective subject-matter). Further, because both are *Shaastra Vaakyas* or scriptural sentences, the knowledges that accrue from both kinds of sentences must necessarily be substantive or tangible also; for example, just like the results of Knowledge of rituals like *Darshapooma Maasa* etc. which are not perceptible to the empirical valid means like perception, inference etc. — the fruits of the Intuitive Knowledge of the essential nature of *Paramaatman* or the Supreme Self also must necessarily be substantive or tangible (*Yataartha*). In this regard there is no scope to show any difference whatsoever between *Karma Kaanda* and *Jnaana Kaanda Vaakyas*.

9. G. Bh. 2-69. p. 117.

11. Su. Bh. 3-2-20. p. 622.

10. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 43.

12. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. p. 47.

73. Even though many people have accepted that from the *Vedanta Vaakyas* (*Jnaana* sentences) *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge accrues, they have not approved of the fact that *Jnaana* is verily the Intuitive Knowledge of the Supreme Self which is propounded in *Shaankara Vedanta* as explained or elucidated in his extant *Bhaashyas*. It is the opinion of the *Meemaamsakas* that those scriptural sentences have the real purport of stating, signifying that Knowledge of *Atman* who is the agent of action (*Kartru*) for the *Karmas* as a means of discipline to attain *Puruushaartha* (i.e. the goal of human existence or life) and so it is proper to reckon them to be *Arthavaada* or of secondary importance subordinate to the *Karmas* stipulated in the scriptures. Their opinion is: "In *Vedantas* (*Upanishads*) there are several episodes like — 'the story of Maitreyi-Yajnavalkya', 'The story of Pratardana', 'the story of Jaanashruti' etc.; because of the fact that from the mere knowledge of a story there does not accrue any benefit or advantage, these episodes should be utilized for the purpose of *Kathhaakhyana* or narrating an old legendary story, as stipulated as an injunction in the scriptures, to a King who is in the company of children, his ministerial staff or other companions on the occasion of his performing the *Ashwamedhayajna* by way of '*Paariplava*' or a mere mental recreation."

These opinions especially are not at all proper, justifiable. For, we have already stated in section 65 that the *Paramaatma Vijnana* or the Intuitive Knowledge of the Supreme Self which can be known from the *Upanishads* exclusively can never be subordinate or secondary (in its importance or magnitude) to any *Karma* or ritual. This *Atman* is not

of the essential nature of mere *Kartru* and *Bhoktru* ; the *Vedanta Vaakyas* or *Vedantic*, *Upanishadic* sentences signify *Paramaatman* who is devoid of any characteristics or qualities of transmigratory life like *Kartrutwa*, *Bhoktrutwa* etc. By the virtue of that *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge *Karmas* stipulated in the *Shaastras* are themselves destroyed. Thus because they teach quite independently and in their own right the essential nature of the Supreme Self, it is not possible to say or dismiss these scriptural sentences as *Arthavaada*. Even in case we accept them to be *Arthavaada*, because that *Jnaana* or Intuitive Knowledge of the Self born out of those scriptural sentences does not either signify any entity or object perceptible and because that *Jnaana* does not denote or connote any meaning which is opposed to, or contradictory to, any other valid means, we have to per force accept that those scriptural sentences teach invariably the essential nature of an Entity which really exists.

The episodes like 'Maitreyi-Yaajnavalkya story' etc. are not mere stories; there is no evidence or valid means to show that they should be utilized in *Yajnas* as *Paariplava* or sport, recreation. Besides, particular stories alone like Manu's stories etc. are especially stipulated to be utilized for *Paariplava*, and to this effect are specific injunctions stipulated also. Therefore, with regard to the stories mentioned or referred to in the present context it is proper to reckon or discern that according to the Chapter or *Prakarana* devoted to a particular *Vidya* the respective stories have been utilized as introductions to the respective *Vidya* alone. It is also possible to refer and reconcile them in that manner. Hence, to say or insist that the Self-Knowledge (*Jnaana*) that is produced by the *Vedanta Vaakyas* or *Upanishadic* sentences pertaining to the essential nature of *Brahman* or *Atman* is subordinate, subservient to the knowledge of *Karmas* (rituals) there is not even an iota of scope or room.

13. Su. Bh. 3-4-8. pp. 763, 764.

16. Su. Bh. 3-4-23. p. 781.

14. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. p. 49.

17. Su. Bh. 3-4-24. p. 781.

15. Su. Bh. 1-3-33. pp. 226, 227.

74. Some disputants during the time of Shri Shankaraachaarya were of the opinion: "Even if it is accepted that by means of *Vedanta Vaakyas* describing the essential nature of *Brahman* or *Atman* the Knowledge of the Supreme Self (*Paramaatman*) is attained, in the ordinary course the knowledge which accrues from a sentence is *Paroaksha* or extroverted, objective in its aspect (i.e. the knowledge is that of an object or phenomenon external to us). Because the perceptual knowledge of the type — 'I am a *Samsaaree* or a transmigratory soul' — which is deep-rooted as a latent impression in our minds from time immemorial, is stronger than the knowledge accruing from listening to the *Upanishadic*

sentence, the latter, i.e. *Vaakyajanya Jnaana* or the knowledge accruing from listening to a *Vedanta Vaakya*, gets falsified, cancelled. Therefore, till the Knowledge that — ‘I am *Paramaatman* who is *Akartru* (not an agent of action) and *Abhoktru* (not an enjoyer)’ — is firmly rooted, established in us we should practise this form of getting that *Jnaana*, called ‘*Prasankhyaana*’, repeatedly.”

Some others have even argued in the manner — “Because sentences invariably signify the association or relationship among various objects or things, by means of such sentences the Intuitive knowledge of the Self, called ‘*Aparoaksha Jnaana*’, can never be attained directly; if that *Vaakyajanya* knowledge is practised repeatedly, in the end the knowledge of *Akhandaatman* or immutable Self, devoid of any relationship with any other thing whatsoever, is attained. Even if a knowledge of conviction is obtained by means of a sentence, the false illusory knowledge may persistently continue to exist; just as in spite of our conviction that jaggery is sweet, because of the after-effects of a disease, it may taste as if it is bitter, when *Samsaaritva* (transmigratory nature of the soul or *Jeeva*) is appearing to be stronger, then in order to overcome that, or to remove that, it is quite necessary to practise repeatedly the *Tattwaabhyasa* or the knowledge of the Self.”

None of these theories is acceptable to Shri Shankara. There is no rule of law whatsoever that from a sentence knowledge of an external object alone should accrue. The story of the tenth man itself is an illustration for this. Ten deluded people were having a misconception that somehow one among them had disappeared. They had reckoned, having counted nine others without each counting himself, that — “We are only nine people”. A passerby who saw these people grieving that they had lost the tenth man, addressed each one of them in the manner — “You yourself are the (missing) tenth man” and taught them (i.e. removed their misconception). Then to each one of them the knowledge or cognition to the effect — “I myself *am* the tenth (missing) man” — dawned. **In the same way, to the ignorant people who, having been captivated by desires, are perceiving the *Anaatman* or not-selves alone, by means of the *Vedanta Vaakya* of the type — “*Tattwamasi*” meaning “That thou art” — i.e. you are verily that Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Brahman*, the Intuitive Knowledge or cognition of the type — “I myself *am Brahman* or the Ultimate Reality” — can possibly accrue directly culminating in this Intuitive experience here and now (*Aparoaksha Jnaana*).**

In the *Upanishad* (viz. *Chhaandogya*) it is mentioned that that kind of Intuitive experience was attained by Shwetuketu and even in these modern times too that Self-Knowledge is attained by the qualified people all right. The argument that — “By means of *Jnaana* caused by a sentence the misconception of the type — ‘I am *Abrahman* (i.e. not being

the Reality of *Brahman*) or I am verily *Anaatman* (i.e. the not-self) — does not get sublated or falsified” — also is not reasonable; for, the scriptural sentences like — “*Tattwamasi*” (That thou art) and “*Neti, Neti*” (Not this, not that) — etc. clearly signify the identity or unity of *Brahman* and *Atman* alone . The statement that — “A sentence is falsified by perceptual knowledge” — will be proper in the context of matters objectifiable by the valid means of perception (*Pratyaksha Pramaana*). For example, in the sentence — “*Krishnalaan Shrapayet*” — it has been stipulated as an injunction that bits of a metal called ‘*Krishnala*’ should be baked; but because it is established in our perceptual knowledge that any metal cannot be possibly baked so as to make it soft, we have per force to interpret that sentence to mean that those metal pieces have to be baked in that manner in order to impart a particular invisible effect or special characteristic (*Samskaara*) to them. But the fact that — “*Atman* is a *Samsaaree*” — is not established on the strength of any perceptual knowledge; for, *Atman* is not an object for perception at all (section 56).

Therefore, it may be plausible that by means of the *Shaastra Vaakyas* of the type — “*Tattwamasi*” — the *Samsaaritwa* of *Atman*, which appears to be (i.e. apparently) true to perception, may be sublated. However, it is not proper to doubt, even after the non-dual (i.e. unitary) Intuitive Knowledge (or experience) is attained by means of the scriptural sentences, in the manner that the *Samsaaritwa* may reappear, just as in the case of the jaggery tasting as if to be bitter as a result of the ill effect of high temperature; for, when the non-dual, unitary Knowledge dawns there does not exist any second object or thing at all and hence, unlike in the example that there is an ill effect of the experience of high temperature, after the unitary, non-dual Intuitive Knowledge of the Self is attained there does not exist any other phenomenon or thing whatsoever which can possibly falsify or vitiate this Intuitive experience.

Therefore, the advice to practise (repeatedly) the *Vaakyayukti* or the devices signified by the scriptural sentences is only for the sake of discrimination about the *Padaartha* or the existing Entity, and not to practise over and over again even after the Intuitive Knowledge of the Reality is grasped through the meaning of the scriptural sentences. For the scriptural sentence — “*Vijnaaya Prajnaam Kurveeta*” — (*Brihadaraanyaka* 4-4-21), meaning, “After knowing, attain the Intuitive experience ” — the interpretation is not that the seeker, after understanding the literary meaning of the sentence, should by means of practising repeatedly attain the *Saakshaatkaara Jnaana* (perceptual knowledge of the materialization) of what is called “*Anubhava*” or “Intuitive experience”. Even after the Intuitive experience is attained — because the *Karmatraya* or the triad of *Karmas* may function extrovertedly as a result of their being under the influence of inertia

or momentum of *Praarabdha Karma* (fruits of past actions which have ripened in the present life), just like an arrow which is already released from the bow and is traversing its course or path — the seeker should stabilize the sublime memory of the Intuitive experience as it accrues. This alone is the genuine meaning or purport of the scriptural sentence. Even this is stated from the empirical viewpoint (*Adhyaaroopa Drishti*) alone. It will be more reasonable if this scriptural sentence is interpreted in the following manner: “Because for the *Jnaani* or a Realized Soul (i.e. one who has attained Self-Knowledge) there is no need whatsoever for any scriptural injunctions to the effect that — ‘He should stabilize or establish his mind in the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* alone’ — or that — ‘He should not allow his mind to wallow in the *Anaatman* (not-self) which is *Anitya* (non-eternal), *Ashuchi* (impure) and *Duhkhakara* (causing misery)’ — the scriptural sentence stipulates for the benefit of the *Mumukshu* or the seeker of Enlightenment that he should acquire qualifications like *Sannyasa* (asceticism), *Shama* (control over the mind), *Dama* (control over the senses) etc. essential for attainment of Intuitive experience of *Atman*, and hence the scriptural sentence advises the seeker to acquire this *Vijnaana* or special Knowledge from *Shaastra* as well as *Achaarya* and thereby attain the *Prajnaa* or Intuitive experience of the Self which is really the culmination of or fulfilment of the genuine desire for Enlightenment.” It is quite evident or clear here that even after the dawn of the Intuitive Knowledge born out of the scriptural sentence which purports to signify the non-duality of *Atman* if the seeker reckons that in order to Intuit or cognize *Brahman* or *Atman* yet another *Pramaana* (medium) is needed, then that will never be justifiable or acceptable in any manner whatsoever.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 18. Up. Sa. Pr. 18. p. 256. | 24. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 135. |
| 19. Br. Up. 1-4-7. pp. 129, 130. | 25. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 131. |
| 20. Up. Sa. 18-185. p. 259. | 26. Br. Bh. 4-4-21. p. 747. |
| 21. Up. Sa. 18-189. p. 260. | 27. Ma. Bh. 7. p. 207. |
| 22. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 331, 332. | 28. Up. Sa. 18. pp. 223, 224; p. 270. |
| 23. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. pp. 816, 817. | |

75. If we consider it with complete insight we realize that it will not be proper even if it is stated that as a result of, or by means of, the *Vedanta Vaakyas* the Intuitive experience of the Self (i.e. *Atmaanubhava*) accrues or is produced. For, *Atman* Himself is perennially or eternally of the very essence of *Anubhava* or Intuitive experience; hence, there is no scope whatsoever for the special or extraordinary states of the types of — “Not having attained Intuitive experience of *Atman*” — and — “Intuitive experience of *Atman* attained afresh” — to be produced or to exist at all. Therefore, just like the cognition of the tenth man, to say that the Intuitive Knowledge or experience of *Atman* is attained afresh or anew also is not proper.

Even so, while Intuiting *Atman* as of the very essence of Intuitive experience or *Anubhava Swaroopa*, the mental concept pertaining to this Pure Consciousness when It is formed in the *Jijnaasu* or true seeker, It is 'born' appearing as the *Aatmachaitanya* or the Pure Consciousness (i.e. Intuition of the Self) alone; but that mental concept of the appearance, or rather the replica, of that Pure Consciousness is Itself transacted as or called *Aatmaanubhava* or Self-Knowledge (Self-Consciousness) in the empirical world. In our workaday world too when we say that the knowledges or perceptions of the various objects like *Shabda* (sound), *Sparsha* (touch) etc. are produced or acquired, in truth, our inner instrument of the mind (psyche) cognizes the respective external object through the means of the five senses etc. and thereby get 'transformed' into their shapes; those mental concepts of the form or nature of such transformations are also produced or born being 'objects' to the *Aatmachaitanya* or Pure Consciousness of the Self alone, as also being pervaded by that very Pure Consciousness of the Self alone. Because they appear as *Aatmachaitanya*, they are called "*Vijnaana*" or "cognitive or Intuitive Knowledge" of those respective objects. Although they are by nature the appearances of Pure Consciousness, they are not the qualities or special characteristics of *Atman*; neither is this *Atman* who is of the very essence of Pure Absolute Consciousness an object for those knowledges. For this reason alone, we have previously stated in section 67 that for the words like "*Jnaana*" (Intuitive Knowledge) or "*Anubhava*" (Intuitive experience) etc., which are the nomenclatures of the concepts, *Atman* or the Self is not *Vaachya* or the object signified or named object, but He is "*Laxya*" or the subtle or sublime purport to be Intuited only.

29. Up. Sa. 12-9. p. 118.

31. Up. Sa. 18-205. p. 265.

30. Up. Sa. 18-221. p. 269.

32. Tai. Bh. 2-1-1. p.296.

76. The fact that — 'The *Jnaana* (Intuitive experience) which is gained from the *Brahma Vaakya* as found in the *Jnaana Kaanda* is by no means "*Vidheya*" or 'something enjoined or prescribed to be done' — is indeed the spiritual teaching of **Shri Shankara's Vedanta**. Wherever in the scriptural lore after the *Vaakya Jnaana* or literary meaning is gained there remains something or other that is yet to be done and the aspirations or hankerings of the type — "What is to be done next; with what means or instruments should I do it and how should I do it?" — are engendered in us, and thereafter sentences which promote or guide us to fulfil or complete those remaining duties or actions are found — in all such contexts the scriptural injunctions become necessary and valid too. But after the *Brahma Jnaana* or Intuitive experience or Knowledge of *Brahman* or *Atman* is attained by means of the scriptural sentence, no aspiration or burning desire of any kind whatsoever is engendered nor does it exist or subsist (section 51); for, by virtue of that Intuitive

Knowledge both the opposites of *Abrahmatwa* or non-reality and *Anaatmatwa* or not-selfhood are sublated. It is true that with regard to the *Upaasana Vaakyas* or sentences devoted to meditations found in the *Jnaana Kaanda* even after the intellectual knowledge of the literary meaning of the sentence is engendered something still remains to be done. But the purport of those sentences is not to teach or signify directly, or Intuitively, the essential nature of *Brahman*; we have, in fact, stated already in section 71 that they are there to teach meditations by way of injunctions alone.

Some people have believed that — “Because *Upaasanas* too, just like *Jnaana*, is a mental process only and because the scriptures call ‘*Upaasana*’ by terms like ‘*Jnaana*’, ‘*Vedana*’ etc. which are synonymous with *Jnaana* or Intuitive Knowledge, further because even *Jnaana* or Intuitive Knowledge or experience being termed ‘*Upaasana*’ is to be found in the scriptural texts — the term *Jnaana* means *Upaasana* or meditation alone and apart from, or other than, *Upaasana* there does not exist any *Vedanta Jnaana* or *Upanishadic* teaching of Intuitive Knowledge or experience whatsoever.” This is not proper. **For, *Upaasana* is *Purushatantra* as well as *Choodanaatantra***, which means, it is a *Kriya* or action which a human being (*Purusha*) can perform or give up or can do in a different manner other than the stipulated manner and further it is a rite or ritual which the scriptures can stipulate as injunctions to be performed in a particular manner alone. **But *Jnaana* or Intuitive Knowledge or experience is not *Purushatantra* like this, nor is it *Choodanaatantra*, that ritual or action which can be stipulated as an injunction; It is indeed *Vastutantra* and thereby It is Intuitive or cognitive Knowledge of the *Vastu* or Entity as It really exists born through the relevant *Pramaana* or valid means.** This *Jnaana* cannot be stipulated as an injunction by any sentence whatsoever. Even the scriptural sentences which appear as if they are stipulating *Jnaana* as injunctions become themselves blunted or innocuous just like a sword becoming blunted when it is used to smoothen a stone; for that reason alone, we have previously stated in section 65 that the scriptural words like — “*Drishtavyaha*”, “*Shroatavyaha*”, meaning, “One should see” and “One should listen to this *Atman*” — are not predominantly teaching *Vidhis* or injunctions. For all these reasons, both the *Upaasana Vaakyas* and the *Brahma Vaakyas* are not mutually connected as parts of each other; it should be discerned here that *Brahma Vaakyas* are totally different in their import and purport. This deliberation on *Upaasana* we will take up in due course in a separate independent and exclusive Chapter.

33. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 129.

34. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 132, 133.

35. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 34.

36. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 34, 35.

37. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. p. 619.

XI. SAAKSHI OR THE WITNESSING PRINCIPLE

77. Because Vedantins say that the *Vedantic* texts teach that — “*Brahman* is verily our *Atman*” — and because in the scriptural sentences like — “*Aham Brahmaasmi*”, meaning “I am *Brahman* alone” — *Atman* is called by the word ‘I’ alone, there is a possibility of the ignorant people misconceiving, or getting deluded, thinking that *Atman* is truly the object for ‘I’ notion (*Ahampratyayagamya*). Both the *Meemaamsakas* and *Taarkikas* argue out saying that *Atman* is that object signified by the ‘I’ notion alone. But although the cognition of the ‘I’ notion is engendered in us, *Chaarvaakas* (Materialists) and *Bauddhas* (Buddhists) do not accept an *Atman* apart or different from the body. It is not seen in our workaday world that in the event of a *Pratyaya* (definite cognitive knowledge) being engendered through perception etc. in the manner — “This is a pot; this is a stump of tree” — an argument being carried out between one group of people holding the view that — “This is a pot; this is a stump of tree” — and another group of people holding the opposite view of — “This is not a pot; this is not a stump of tree”. Therefore, the statement that — “*Atman* is an object perceptually for the cognitive notion of ‘I’ ” — is not proper; for, that is a subject-matter of a controversy. Basing their arguments on certain characteristics or symbolic statements made in the scriptures to the effect that — “*Atman* exists” — alone, some people like *Meemaamsakas*, *Taarkikas* etc. are under the delusion that *Atman* can be established on the strength of the empirical valid means of *Anumaana* or inference too. That is all. We have already shown in section 55 the defects that exist in the theory — “*Atman* is *Pramaanagamya* or an object for any empirical valid means”. To establish the truth of the existence of *Atman* who is related to other lives (*Janmaantara*) on the strength of empirical valid means of perception, inference etc. is never possible at all. In the *Upanishads* it has been taught that — “Apart from or other than this *Atman* who is the object for the ‘I’ notion there exists another *Atman* or Self who is ‘*Sarvasaakshi*’ or the Witnessing Principle for everything.” Neither the *Meemaamsakas* nor the *Taarkikas* know this essential nature of *Sarvasaakshitva* of *Atman*. Vedantins call this alone *Atman*, who is *Asamsaaree* or devoid of transmigratory existence and who can be known exclusively from the *Upanishads* alone (*Aupanishad Purusha*). We have previously in sections 65, 69 mentioned that the *Vedantic* statements culminate in, or have the ultimate purport of, teaching or expounding this essential nature of this Supreme Self alone.

1. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 36, 37.

2. Br. Bh. Intr. pp. 3, 4.

78. We have propounded above that — “The statement that — ‘*Atman* who is the object for the ‘I’ notion (*Ahampratyayagamya*) is

related to other worldly bodies' — is not a matter to be ascertained by perception." *Loakaayatikas* (a sect of Materialists) are saying: "What is known from this *Ahampratyaya* or 'I' notion is the body alone; apart from the body associated with consciousness there is no *Atman*." The *Vijnaanavaadins* among the the Buddhists argue in the manner: "Apart from the body there exists a '*Vijnaana*' or intelligence, which cognizes itself, and that *Vijnaana* alone is the real *Atman*."

But the statement that the body is associated or endowed with Consciousness (*Chaitanya*) is contrary to universal experience. For, *Chaitanya* is *Vishayi* or the subject, and the body, according to the *Chaarvaakas* or *Loakaayatikas*, is an object produced from four elements; it will be reasonable only to assume that *Atman*, who is the subject as well as of the nature of *Chaitanya*, is distinct from the body. To assert that an object cognizes itself is as ridiculous a statement as — "One is squatting on his own shoulders". Apart from this, if it is maintained that the body alone is the Consciousness, which cognizes everything, then the blind man cannot possibly see what he had seen previously in his dream; for, the eyes which were the instruments of sight for the body are not available; even so, the blind man asserts in his waking that what he saw in the past in his dream as a summit of the Himalaya Mountain he actually saw. Hence it should be deduced that *Atman* who appears in the dream is himself appearing in the waking too. In the same way, to assert that *Vijnaana* or empirical consciousness (i.e. intelligence) is itself both the *Vishayi* or subject and the *Vishaya* or object is contrary to *Anubhava* or universal experience. In fact, to say that — "The *Saakshi Chaitanya* or the Witnessing Consciousness or Principle, which illumines and shows *Vijnaana* when it is born and when it is destroyed or is extinct, exists apart or distinct from that *Vijnaana*" — is itself in consonance with universal experience. By the experience or enjoyment of an object *Vaasana* or its latent impression is engendered and stays put; later on, from time to time either *Smriti* (memory) or *Pratyabhijna* (recognition) will be produced, and for all these phenomena some substratum or support is invariably required. That substratum has to be necessarily either the *Pramaatru*, i.e. that 'I' notion (cognizer) related to the sphere of the triad of time, or the *Saakshi*, the Witnessing Principle (Consciousness) who is *Kootastha* (i.e. fully established, steadfast — beyond the time-space-causation categories). In the tenets of the *Kshanika Vijnaanavaadins* or the proponents of *Vijnaana* to be momentary (a sect among the Buddhists) none of these propositions has been accepted. "If it is contented that *Vijnaana* is cognized by something other than itself, then to cognize that second thing another cognizing principle will be needed and further to cognize that third thing another cognizing principle will be needed and so on. Thus there will be no end or finality to the succession of *Vijnaanas*. Besides, because the *Vijnaana* which cognizes the first

Vijnaana is invariably of the essential nature of the first *Vijnaana* alone, to imagine or conceive the distinctions or special features of one *Vijnaana* being the cognizer and the other being the cognized is not proper or reasonable; for, no one thinks or imagines that one lamp or light illumines another. Therefore, *Vijnaana* illumines itself. This alone is the reasonable argument" — thus the Buddhists argue out. But this logical dissertation is not correct; for, as we (Vedantins) say that *Saakshi* or the Witnessing Principle or Pure Consciousness is the one and only (non-dual) Entity which cognizes all *Vijnaanas* or empirical knowledges or consciousnesses, there is no necessity whatsoever for yet another *Vijnaana* to cognize It. Because, that thing which is itself (of the essence of) *Graahya*, i.e. objectifiable or an object of comprehension, that thing will invariably require or desiderate a separate *Graahaka*, i.e. subject, an objectifying or comprehending principle; logically speaking, there is no *Yukti* or logical rule or device to establish an axiom that — "That thing which is by its very nature a *Graahaka*, i.e. subject or a principle which can only be a *percepti*, does not desiderate or need another *Graahaka* or *percepti*." To say that — "Just like a lamp or light, *Vijnaana* illumines itself" — is also not correct. For, there is no meaning for a statement that — "A thing illumines itself." There is no possibility of imagining or thinking about the special circumstance like — "When the light does not illumine itself, how will it be?" Only in the case of objects or things like an earthen pot, pitcher etc. which have different states like — "One state when the illumining principle or light is near, and another state when the illumining principle or light is not in the vicinity" — can be called "*Prakaashya*" or that thing which is illumined. In that manner or sense, it is not possible to imagine or think about a light to be near itself in one particular moment of time and far off from itself in another moment of time. If it is asked — "Since the *Saakshi* or Witnessing Consciousness too needs another instrument of cognition in the form of a *Vijnaana* in order to cognize the first *Vijnaana*, does it not amount to facing the defect or anomaly of 'not reaching any finality' (for the Vedantins)?" — the answer is 'No.' For, though for the earthen pot when there is a light or lamp of the essential nature of an illumining light (nearby), then that earthen pot invariably possesses *Graahyatwa*, i.e. objectivity or the capacity of being objectified or comprehended, but to cognize or perceive the light itself another light is not at all needed; in the same way, to say or assert that — "In order to perceive or cognize one *Vijnaana* another *Vijnaana* is required" — is not a rational or proper logic.

3. Su. Bh. 3-3-54. pp. 742, 743.

4. Br. Bh. 4-3-6. p. 605.

5. Su. Bh. 2-2-21. p. 407.

6. Su. Bh. 2-2-28. pp. 421, 422.

7. Br. Bh. 4-3-7. pp. 621, 622.

8. Br. Bh. 4-3-7. p. 620.

79. It is an assiduous belief of Buddhists that between their doctrine of *Vijnaana* being *Swayamprakaasha*, i.e. of self-illuminating nature, and the Vedantins' doctrine of *Saakshi Chaitanya*, i.e. the Witnessing Consciousness of the innate nature of self-illuminating essence, there is no difference whatsoever. But this opinion is wrong. For, *Vijnaana* (i.e. empirical consciousness) has features like birth and growth whereas *Saakshi Chaitanya* is *Kootastha Nitya* or eternally steadfast or immutable and true (i.e. changeless Reality); *Vijnaana* is manifold, *Saakshi Chaitanya* is unitary, non-dual. The Buddhists say that because *Vijnaana* is like a light or lamp, it illumines itself and it is of self-illuminating nature; but we have already shown that the statement — "A light or lamp illumines itself" — has no meaning. The doctrine of Vedantins that — "Just like a light or lamp, though it illumines all other things around it, desiderates another *Vijnaana* in order to illumine or know it, *Vijnaana* too desiderates *Saakshi Chaitanya*, i.e. the Witnessing Principle or Pure Consciousness, which is quite separate from *Vijnaana*, i.e. empirical consciousness itself" — is the only teaching that is proper or reasonable.

9. Su. Bh. 2-2-28. p. 422.

10. Br. Bh. 4-3-7. pp. 620, 621.

80. "Because the Buddhists averred that *Vijnaana* is momentary, there may arise a need of assuming or anticipating that, apart from that *Vijnaana*, there should necessarily exist a *Vijnaatru* or knower of that *Vijnaana*. The *Taarkikas* and *Meemaamsakas* have accepted the *Atman*, who is the object for the 'I' notion to be steadfast or changeless and hence in their doctrine there does not seem to exist any defect. To imagine or conceive of another *Atman* other than this *Atman*, who is the *Vijnaatru* established in every one's experience, what evidence or valid means (*Pramaana*) exists? Besides, by such imagination what benefit or utility accrues at all?" — Thus some people may raise an objection.

But the *Saakshi* or Witnessing Consciousness which the Vedantins propound is to be known only from the valid or authoritative means of *Shruti*, i.e. *Upanishadic* lore. On this essential nature of *Saakshi* alone the common run of people and the *Meemaamsakas* have superimposed the *Ahampratyayagamyatwa* or the objectivity of the 'I' notion. This misconceived or superimposed form of 'I' notion is also called "*Pramaatru*". We have previously in section 28 mentioned that this *Pramaatrutwa* or nature of 'I' notion as cognizer is misconceived in, or superimposed upon, the *Saakshi Chaitanya*. **This *Atman* who is *Ahampratyayagamya* i.e. who is the substrate or support for the percept or cognition of the form of 'I' notion or sense, although a seer or perceiver, invariably cognizes, perceives the external objects through the valid means of knowledge (cognition) or *Pramaanas*; but he is not a direct perceiver like the *Saakshi*. Just like**

the Sun illumines all the objects directly (without the help of any mediatory means) *Atman*, who is the *Saakshi* in all of us, cognizes everything directly or Intuitively; the whole range of *Anaatman* or not-selves is the *Saakshya*, i.e. the witnessed object for Him. Because *Pramaatru* (i.e. the 'I' sense in us) cognizes everything through, or by the mediatory means of, *Antahkarana* or the inner instrument of cognition (i.e. the Mind in its totality), which is the *Pramaana*, and because this *Antahkarana* has per force to cognize by acquiring or assuming the form of the respective object to be cognized, the mutations or changes that occur in the *Antahkarana*, which is an adjunct, do affect the *Pramaatru* too; but *Saakshi* cognizes or Intuits all at once (spontaneously, so to speak) everything without any mutations or changes whatsoever. Because *Pramaatru* is an agent of action or *Kartru*, he performs a particular action and experiences the respective fruit of that action; but because *Saakshi* is witnessing these *Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa*, in Him (*Atman*) these two adjuncts do not exist in reality. Because *Atman* of the essence of Witnessing Consciousness is verily the core of Pure Being of all of us, it is not possible to deny His existence and this fact we have mentioned previously in section 53. We have now revealed that if we do not accept the essential nature of *Saakshi Chaitanya* or the Witnessing Pure Consciousness, it will not be possible to justify the Intuitive experience of perceiving or cognizing all the objects all at once, spontaneously, simultaneously. Not being able to separate or distinguish between the essential nature of *Saakshi* and the *Ahampratyayee* or 'I' sense (i.e. *Pramaatru*) and thereby, as a result of it, our misconceiving these two aspects, each in the other, is itself the cause for our having *Kartrutwa* i.e. agentship of all action, and *Bhoktrutwa* or enjoyership, and hence if we Intuit the essential nature of *Saakshi*, the calamity of suffering all the miseries of transmigratory life (*Samsaara Anartha*) of the nature of *Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* will invariably be destroyed and this alone is the great benefit accruing.

11. Mu. Bh. 3-1-1. pp. 144, 145.

13. Up. Sa. Pr. p. 46.

12. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 33.

14. Adh. Bh. p. 6.

81. The *Pramaatrutwa* or cognizership of *Atman* is caused by the *Adhyaasa* or superimposition of the *Dharmas* or special characteristics of the body, the senses and the mind and hence the viewpoint of this *Atman* arising out of this misconceived relationship, or contact, with the senses and the mind is *Anitya* or non-eternal. Because this viewpoint as well as the Knowledge arising out of it is non-eternal, the divisions of the type — 'a blind man' and 'a person who can see'; 'a *Jnaani*' and 'an *Ajnaani*' — have arisen. By means of the senses the special features like sound, touch, form, taste and smell are cognized (or perceived), but *Atman* or the Self, who is the Witnessing Consciousness (*Saakshi*), is of the very essence of eternal, perennial (i.e. Absolute,

plenary) Consciousness and hence He always directly Intuits (i.e. without the aid of any mediatory instruments or means) all phenomena like sound, touch etc. *Jnaatru* or the knower, *Upalabdhtru* or the procurer, *Vidwaan* or a scholar, *Jnaha* or a conscious being — all such synonymous terms are used for *Pramaatru*, i.e. the cognizer. The common people, because of their *Avidya* which is of the nature of being without any discrimination between the respective mental concept (*Buddhi Vritti*) and the *Saakshi*, transact in the manner — “*Atman* cognizes phenomena like sound, touch etc.” In the same manner, they transact that one who has carried out the discrimination between *Atman* and *Anaatman* and has attained *Vidya* or Self-Knowledge (Intuitive experience of the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*) is an “*Aatmajnaani*”. In truth, in *Atman* these non-eternal viewpoints (or cognitions) do not exist at all. He is of the very essence of eternal or Absolute Intuition; of the very essence of eternal or Absolute Consciousness and he always witnesses the non-eternal viewpoints and cognitive knowledges etc. of the *Vyaavahaaric* sphere.

15. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. pp. 158, 159.

17. G. Bh. 2-21. pp. 64, 65.

16. Ch. Bh. 8-12-5. pp. 662, 664.

18. Ch. Bh. 8-12-5. p. 665.

82. Some ancient Vedantins like *Bhartruharyan* had believed that — “In the statement — ‘*Atman*’s viewpoint as the Witnessing Consciousness is eternal’ — there is something to be examined in depth. In the *Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad*, 4-3-23 to 30, it has been stated that the viewpoint of *Atman* and the *Shruti*, i.e. *Vedic* texts, do not have any flaw or defect whatsoever. Therefore, in the *Saakshi* too special characteristics or qualities like *Drishti* or viewpoint etc. are many and though they are mutually different from one another they are one with *Atman* and so *Atman* by His own nature, unto Himself, is one and one only; but from the standpoint of His *Dharmas* or special features He is manifold.” Although cow as a genus is in itself one alone, but from the standpoint of special features like the skin hanging loose from the neck, its hump etc. its species are many; similarly, it was their opinion that both unity or oneness and manifoldness may co-exist in *Atman* Himself. *Shri Shankaraacharya* has refuted this doctrine, viz. that *Atman* is of *Naanaarasa* or of the essence of manifold natures, and has established that *Atman* is *Ekarasa* or of the essence of oneness (non-duality) and is one and one only. Although *Atman* is of the essential nature of Pure, Absolute Consciousness, by virtue of His being associated with adjuncts like eyes, ears etc. (i.e. *Drishti* or sight, *Shruti* or hearing etc.) and such other forms of manifoldness He is appearing as many in the waking and the dream. But in *Sushupti* or deep sleep when all transactions carried out in association with any adjuncts have come to a standstill we do not perceive any distinctions or differences whatsoever

of the type of sight, hearing etc.; then, He exists as Pure, Absolute Consciousness alone. Even so, in order to point out that because therein, i.e. while in deep sleep, there do not exist either any objects whatsoever, or these special cognitions like seeing, hearing etc., the *Upanishad* assumes whatever differences like seeing, hearing etc. that are available in the waking to be apparently true (by way of *Adhyaroopa* or deliberate superimposition). But the *Upanishads* do not at all have the purport thereby of teaching in such contexts that, in reality or in the absolute sense, there exist these distinctions or differences like seeing, hearing etc. in *Atman*. In our workaday world too instead of saying — “He sees with his eyes”; “He hears with his ears” — it is customary to refer to sensual perceptions like sight, hearing etc. by words like ‘experience’, ‘cognition’ or ‘knowledge’ alone in the manner — “He knows or cognizes form by means of his eyes”; “He cognizes or knows sound by means of his ears”-and so on. Just as in the example — “A clean singular marble stone in association or conjunction with adjuncts like various colours or hues appears itself to be having those very colours, and at that juncture, it cannot at all be imagined that the marble imbibes the respective colour in truth” — similarly here too we should understand that *Atman* does not in reality have manifoldness or distinctions of any kind whatsoever.

19. Br. Bh. 4-3-30. pp. 679, 680.

21. Br. Bh. 4-3-30. pp. 680, 681.

20. Up. Sa. 17-54. p. 195.

83. To believe in the manner — “There are two kinds of *Jnaana*, namely, one which is *Anitya Jnaana* or non-eternal Knowledge or Consciousness of the nature of cognizing sound, touch, form etc., found in the senses and the second which is *Nitya Jnaana* or eternal Knowledge or Consciousness, found in the *Atman* Himself, who is the Witnessing Consciousness or Principle” — is wrong. *Atman* Himself is the one who cognizes objects or phenomena like sound, touch, form etc. through the senses; or, to know that — “The *Pramaatrutwa* or cognizership, i.e. the ‘I’ notion, itself is a projection or product of *Avidya* or ignorance and hence the Intuitive cognition (*Jnaana*) of *Atman* Itself appears as the cognition of sound, touch, form etc. gained through the senses, the mind etc. which are the *Pramaanas* or valid, mediatory means” — is the correct knowledge alone. There is no proof or evidence by way of a *Pramaana* at all to show that in the senses there exists consciousness independently by itself. In fact, because all the senses are organic or material in content alone, just like objects, they too like the phenomena of sound, touch, form etc. must be known or cognized by another entity, but they cannot by themselves independently shine (or function). Just as the sound cannot illumine touch, the touch cannot illumine taste and so on, in the same way the senses too cannot

illumine one another. We have already propounded in sections 65 - 75 that — “Even the consciousness or knowledge that appears in the thoughts or concepts of the *Antahkarana* or mind is truly the brilliance of Pure, Absolute Consciousness or *Chaitanya* of the *Saakshi* (the Witnessing Consciousness); further, though that Consciousness is signified by the word *Jnaana*, in truth, that word has the *Lakshaartha* (implicit meaning) of *Atma Chaitanya* or Self-Consciousness, Pure Consciousness.” Hence, just as for the phenomenon of a piece of iron burning hot fire alone is the cause, for the senses to be functioning as senses with their respective faculties of cognizing form, sound etc. the root cause is the mind alone; further, for the mind to function as the mind (that means — the mind by virtue of its faculty of producing thoughts or concepts by illumining their respective objects) the root cause is *Saakshi Chaitanya* in all of us indeed. We must also understand or discern that by virtue of that essential nature of Pure Consciousness alone the cognitive knowledges seen both in the mind (in the form of thoughts or concepts) and the senses (in the form of percepts, sensations) appear to be separate or different cognitions or knowledges only. *Atman* illumines all of these phenomena, viz. the mind, the senses, the various external objects. There is nothing whatsoever anywhere (and at any time) which is not illumined by the Pure Consciousness of *Saakshi* in us.

22. Ch. Up. 6-7-6. p. 452.

23. Ka. Bh. 2-1-3. p. 174.

24. Up. Sa. 14-41. p. 139.

25. Ke. Bh. 1-2. p. 41.

26. Ke. Bh. 1-2. p. 42.

27. Ke. Bh. 1-2. p. 42.

28. Up. Sa. 17-35. p. 190.

84. For those people who make an attempt to determine the real essential nature of *Atman* it becomes clearly known that for *Atman* having the generality of actions like speaking, seeing, hearing, thinking etc. is not His true essence of Being. Just as the names like grain cutter, cook etc. are those epithets given to a person according to the work he performs and they do not at all signify the person's complete essence of Being, in the same way various names like a creature, speaker, seer, hearer, thinker etc. — the names that may be given to *Atman* when He is associated with such respective actions (but distinctly they are not the names which can be addressed to Him always) — are given to Him. There is an axiom like — “If one is **speaking alone** he is called a *Vaktru* or speaker; if one is speaking, then he is called a *Vaktru* or **speaker alone**.” When he is not speaking, or for instance, when he is simply seeing, he is not at all a speaker. Even so, whether any of these actions are being performed or not, the *Saakshi Chaitanya* which is the essential nature of Being of *Atman* invariably exists. Therefore, because It has pervaded all states of (physical or

mental) actions as well as all states of the absence of any kinds of actions the *Saakshi Swaroopa* or the essential nature of the Witnessing Principle in all of us alone is *Atman* or our real Self. Hence, as long as we reckon our selves to be endowed with forms or natures of the type — “I am seeing”; “I am hearing” — till then we do not at all Intuit or cognize completely our plenary essence of Pure Consciousness at all; the nature of *Pramaatru* or the cognizer is not complete or of a plenary nature. In truth, **the Saakshi Chaitanya or the Witnessing Consciousness alone, which illumines that nature of Pramaatru and which exists even when Pramaatrutwa does not exist, is our essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss** and if this truth is Intuited or cognized alone it amounts to our “Intuiting completely and truly” the real essence of our Being.

29. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 123, 124.

30. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 124, 125.

85. We will conclude this deliberation after referring to another topic. We have indeed previously stated in sections 78, 80 that if we do not acknowledge the existence of the Witnessing Consciousness, then the Intuitive experience by virtue of which every object or phenomenon can be examined or investigated cannot at all be justified or vindicated. Some people who have not properly discerned the purport behind this statement raise a doubt of the type — “In order to mark the identity of the one *Pramaatru* in the manner — ‘That ‘I’ who hears the sound, that ‘I’ alone sees the form indeed’ — one and the same *Saakshi* or Witnessing Principle is needed, is it not? Because that *Pramaatru* is separate for each body, evidently for each *Pramaatru* a separate *Saakshi* is needed. Otherwise, it can be reasoned out in the manner — ‘What *Chaitra* organized, the same thing was cognized by *Maitra* too’. For this reason, there must be, just like the manifold *Pramaatrus*, the *Jeeva Saakshis* or the Witnessing Principles in each one of the *Jeevas* also should be many.” Such is their contention or line of argument.

This opinion is not correct. For, we have previously in section 77 mentioned that *Saakshi* is to be known with the guidance of the *Upanishads* exclusively. But in *none* of the *Upanishads* the tenet of many *Saakshis* has been taught. On the other hand, in *Shwetaashwatara Upanishad* (6-11) it has been very clearly taught that one and the same *Saakshi* alone exists in all things. There is no need of inferring about the existence of *Saakshi* on the strength of a logical device or axiom of the type — “There must be one Witnessing Principle which can cognize all objects.” For, we have previously in section 53 stated that *Saakshi* is *Swayam Siddha* or self-established and further that the *Shaastras*, merely on the ground of their teaching that the special features of the *Saakshya* (the witnessed phenomena) do not exist whatsoever in the *Saakshi*, are called *Pramaanas* (the valid, authoritative sources). If at all the existence or reality of *Atman* could be

established or proved by dialectics, it will amount to saying that both those who do not accept that logical device or those who innovate a better, stronger method than that logical device to suit their conclusions may reject the existence or reality of *Atman*. **The spiritual teaching that — “Because one who attempts or undertakes either to establish or to reject the existence or reality of *Saakshi* either by *Pramaanas* or by *Tarka* is himself the Witnessing Principle for both *Pramaanas* and *Tarka*, no one can ever possibly reject or refute the existence or reality of his own Self” — is the correct one alone.** Even if for argument's sake it is assumed or accepted that *Saakshis* are many, because in order to cognize the manifoldness of their own making one singular *Saakshi* will be needed, and further because people, who accept that *Saakshis* are of the nature of being a *Saakshya*, will be contradicting themselves — the manifoldness of *Saakshis* is illogical to boot. Therefore, it should be discerned that just as for all mental thoughts of a single *Antahkarana* alone there exists one *Saakshi*, in the same way for all *Antahkaranas* there exists one unitary *Saakshi* alone; as also in that one unitary non-dual *Saakshi* alone, by virtue of the association with the *Upaadhis* or adjuncts, the empirical transaction of *Naana Pramaatrutwa* or manifold cognizership has arisen. This topic we will refer to in due course in section 140.

Now one can raise an objection of the type — “In the teaching of the unitary, non-dual existence of *Atman* how at all can a *Shaastra*, which teaches in the manner — ‘This should be done or performed; this should not be done or performed’ (with *Vidhi* or *Nishedha Vaakyas*) — be relevant or suitable? There cannot indeed be any cause or scope whatsoever to stipulate in the manner — ‘For such and such a person such and such duties are stipulated’! Besides, the fruits or results of one's actions another person would have to experience indeed. What one experiences, another person would have to cognize or realize!”

But because the *Jeeva* who is a *Pramaatru* is called a ‘*Jeeva*’ as a result of his association with adjuncts like the body, the mind and the senses, and since when the adjuncts are manifold there does not exist the unitary existence of the *Jeeva* — this objection is not valid, or in other words, this apparent defect does not affect Vedantins' teaching of non-duality. This topic too we will explain when we deliberate upon ‘*Jeeva*’ in section 128.

31. Sve. Up. (R.) 6-11. p. 746.

33. Su. Bh. 2-3-49. p. 515.

32. Up. Sa. 7-2. pp. 95, 96.

XII. ATMAN AS THE CAUSE OF THE UNIVERSE

86. Because *Brahman* is devoid of any kind of special features It cannot at all be signified by means of Its pure essential nature alone.

Just as *Brahman's Saakshitwa* (Witness-hood) is superimposed deliberately and thereby it is shown that *Brahman* has no special features or qualities of *Saakshya*, witnessedness (which signifies that *Brahman* as the subject has no relationships with any object), in the same manner the cause-ness of the universe (*Jagat Kaaranatwa*) is superimposed on *Brahman* and thereby it is shown that the form or nature of *Kaarya* or effect (the universe in this context) does not at all exist in It. *Kaarana* and *Prakriti* are synonyms, while *Kaarya*, *Vikriti*, *Vikaara* are synonyms.

Earthen pots, pitchers, plates etc., which are 'born' out of clay, subsist in the clay only and finally merge in the clay alone, do not exist apart from the clay; in the same manner, the universe, which is 'born' out of *Brahman*, subsists in *Brahman* only and merges in *Brahman* alone, does not exist apart from *Brahman*. For this reason alone, the *Shruti* is stating that — "If the one entity (reality) of clay is known or cognized, all its effects are assumed to have been known or cognized; for, the effect is merely a name mentioned for the name's sake." The scripture further states, on the strength of that illustration of the clay pots, pitchers etc., that if the one Reality of *Brahman* is known or cognized, the whole of the universe (the effect) becomes known.

1. Su Bh. 1-2-1. p. 109.

2. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 326, 327.

87. By means of enunciating the theory or methodology of the cause-ness for the universe which is mentioned in the scriptures not only the spiritual teaching that — "The universe does not exist apart from *Brahman* (the Ultimate Reality)" — is evolved, but also the subsidiary theory that doctrines like — "Insentient causes like *Pradhaana* (as propounded by *Saankhyans*), *Paramaanu* (as propounded by *Vaisheshikas*) etc. give rise to the universe" — are not proper is established. Therefore, because the universe appears to exist and because it is for empirical transactions of utility, people in general have believed it to exist in reality, and hence in order to instruct such people that — "Anything which is gross or insentient, whatever it may be, cannot ever be a cause" — the scriptures teach the theory or methodology of the cause of the universe (i.e. by way of superimposition or *Adhyaaroopa*) and not with the ultimate motive or purport of teaching that — "Really *Brahman* is an Entity having relationship or an association with empirical categories like cause and effect." But those people, who have discerned this purport of the scriptural texts clearly, have without any doubt lurking in their minds Intuited (to wit, they have gained complete conviction or a sense of certainty, which is the hallmark of Intuitive experience) to the effect that

— “That Entity or Reality, which is devoid of birth, which is non-dual and which is everyone’s *Atman* is Itself *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality.”

3. Ma. Ka. 4-42. p. 360.

4. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-42. p. 360.

88. The fact that the doctrines of those who say that — “*Pradhaana*, *Paramaanu* etc. are the cause for the universe” — are not proper can be determined both by means of the examination of the essential nature of the universe and by means of the support of the authoritative source of the *Shrutis*. This universe is diversified as names and forms; it is full of many agents of action (*Kartrus*) and enjoyers (*Bhoktrus*); it has a fully organized system with rules and regulations of the type — ‘For such and such action taking place in such and such place in such and such time and with such and such a cause — such and such fruit or result will accrue.’ No sculptor, however much intelligent he may be, cannot possibly imagine by his mind as to how this universe must have been caused by *Parameshwara* who knows its essential nature of Being, who is omniscient and who is omnipotent in that He is capable of creating all this universe, but surely it is not possible at all for such a marvellous universe to have been caused by the insentient phenomena like *Pradhaana*, *Paramaanu* or by *Abhaava* (non-existence) or by any one *Samsaaree* (transmigratory soul, *Jeeva*) who is devoid of omniscience and who is of a meagre strength or power. It cannot at all be contended that the very nature of this universe is certainly like this and that it does not at all need any cause whatsoever; for, we have mentioned already that the regularisation or systematization of time, space and causation categories is fundamental for actions and their fruits. Especially the doctrines of *Saankhyans*, *Vaisheshikas* etc. are invariably opposed to the authentic or valid source of the *Shrutis*. For, it has been very clearly stated in the scriptures that — “*Brahman* alone is the cause for the universe; *Brahman* is the Pure Consciousness which thinks (conjectures) and creates.”

5. Su. Bh. 1-1-2. p. 14.

9. Tai. Up. 1-1-1. p. 20.

6. Su. Bh. 1-1-5. p. 47.

10. Pr. Up. 6-3-4. pp. 449, 450.

7. Tai. Up. 3-1. p. 371.

11. Mu. Up. 1-1-9. p. 94.

8. Su. Bh. 1-1-5. p. 47.

89. The statement that — “The sentient *Brahman* is the material cause for the universe” — is contrary to the universal (common people’s) experience. For, a sentient pot-maker can only be an efficient cause (*Nimitta Kaarana*) for an earthen pot but not a material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) like clay. Therefore, it becomes established only to the extent that — “If at all *Brahman* is a cause for the universe, It will be merely an efficient cause” — that is all. Hence, a doubt of the type — “What is wrong in arguing in the manner — ‘Either *Pradhaana* — just

as the *Pradhaanavaadins* (*Saankhyans*) affirm — or *Paramaanu* — just as the *Vaisheshikas* assert — must be the material cause for the universe?" — may arise. According to the *Vaisheshikas*' doctrine, the cotton thread is the *Samavaayi Kaarana* or inherent cause for the cloth; the conglomeration or conjunction of the threads is the *Asamavaayi Kaarana*; and the weaver is the *Nimitta Kaarana* or efficient cause. (*Vaisheshikas* have divided 'cause' into three types, viz. *Samavaayi*, *Asamavaayi* and *Nimitta*; *Saankhyans* and *Vedantins* have included everything other than *Nimitta Kaarana* in *Upaadaana Kaarana*, i.e. material cause).

But the theory that — "*Ishwara*, the Lord Creator, is merely a *Nimitta Kaarana*" — is opposed to logic or reasoning. It is not established (determined) as to which thing is the material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) for the universe; further, to imagine or conjecture that *Ishwara* uses a particular material which is not perceptible to our valid means like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. and creates the universe, there is no valid means or (convincing) proof whatsoever. If we attempt to imagine like that from the analogy of the pot-maker, or if we attempt to imagine, on the basis of the analogy of a king, that there should be a Lord Creator for the universe, then *Ishwara* too will become, like the pot-maker or a king, a *Samsaaree* and not an omnipotent Lord Creator who can create such a wonderful universe. If we imagine the triad of entities like *Ishwara* (the Lord Creator), *Jeeva* (soul) and *Upaadaana Kaarana* (material cause), in the process of which we divide each from the other, then the defect that *Ishwara* is a mutable or partible thing will adduce itself to our reasoning. Further, because the *Shrutis* say very clearly in the manner — "*Paramaatman* or the Supreme Self thought or imagined that — 'I will become many' — and then He created the universe" — and because the scriptures also state that — "The creation and the destruction of the universe are caused (i.e. carried out) by *Brahman* alone; It by Itself created Itself" — the doctrine or theory that *Ishwara* is merely the efficient cause (*Nimitta Kaarana*) for the universe is opposed to the *Shrutis*. This doctrine of mere *Nimitta Kaarana* is refuted in the *Bhaashya* on *Pratyadhikarana* of the *Shaareeraka Meemaansaa* or *Brahma Sootras* (*Sootra Bhaashya* 12-2-37 to 41).

12. Su. Bh. 2-2-39. pp. 436, 437.

13. Su. Bh. 2-2-39-40. pp. 437, 438.

14. Su. Bh. 2-2-41. p. 438.

15. Su. Bh. 1-4-24. p. 294.

16. Su. Bh. 1-4-25. p. 294.

17. Su. Bh. 1-4-26. p. 295.

18. Sve. Up. 1-2. p. 709.

90. It may appear that the assumption — "For the universe which is full of sentient and insentient things or objects, a sentient or conscious *Brahman* is the material cause" — is opposed to logic or dialectics. For,

If the sentient can be a cause for the insentient then it amounts to saying that there may be *Vailakshanya* (contrariety) between the cause and the effect. Then in that event, it may be possible to say that from clay golden ornaments and from gold the earthen pots, pitchers etc. can be produced. If we try to infer or think in the manner — “Because it is stated in the *Shrutis* that *Brahman* is sentient (conscious), the universe too should per force be sentient or conscious” — we find that the fact of the universe having the divisions of the sentient and the insentient phenomena is quite familiar or popular. Hence, protagonists of the theory of *Pradhaana* as the cause (*Saankhyans*) etc. were saying that — “To assume or reckon that, in accordance with the nature of the universe, an insentient thing alone to be the material cause for the universe is proper.”

But the theory that there should be agreement or similarity between the features of the material cause and its effect is itself not proper. For, if there is complete similarity or identity in all respects between them, then the difference itself of the type — “This is the cause, this is the effect” — will not be there at all. Besides, in our workaday world too we have invariably seen from the human body things like hairs, nails, which are totally different in nature from it, growing or being born. If it is contended that there must necessarily be some modicum of similarity or common features, then between *Brahman* and the universe the similarity or common feature called “*Sattwa*” (existence) does exist.

The doubting Thomas may ask the question — “Because *Brahman* is *Chaitanya* (Consciousness) Itself, if the universe were born or created from It, the universe which is created should have been endowed with or associated with Consciousness of *Brahman* — in this manner why should not we infer?” But the logical or syllogistic ‘universal concomitance’ (*Vyaapti*) between the middle term (*Hetu*) and the major term (*Saadhyā*) — called in logic “*Anvaya Vyatireka Vyaapti*” (in simple terminology — agreement and disagreement; comparison and contrast) of the type — “That thing which is born from or out of *Chaitanya* is invariably endowed with Consciousness; that thing which is not born out of *Chaitanya* is not endowed with Consciousness” — can never be demonstrated or proved by anybody, whosoever he may be. For, no one can possibly exemplify or demonstrate in a convincing manner to the Vedantins the illustration of the type — “Because such and such a thing is unconscious or insentient it is not born out of *Brahman*.” The reason for this is the truth that — “Everything is born out of *Brahman* alone” — and this alone is the spiritual teaching of Vedantins.

The opponent may ask the question — “If everything were born out of *Brahman*, how could the division of some things being conscious or sentient and the rest being unconscious or insentient arise at all?” The answer to that question is: “Because Pure Consciousness is not

appearing or manifest in insentient or gross objects, people transact in the manner that those things are insentient or unconscious. Even in the case of creatures which are fully known to be quite alive and conscious, during their states of deep sleep and such other conditions, it looks as though they are devoid of consciousness. Therefore, the truth that — ‘From *Brahman* which is Conscious the universe is born’ — is not contrary to logic.”

Another point: To those who argue that from the conscious or sentient entity an unconscious or insentient thing cannot be born, we can also put forth a counter-argument of the type — “From the unconscious or insentient, gross thing too a conscious or sentient thing cannot be born, is it not?” Therefore, the logic based on *Vailakshanya* (contrast in the special features) alone is not proper. Because the *Shrutis* have enunciated or expounded that — “*Brahman* which is of the essence of Pure Consciousness has manifested as the world of the dual forms of sentient and insentient things” — the spiritual teaching that *Brahman* is the cause of the world is in consonance with the scriptures, as also it is unopposed to logic.

19. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. pp. 312, 313.

21. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 315.

20. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 313.

22. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 315.

91. Some people have taken the literary meaning, word for word, of the scriptural statement — “*Brahman* became (attained the form of) the *Jagat* (the universe)” — as the fundamental tenet and, analogous to the example of milk getting transformed into curds, they have interpreted the above scriptural sentence to mean that — “*Brahman* got transformed into the form of the universe.” This theory is opposed to the scriptural teaching that — “*Brahman* is devoid of parts or limbs.” Because the scriptures clearly affirm that — “*Brahman* is *Aja* (devoid of birth)” — the theory or doctrine that *Brahman* has really got transformed into the universe of the dual forms of *Chetana* (sentient) and *Achetana* (insentient) is undoubtedly contrary to the scriptural teaching. It becomes clearly evident that because the scriptures emphatically state that — “Even after *Brahman* gets converted into the form of the universe It (*Brahman*) subsists in Its *Avikritaroopa* (unchanged, immutable form) apart or quite distinct from the (apparent) effect and because *Brahman* is (as stated above) devoid of parts or limbs (*Niravayava*), the *Shrutis* do not have the ultimate purport of teaching or propounding “*Parinaama*” (transformation) at all. We will clarify further in the next three Chapters the real purport of the *Shrutis* when they teach that — “*Brahman* became or attained the form of the universe.” The *Jijnasus* (the true seekers of the ultimate goal of Beatitude) should never forget the fact that just as much the “*Pradhaana Parinaamavaada*”, i.e. the *Saankhyan* doctrine

of the primordial matter of *Pradhana* getting transformed into the universe, is opposed to both *Shruti* teachings and *Yukti*, so much too is the "*Brahma Parinaamavaada*", i.e. the doctrine of *Brahman* getting transformed into the universe (of duality), opposed to *Shruti* statements as well as to *Yukti*. The real cause for giving rise to this misconception is the scriptural statement to the effect — "By means of *Upaasanas* one attains the *Brahma Swaroopa*." The *Gati* or resultant fruit of reaching, going to *Brahma Loka*, referred to in the *Upaasana Vaakyas*, we will explain in the Chapter devoted to the deliberation on *Upaasanas* (viz, XXIII Chapter).

23. Br. Up. 2-1-20. pp. 300, 301.

25. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-1. p. 269.

24. Su. Bh. 2-1-27. p. 354.

92. The *Upanishad* is clearly stating — "*Brahman* transformed Itself by Itself into the universe." The *Sootrakaara* (i.e. the author of the *Brahma Sootras*, viz. Baadaraayanaachaarya) also has preached *Brahma Parinaama* or the transformation of *Brahman* into the universe in the manner — "*Aatma Krutehe Parinaamaat*" — (*Sootra* 1-4-6). It being so, how can we discern that neither the *Shruti* nor the *Sootrakaara* has the purport of teaching *Parinaama*? — In this manner a doubt may arise in the minds of some people.

But we have already delineated above that to say that *Brahman* has, in reality, got transformed (converted) into the universe is contrary to *Shruti*, *Smriti* (the *Geeta*) and *Nyaaya* (*Brahma Sootras*). It is redundant indeed to stress that the statement — "*Brahman* is birthless and non-dual; but It has a mutation, transformation into another form of the universe too" — is a self-contradictory one. The topic as to why the scriptural statements propounding the truth of *Brahman* being devoid of any birth (mutation, transformation) are more predominant and stronger than the scriptural texts or statements pertaining to *Parinaama* of *Brahman*, will be explained in the next three Chapters. The *Sootrakaara* has followed the spiritual teaching (*Siddhaanta*) of — "The *Kaarya* (effect) does not exist apart from the *Kaarana* (the cause)" — alone in the *Sootra*, viz. "*Tadananyatwamaarambhanashabdaadi-bhyaha*" — (2-1-14) and such other *Sootras*. He had accepted the effect (*Kaarya*) of the universe of the forms of *Bhoktrus* (enjoyers) and *Bhogya* (the enjoyed objects) from the standpoint of *Vyavahaara* alone. Without refuting the existence of *Kaarya* the adoption of *Parinaamavaada* is for the purport of espousing or enunciating *Upaasanas* (meditations). All these teachings will become evident by stages in due course.

26. Su Bh. 2-1-14. p. 326.

28. Su. Bh. 2-1-15. p. 335

27. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 327

XIII. SATKAARYAVAADA OR THE THEORY OF THE BIRTH OF AN EXISTING ENTITY

93. The relationship of cause and effect between *Brahman* and the universe is accepted only for the purpose of signifying that — “*Brahman* of the essential nature of Pure Being alone is real; in It the universe, which is an effect, does not exist whatsoever.” (section 86). We have also previously mentioned in section 87 that the theory or doctrine of *Brahman* as the cause is enunciated, firstly, in order to refute or dismiss theories like *Pradhaanavaada* and *Paramaanuvaada* etc., and secondly, to indicate that it is of utility to enlighten *Aastikas* or believers in the *Vedas* and the existence of the Ultimate Reality of God, stage by stage, that — ‘*Brahman* is birthless and non-dual.’ If one discerns with consummate insight, the categories of cause and effect and their mutual relationships are not at all in keeping with, or in consonance with, dialectical devices. For, let us first of all ask the questions separately — “Whether the cause is real or unreal or real as well as unreal?” — and — “Whether the effect is real or unreal or real as well as unreal?” What is real is not born; for example, clay etc. is not born. What is unreal, like ‘horns of a hare’, ‘barren woman’s son’ etc., is also not born. In the same way, from the unreal neither an unreal thing is born nor from it a real thing too is born; from the real neither a real thing is born nor an unreal thing is born. ‘Real as well as unreal’ is a self-contradictory statement. Therefore, nothing is ever possibly born at all; the statement that the effect is born is merely an imagination. Thus by means of dialectics it can be deduced. Hence, the theory of *Brahman* as the cause of the universe — which is propounded by the Vedantins — is not at all to establish firmly or convincingly the theory of the relationship of cause and effect; on the other hand, it should be understood that it is enunciated in order to refute the theories of *Satkaaryavaada* as also *Asatkaaryavaada* of other proponents like the *Saankhyans* and the *Vaisheshikas*, respectively.

1. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-22. p. 342.

2. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-40. pp. 358, 359.

94. *Ajaativaada*, meaning, the theory which propounds that *Brahman* alone is the Absolute *non-dual* Reality. It is immutable, changeless and in It there does not exist really any cause-effect categories or relationships at all — which theory of the cause-effect relationship the Vedantins have accepted only for the purpose of teaching, stage by stage, the people of low and middle class intelligence or qualifications — is called “*Satkaaryavaada*” alone. In order to refute or negate the *Satkaaryavaada* which the *Saankhyans* have acknowledged and the *Asatkaaryavaada* which the *Vaisheshikas* and the *Buddhists* have accepted, the Vedantins have adopted this

Satkaaryavaada. In the opinion of the *Saankhyans* the root cause called "*Pradhaana*" is of the essential nature of Reality; that alone in reality gets transformed into the real forms of effects like *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. In so far as it is propounded that before the effect is born it (the cause) exists in the form of *Pradhaana* which is real, the *Saankhyans* are *Satkaaryavaadins* indeed. Because of reasons like — (a) they have accepted this doctrine of *Satkaaryavaada* which is very close or akin to the *Vaidika Satkaaryavaada*, as also (b) they have accepted the doctrine of *Asangaatma* (Atman being Absolute or unrelated to anything else) etc. *Manu Rishi* and others have to a little extent utilized their doctrines. But if examined in depth, they too are, like the *Vaisheshikas*, *Asatkaaryavaadins* alone. For, they have adopted the doctrine that *Pradhaana* really gets born in the forms of *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. which were not existing before; in case they contend that *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. do exist in the beginning and later on they get manifested, even then because they will have to per force agree that at least *Abhivyakti* (manifestation) and *Tiroabhaava* (disappearance) were not existing before and later on came into being, it amounts to their accepting *Asatkaaryavaada* alone. *Asatkaaryavaada* means the theory or doctrine that — "What was not existing before gets born, i.e. it comes into being". Just like the *Vaisheshikas* say that *Dvyanuka* (bi-atomic), *Tryanuka* (tri-atomic) matter which did not exist before come into being afresh, in the same way if the *Saankhyans* too adopt or accept the doctrine that *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. or their manifestation and disappearance, non-existing in the beginning, come into existence or being, then what else can it be but *Asatkaaryavaada*? Therefore, in order to refute the doctrines of these two schools of philosophy Vedantins have propounded their own *Satkaaryavaada*. **The real or genuine "Satkaaryavaada" is: "Brahman which alone is of the essential nature of Pure Being or Existence appears to have obtained, in a magical fashion, birth, sustenance and destruction" — alone.**

3. Su. Bh. 2-2-17. p. 396.

5. G. Bh. 18-48. p. 715.

4. G. Bh. 18-48. p. 715.

6. Su. Bh. 2-1-18. pp. 344, 345.

95. Now the question that is to be understood clearly and the proper answer for which is to be found out necessarily is: "Whether the *Saankhyans* are *Satkaaryavaadins* or whether they are *Asatkaaryavaadins*; and finding which defect in their doctrine should we refute their opinion?" The *Saankhyans* call themselves *Satkaaryavaadins*, while the *Vaisheshikas* claim themselves to be *Asatkaaryavaadins*. The *Asatkaaryavaadins* point out a defect in the doctrine of *Satkaaryavaada* in the manner — "An existing thing cannot be born; that thing which exists already does not (need not) have birth.

For example, *Purusha* (which the *Saankhyans* posit as Reality) does not get born. Therefore, it would only be reasonable to say that *Pradhaana* (which the *Saankhyans* posit as a second Reality serving *Purusha*) — whether it is a cause or whether it is an effect — if it exists already, then it need not be born at all." In the same manner, the *Satkaaryavaadins* (*Saankhyans*) point out a defect in the doctrine of *Asatkaaryavaada* of the type — "That thing which in the beginning itself does not exist at all, such a thing cannot at all be born. For example, the horns of a hare never exist nor are they born." Because these disputants can never possibly solve or mitigate the defects that each points out in the other's doctrines, it becomes established on the strength of their debate or polemics that both these doctrines, viz. *Satkaaryavaada* and *Asatkaaryavaada*, are defective indeed. Therefore, on the strength of their debate too the Vedantins' teaching that — "The Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman* is not one which is born; It is *non-dual* alone" — becomes completely established and substantiated.

7. Ma. Ka. 4-4. p. 328.

8. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-4. p. 328.

96. We have stated above that on the strength of the debate or dispute that is being carried on between *Saankhyans* and *Vaisheshikas* itself *Ajaativaada* (the doctrine of *Brahman* being devoid of any kind of birth) is established, is it not? Now, we may examine in detail the special or particular defects that exist in the doctrines of these disputants. In the doctrines of *Satkaaryavaadins*, who propound that *Pradhaana*, the cause, gets transformed itself into the effects of the forms of *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. there is the explicit contradiction of saying that *Pradhaana* is an entity which is devoid of birth but at the same time asserting that it is born in the forms of *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. If it is contended that one part of *Pradhaana* gets transformed into various forms like *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. and thus if it gets divided, then the acceptance of the doctrine that *Pradhaana* is *Nitya* (eternal) will have to be given up. For, earthen pitchers or pots etc. which are brittle are not eternal. The *Saankhyans* opine that the effect is not anything other than or different from the cause; in that case, the effect too, like *Pradhaana*, can be said to be devoid of birth. If *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc. which have a birth are *Pradhaana* (i.e. their very cause) alone, then how can it be possible for *Pradhaana* to be eternal? We have not seen in our workaday world a birthless cause giving rise to an effect. If it is contended that from a thing (cause) that is born, i.e. which has birth, another thing (effect) is born, then because that cause too per force will have to be born the defect of reasoning without reaching a finality by way of an endless series of causes and effects (called in *Tarka Shaastra* or logical texts "*Anavasthaa Dosha*") will creep in the manner — 'A born cause having a prior cause and the latter in turn having

another as its cause' and so on. In this way, the *Satkaaryavaada* of the *Saankhyans* is in all respects contrary to logic.

9. Ma. Ka. 4-11. p. 332.

11. Ma. Ka. 4-13. p. 334.

10. Ma. Ka. 4-12. p. 333.

97. On the face of it the *Asatkaaryavaada*, which the *Vaisheshikas* and others propound, may appear to be in consonance with logic. For we get a distinct apprehension or perception (*Prateeti*) invariably to the effect — "The cause existed first and then the effect came into existence". In the *Shrutis* too it has been stated that — "*Sadbrahman* (Absolute Being of *Brahman*) by Itself alone first existed; from It the universe, the effect, was born, i.e. came into being." Any one may ask — "Why should this doctrine be refuted?"

But this theory also cannot stand against the onslaught of logic. If one wants to know how, then the answer is: "The *Vaisheshikas* are of the opinion that *Dvyanuka*, *Tryanuka* etc. are in the beginning absolutely unreal (*Asat*); they are born, subsist for a while and then completely (absolutely) become non-existent. But *Abhaava* (non-existent thing) becoming *Bhaava* (an existent thing) is contrary to valid means of knowledge (*Pramaanas*). The doctrine of the *Vaisheshikas* that — '*Dvyanuka*, *Tryanuka* etc. which were first non-existent, desiderating or needing the triad of causes, viz. *Samavaayi* (inherence), *Asamavaayi* (non-inherence) and *Nimitta* (efficient cause), come into being' — will have to bow down before the objection of the type — 'A hare's horns too may come into being or become real, is it not?' Real earthen pots, pitchers (which are in the beginning itself existent) — how can they desiderate a cause in order to get manifested? How can we at all believe the valid dealings of *Pramaana* and *Prameya*, taking place in the doctrine which says — 'A non-existent thing becomes existent; an existent thing becomes non-existent'? Anything can become anything else, is it not?"

This theory is opposed to the scriptures too. For, the doctrine that — "The effect is one with, or not apart from the cause" — is not only in agreement with the scriptural teaching that — "All this was in the beginning *Sat* or the Reality alone" — but also the scriptural teaching that — "If this one *Entity* is known, all else becomes known." But, the doctrine that — "A non-existent effect gets born as also, at the same time, is one with the cause" — cannot agree with this above scriptural statement or teaching in any respect whatsoever.

The *Buddhists* have accepted another kind of *Asatkaaryavaada*. Their doctrine is: "If the cause continues to exist as it is, from it no effect whatsoever can ever be produced. Only after the seed gets disintegrated and becomes non-existent alone the sprout comes into being, is it not? In the same way, because only when every cause

becomes non-existent alone the effect comes into being, we should admit that *Abhaava* or non-existence alone is the cause."

This theory is not correct. For, if from a non-existent thing an existent thing were to be born, then to accept the rule or regulation that — "From such and such a non-existent thing (*Abhaava*) alone such and such an effect should emerge or be born" — will be rendered futile. Therefore, in this doctrine there is no scope for a rule or regulation like — "From a seed alone a sprout can emerge; from milk alone butter-milk can emerge" — to exist or to be formulated. Besides, because in a non-existent thing there does not exist any special characteristics or features, from a hare's horn also any particular effect can be born or can emerge; for, that hare's horn too is a non-existent thing. Even a stationary person also will have to be acknowledged to be having an effect of the nature or form of having performed an action. Further, if from a non-existent thing an effect were to be produced, then in accordance with the nature of that cause the new-born effect too would have had to appear to be of the nature of non-existence alone; but, in truth, it is not like that at all. The statement that — "On a seed becoming a non-existent thing, a sprout comes into being" — is also not correct; for, after the seed disintegrates its parts themselves continue to exist in the sprout, which is the effect, and hence those very parts are invariably the cause and not the non-existence of the seed. Hence, this doctrine of the *Buddhists* that — "From an unreal thing (*Asat*) an effect is born" — also is not tenable or proper.

Especially the *Buddhistic* doctrine that — "Both the cause and the effect are *Asat* (unreal)" — is contrary to all kinds of valid means of cognition (*Pramaanas*). In the teaching of those *Shoonyaavaadins* (proponents of essencelessness or *Nihilism*) of the type — "All empirical or workaday transactions are invariably unreal or absolutely untrue" — there is no satisfactory answer to the question — "Accepting which Ultimate or Absolute Reality do these *Shoonyaavaadins* assert that the empirical objects, established on the strength of valid means of cognition like *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc., to be unreal?" Without accepting or adopting any common valid means of cognition whatsoever if they assert that everything is *Shoonya* (essenceless), then no one can ever comprehend their doctrine which is baseless or without any support of any valid means of cognition. Besides, the *Shrutis* have refuted this '*Asadvaada*' (theory of unreality) in the manner — "How can the universe which is in and through real, be born from *Asat* or unreality?" "*Asat* or an unreality has no '*Utpatti*' or birth and *Sat* or reality has no destruction" — To this *Smriti* (*Geeta*) statement too, the "*Asatkaaryavaada*" (the theory of an unreal thing giving birth to or producing an effect) is opposed. This "*Asat*" mentioned here is not that *Asat* which the *Naiyayaayikas* (followers of *Nyaaya* school of philosophy) call "*Asat*" which, according to them, is the contra or opposite category

of *Sat* and which the *Buddhists* propound as *Asat* or *Abhaava* (non-existence). For the non-existence of a '*Ghata*' (an earthen pot), there should necessarily be the *Ghata*; but, it is the doctrine of the *Buddhists* that Absolute *Asat* (essencelessness) alone is the cause of the universe or the world of duality. This means, the essential nature of being or existence of the world of duality is not there whatsoever. This is their teaching. It is not possible at all to acknowledge absolute *Asat* (essencelessness); for, at least we have to accept the existence of the person who acknowledges such a tenet or doctrine. If it is contended that prior to creation or his birth he too does not exist, then the statement that — "Everything is *Asat* or essenceless" becomes opposed to or without the support of valid means of cognition indeed. In that event, absolute *Asat* or essencelessness can never be even imagined or conceived of. Therefore, it will be proper or justifiable to totally refute this doctrine which is contrary to the *Shrutis*, *Smritis* like *Geeta*, and *Nyaaya* (the axiomatic texts and their tenets).

12. G. Bh. 18-48. p. 711, 712.

16. G. 2-16. p. 50.

13. Su. Bh. 2-1-18. p. 345.

17. G. Bh. 18-48. P. 711.

14. Su. Bh. 2-2-26. pp. 414, 415.

18. Ch. Up. Bh. 6-2-1. p. 415.

15. Su. Bh. 2-2-31. pp. 425, 426.

98. In what respects is the Vedantins' doctrine of — "*Brahman* becomes the universe of the forms of space, air etc." — different from the *Satkaaryavaada* of the *Saankhyans*, which says — "*Pradhana* gets transformed into the forms of *Mahat*, *Ahamkaara* etc."? The doctrine that — "From *Brahman* which is sentient, pure and devoid of *Shabda* (sound), *Sparsha* (touch) etc. the universe, which is of an opposite nature of being, meaning which is insentient, impure and associated with sound, touch etc., is born" — is verily the *Asatkaaryavaada* of the *Vaisheshikas*, is it not? — Such doubts or objections cannot possibly be hurled at the Vedantins.

For, Vedantins do not propound that, like *Pradhana*, *Brahman* really gets transformed into the form of the universe. They say that by virtue of *Maayaa*, *Brahman* appears as if It is born as the universe. Hence, there is no comparison between the *Saankhyans*' doctrine of the *Pradhana* really being born and the Vedantins' teaching (of *Maayaa Satkaaryavaada*). In the same way, Vedantins also do not propound that the universe associated with sound, touch etc., which did not exist before being born or coming into existence, like *Dvyanuka*, *Tryanuka* etc., is born afresh or anew. They reckon that the doctrine that — "Non-existence, like a barren woman's son or a hare's horns etc., becomes existent" — is opposed to universal experience. In fact, the Vedantins expound that — "The universe associated with sound, touch etc. before its birth as well as after its birth exists in the essential nature of

Brahman alone; besides, even now, i.e. when it is being perceived or rather it appears, it does not exist by itself at all in its own essential nature apart or different from its cause (*Brahman*).” Therefore, there is no comparison or similarity whatsoever between the *Vaisheshikas*’ *Asatkaaryavaada* which says that — “*Dvyanuka, Tryanuka* etc. which did not exist in the beginning get born or come into being and acquire the *Sattaasambandha* (relationship, association with the genus or general category of *Sattaa* or reality)” — and the Vedantins’ teaching. Because *Abhaava* (non-existence) is *Nirvishesha* (devoid of all special characteristics), to say that from such non-existence things, which are endowed with special characteristics, are born is not proper or reasonable. Especially, between the *Asatkaaryavaada* of the *Shoonyavaadins* which says — “Before its birth and after its birth too the universe which was absolutely or totally unreal appears to be born by virtue of *Maayaa*” — and the Vedantins’ (*Maayaa*) *Satkaaryavaada* there is no comparison whatsoever. For a real rope, sea-shell etc. may by virtue of *Maayaa* (mystic power or magic) ‘become’ a snake, silver etc., but an unreal barren woman’s son, a hare’s horns and such other unreal (non-existing) things or phenomena cannot at all be born really or by virtue of *Maayaa* (mystic power or magic). It may appear that our branding *Maadhyamikas*, a particular school of *Buddhists*, who are *Shoonyavaadins* (Nihilists), as *Asatkaaryavaadins* is a false allegation levelled against them. For, it is their contention too that — “No effect whatsoever is born in any manner; birth itself is not valid; no object or thing has any essence of being at all.” Even so, it is their overbearing attitude of maintaining that — “The universe which is perceived by every one is verily *Shoonya* or essenceless” — on the strength of mere logical gimmicks that causes this predicament. The *Saakshivaada* (the doctrine of *Saakshi*, the Witnessing Consciousness of *Brahman*, *Atman* based on the firm conviction of Intuitive experience, which is also universal and consummate) which the Vedantins expound cannot possibly be refuted by means of, or on the strength of, any such logical device whatsoever; therefore, all those *Taarkikas* have no other go but to accept the *Vedic Satkaaryavaada* which propounds that — “For the false appearance of the universe *Atman* alone is the substratum.”

19. Ma. Ka. and Ka. Bh. 3-27.

pp. 303, 304.

20 (a) Su. Bh. 2-1-7. p. 316.

(b) Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-28. p. 304.

21. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p.36.

99. The *Taarkikas* (logicians) do not acknowledge that *Abhaava* (non-existence) is like the barren woman’s son or the hare’s horns etc. Just as the perceptive knowledge of an earthen pot desiderates an existing or real object called a pot, in the same way the (negative) cognition or perceptive knowledge of the type — “Non-existing thing” or “Not this” etc. — also desiderates *Abhaava* or non-existence, and hence

Abhaava also is an (existing) object indeed. Besides, because in *Abhaava* special characteristics like *Praagabhaava* (the non-existence which existed before the birth of an object), *Pradhwamsaabhaava* (the non-existence that exists after the destruction of the object), *Anyoanyaabhaava* (the non-existence that is not to be found relatively in either of two objects) and *Atyantaabhaava* (non-existence that is not to be found anywhere in the absolute sense) etc. are seen, the statement that — “*Abhaava* is *Nirvishesha* (devoid of all special characteristics or categories)” — is not correct or proper. Just as the Vedantins assert that although *Brahman* is *Nirvishesha*, from It a world of special features is born, in the same way if the *Taarkikas* contend that — “Even though *Abhaava* is *Nirvishesha*, from it also an effect which is associated with special characteristics can be born” — there is no defect whatsoever in their argument. In this way, the protagonists of the logicians’ doctrines may raise a doubt or objection.

But none of these doubts can ever be accepted. For, there is no rule of law that merely there being *Prateeti* (cognitive or perceptive knowledge), there should really exist an object. The well which was perceived by a person from the top to be “deep” is itself perceived by another person from the bottom to be “high”; but in this example, because of two perceptive knowledges two distinctively existing objects or phenomena do not get established whatsoever. If any particular statement is made, one particular (distinctive) meaning may be comprehended; but by the mere transaction of knowing the literary meaning or connotation of a word it cannot be thereby established that that object or phenomenon (signified by the word) is really existing invariably. If it were to be established in that manner, then by mere transaction of the usage of words like “hare’s horns” or “barren woman’s son” etc. the existence of the corresponding phenomena like a hare’s horns or a barren woman’s son will have to be accepted as established to be really existing. In fact, the real and proper transactions in the empirical, workaday world can be carried out in the case of things signified by words, but at the same time their existence can possibly be established on the strength of various valid means of cognition; the dealings based on delusion may take place even if there are no real objects available or present at the time. To say that in non-existence (*Abhaava*) there exist special characteristics like *Praagabhaava*, *Pradhwamsaabhaava* etc. is also not proper or reasonable. For, it is not possible in the case of *Praagabhaava*, *Pradhwamsaabhaava* etc. to demonstrate, by way of proving their essential nature of being, any special characteristics whatsoever. If in case there exist special characteristics in *Abhaava* too then between *Abhaava* with special characteristics and *Bhaava* (an existing entity) with special characteristics, there cannot possibly exist any difference or distinction whatsoever, and thereby *Abhaava* also will become *Bhaava* alone. Besides, because there does not exist

any distinction or difference with regard to their essential natures, it will not be justifiable to stipulate or regulate in the manner — “*Praagabhaava* alone is the cause for the particular effect and not *Pradhvamsaabhaava*, and so on”. It is reasonable to conclude that people in general misconceive *Bhaava* (Absolute Existence) alone to be of various types like *Ghata Bhaava*, *Pata Bhaava* etc. despite the fact that *Bhaava* is one and one alone; in the same way, it is reasonable to say that they misconceive *Bhaava* alone to be *Abhaava* also. On the basis of all these reasons, the statement that — “*Abhaava* is mere misconception alone, just like a barren woman’s son, a hare’s horns etc.” — is fully justified indeed.

22. Su. Bh. 2-2-15. p. 394

24. Su. Bh. 2-2-26. p. 415

23. G. Bh. 18-48. pp. 714, 715

100. *Abhaava* appears to be quite different and queer compared to *Bhaava*, is it not? In it special characteristics are also seen! Even so, if it were to be obstinately contended that *Abhaava* is *Avastu* (unsubstantial or non-material) and in it there do not exist any special characteristics whatsoever, then one can well establish by showing any particular kind of absence of reasonable grounds or inconclusive reasoning (*Anupapatti*) that none of the objects which are actually perceived by the senses does exist at all, is it not? — Such a doubt pesters some people.

But there is no cause for such a doubt to arise at all. We do not say that in our workaday world transactions, there does not exist any *Prateeti Vailakshanya* (contrariety of perceptual knowledge) of the type — *Bhaava* and *Abhaava*. It is true that a sea-shell appears to be silver; even so, because therein silver does not exist in reality its perceptual knowledge (*Prateeti*) is a mere delusion (*Bhraanti*) alone. In the same way, because *Abhaava* is a contra (*Prati Dvandvi*) to *Bhaava*, that too appearing in manifold forms like *Bhaava* is quite natural indeed. That *Ghata Bhaava* or the perceptual knowledge of an earthen pot, *Pata Bhaava* or the perceptual knowledge of cloth etc. are actually different kinds of existences — no one can emphatically assert at all. In the same way, by virtue of a relationship with action (*Kriya*) and qualities (*Guna*) *Abhaava* too like *Dravya*, *Guna* etc. appears to be different. If we examine it with insight, *Bhaava* is one and one only, *Abhaava* also is one and one only. Still further if we try to discern or probe in this manner, then the statement that — “*Ghata*, *Pata* etc. are distinct varieties of *Bhaava*, an existing entity” — does not hold water at all.

Vaisheshikas opine that — “*Bhaava* means reality, existence. *Dravya* (substance), *Guna* (quality), *Karma* (action) — in all these *Sattva* (existence), a particular kind of *Parasaamaanya* (subtlest or highest genus), by virtue of a special relationship called *Samavaaya*

(Inherence), is associated or conjoined." It is their belief that just as among all cows there is a genus called "*Goatwa*" (cowness), all objects or things are associated with *Sattaa* (existence, i.e. the highest genus), quite inherently. It is their doctrine that *Prithveetwa* or earthness, *Dravyatwa* or substantiveness, *Sattaa* or the subtlest genus which is inherent — are in that order the various genera, each being more pervasive than the previous category. The *Sattaa* genus is the highest in its pervasiveness; therefore, that *Sattaa* alone is the *Prasaamaanya*, that means, it is the highest or subtlest genus most pervasive among all of them.

But Vedantins do not acknowledge any other *Sattaa* Reality other than *Brahman* which is of the essential nature of Absolute Existence. This topic we will elucidate in due course in section 101. In *Vedanta*, *Sadvastu* (the Ultimate Reality or Existence) means *Brahman* alone; all else is *Asat* (unreal or non-existence) alone. People are dealing with the one and only *Sadvastu* as *Ghata Sattaa*, *Pata Sattaa* etc. Because *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. are effects, they are *Ananya* (identical) with their respective causes of clay, cotton etc., respectively. Therefore, in their essential nature of cause they are *Sat*, but in their respective forms of appearance they are *Asat* alone. *Sadbuddhi* (the cognitive nature of Pure Being or Existence) does not change perennially; but the cognition of *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. go on merging in their respective cause forms like clay, cloth etc. and finally all of them become quiescent or merged in the supreme or ultimate cause of *Brahman* which is the Ultimate Reality (*Sadvastu*). Thus when *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. are themselves *Asat*, where is the necessity to say that the *Ghata Abhaava* and *Pata Abhaava* etc. (all of which can only be established similarly in relation to *Ghata*, *Pata* etc.) — are *Asat*? Although on the strength of valid means of cognition like *Pratyaksha* (perception), *Anumaana* (inference) etc. the existence of objects like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. is established or determined, till the Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* alone is Intuited as real, if we deal with the objects like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. to be real empirically it will be quite reasonable and proper indeed; but from the viewpoint of *Paramaartha* (in which *Brahman* alone is reckoned to be the Absolute Reality) if we cognize those things like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. to be real it will never be justifiable at all. This has already been expounded in section 28. Therefore, what we have stated from the viewpoint of the Absolute Reality, viz. (i) that there do not exist any special characteristics in *Bhaava* and *Abhaava*, and further (ii) that our refuting in the manner — "*Abhaava* is unreal" — is not unreasonable at all.

25. Tai. Bh. Intr. pp. 227, 228.

26. G. Bh. 2-16. pp. 51, 52.

101. With regard to *Satkaaryavaada* there remains the task of raising one more doubt and providing a solution for it. The doubt is:

"The statement that *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. are *Asat* is opposed to *Prateeti* (conviction or settled belief) of a reality (*Sat*) that exists in those entities. If it is contended that *Ghata* is *Asat* and its *Abhaava*, too is *Asat*, then in that event between the *Prateeti* of *Abhaava* of the *Ghata* and the *Prateeti* of *Bhaava* of the *Ghata* there will be a contradiction. If it is asserted that from *Brahman*, which is of the essential nature of *Sat*, the *Jagat* or the universe of the essential nature of non-existence (*Asat*) is born, then we will be giving room for a doctrine of the type — 'From *Sat* *Asat* is born or created' — which is clearly contradictory to logic or reasoning. The scriptural statement — 'How can the *Sat* be born from *Asat*?' (*Chhaandoagya Upanishad* 6-2-2) — also is propounding that *Jagat* is real only. Besides, because *Brahman*, of the essential nature of Reality, is devoid of parts (and hence is immutable) the doctrine that — 'Like the clay, iron, gold etc. *Brahman* is the cause for variegated universe' — will be opposed to logic indeed. Thus, it becomes apparent that the teaching that the universe is *Asat* (unreal, non-existent) and the teaching, *Brahman* that of the essential nature of Reality, is the cause for the universe are both opposed to *Shrutis* as well as to *Yukti* or reasoning."

The solution to the above doubt is: "The argument that both the objects like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. and their respective *Abhaavas* are *Asat* (unreal) is not an undesirable doctrine at all for the Vedantins; for, all the things that are apart from *Brahman* are *Asat* only. *Asat* means false appearance alone. From this viewpoint there is no difference whatsoever between earthen pots etc. and their *Abhaava*. **That thing which is seen in a particular form and which does not at all get that form ever changed — that thing is real.** To say that — 'What is perceived (and believed to be true) and what is an object which is subject to cause and effect is real' — is not proper or reasonable. In due course this fact will be clarified. But that thing which is seen in a particular form and which goes on getting that form changed — that thing is invariably *Asat*, *Anrita*. Even among the things of the dream, which are acknowledged by everyone as false appearances, there exists the division of 'real' and 'unreal'; therefore, the perception of the division or distinction of the type — *Bhaava* and *Abhaava* — cannot at all be a hurdle for determining that those things are *Asat* or unreal, non-existent. Hence, **the empirical transaction of considering water to be real in comparison with a mirage (water) is not an hindrance at all to the doctrine — 'Jagat or the universe is *Asat*' — enunciated from the viewpoint of the Absolute, Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*.**"

Just as the *Taarkikas* have acknowledged that *Sattaasaamaanya* the objects like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. as also their *Praagabhaava* are both real objects or entities, Vedantins have not acknowledged an independent entity of *Asat* apart from *Atman*. Just as the rope-snake does not really

exist at all apart from the rope, similarly apart from *Sadbrahman* (the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*) objects or entities like *Ghata*, *Pata* etc. or their *Abhaava* (non-existence) do not at all exist. In fact, *Sat* (*Brahman*) alone is appearing as the various forms of *Dvaita* (duality). Therefore, *Dvaita* also, in the absolute sense, is *Sat* alone, but not *Asat*. **“All that is different or distinct from Atman in its own form is Anritam (unreal, false), but in its essential nature as Atman is Sat or Pure Being-Existence alone” — this alone is the spiritual teaching (Siddhaanta) of Vedanta.**

The purport of the *Shruti* statement — “How can *Sat* come into being from *Asat*?” — is that the effect called *Jagat* (the universe), which is born from *Sat* (*Brahman* or *Atman*) is not different or separate from *Sat* (*Brahman* or *Atman*). Some disputants opine that from *Asat* alone *Jagat* came into being; but just as earthen pots which are organically connected or associated with clay are truly effects of clay only, the *Jagat* also, which is ‘substantially’ associated with *Sat* can only be the effect of *Sat* alone and not an effect of *Asat* at all. Because the purport of the *Shruti* sentence lies in affirming or emphasizing the truth that the cause is *Sat* alone, the scriptural sentence does not at all have the ultimate goal or intention of signifying that the universe is either *Sat* or *Asat*. Therefore, this scriptural sentence is not a valid, authoritative statement to support or substantiate the doctrinaire interpretation of it to mean that *Jagat* is real; in fact, the *Shruti* sentence mentioning it to be “*Vaachaarambhana*” — meaning, that the discussion about *Aarambhana* (creation or birth) is mere desultory talk — is stating that the universe which is an effect is unreal only; and hence this *Shruti* sentence is harmful to the doctrine of the reality of the universe.

The objection of the type — “From *Sat* (*Brahman*) which is devoid of parts or components how can the universe (which is a conglomeration of various things and parts) be born or created?” — cannot raise its head at all. **For, to the universe which is born magically (*Maayika*) the parts or components which are imagined by the deluded *Buddhi* or intellect in the substratum of *Sat* or Pure Being-Existence — those misconceived parts or components themselves are sufficient to serve their purpose.**

27. Tai. Bh. 2-1. P. 291.

31. Ch. Bh. 8-5-4. P. 608.

28. Tai. Bh. 2-6. P. 339,340.

32. Su. Bh. 2-2-26. P. 415.

29. Ma. Ka. 2-9. P. 240.

33. Ch. Bh. 6-2-2. P. 420.

30. Ch. Bh. 6-2-3. P. 423.

34. Ch. Bh. 6-2-2. P. 422.

XIV. MAAYAA OR THE DIVINE MYSTIC POWER

102. In order to teach the people with low and middle class intelligence and capacity the truth that — “*Brahman* alone is

the Absolute Reality or Entity" — the *Satkaaryavaada* (section 98) which propounds that — "The universe is born through *Maayaa* (divine mystic power) from *Brahman*" — is tentatively accepted in the *Vedanta* philosophy, is it not? Now the opportune time has arisen to find out the answer to the question — What is *Maayaa*? For, is *Maayaa* different or apart from *Brahman* or not? If it is separate, then there is contradiction of *Advaita* (teaching of non-duality); if it is one with *Brahman* alone, then the teaching that — 'From *Kootastha* (immutable, absolutely changeless and eternal) *Brahman* the mutable universe is born' — is not tenable and justifiable.

In relation to the *Jagat* or the universe *Brahman* is called *Ishwara* (the Lord Creator). In *Vedanta* it has been acknowledged that *Maayaa* cannot be said to be of an essential nature which is either separate from *Brahman* or not separate from *Brahman*; *Maayaa* is nothing but the seed form of name and form which are projected or imagined by virtue of *Avidya*. The universe is now (i.e. in the waking) appearing with names and forms, is it not? This is called *Vyaakrita Jagat* (manifested universe). This universe at the time of *Pralaya* (dissolution) and before re-creation exists in the state of *Avyaakrita* (without being divided or differentiated into various parts or units in an unmanifested, latent or potential) form, so to speak. Because this *Avyaakrita* alone is the raw material for *Paramaatman* (the Lord Creator), it is called *Ishwara's Shakti* (the mystic power of the Lord Creator) and also as *Prakriti* (the primordial matter). Because it is not possible to determine and then to say that this *Maayaa* is either *Paramaatman* Himself or a separate entity apart from Him existing by itself, it is called *Avyakta* (unmanifested state); because it is pervasive it is called *Aakaasha* (space); and because it is a phenomenon which is never destroyed unless and until *Jnaana* (Intuitive experience) is attained, it is called *Akshara*. It is the spiritual teaching of *Vedanta* that because *Ishwara* (*Brahman*) is of a quite different essential nature of Being other than the *Maayaa*, which is projected by *Avidya* and which is of the nature of names and forms, no defect or any blemish, whatsoever, of *Maayaa* affects *Ishwara*.

1. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 333, 334.

3. Mu. Up. 2-1-2. pp. 116, 117.

2. Su. Bh. 1-4-3. p. 249.

103. While *Paramaatman* assumes the form of the universe no change or mutation whatsoever has taken place in His essential nature. The names and forms (which have been mentioned earlier) which were in the seed form of *Avyaakrita* have assumed the manifested form (*Vyaakrita* form of the universe). Because both these forms of *Vyaakrita* and *Avyaakrita* are, in truth, *Avidyaakrita* (projected by ignorance), even if it is stated that through them (these *Vyaakrita* and *Avyaakrita*

forms) *Atman* gets transformed (*Parinaama*) into the form of the universe. He is invariably and eternally existing as *Kootastha* (Pure, Absolutely Immutable, steadfast Existence alone). Just as in the beginning what was water alone later on if it assumed two forms of water and foam even then the foam is nothing but water alone, in the same manner in the beginning what existed as *Atman*, after the creation even when the two forms of *Atman* and the universe (which is perceptible as various names and their respective precepts) everything is, in truth, nothing but *Atman* alone. When it is stated that — “Names and forms which were *Avyaakrita* became *Vyaakrita*” — the opinion or purport of the statement is not at all that they (names and forms) exist apart from *Brahman* or *Atman*. **The *Avyaakrita* names and forms invariably retaining their essential nature of Pure Being of *Atman* become *Vyaakrita* (manifested); while for the names and forms *Brahman* alone is the *Swaroopa* (essential nature of Pure Being), vice versa, it is not true, that means, for *Brahman* the names and forms, are not the *Swaroopa* (His essential nature of Being) at all. For the *Shrutis* pronouncing in the manner — “Even now (in this waking, manifested state) everywhere *Atman* alone exists” — this alone is the reason. Apart from *Atman*, what is called *Anaatman* or not-self never, at any time and nowhere, exists at all. Even what is stated in the *Geeta* in the manner — “In *Atman* there exist two *Prakritis*, one that is *Chetana* (sentient) and the other *Achetana* (insentient), and through these two *Prakritis* alone *Paramaatman* becomes the cause for creation” — is also for this reason alone. Both those *Prakritis* too are of the essential nature of Absolute Being of *Paramaatman* alone.**

4. Su. Bh. 2-1-27. p. 356.

6. Tai. Bh. 2-6. pp. 332, 333.

5. Ait. Bh. 1-1-1. pp. 20, 21.

7. G. Bh. 7-6. p. 320.

104. By now it must have flashed to the minds of the readers as to what difference there is between the *Pradhaana* (primordial matter), which the *Saankhyans* propound as the root cause for the universe, and *Maayaa*, which the Vedantins propound as of the form or nature of *Avyaakrita* (unmanifested seed form of the universe). The *Saankhyans* affirm that although *Pradhaana* is insentient (*Achetana*), it by itself independently gets transformed (*Parinaama*) into the universe, quite contrary to logic or reasoning. Whereas to the doctrine, which the Vedantins have accepted, there is no danger whatsoever because *Maayaa* is *Ishwara*'s power and because it is not separate from *Ishwara* who is of the very essence of *Chaitanya* (Pure Absolute Consciousness). The universe which is the effect is not a separate entity apart from *Ishwara*'s power or *Shakti*; that *Shakti* is not separate from the cause of *Brahman*; therefore, there is no harm, or danger, to *Advaitavaada* (the spiritual teaching of non-duality) also. Just as, although the foam

appears to be separate or different from water, in reality, it is water alone, in the same manner, although from the *Avidya Drishti* (empirical viewpoint of ignorance) names and forms appear to be separate, in reality, they are not separate or different from *Paramaatma Tattwa* (the Ultimate, Absolute Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*). Therefore, merely on the ground of Vedantins saying that *Maayaa* is the cause for the universe there is never any danger whatsoever to either the doctrine of *Brahman* being the cause for the universe or the doctrine of *Advaita* or non-duality.

8. Su. Bh. 1-4-3. p. 249.

10. Su. Bh. 2-1-18. p. 340.

9. Su. Bh. 1-4-3. p. 249.

11. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. pp. 477, 478.

105. In the doctrine that — “The universe is not separate from *Maayaa*; *Maayaa* is not separate from *Ishwara*” — it amounts to saying that — “At the time of dissolution the universe dissolves or merges in *Maayaa*, that means, through *Maayaa* it dissolves in *Brahman* alone.” Some people may get a doubt that — “Therefore, after dissolution the defects of the universe will taint *Brahman* also!” But if the *Vedantic* teaching that — **“The effect called the universe, which is *Vyaakrita* or manifested, and the cause for it, viz. *Maayaa*, which is *Avyaakrita* or unmanifested seed form, are both *Avidyaakalpita* (projected, imagined or conjured up by ignorance)”** — is discerned, then this doubt disappears into thin air. In the spiritual teaching (*Siddhaanta*) of *Vedanta*, unlike the doctrines of the logicians, the word “*Kaarana*” (the cause) is not used in the sense, or with the meaning, of ‘that thing which is definitely or distinctly existing in time prior to that of the effect’. According to the teachings of Vedantins even phenomena like *Aakaasha* (space), directions, time, mind, atom etc. are all the effects alone of *Brahman*. *Kaarya* means that which is superimposed upon, or misconceived in, *Brahman* (that means, a false appearance, a delusion). The Vedantins say that all those things which appear to be separate or distinct from one another are, in fact, *Kaarya* (effects) alone; therefore, time and space too are the effects only. Just as in the workaday world *Maayaa* (magic) does not touch or taint the *Maayavi* (the magician) and does not affect or vitiate his being by the effects of its false appearances, and just as the defects or ill effects of a dream do not really affect or taint the dreamer, in the same manner this *Samsaara Maayaa* (this magic of transmigratory existence) does not affect *Paramaatman* (the Supreme Self). The universe as well as its seed form of *Maayaa* is *Avidyaakalpita* or it is delusory (that means they are misconceived appearances alone). That entity or thing on which another thing is superimposed or misconceived, that entity is not in the least related to or affected either by the good qualities or by the defects, ill effects of that thing which is superimposed or misconceived;

therefore, the assumption that — “*Brahman* is not related to or affected by the defects of either the universe or its seed form of *Maayaa*” — alone is in consonance (in full agreement) with reason.

12. Su. Bh. 2-1-9. p. 319.

15. Su. Bh. 2-1-9. p. 318.

13. Su. Bh. 2-3-7. p. 454.

16. Adh. Bh. p.4.

14. Su. Bh. 2-1-9. p. 318.

106. Now to some people it may appear that still there remains one more logically-oriented objection to be solved. That is: If creation is the effect of *Maayaa*, of which phenomenon is *Maayaa* an effect? At least, as long as *Maayaa* exists the world of duality has per force to exist, and hence to that extent at least there is danger caused to the doctrine of *Advaita* (*non-duality*), is it not? If it is contended that *Maayaa* is *Avidyaakrita*, then finally *Avidya* will have to be accepted to subsist; if so, at least to that extent will there not be any danger to the doctrine that *Advaita* alone is the Ultimate Reality?

This objection too raises its head because of our forgetting the Vedantic teaching that — “**Both *Maayaa* and *Avidya* are phenomena which have been imagined or hypothetically posited by virtue of the axiom of *Adhyaaroopa Apavaada* (the methodology of Superimposition and Rescission) and not that they are existing in reality.**” Vedantins propound “*Maayaa*” in order to teach the truth to people of low and middle order intellect who obstinately cling on to the belief that the reasoning of cause-effect which appears to be valid in the empirical workaday world is real; and for the sake of those who get deluded that by virtue of *Maayaa* the world is really created or caused, they propound that *Maayaa* is projected or conjured up by *Avidya*. Further, in order to make it known to those who doubt in the manner — “The defect or ill-effect that is engendered or caused by that *Avidya* — does it not affect or taint *Atman*?” — the Vedantins propound that *Avidya* is a special characteristic of the inner instrument of the mind (*Antahkarana Dharma*). For the sake of those who doubt in the manner — “Don’t these *Maayaa* and *Avidya* cause or engender any special features or changes in *Atman*” — the Vedantins answer that this assumption of these phenomena which are on the side of *Anaatman* (not-self), causing special changes in *Atman*, is also nothing but *Avidya* alone of people who assume in that manner. If it is further contended that — “That *Avidya* at least exists, is it not?” — the Vedantins answer that even that exists only from the standpoint of such a doubting Thomas and not in reality. *Maayaa* and *Avidya* — these are, in fact, *Samvriti*, which means covert empirical transactions based on *Avidya* or misconception, delusion alone. Therefore, the world of duality, existing in reality, does not get falsified or removed (sublated, negated) after the knowledge of *Advaita* is born (or it dawns). Although the snake

(i.e. misconceived) does never exist in the rope at all, the teaching that — “The appearance of the rope-snake (the misconceived notion of the snake) will be got rid of by means of the *Jnaana* (true knowledge) of the rope is analogous to the transaction that after the mystic spell of the magic that the magician had exercised or cast (on the onlookers) is removed or withdrawn the spell is said to be gone or removed only” — has to be discerned.

To those people who raise the question that — “Of which entity is *Maayaa* the effect?” — the fact that from the empirical viewpoint *Maayaa* is *Anaadi* or beginningless is totally forgotten. There do exist doctrines mentioned in the scriptures (*Shrutis*) and works of sages or seers (*Smritis*) that *Maayaa* called by names like *Avyakta*, *Avyaakrita* has come into being from *Atman*; but for those doctrines the only meaning is that *Avyaakrita* state turned into the *Vyaakrita* state, that is all. For, if it is affirmed that *Avyaakrita* also is born anew, then it will amount to accepting the doctrine that — “The *Samsaara* is with a beginning and consequently for each one of the *Kalpa* or aeon one different or fresh universe is born or created” — and then, in that event, the defect of *Akritaabhyaagama* (enjoyment of fruits or consequences of deeds or acts which have not been performed at all) as also the defect of *Kritavipranaasha* (the fruits or results of acts or deeds performed actually not accruing) will attach themselves. Unless and until *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge) is attained the empirical transaction of *Maayaa* having disappeared or having been got rid of never arises; besides, the fact that *Maayaa* is false or unreal will never be cognized at all. Therefore, it becomes established that by doctrines of *Maayaa* and *Avidya* there is no harm or danger whatsoever posed for the spiritual teaching of *Advaita* philosophy.

17. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-58. pp. 371, 372.

19. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 722.

18. Ma. Ka. Bh. 1-17. pp. 218, 219.

20. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 725.

107. It is the opinion of some people that because the word “*Maayaa*” is synonymous with “*Jnaana*” in the *Vedic* literature, this word has never been used in the sense, or with the meaning, of ‘a non-existent object’ (false appearance). *Yaaska Aachaarya* has used this word “*Maayaa*” in his work of “*Nighantu*” (a glossary of *Vedic* words) as a synonymous term of “*Jnaana*” alone. Even so, in scriptural sentences like — “*Indroa Maayaabhili Purooropa Eeyate*” — meaning, “*Indra* by virtue of his *Maayaas* appears as of many forms” — and such other usages the word “*Maayaa*” means “the knowledge or cognition gained or accruing through the senses” alone; because the perceptual knowledge gained through the senses is of the nature of *Avidya* (ignorance) alone, the ultimate meaning of — “*Indra* or *Parameshwara*, the Supreme Lord, by virtue of His *Maayaa* (*Shakti*) appears as many;

if seen from the proper viewpoint of Intuitive experience He, i.e. *Indra*, the Supreme Lord *Parameshwara*, is one and one alone" — will invariably hold water. Therefore, even when we accept the meaning of "*Jnaana*" for the word "*Maayaa*" it signifies nothing but *Mithyaajnaana* (misconception) alone. Especially, in the scriptural statement — "*Maayaam Tu Prakritim Vidyaaat*" — in which *Avyaakrita* (unmanifested seed form of the world) is called *Maayaa*, the interpretation of *Jnaana* for the word *Maayaa* does not suit at all; it becomes imperative there, in that context, to accept the *Laxanaartha* (the implied meaning) of — "The false appearance projected by *Mithyaajnaana* (misconception)" — alone. Therefore, there is no hindrance or valid objection whatsoever to affirm the teaching of *Advaita* in the manner — **The world is *Maayika*, i.e. illusory; it is a false appearance like the dream, a magical show, *Gandharva Nagara* (the world of the celestial beings) etc. — alone is the true genuine spiritual teaching of *Vedanta*.**

21. Ma. Bh. 3-24. pp. 297, 298.

22. Ma. Ka. and Ka. Bh. 2-31. p. 255.

XV. BRAHMAN IS THE NIMITTA KAARANA (EFFICIENT CAUSE) ALSO FOR THE UNIVERSE

108. Hitherto we have carried out our deliberations assuming the meaning of the sentence — "*Brahman* is the cause for the universe" — to be that *Brahman* is the material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) for the universe, just as clay is the material cause for the earthen pot. For, with regard to the question — "What is the material cause for the creation of universe?" — itself there are many differences of opinion among the disputants. In the olden times *Saankhyans* used to argue out that *Pradhaana* (primordial matter) itself was the cause for the universe whereas the *Vaisheshikas* used to contend that the atoms (*Paramaanus*) themselves were the cause for the universe.

Some Vedantins who were following a tradition quite different from the traditional school of philosophy followed by *Adi Shankara* were propounding that *Brahman* Itself was the material cause for the universe. There are defects in their doctrines; for, neither the insentient *Pradhaana* nor *Paramaanus* by themselves can ever get transformed into the form of the universe; if they can get transformed, they will have per force to keep on transforming themselves continuously. The author of the *Brahma Sootras* (*Baadaraayana*) as also the *Bhaashyakaara* (*Shankara*) have refuted the doctrines of these opponents saying that there does not exist any external cause whatsoever which can either prompt or promote them into action or help discontinue (or recede away) from action. In the same manner, the doctrine that — "*Brahman*

has really got transformed into the form of the universe" — is also not proper; for, if *Brahman* were to get transformed it will amount to saying or accepting that *Brahman* is *Saavayava* (made up of parts or limbs) and that It is *Anitya* (non-eternal). Thus the *Bhaashyakaara* has brushed aside the doctrine of the other alien Vedantins who were *Parinaamavaadins* (proponents of the theory of transformation) and has established his teaching by clarifications and reasons of the type — "In the *Shrutis* the statement that — '*Brahman* gets transformed into the form of the universe' — is in relation to the adjuncts of names and forms which are *Avidyaakalpita* (projected or conjured up by ignorance); in truth, *Brahman* eternally exists as It is without getting any transformation whatsoever."

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Su. Bh. 2-2-1. pp. 368, 369. | 5. Su. Bh. 2-2-14. p. 392. |
| 2. Su. Bh. 2-2-2. pp. 370, 371. | 6. Su. Bh. 2-1-27. p. 355. |
| 3. Su. Bh. 2-2-4. p. 374. | 7. Su. Bh. 2-2-7. p. 378. |
| 4. Su. Bh. 2-2-12. p. 389. | 8. Su. Bh. 2-1-27. p. 356. |

109. *Vedantins* have not refuted the doctrines of *Saankhyans* and others by assuming that the cause of the universe is the material cause alone. For, it is the teaching of *Vedantins* that — ***Brahman* is the material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) and It is the Creator (*Kartru* or *Nimitta Kaarana*) as well.** *Vedantins* also refute the doctrines of those people who maintain that *Ishwara* is merely the Creator (*Kartru*) for the creation of the world. While it is being propounded that *Brahman* is the cause for the world, it is implied that causes like *Pradhaana*, *Paramaanu* etc. are not those which are mentioned by the *Vedantas* (*Upanishads*); for, it is stated in the *Shrutis* that *Brahman*, which is the cause for the world, in the beginning, "reflected in Itself". (Evidently, it implies that *Brahman* is sentient and not insentient or inert like *Pradhaana* or *Paramaanus*). In this manner *Vedantins* refute their doctrines. For this reason alone, it is tantamount to saying that *Brahman*, i.e. *Paramaatman*, is only the efficient cause. For, the function or act of first reflecting and then carrying out an action is seen in *Nimitta Kaaranas* (efficient causes), like a potter, a carpenter etc.; just as for the potter many implements and raw materials like a pole, a wheel, clay etc. are needed, it is quite reasonable to assume that for *Paramaatman* a material cause, separate from Him, is needed. Lords like *Vaivaswata* and others are seen to be merely the efficient causes (*Nimitta Kaaranas*) for their respective functions. Therefore, to say that *Parameshwara* (the Supreme Lord) too is merely the *Nimitta Kaarana* alone is reasonable. Thus the proponents of *Brahman* being the efficient cause argue out. In answer to their contention *Vedantins* say that *Brahman* is the material cause too. For, in *Vedantic* texts it has been stated as a proposition to be proved in due course that

— “If the one unitary cause is cognized, it amounts to knowing all else”; but in our empirical workaday world merely knowing the *Nimitta Kaarana*, it does not amount to knowing the whole of the effect at all. Besides, in the scriptures the material cause (*Upaadaana Kaarana*) itself is given as an illustration in the manner — “Just as by knowing one lump of clay all the effects made out or produced out of clay are supposed to be known.” For that reason too, it is the teaching of *Advaita* Vedantins that “*Brahman* is the *Upaadaana Kaarana* also for the universe”. Hence, they also contend that the doctrinaire teaching that “*Ishwara* (the Lord Creator) is merely the *Nimitta Kaarana* for the universe” — is contrary to the *Vedic* tenets. The present-day *Dvaita* Vedantins (the followers of *Maadhva* *Vedanta* traditions) are proponents of *Brahman* being a mere efficient cause (*Kevala Nimitta Kaarana Vaadins*).

9. Su. 1-1-5. p. 47.

11. Su. Bh. 2-2-37. p. 433.

10. Su. Bh. 1-1-5. p. 47.

12. Su. Bh. 1-4-23. pp. 292, 293.

· **110.** Hitherto we have mentioned the solutions for the doubts or objections that may arise with regard to the doctrine that — “*Brahman* is the material cause for the universe.” Now we have to find out the solutions for the difficulties that may arise if it is assumed that — “*Brahman* is merely the *Nimitta Kaarana*.” If it is taken that *Ishwara* is merely the efficient cause for the world, then between Him, on the one hand, and the *Prakriti* (the primordial matter of the world) and the *Jeevas* (the transmigratory souls), on the other, there will not be any relationship at all. For, it will not be possible to say that — “All these (the world of duality and the souls) will be *Sarvagata* (all-pervading) and *Niravayava* (devoid of any parts, limbs or components)” — and because the question as to whether *Brahman* is the efficient cause or not is itself controversial, it will not be possible to assert that the world exists depending upon *Ishwara*. Further, because of the reason that prior to the creation *Ishwara* does not have a body, the function or transaction of creation is not possible at all. If *Ishwara* knows the numbers or limitations of His *Prakriti* and the *Jeevas*, then the concept of both *Prakriti* and *Jeevas* being *Ananta* (devoid of destruction or end) will be wrong, unreasonable because they are mutually different. If it is contended that — “Both *Pradhana* and *Purusha* are invariably eternal and *Ishwara* does not know their end or destruction” — then He does not become *Sarvajna* (all-knowing or omniscient). Any person may ask the question that — “Don’t the Vedantins have this defect?” But in their spiritual teaching, between *Paramaatman* and the *Jagat* there exists an innate relationship of identity (*Taadaatmya*). That means, the Vedantins acknowledge that *Jagat* is in reality *Paramaatman* alone. Because they conceive or infer the cause for the world on the strength of

Vedantas (Upanishads), which are *Apourusheya* (not the works of human origin but of divine origin), they do not suffer from the defects of logic. If it is argued in the manner — “The others too may quote the ‘*Aagama*’ as the valid or authoritative sources, is it not?” — the answer is “No”. For, in their doctrines it is said that — “Because the omniscient *Ishwara* has propounded or proclaimed the *Aagamas*, they are authoritative sources”. To wit, the logical defect of “*Anyoanyaashraya Doasha*” (inutual dependence for establishing either of the propositions) of the type — “If the validity or authority of *Aagamas* is established, then the omniscience of *Ishwara* can be established; similarly, if *Ishwara*’s omniscience is proved or established, then only the validity or authority of the *Aagamas* become established” — will arise in their doctrines.

13. Su. Bh. 2-2-38. pp. 435, 436.

15. Su. Bh. 2-2-41. pp. 438, 439.

14. Su. Bh. 2-2-40. pp. 437, 438.

16. Su. Bh. 2-2-38. p. 436.

111. If *Brahman* is the *Kartru* (the efficient cause for the world), then like the *Kartrus* of the type of potter, weaver etc. many implements and raw materials (*Kaarakas*) will be needed by Him for creation. It is seen (and known in common experience) that *Kartrus* like a potter or a weaver, in order to produce their creations or effects like pots and cloth, respectively, need implements and raw materials like clay, a stick, a wheel, cotton thread, a loom etc. It may be objected in the manner now — “Since the non-dual *Brahman* does not have any raw material or implements whatsoever, how can *Brahman* become the cause for the world of duality at all?”

But it is seen or known that without any other cause being there milk by itself turns into curds. Because the milk has an innate or inherent capacity, by means of the heat in the atmosphere etc. it gets converted fast into curds. In the same way, *Brahman* existing by Itself (being non-dual can by Its inherent capacity) ‘create’ the world; because It has absolute or consummate power (omnipotence), It does not desiderate any other source of power at all. Because It has manifold powers in Its own right *Brahman* alone can, without desiderating any aid from a second thing or entity (in the absolute sense) manifest Itself or become converted into various forms.

17. Su. Bh. 2-1-24. pp. 350, 351.

112. Gross things like milk etc. by themselves assuming the forms of curds etc. is seen. But how can sentient beings like a potter, a weaver etc. perform their actions without implements and raw materials? In answer to this question, it is learnt from *Mantra* or *Vedic* verse addressed to a deity, from *Arthavaada* (eulogy), *Itihaasa* (history) and *Puraana* (ancient legends or mythological works) that sentient beings

like *Devatas* (deities), *Pitrus* (forefathers) and *Rishis* (sages or seers) used to create whatever they wanted merely by their will or whim. The opponent may argue in the manner — “A spider by itself (by means of its own saliva) creates its thread (needed for its web); the deities have their physical bodies and such other material things, is it not?” But every one without exception will have to per force accept the fact that between the illustration of a potter, a weaver etc. and this example of a spider and a deity there exists a difference or distinction. A potter does not create earthen pots merely from his body alone; he needs implements and raw materials like a stick, a wheel, clay etc. But for deities, celestial beings etc. no other external thing or implement is needed for their creations. From this elucidation it becomes evident that there is no rule of law whatsoever that just like one person’s or being’s capacities or capabilities all the others also must have similar capacities or capabilities. Therefore, it is not proper or reasonable to stipulate or put restrictions in the manner — “Just like a potter or a weaver *Paramaatman* also must necessarily have separate or external implements and raw materials for creation.”

18. Su. Bh. 2-1-25. p. 352.

20. Su. Bh. 2-1-30. pp. 358, 359.

19. Su. Bh. 2-1-25. pp. 352, 353.

21. Su. Bh. 2-1-24. p. 351.

113. Anybody may raise a question of the type — “Deities and such other celestial beings, though they have the powers of creation, have bodies and senses and hence they may perform their respective actions or functions. But *Paramaatman* does not possess a body or the senses like the eyes, the ears etc. Besides, because it has been stated in the *Shrutis* that — “Not this, not that” — and thereby it has been indicated that in *Paramaatman* no special characteristics whatsoever exist at all, how at all from such a being any creation can take place?”

A solution to this problem has already been provided by saying that it is not proper or reasonable to assert or assume that the same capacities or capabilities which one person or being possesses should invariably be possessed by others too. It is probable for *Brahman*, despite His not having any special characteristics whatsoever, to possess all powers by virtue of the special characteristics or forms superimposed on Him or misconceived in Him by *Avidya*. For this reason alone, the *Shrutis* are stating that although He does not possess any instruments of knowledge (*Jnaanendriyas*) whatsoever, *Paramaatman* possesses the capacities or capabilities of all instruments of knowledge or cognition. This truth, or fact of life, itself has invariably to be realized by means of the *Shrutis* alone, exclusively, and not to be imagined, inferred, conjectured or surmised by means of logical or dialectical arguments at all. This fact has also been already mentioned.

22. Su. Bh. 2-1-31. pp. 359, 360.

114. It is stated in the *Shrutis* that *Paramaatman* created the universe and He Himself entered into it in the form of the *Jeeva* (soul). It is also taught that *Jeeva* is *Paramaatman* alone. How can that *Paramaatman*, who is independent, get entangled with *Samsaara* (transmigratory life, of a *Jeeva*) which is of the nature of birth, death, illnesses, diseases, etc. and which is dangerous, disastrous as also uncongenial to Himself? In case He has done so, He should have had the remembrance in the manner — “I have thus got entangled with *Samsaara*”; but it is not so. A magician, even after he has cast his spell of creating the objects through his *Maayaa* (magical power), can at his will and pleasure remove or withdraw his spell; whereas a *Jeeva* cannot even give up his body easily and escape from its hazards. Therefore, it does not appear to be possible that *Parameshwara* has created the universe, is it not? — Thus any one may doubt.

But in *Vedanta* philosophy *Paramaatman* is stated to be the creator of the universe and not *Jeeva* as the creator of the world. Besides, it is stated that — “*Paramaatman* is of a superior state to that of the *Jeeva*; He is *Sarvajna* (omniscient), *Sarvashakta* (omnipotent), *Nitya Shuddha Buddha Mukta Swaroopaha* (He is of the essential nature of being Pure eternally, being Conscious eternally, being Free eternally); He does not have anything either congenial (beneficial) or uncongenial (not beneficial) to Himself”. Although the *Shruti* statement that *Jeeva* himself is *Paramaatman* is true, till that truth is realized or Intuited, *Jeeva* is an *Alpajna* (a being with limited knowledge), who has yet to know or cognize that truth through spiritual practices like *Shravana* (listening) of the *Shrutis*, *Manana* (ratiocination or discrimination on the scriptural teachings) etc.; the type of difference that exists between the external space and the *Ghataakaasha* (space within an earthen pot) is likewise existing between *Paramatman* and *Jeeva*. Therefore, there is no room or scope here in this context for an objection of the type — “How can there be *Bhedaabheda* (difference cum non-difference) between the *Jeeva* and *Paramaatman*?”

Supposing it is asked — “When the *Jeeva*, by means of the spiritual instruction by the *Shaastras*, Intuits that — ‘I am *Paramaatman* alone’ — then in that event what is your answer?” — then we say: “Then neither *Jeeva* is a *Samsaaree* at all, nor *Brahman* is a creator; the differentiated empirical, workaday transactions projected or conjured up by misconception will have vanished then.” To exist or live without being able to distinguish between the (essential natures of) gross phenomena like the body, senses, mind etc., which are merely of the nature of names and forms projected by *Avidya* (misconception), on the one hand, and one’s Self, which is his essential nature of Pure Being, on the other, is itself *Samsaara* indeed. Hence, if *Paramaatman* were to be the creator of the universe, the argument or objection that the defects of having the duties or responsibilities of providing *Hita* (beneficial,

congenial things) or removing the *Ahita* (things which are not congenial or beneficial) will taint *Atman* or *Brahman*, will not hold good.

23. Su. Bh. 2-1-22. p. 348.

24 to 26. Su. Bh. 2-1-22. pp. 348, 349.

115. Some people raise an objection of the type — “If it is contended that *Paramaatman* is the creator of the world, then it will amount to saying that He has defects of *Pakshapaata* (partiality, favouritism) and *Dayaaraahitya* (not having compassion, kindness). For, among creatures or beings He has made some like *Devatas* etc. immensely happy, while He has created some others like animals, birds etc. extremely miserable; He has made some others like human beings etc. as the middle class of beings having happiness and miseries in equal proportions. Such a partiality or favouritism cannot befit *Ishwara*, who is considered to be devoid of *Raaga* (attachment) and *Dvesha* (hatred). Neither does the quality or characteristic of cruelty, like subjecting creatures or beings to misery and at the time of *Pralaya* (final dissolution of the world) killing or destroying all the beings, befit His essential nature. Therefore, it is not proper to affirm that *Ishwara* is the cause for the world.”

This is not an objection which is proper or reasonable. For in relation to, or proportionate to, the *Dharma* (merits) and *Adharma* (demerits) of the creatures or beings alone *Ishwara* has ‘created’ this universe. Just as in the example — although rain is the common cause for the growth of various grains like paddy, wheat etc., the respective seeds of those grains themselves are the root cause for their respective differences or distinctions — similarly though *Ishwara* too is the common cause for creation of the world, for the disparity or divergence in the happiness and misery of the various creatures or beings their respective actions, i.e. merits or demerits, themselves are the cause. It is in the fitness of things if it is assumed that because *Samsaara* is beginningless, the actions of the previous periods of time are the cause (responsible) for the disparity or apparent discrepancy in the creations of the future periods of time in a series.

27. Su. Bh. 2-1-34. pp. 362, 363.

28. Su. Bh. 2-1-35. p. 364.

116. There arises a doubt of the type — “By creating this world what is the benefit or purpose that accrues to *Paramaatman*? Is He not eternally contented? If it is argued that there is no benefit, or purpose served, whatsoever, then it will amount to saying or accepting that He is not *Sarvajna*, is it not? Who will ever create such a stupendous universe without getting any benefit whatsoever?” This is not a reasonable or valid doubt at all. For, there is no rule of law that all actions or deeds should have always a purpose or utility. People like a king, a minister etc. also, despite the fact that they are not gaining any

benefit whatsoever, indulge in sports, walking, jogging etc. merely for *Leela* (recreation, amusement or a pastime). For the acts like inhalation and exhalation, which *Jeevas* (creatures) perform continuously, do not acquire any benefit whatsoever. For the omnipotent *Parameshwara* creation of this universe is not at all a stupendous task; for Him this is a *Leela* indeed! Even if every being invariably gets some sort of a benefit out of an action, there need not be such a stipulation of getting a benefit for *Parameshwara*; for, the scriptures state that He is *Aaptakaama* (one who has attained fruits of all desires). Apart from this, what is the real purport of saying that *Brahman* is the *Nimitta Kaarana* for the universe? *Brahman*, being Absolute Consciousness, is the Witnessing Principle (*Saakshi*) for everything. Being an object invariably to that Witnessing Consciousness alone all the progress or activity of, and in, the universe is going on. Thus *Paramaatman* remains as Pure, Absolute Consciousness alone; apart from Him there does not exist any other conscious being whatsoever who is an enjoyer. Therefore, there is no cause or scope for the question of the type — “Why does the creation of the universe take place?” — and there is also no need or cause for an answer to be given for such a question.

29. Su. Bh. 2-1-33. p. 361 (earlier).

31. G. Bh. 9-10. pp. 377, 378.

30. Su. Bh. 2-1-33. p. 361 (later).

32. Su. Bh. 2-1-33. p. 361.

117. Thus even if we reckon *Brahman* to be either as the material cause or the efficient cause for the world of duality, there is no scope for any objection of the above type being raised. All the aspects of cause (*Kaarana*) suit or besit *Brahman*. For, *Brahman* is of the very essence of omniscience, omnipotence, and more than anything else, highly and profoundly mystic (*Mahaa Maayaavi*). Vedantins do not say that this creation is caused in the absolute sense (it is not really real); in fact, it is their opinion that this creation is the objective phenomenon of the empirical transactions of the nature of names and forms alone projected or conjured up by *Avidya*. It is the spiritual teaching of Vedantins that this ‘creation’ is taught or expounded in the scriptural texts merely as a device to help Intuit *unity* or *non-duality* of *Brahman* and *Atman* alone. Therefore, in this regard there is no defect whatsoever.

33. Su. Bh. 2-1-37. p. 366.

34. Su. Bh. 2-1-33. p. 361.

XVI. SCRIPTURAL TEXTS ON CREATION

118. We have explained so far that the theories like *Kaarya Kaarana Vaada* (theory of cause-effect), *Satkaarya Vaada* (theory that an existing entity is born) and *Maayaa Vaada* (theory of the mystic power of the Lord Creator) etc. are all devices which have been accepted as

also adopted in the scriptures to propound the non-duality (*Advaita*) of *Atman* by the utilization of the *Nyaaya* (axiom) of *Adhyaaroopa* (Superimposition) and *Apavaada* (Rescission). But the *Maayaa Vaada* or theory of the mystic power of the Lord Creator is not to be found in all the sentences pertaining to creation; how then can it be determined or concluded that this *Maayaa Vaada* alone is acknowledged by the scriptures? In the scriptures some sentences indicate the creation of *Aakaasha* (space), *Vaayu* (air) etc. as also the creation of the *Jeevas*; how could we interpret such scriptural sentences? — This question should be considered now.

In *Brahman* duality does not exist whatsoever, in reality; duality is *Maayika* (a false appearance) alone. Thus it has been established or determined on the strength of *Shruti Vaakyas* and *Yukti*. Therefore, it is not possible to imagine that the scriptures expound or teach creation quite contrary to its own statements (*Vyaahata*) and quite opposed to logical devices or arguments (*Yukti Viruddha*). Besides, the scriptures clearly and explicitly state not only that by virtue of *Avidya* alone duality appears as if it exists, but also that, when viewed from the Absolute or Transcendental standpoint of *Atman* alone being everything, one person does not at all cognize another person or another object whatsoever. The scriptures further state that *Jeevas* are devoid of birth, without cause, eternal; they are devoid of any change or mutation whatsoever; in truth, changeless, immutable *Brahman* (the Ultimate Reality) alone has assumed the forms of *Jeevas* or souls. Those *Jeevas* are really of the essential nature of *Brahman* alone. Therefore, it is tantamount to saying that the scriptures do not at all have the ultimate purport of teaching the subject-matter of the world, of the form of sentient and insentient beings, as really born or created.

1. Br. Bh. 2-4-14. pp. 374, 375.

3. Su. Bh. 2-3-17. pp. 473, 474.

2. Br. Bh. 2-4-14. p. 375.

119. Some people may raise the question — “Let it be that *Dvaita* is unreal; let it also be that *Jeevas* being born is not possible; just as all this is established or determined by the valid means of *Shrutis*, the fact that this world comprising *Aakaasha*, *Vaayu* etc. as also the fact that the *Jeevas* are born are both established by the valid means of the *Shrutis* alone, is it not? Then, what will happen to these scriptural statements?”

The *Shrutis* mentioning about or expounding creation is not for the sake of establishing the reality of creation. Utilizing the axiom that — “*Kaarya* (the effect) is *Ananya* (not separate or is one with) *Kaarana* (the cause)” — the *Shrutis* expound creation in order to bring home (with the prime purpose of inculcating in us) the truth of the unity or oneness of *Jeevas* with *Atman* by illustrations of clay, iron, fire sparks etc. Just as *Aakaasha* has assumed the various forms of *Vaayu*, *Agni*,

Ap, Prithvi, in that order, *Atman* manifests Himself in the various forms of the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect, the ego etc., which are conglomerations of the nature of *Kaarya Karana*; just as *Aakaasha* by virtue of its relationship, or in association with, *Ghata* (pot), *Mata* (pitcher) etc. appears to be *Ghataakaasha* (pot space), *Mataakaasha* (pitcher space) etc. *Atman* appears to be various *Jeevas*. This alone is the prime purport of the sentences pertaining to creation. Just as from the Absolute Reality viewpoint it is determined or established that either *Ghata, Mata* etc., on the one hand, or *Ghataakaasha, Mataakaasha*, on the other, are not really separate or different from *Aakaasha* (pure space), in the same way neither the world of the type of *Aakaasha, Vaayu* etc. nor the *Jeevas* are separate or different entities other than, or apart from, *Atman*. In this final spiritual teaching alone these *Shrutis* have their prime purport fulfilled or achieving their fruition.

4. Ma. Ka. 3-15 and

Ka. Bh. 3-15. pp. 287, 288.

5. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-3. pp. 271, 272.

120. Anybody may ask the question: "In all the scriptural sentences pertaining to creation it is not to be found that space, air etc. as also *Jeevas* are born by means of *Maayaa*. What is there to support or justify the endeavour for giving up the predominant meaning and for adopting or assuming the secondary meaning (*Gouna Artha*) of the creation being caused through *Maayaa*?"

But, in answer, we maintain that neither is it stated in the scriptures that — "Creation is absolutely real." Therefore, the scriptural statement pertaining to creation is common both to the *Paramaarth Shristi* (really real creation) and *Maayika Shristi* (mystic creation). To say that *Maayika Shristi* is *Gouna* (of secondary importance) is not proper; for, we have already shown (in the 13th Chapter) that creation cannot at all take place in any other manner. Therefore, *Mukhya Shristi* (creation in the predominant sense) and *Gouna Shristi* (creation in a secondary sense) are all *Aavidyaka* (projection of *Avidya*) alone. There is no possibility of any purpose or utility accruing from knowing creation (or its methods). Just as the anecdote of the dialogue among the *Praanas* (senses) and the *Mukhya Praana* (the vital force), mentioned in the scriptures, is enunciated merely to signify the speciality or singularity of *Mukhya Praana* and there is no cause to assume that the scriptures really have a purport in mentioning that the dialogue really took place, in the same way the scriptural statement pertaining to creation has the ultimate or prime purport of teaching the non-duality (*Advaita*) of *Atman* alone; the scriptures do not have the ultimate purport of teaching that creation is real. Thus it should be discerned. Just as it is not proper to meditate on the quarrel of the form of a dispute between the *Mukhya Praana* and the *Indriyas* (the senses),

in the same way it is not proper to meditate on creation; for, by that means an undesirable result alone may accrue. Therefore creation has not been mentioned for the purpose of meditation. Consequently, the statement to the effect that creation is *Gouna* or *Maayika* alone is verily sustainable, meaning, that teaching alone can be substantiated or proved to be valid.

6. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-23. pp. 296, 297.

7. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-15. pp. 288, 289.

121. “The scriptural sentences pertaining to the creation of the world, like the sentences pertaining to the teaching of the essential nature of *Brahman*, are invariably scriptural sentences alone. It being so, what is the reason to disregard or dismiss those sentences by means of dialectical arguments or devices?” — Thus anybody may raise a doubt. But this doubt is not reasonable or proper. For, the sentences with regard to creation are to be found in a *Brahma Prakarana* (a chapter in the scriptures exclusively devoted to the exposition or enunciation of *Brahman in esse*). Besides, for such creation sentences no benefits or fruits have been mentioned in the scriptures. Taking the creation sentences along with the sentences pertaining to the essential nature of *Brahman* alone the purport of achieving full agreement or reconciliation is seen to be fulfilled. In the scriptures for the *Brahma Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge or Self-Realization) the final fruit called *Paramapurushaartha* (the ultimate goal of all human endeavour and existence) is propounded; therefore, we should follow the logical axiom that — “If in the scriptures a sentence with resultant fruits or benefits is mentioned along with another sentence without any such fruits or benefits, then the latter should be assumed to be *Anga* (subordinate or subsidiary) to the former” — and accept that the scriptural sentences about the creation are subordinate or subsidiary to the sentences pertaining to, or propounding, the essential nature of *Brahman*. Not only this, but also it is mentioned in the scriptures emphatically and in clear terms that suggestions of the type of creation, causation etc. are for the prime and final purport of teaching the Intuitive Knowledge of *Brahman* (*Brahma Jnaana*). For all these reasons, it becomes established that creation sentences in the scriptures are not having the ultimate goal or purport of expounding creation as such.

8. Su. Bh. 1-4-14. p. 273.

10. Su. Bh. 1-4-14. p. 273.

9. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 332, 333.

122. “It is also stated in the scriptures that *Atman* gets born in the form of the *Jeeva*; further, it is stated therein that there are no distinctions or special features in Him and that He is the one and the only *non-dual* entity. It being so, why should we assume the scriptural sentences pertaining to birth, dissolution etc. alone to be subsidiary to

those which pertain to the essential nature of *Brahman*? On the contrary, why should we not reckon that the scriptural sentences about the essential nature of *Brahman* themselves are subsidiary to the scriptural sentences concerning birth, dissolution etc.? Or, why should we not conceive that both kinds of scriptural sentences too are independently valid or authentic and *Brahman* — just as a tree in its total form is one entity but in its forms as branches, sub-branches, leaves, etc. is manifold, or just as the sea in its total form is one but in the forms of waves, bubbles etc. is manifold — is endowed with many powers of existing as one and at the same time as many? Then, in that case, both the *Karma Kaanda* and the *Jnaana Kaanda* will be equally valid or authentic, is it not?" — This is the doubt raised by *Brahma Parinaama Vaadins* (protagonists of the doctrine of *Brahman's* transformation).

There is no need whatsoever to stress that this type of a doubt is totally unreasonable and contrary to the scriptural teachings. For, if the scriptural sentences which preach indistinctiveness (of *Brahman*) are reckoned to be valid or authentic, then we get the Intuitive cognition of the type — "Here *Purushaartha* (the goal or the *summum bonum* of all human existence and endeavour) ends up" — and thereafter there does not remain any aspiration whatsoever. It is also seen that *Jnaanīs* (Realized Souls) rest fully content without hankering after anything whatsoever. It is also stated in the scriptures that because a *Kaarya* is *Anrita*, one should not hanker after it. If the meaning or purport of the scriptural sentences which describe the birth or creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world is cognized, no one becomes rid of all hankering at all; besides, as stated above the fact that those scriptural sentences are means of disciplinary practices to attain *Brahma Jnaana* has been explicitly and clearly expressed by the scriptures themselves. By this reasoning alone the doctrine of the type — "Let both the non-duality (*Monism*) and duality (*Dvaita* or manifoldness) be absolutely or really real' — stands refuted as being defective. For, in the scriptures first having declared that the cause alone is real and the effect unreal, it has been taught by means of examples or illustrations like the clay, iron, gold etc. that the cause is *Brahman* (Absolute Existence in *esse*) and finally it has been instructed that — "That *Brahman* is itself in truth subjectively you"; by means of the illustration of a thief it has been distinctively taught that — "One who has identification (*Abhisandhi*) with *Anrita* (unreal, false things like the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect etc.) is bound; one who has identification with the Ultimate Reality (*Satyaabhisandhi*) is liberated or, in other words, has attained *Moaksha*"; it has been emphasized further that by means of the Intuitive Experience of non-duality of *Brahman* or *Atman* one attains *Moaksha*. If non-duality and duality or diversity are both real, then all these above teachings do not become valid at all. Therefore,

the doctrine of *Bhedaabheda* (being both distinct and non-distinct at the same time) of the type — “*Brahman* is one (non-dual) and many (diverse) at the same time” — is always opposed to the scriptural teaching.

11. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. pp. 885, 886.

13. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 329.

12. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 328.

123. Some people may ask the question: “If creation is not there at all, then why at all creation has been described or depicted in such detail (in the scriptures)? Why at all the *Sootrakaara* (Shri Baadaraayanaacharya) also has made such elaborate attempts to systematize the order of creation? Why has he accepted the world comprising enjoyers and the enjoyed objects by means of illustrations like the sea and the rivers etc.?”

But because we have clarified above that the scriptures expound creation keeping in view the ultimate purport of teaching the non-dual Intuitive Knowledge of *Brahman* or *Atman* alone, there is no possibility of doubting any contradiction in the scriptures. The *Sootrakaara* in the second section of the second Chapter has refuted the doctrines of other schools of philosophy and has indicated self-contradiction in their doctrines. Therefore, with a view to preventing the *Mumukshus* (seekers of Emancipation) from losing faith in, or reverence towards, the *Vedantic* teachings because of the apparent reason of the scriptural sentences pertaining to creation being mutually contradictory, the *Sootrakaara* has started the third section so as to elucidate and emphasize the fact that there is no inconsistency whatsoever in regard to the *Kaaryas* (i.e. the creation details). All this is stated from the *Vyaavahaarika Drishti* (empirical viewpoint) alone, and not with the purport of teaching that in reality there is creation or that creation is really and absolutely real. For, if in *Brahman*, which is taught to be the cause for the world, all the scriptural statements are shown to acquiesce in or agree fully, it suffices to sustain or substantiate the *Vedantic* spiritual teachings. This has been enunciated in the *Sootra* 1-4-14 which reads: “*Kaaranatwena Chaakaashaadishu Yathaa Vyapadishtoaktehe*”. The *Sootrakaara* has exemplified in *Sootra* 2-1-14, which reads — “*Tadananyatwamaarambhana Shabdaadibhyaha*” — that *Kaarya* is not different at all from the *Kaarana*. In the previous three sections we have elucidated that the scriptures do not at all have any deep interest (purport) in the doctrine of cause-effect. Therefore, just as we have previously (in section 92) stated, by accepting the effect of the world (for the time being, from the empirical viewpoint) the deliberation with regard to the effect (the creation) is carried out for the purport of facilitating the teaching of *Upaasanas* (meditations) alone.

While we deliberate upon *Upaasanas* in due course we will once again broach this topic.

14. Su. Bh. 2-3-1. p. 444.

16. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 335.

15. Su. Bh. 1-4-14. pp. 272, 273.

XVII. THE METHODOLOGY OF SAAMAANYA (GENUS) AND VISHESHA (SPECIES OR PARTICULAR)

124. It has been previously stated that the *Vedantic* teaching — “Accepting that there is a relationship of cause and effect between *Brahman* and the world, respectively, it has been enunciated that the birth or creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world take place all owing to *Brahman*” — is only to help reckon that the world does not exist apart from *Brahman* at all, but **not to** propound that the categories or phenomena of cause and effect are really real. *Brahman* or *Atman* of all of us is a *Maayika* cause for the world; because the world is caused by *Atman* alone, it is sustained by and in *Atman* alone and it is dissolved in *Atman* alone — it invariably evolves that everything is nothing but *Atman* alone and this alone is the true, genuine *Vedantic* teaching. With a view to driving home the spiritual teaching that — “Even during the existence of the world there really exists *Atman* alone who is devoid of all special features” — superimposing *Saamaanyatwa* (the category of genus) on *Atman* is one of the methods of instruction adopted by *Vedanta*.

Taarkikas acknowledge six categories, like *Dravya* (substance), *Guna* (quality), *Karma* (action), *Saamaanya* (genus), *Vishesha* (particular, species), *Samavaaya* (inherence). *Dravyas* are associated with internal differences like *Prithvi* (the element of earth), *Ap* (the element of water), *Agni* (the element of fire), etc.; in all of them the genus of *Dravyatwa* (substantiality) exists. It is their doctrine that in the same manner in all *Gunas* the genus of quality-ness, in all *Karmas* the genus of action-hood exist. Besides, there exist *Aparasaamaanyas* (sub-genera), like *Prithveetwa* (earth-ness), *Aptwa* (water-ness), *Agnitwa* (fire-ness) etc. which are inferior or subaltern to *Dravyatwa*; in the same manner, inferior to *Prithveetwa* the sub-genera like *Ghatatwa* (pot-ness) etc. also exist; similarly, inferior to *Gunatwa* and *Karmatwa* there exist sub-genera. But more pervasive than all these genera like *Dravyatwa*, *Gunatwa*, *Karmatwa* etc. there exists a super genus called *Sattatwa* (absolute existence) beyond which no other *Parasaamaanya* (superior genus) does exist at all. This is then the logicians' teaching. In *Vedanta* this teaching method of the logicians is not accepted to be valid. We

have already, in section 97, refuted the logicians' doctrinaire teaching that the effects like *Dvyanuka*, *Tryanuka* etc., which in the beginning did not exist but were born fresh, got associated with their respective causes as well as with the super-genus of *Sattaa* by virtue of a special relationship called *Samavaaya* (inherence). These logicians, first having enunciated that *Dravya*, *Guna*, *Karma* etc. have quite distinct characteristics just like a man, a horse, a hare etc., have later on acknowledged and expounded — quite contrary to their above enunciation — that *Guna*, *Karma* etc. are all subordinate to *Dravya* (substance) and that they are associated (conjoined) with it by a (queer) relationship of *Samavaaya* (inherence). Shri Shankara has opined that — **“If we deliberate in accordance with their acknowledged doctrines, then it will be reckoned that there is no valid means (*Pramaana*) to determine that, apart from *Dravya*, categories like *Guna*, *Karma* etc. exist at all or that apart from *Atman*, who is of the very essence of Pure Existence, the genera like *Sattaa* etc. exist at all.”**

1. Br. Bh. 2-4-6. p. 358.

2. Su. Bh. 2-2-17. pp. 396, 397.

125. There is an axiom that that thing which cannot be cognized apart from another thing, that former thing is invariably a form (appearance) of the latter entity. For example, when a drum is being beaten the sounds that emit from it have necessarily to be cognized as the sounds of the drum alone, but they are not heard by themselves without any relationship with the drum. In the same manner, the particular sounds like conch sounds, *Veena* sounds etc. have to be cognized by means of the common cognitive genus alone as the sounds respectively of the conch, *Veena* etc. only. Further, none of these sounds can be separately cognized apart from the common cognitive genus of sound. Therefore, apart from this common cognitive genus of sound, these particular sounds do not exist. Similarly in the empirical workaday world whatever genera and particular categories are seen they all can be determined as not to exist apart from the common genus of *Sadroopa* (Pure, Absolute Existence) or *Chidroopa* (Pure, Absolute Consciousness). From this it is established that the common genus of Pure, Absolute Existence-Consciousness-Bliss alone of *Atman* is, in the ultimate analysis, the *Paramaarth*a (the Ultimate Reality). **The difference between the *Sattaasaamaanya* (common genus of *Sattaa*, the category of existence), which the *Vaisheshikas* propound and the *Sat* (Pure Absolute Existence), which the Vedantins expound, is that the Vedantins (unlike the *Vaisheshikas*) affirm that the *Sat* of *Atman* exists by Itself and unto Itself in deep sleep as well as in dissolution of the world. But *Vaisheshikas* do not at all acknowledge mere *Sat*; they say that even during dissolution of**

the world the non-existence of the effects as also the atoms, like *Dvyanuka*, *Tryanuka* etc., do exist.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 3. Br. Bh. 2-4-7. p. 359. | 7. Ch. Bh. 6-2-1. pp. 413, 414. |
| 4. G. Bh. 2-16. p. 52. | 8. Br. Bh. 2-4-7. p. 359. |
| 5. Su. Bh. 2-1-6. p. 313. | 9. Br. Bh. 2-4-9. p. 360. |
| 6. Ch. Bh. 6-2-1. pp. 414, 415. | |

126. The *Sadroopa* and *Chidroopa*, which pervade the effects of *Aakaasha* (space), *Vaayu* (air) etc. is one and the same Entity only. If it is reckoned that in *Atman* there exist two genera like *Sadroopasaamaanya* and *Chidroopasaamaanya*, merely by such concepts even we will be giving rise to *Savisheshatwa*, meaning, *Atman*, the Reality, being associated with particulars or special features. In fact, doubting in the manner — “Is *Brahman* (*Atman*) *Sadroopa* or *Chidroopa*?” — is not proper. For, *Sat*, which has been taught to be *Atman* of the conscious, sentient *Jeeva*, has per force to be of the very essence of Consciousness alone; no one can ever conceive or imagine by his mind that *Chaitanya* is devoid of existence. If it is contended that *Brahman* is *Sadroopa* and also *Chidroopa*, then it amounts to saying that *Brahman* is manifold. We have already signified and explained in section 122 that the doctrine of — “*Brahman* is manifold” — is opposed to *Shrutis*’ teaching, and also to *Yukti*. Therefore, it should be rightly discerned that — “*Sat* (Pure, Absolute Existence) alone is *Chit* (Absolute Consciousness); *Chit* alone is *Sat*.”

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 10. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. pp. 617, 618. | 11. Ch. Bh. 6-2-1. p. 413. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|

127. Just as we reckon the essential nature of *Atman* (Absolute Being or Existence) as the common genus of *Sadroopa*, as also of *Chidroopa*, we can also consider It to be of the essential nature of *Aanandarooka* (Absolute Happiness or Bliss). The joy or delight which accrues on the visualisation of a desirable result or fruit of meritorious deeds (*Punya Karma*) is called *Priya* (agreeable, dear one); if that result is actualised or acquired, then the delight or pleasure that accrues is called *Mooda* (rejoicing); when *Mooda* gets enhanced it is called *Pramooda* (ecstasy, excessive revelry). Thus, because there appear distinctions of the type of *Priya*, *Mooda*, *Pramooda* in happiness or pleasure, it should not be doubted that happiness (*Aananda*) cannot be the essential nature of *Atman*. For these special features are not distinct from the common genus of *Aananda* (Pure Bliss); that common genus of Bliss pervades all these empirical pleasures. *Priya*, *Mooda* and such other empirical or mundane pleasures really do not accrue from the things or objects (external to us); when one sees or acquires a thing desired by him by dint of his meritorious deeds, then the covering of *Tamas* (darkness, ignorance), as one of the three *Gunas* (qualities),

which are the three constituents of every object, is removed and a particular sort of concept appears in one's mind (*Antahkarana*); at that instant, in that *Antahkarana* the Bliss (*Aananda*) of the essential nature of *Atman* (the Self) gets manifested or projected. **Just as people call the concept or thought (*Vritti*) which is a reflection or replica of Consciousness or Knowledge (*Jnaanaabhaasa*) as *Jnaana* (sections 67, 75), in the same way the mental concept or thought of the reflection of *Sukha* (*Sukhaabhaasa*) is called by the common people as *Sukha*.** Because the *Punya*karma (meritorious deed or action) is *Alpa* (limited or small), this resultant *Vritti* also is transient or evanescent (*Kshanika*). But the Bliss (*Aananda*) of the essential nature of *Atman* is not at all transient or evanescent. In proportion to the degree to which the *Antahkarana* acquires purification by virtue of spiritual disciplines or practices like *Tapas* (penance), *Upaasana* (meditations), *Brahmacharya* (celibacy), *Shraddha* (steadfast devotion or dedication) etc. higher and higher *Aananda* manifests in that *Antahkarana*. Just as many drops of water together go to make a sea, in the same way all the happinesses or pleasures accruing from *Vishayas* (objects) have become one with, or have merged in, *Aatmaananda* (Bliss Absolute of the Self); **in that Absolute Bliss the distinctions of *Aananda* (Bliss) and *Aanandi* (the person having or enjoying that Bliss) do not exist whatsoever. *Atman* Himself is *Aananda* (Happiness *par excellence*), as also *Aanandi* (the Entity full of or ebullient with that Blissful nature) — both rolled into one, so to speak.** Therefore, in the essential nature of Bliss of *Atman* really there do not exist any special characteristics or distinctions whatsoever.

12. Tai. Bh. 2-5. pp. 323, 324.

13. Tai. Bh. 2-7. p. 354.

128. Although *Brahman* (*Atman*) is of the essential nature of *Sat* and of the essential nature of *Chit*, It (*Brahman*) is not split up into two distinct categories of *Sat* and *Chit*; in the same manner, when *Brahman* is spoken of as *Aananda*, it means that It is not a distinct, a separate category or entity by itself other than *Sat-Chit* nature of essence. Although it is stated in the scriptures that *Brahman* is both *Vijnaana* (Intuitive experience or knowledge) and *Aananda* (Bliss), *Brahman's* *Aananda* is not an object for *Vijnaana*. Some disputants used to say that in *Moaksha* (Enlightenment, Liberation) *Aananda* is experienced. But because all disputants have accepted the standpoint that in *Paramamukti* (the Supreme or final Beatitude) there exists neither a body nor any senses or instruments of knowledge or cognition (*Karanas*) whatsoever, the statement — "Then (in Self-Realization) one experiences *Aananda* (Bliss)" — has no meaning whatsoever. Because *Atman* or *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, is eternally or perennially of the essential nature of Bliss or *Aananda*, He cannot possibly stand

apart from Himself to experience Himself. The scriptural statement — “Wherein a second thing is not seen, that state or experience is *Bhooma* (the Ultimate Reality)” — (*Chhaandogya* 7-24-1) — which signifies *Brahman*, confronts those who accept the two special features of *Vijnaana* and *Aananda* in *Brahman*. If it is contended that *Vijnaana* and *Aananda* are mutually exclusive, then it will amount to saying that *Aananda* is distinct from *Brahman* of the essential nature of *Vijnaana*, as also that It is not the real essential nature of *Aananda*. Therefore, Shri Shankaraachaarya has refuted the “*Samvedyaananda Vaada*” (the doctrine of perceived or cognized Bliss) by elucidating that the scriptural sentence — “*Vijnaanamaanandam Brahma*”, i.e. “*Brahman* is *Vijnaanam* (Intuitive experience) as well as *Aanandam* (Bliss)” — does not teach an *Aananda* which is distinct from the Self who experiences it objectively as something separate from Himself. Hence, it should be understood (discerned) that **for the doctrinaire teaching that — “*Brahmaananda* (the essential nature of Absolute Bliss of *Brahman*) is *Anubhava-goachara* (to be experienced perceptibly or objectively)” — the *Mithyaajnaana* (misconception), which presumes that *Atman* is an object for the cognition of ‘I’ notion, alone is responsible.** Here the commentaries (*Bhaashyas*) by Shri Shankara on *Brihadaraanyaka* 3-9-28 (concluding part) and *Chhaandogya* 7-24-1 should be completely and exhaustively studied.

14. Br. Bh. 3-9-28. p. 567.

16. Ch. Bh. 7-24-1. p. 559.

15. Ch. Bh. 7-23-1. pp. 557, 558.

129. It may appear to some people that if *Aananda* (Bliss) is not one to be experienced, then to call It *Sukha* (happiness) or *Aananda* (Bliss) is not proper. But there is no rule of law that *Sukha* should per force be an object for experience. If there were such a rule of law, then for those who do not have the objects of enjoyments happiness should never accrue. But in our workaday world that is not to be seen; on the other hand, it is seen that *Jnaanis* (Self-Realized souls), who are invariably *Sannyasins* (monks, ascetics) who have abstained from or discarded all objects of happiness or pleasure, are happy as much as people who are enjoying sweet things like sugar, honey etc. It is in every one’s experience that in *Sushupti* (deep sleep state), despite the fact that therein no divisions or distinctions of *Vishayi* (subject) and *Vishaya* (object) whatsoever are found, people are happy. The scriptures are proclaiming that that happiness (which is experienced by every one in deep sleep) is the *Paramaananda* (supreme Bliss) that people attain. Therefore, it is not wrong to call *Atmaswaroopa* (the essential nature of the Self) “*Aananda*” which apparently accrues without the strain or constraint of the mind transforming into two divisions of *Vishayi* and *Vishaya*. Besides, it has been affirmed in the scriptures that

the *Aananda* (Bliss) that accrues in the deep sleep state is invariably that of *Atman* alone. We have already in section 127 stated that the happiness (*Sukha*) that is enjoyed or experienced is produced afresh by the association or contact between the external objects and the senses and is nothing but a "*Sukhaabhaasa Vritti*", meaning, a mere concept of the illusory, evanescent happiness which appears to be apart, separate or distinct from oneself.

17. Tai. Bh. 2-7. p. 343.

19. Br. Bh. 4-3-32. pp. 684, 685.

18. Ma. Bh. 5, p. 189.

20. Su. Bh. 1-3-9. p. 174.

130. The essence of whatever has been stated in this Chapter is this much: "All that appears to us in our workaday world (empirical sphere) as *Sattaasaamaanya* (the common genus of existence), *Chitsaamaanya* (the common genus of consciousness) and *Sukhasaamaanya* (the common genus of happiness) is verily *Aatmaswaroopa* (of the essential nature of the Supreme Self) alone. The appearances of the type — *Sadvishesha* (the particulars or special distinctive features of existence), *Chidvishesha* (the particulars or special distinctive features of consciousness or knowledge), *Sukhavishesha* (the particulars or special distinctive features of happiness) are all the phenomena appearing because of the relationship with respective *Buddhivritti* (mental concept). If one examines this fact from the standpoint of Intuitive experience, then the phenomena of *Vishesha* (distinctive features or characteristics) do not exist at all. Therefore, *Atman* is verily *Satchidaananda Swaroopa* (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss alone *per se*). He is invariably devoid of particulars or distinctive, special features and is not — from the standpoint of the Ultimate Reality or Intuitive experience — of any common genus either."

XVIII. THE DISTINCTIONS OF JEEVA (SOUL) AND ISHWARA (THE LORD CREATOR)

131. "In the scriptures which are formulated with the prime purport of teaching the unity or non-duality of *Atman* alone why at all has the essential nature of *Jeeva* been described? In the *Shaareeraka Meemaamsaa Sootras* (*Brahma Sootras*) which are written with a view to determining the prime purport of the *Vedanta* sentences, Shri Baadaraayana every now and then keeps on saying — 'In this sentence *Ishwara* (the Lord Creator) is relevant, or is referred to, but the *Jeeva* (the transmigratory soul), who is separate or distinct from *Ishwara*, is not relevant or referred to.' When there are no two *Atmans* or selves at all, why at all has been this division or distinction brought about

by Shri Baadaraayana?" — This doubt is seen to plague the minds of some scholars.

Although *Atman* is one and one only and non-dual (without anything second to Him), the reason for which the divisions or distinctions of *Jeeva* and *Iswara* have been conceived or imagined in Him is only to adopt or assume for the time being that the *Jeeva* (the transmigratory soul), who is well-known and familiar as such with every one in our workaday world, exists and then to delineate (teach) *Ishwara*, who is the really real essence as Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss of the *Jeeva in esse*. Because *Jeeva* is *Loakasiddha* (familiar and well-known to all the people of the workaday world), the scriptures do not, and need not, at all teach about him as their prime purport; in fact, in order to expound *Ishwara* (the Ultimate, Absolute, Transcendental Reality) of all existence, the scriptures accept or assume by way of a deliberate superimposition the form or nature of *Jeeva*; that is all. The *Sootrakaara* (Shri Baadaraayana) has called *Jeeva* by the nomenclature of "*Itara*" (another person) in order to instruct or teach that *Jeeva* is of a quite different (or variant) nature other than that of *Paramaatman* (the Supreme Self, the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*). But in *Paramaatman*, who is of the essential nature of perennial Purity, Consciousness and Freedom (*Nitya Shuddha Buddha Mukta Swaroopa*), apart from His innate nature an alien nature of soulhood (*Jeevatwa*) is misconceived, just like the lower part of *Aakaasha* (empty space) is imagined to be polluted and coloured etc. In order to signify that *Paramaatman* is separate or quite different from this nature (of the *Jeeva*) the *Sootrakaara* has stated this in the manner — "He is not *Jeeva*"; besides, he has also stated that *Paramaatman* is "*Adhika*", meaning, of greater reality or essential nature than that of the *Jeeva*. In fact, nowhere in the scriptures (*Upanishads*) or in the *Brahma Sootras* it has been expounded that — "*Jeeva really exists apart or separate from Paramaatman.*" *Shaareera*, *Praanabhrit*, *Praani*, *Jantuhu*, *Vijnaanaatma*, *Kartaa*, *Bhoakta*, *Kshetrajnaha*, *Jnaha* — all these are the synonymous terms used for the *Jeeva* (the transmigratory soul).

1. Su. Bh. 1-3-7. p. 166.

2. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 196.

132. "What are the hallmarks to prove that the scriptures have the prime purport or goal of teaching the unity, non-duality of *Atman*? *Jeevas*, it is stated in the scriptures, are born or created by *Paramaatman* alone, is it not? Even for the *Sootrakaara* to say that the prime purport lies in enunciating that *Jeevas* do not exist apart from *Paramaatman*, what indications or clues are there?" — Thus any one may ask. We have previously in section 119 elucidated that the teaching of the birth or creation of *Jeevas* in the *Upanishads* is *Gouna*

(of a secondary sense). Further, in the *Shrutis (Upanishads)* it is stated that if the distinctions (*Bheda*) between the *Jeeva* and *Parameshwara* are believed to be true, it will not be proper; thus it is deprecated and condemned, while the unity or non-duality of *Atman* is praised; it has also been affirmed that by means of *Bhedajnaana* (knowledge of the existence of distinctions or differences) between *Jeeva* and *Parameshwara* causes *Samsaara* (transmigratory existence or life) and *Abhedajnaana* (knowledge of the unity or non-duality of *Atman*) helps attain *Moaksha* (Emancipation, Liberation). The *Sootrakaara* too has acknowledged this truth in *Sootra* 1-1-30, which says: "Like *Vaamadeva*, by virtue of the *Shaastradrishti*, *Indra* (the Lord of all deities) has cognized Himself as *Paramaatman*" (to wit, that *Jeevas* and *Ishwara* are one and the same, non-dual); the *Sootrakaara* has clearly declared in *Sootra* 4-1-3 that — "One should cognize *Paramaatman* to be one's own Self (*Atman*) alone." Therefore, to say that there exist differences in the teachings of the scriptures and the *Sootras* is not acceptable. It becomes established that their prime purport lies in propounding non-duality of *Jeevas* and *Paramaatman* beyond any doubt whatsoever.

3. Ma. Ka. 3-13. and Ka. Bh. 3-13.
pp. 283, 284.

4. Up. Sa. Pr. 26 - 28. pp. 16, 17.

5. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 196.

6. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 161.

7. Bh. 1-1-30. p. 102.

8. Su. Bh. 4-1-3. pp. 818, 819.

133. It is stated in the scriptures that *Jeevaatmas* (selves) have emerged out of *Paramaatman* (the Supreme Self), just like the sparks of fire emerge out of fire. In the *Bhagavadgeeta* it is stated that the *Jeevas* are "Amsha" (parts) of *Paramaatman* and the same statement is to be found in the scriptures too. "Because *Jeevas* are many and are associated with differences or distinctions, the conscious or sentient *Jeevas* are 'Amshas' of *Paramaatman*" — such a deduction or conclusion is in consonance with logical devices also. It being so, how can we at all believe that — "*Jeeva* is *Paramaatman*"?

Shaastras are "*Jnaapakam*" (reminders) and not "*Kaaraka*" (means which produce material results); they teach or signify what exists really (in the ultimate analysis, absolutely), but they never produce anew or afresh what does not exist at all. If it is propounded that — "Just like the sparks of fire, *Jeevas* emerge out of *Paramaatman*" — then it will amount to accepting the fact that there exists some kind of change or mutation in non-dual *Paramaatman*. Consequently, it will have to be accepted per force that because *Jeevas*, who are parts, have acquired *Samsaara*, *Paramaatman*, who is "*Sarvagata*" (omnipresent, all-pervasive), will also suffer from the *Samsaara Duhkha* (the miseries of transmigratory life). Therefore, the word "*Amsha*" does neither mean

that *Jeeva* is an organic part nor a physical limb (of *Paramaatman*). The purport of the illustration is merely to signify that just as the sparks which emerge out of the fire are invariably of the very essence or nature of fire alone *Jeevas* are of the very essence of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Paramaatman* alone. For that reason alone, illustrations indicating "*Pratibimba*" (reflections) of the type of "*Jalasooryaka*" (the various reflections of the Sun in water contained in several buckets or vessels) are enumerated in the scriptures; those exponents (spiritual preceptors), who are well-versed in the *Sampradaaya* (traditional, time-honoured methodology of teaching or propounding *Brahma-Aatma Ekatwa Vidya*), have given the illustrations like "*Ghataakaasha*" etc. pertaining to the *Jeeva*. Because the *Sootrakaara* has expounded "*Ekatwa*" (non-duality, identity) of *Brahman* (*Atman*) and *Jeeva*, he also does not have the prime purport of teaching that *Jeeva* is actually, really an "*Amsha*" alone of *Paramaatman*. Hence, the doctrinaire teaching that — "*Jeeva* is an '*Avayava*' (limb, organ) or '*Vikaara*' (mutation, transformation)" — can never be proper, justifiable.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 9. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 300. | 12. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. pp. 302, 303. |
| 10. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 301. | 13. Su. Bh. 2-3-43. pp. 506, 507. |
| 11. Br. Bh. 2-1-20. p. 301. | 14. Su. Bh. 2-3-50. p. 515. |

134. Although *Paramaatman* is invariably and perennially non-dual alone, the root cause for misconceiving the disparate forms of *Jeevas* and *Ishwara* in *Paramaatman* is the fundamental relationship or association invariably with the adjuncts (*Upaadhis*) of *Kaarya Karana Sanghaata* (the conglomeration of functions and the relevant valid means) which are formulated from the twin phenomena of names and forms projected or conjured up by *Avidya*. The empirical differential transaction of the type — "*Ishwara* is the ruler or Lord; *Jeeva* is the ruled subject" — and the empirical (religious or spiritual) transaction of the type — "By meditating (*Upaasana*) on or Intuiting (*Jnaana*) *Ishwara* the *Jeeva* attains Liberation (*Mukti*)" — are because of this *Upaadhi* (adjuncts of names and forms) mentioned above. Even the deliberate (hypothetical) superimposition (by the *Shaastra*) of *Ishwaratwa* (Lord-hood, Creatorship) on *Paramaatman* is verily because of this basic association with the adjuncts of names and forms alone. Although *Aakaasha* (space) is one indivisible entity alone, the divisions or distinctions which, are misconceived in *Aakaasha* by virtue of the association or relationship with adjuncts like the earthen pot, pitcher etc., can be reckoned or discerned to be analogous to the divisions or distinctions misconceived between *Jeevas* and *Ishwara*. When the unitary Intuitive experience of *Atman* is cognized (attained), then there does not exist any distinction whatsoever of the type of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* in the adjunctless non-dual essential nature of *Atman*.

A reconciliation between apparently contradictory statements made in the *Shrutis* and *Smritis* — for example, in one particular context the division or distinction of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* is accepted and in another context such a distinction is refuted — can be brought about convincingly on the basis or strength of either an association with these adjuncts or non-association with them, respectively, indeed. Just as apart from an imaginary magician or mystic (*Kalpita Maayaavi*) a really real great magician or mystic (*Paramaarth Maayaavi*) exists, we can very well discern that the *Upaadhikalpita Jeeva* (the transmigratory soul who is misconceived because of the association with adjuncts like the body, the mind, the senses, the intellect, the ego) is different from the *Nirupaadhika Ishwara* (the Lord devoid of any such adjuncts whatsoever).

15. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 334.

17. Su. Bh. 1-2-6. p. 115.

16. Su. Bh. 1-1-17. p. 70.

18. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. pp. 334, 335.

135. Some people assume that *Jeeva*, like *Ishwara*, really exists separately (or independently). Just as it is not proper to say that *Ishwara*, who is established to exist by the valid means of *Shaastra*, does not exist, similarly to say that — '*Jeeva* whose existence is established by the valid means of perception, inference etc. does not exist' — is also not proper. This is their opinion.

This contention is not justifiable. For, the physical form of *Jeeva* is contrived or misconceived by the adjunct of *Antahkarana* (the inner subtle instrument of the mind or psyche) alone, but *Jeevatwa* (soulhood), is not perceived to exist independently at all by any one, whosoever he may be. We have before in section 55 refuted the contention that *Jeeva* is perceptible by the valid means of the senses (*Pratyaksha Pramaana*) and inference (*Anumaana Pramaana*). The *Shrutis* are proclaiming that apart from *Ishwara*, who is perennially free, non-dual and omniscient, there does not at all exist any other conscious thing or entity. We have also stated already in section 122 that — "The fact that — 'The *Shrutis* and *Smritis* have eulogised the identity or non-duality of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara*, but at the same time they have unequivocally decried or deprecated the distinction or separation of the two' — is providing a strong support for the spiritual teaching of the unitary or non-dual existence of *Atman*." Therefore, it should be determined conclusively that just as a lone magician by virtue of his magical powers (*Maayaa*) appears as many, the non-dual *Atman* Himself, because of *Avidya*, appears as of manifold forms.

19. Su. Bh. 2-3-30. p. 490.

20. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 195.

136. In the doctrines of those people who say that — "The distinction of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* is *Aavidyaka* (a product or projection of

ignorance); the unitary, non-dual existence of *Jeeva-Ishwara* (as one and the same) is the Ultimate Reality" — it amounts to have discarded or neglected the contrary characteristics existing between *Jeeva* and *Ishwara*; whereby *Ishwara* Himself acquires the *Samsaaritwa* (transmigratory existence); in that event, it is tantamount to *Ishwara*'s non-existence alone. On the other hand, in the doctrines of those who say that — "Apart from *Ishwara* there does not exist any *Samsaari*" — it amounts to saying that there does not exist any transmigratory life at all, and this too is opposed to the valid means of *Pratyaksha* (perceptual knowledge), *Anumaana* (inference) etc. Besides, if the *Jeeva*, who is the proper, qualified person (*Adhikaari*) to study and follow *Shaastras* is himself not existing, then the scriptures which teach about *Bandha* (Bondage) and *Moaksha* (Liberation), *Dharma* (religious tenets or righteous behaviour) etc. become futile. Thus for all these above reasons it becomes evident that the *Jeeva*'s *Jeevatwa* (soulhood) is really real. Thus some people argue out.

This argument is not proper or justifiable. For, the apparent conception that *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* are endowed with disparate qualities or characteristics is itself brought about or projected by *Avidya*. In the spiritual teachings (*Siddhaanta*) of Vedantins who propound that *Samsaaritwa* itself is *Aavidyaka* there is no scope whatsoever to say that *Ishwara* begets *Samsaaritwa*. By the 'water' of a mirage which is imagined or misconceived the desert sand does not become slushy. In this philosophical school it is propounded that — "*Jeeva*, who apparently appears to be a transmigratory soul, is in the ultimate analysis (or in the absolute sense) devoid of all demerits or defects" — but not at all that — "*Ishwara* is perceived to be endowed with *Dharma* or *Adharma*." Besides, Vedantins do not at all assert that *Ishwara*, who is established to exist by the *Shaastras*, does not exist. In view of the fact that Vedantins have accepted that both *Samsaara* and *Samsaari* are *Avidyaakalpita* (misconceived because of ignorance), and further, as a consequence, they have conceived that until the seeker attains *Jnaana* (Intuitive experience or Self-Knowledge) *Samsaaritwa* exists, if it is said that — "There is no one qualified or a fit seeker to follow the *Shaastras*" — then also it is not proper; especially the statement that — "The unitary, non-dual existence is opposed to *Pratyaksha* *Pramaana* *Anumaana*, etc." — is absolutely improper. For, we have previously in section 28 affirmed that the empirical transactions of *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. are phenomena projected by *Avidya*.

21. Su. Bh. 4-1-3. p. 820.

22. G. Bh. 13-2. p. 511.

137. The *Jeeva* is born and he dies; he performs the *Karmas* stipulated as duties in the *Shaastras*; posthumously, he attains *Svarga Loaka* (Heaven) or *Naraka Loaka* (Hell) or *Janmaantara* (rebirths). Thus

It has been stated in the *Shaastras*. It is not proper to refute the *Jeeva's Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* which are established to exist on the strength of the experience of the common run of people, as also the *Shaastras*. *Taarkikas* affirm that *Samsaaritwa* is absolutely real and, apart from the *Samsaari*, *Ishwara* exists. Thus the doctrine that — “*Atman* is non-dual alone absolutely” — is opposed to *Tarka* also. Now, to people who argue out or raise an objection in this manner there is no need at all to give an answer exclusively.

To the *Jeeva* both his *Janana* (birth) and *Marana* (death) are not perceptible; there is only the empirical dealing of the type — “He gets born or he dies” — by virtue of his association with the body. We have mentioned previously in section 119 that the scriptural statement about the *Jeeva's* birth is a topic pertaining to *Maayika Shristi* (delusory or magical creation or birth). Doing or performing *Karmas* is seen to be in the body, the senses, the mind etc. only; but there is no valid means or proof whatsoever to demonstrate that apart from, or other than, the cause or consequence of “*Adhyaasa*” (misconception) *Atman* has in reality (in the absolute sense) any organic relationship with the body, the senses, the mind etc. Although the body is perceptible, because *Atman* is not perceptible the organic relationship between *Atman* and the body too is not perceptible. It is also not proper or reasonable also to surmise that *Atman* begets the body by virtue of his *Dharma* (merits or righteous deeds) or *Adharma* (demerits or irreligious actions); for, even before performing an action (*Karma*) the body is needed. If it is assumed that the fruit or consequence of *Karma*, performed by the body belonging to the previous birth, is this body of the present birth, even then for that earlier body (of the previous birth) another body belonging to its previous birth and for that body, in turn, the body of its previous birth, so on and so forth — thus a pre-condition arises or is desiderated, with the result nowhere (to wit, absolutely in any one body belonging to a particular birth) embodiedness is established; it becomes “*Andhaparampara*” (defect of blind faith in a series of *regressus ad infinitum*) indeed. In the *Shaastras* too because of the fact that *Karmas* are stipulated either as injunctions or prohibitions avowedly on the fundamental assumption of the relationship with the body, which in itself is *Aavidyaka* alone — even by virtue of the valid means of the scriptural texts (*Shaastra Pramaana*) also the embodiedness for *Jeeva* can never be established. The question that — “Consequently, because the actions and their respective fruits too are *Aavidyaka* alone (meaning, delusory) the spiritual teachings by the scriptures (*Shaastra Upadesha*) too are futile, worthless, is it not?” — cannot be valid; for, only for the benefit of, or for the sake of, ignorant, deluded people (*Avidyaavantas*) who have believed that the *Saadhanas* (religious practices) and *Phalas* (their fruits) are real, the *Shaastras* teach or instruct *Karmas* (by way of *Karma Upadesha*).

Therefore, in the absence of any valid means or proofs whatsoever to establish or confirm that *Jeevatwa*, of the forms or natures of *Kartrutwa* or *Bhoktrutwa*, is absolutely real, the tentative acceptance of *Jeevatwa Prateeti* (time-honoured, traditional belief in the reality of soulhood) cannot at all be repugnant or harmful to the teaching of non-duality of *Atman*. Words like *Dharmaadharmou*, *Karma*, *Hetuhu*, *Shareeram*, *Kshetram*, *Dehaha*, *Phalam* — are all synonyms.

23. Su. Bh. 2-3-16. p. 471.

25. Su. Bh. 2-3-48. p. 513.

24. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 40, 41.

26. G. Bh. 13-2. pp. 505, 506.

138. Some disputants may raise an objection of the type — “In the teaching of those people who say that — ‘*Atman* is one, non-dual Reality’ — the fruits of the *Karmas* performed by one person (*Jeeva*) all the others will have to experience, is it not? If one person attains *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge) all the others too will have per force to attain *Jnaana*, is it not?”

In the first place, we should keep in mind the *Vedantic* teaching that — “When we accept the non-dual Reality of *Atman*, because neither any one person’s *Karmas* nor the other persons (*Jeevas*) who can experience or enjoy the fruits of the *Karmas* performed by that one person will exist whatsoever, there is no scope or room for this objection at all.” Besides, because invariably in the state (of duality) wherein — from the empirical, workaday standpoint — *Jeevas* appear to be many, we have to talk about *Karma* and *Karma Phala*, and so, from this empirical standpoint alone we have invariably to provide a tentative but satisfactory solution for the objection.

Just as in the illustrations — viz. although the sky or empty space is one and one only (indivisible), there appear to be many *Ghataakaashas*; although the sun is non-dual (one and one only), the reflections of that singular sun in the water contained in several buckets or vessels appear to be many — in the same manner, though *Paramaatman* is one and non-dual Reality alone, the *Jeevas* may appear to be many. We have already stated in section 133 that when it is stated — “*Jeeva* is an *Amsha* of *Paramaatman*” — it means that *Jeeva* is just like the *Ghataakaasha* and *Jalasooryaka* (reflections of the sun in the water) alone. Let us now analyse a little more these illustrations. The dust, smoke etc. that are superimposed on one ‘*Ghataakaasha*’ cannot affect or taint the other ‘*Ghataakaashas*’. If one *Ghataakaasha*, by virtue of its association with the adjunct of ‘*Ghata*’, is born or is destroyed, and similarly by virtue of such an association if it (*Ghataakaasha*) goes from one place to another or it comes to one place from another place (that means, when the pot moves from one place to another it appears as though the pot-space also moves from one place to another) — the other *Ghataakaashas* are not at all born or destroyed, nor do they go or come

from one place to another. In the same manner, if one *Jalasooryaka* appears to shake as a result of some particular cause, the remaining *Jalasooryakas* do not at all shake. In fact, the prime purport of the illustrations of the type of *Ghataakaasha* or *Jalasooryaka* being mentioned in the authoritative, original (genuine) *Vedantic* texts is exclusively to clarify the teaching that — “*Jeevatwa* and *Jeevaanekatwa* (manifoldness of *Jeevas*) are both misconceived in, or superimposed upon, the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* alone” — and not to teach that really *Brahman* is split up or divided by any other entity or phenomenon whatsoever, nor to teach that actually (in reality) *Brahman* has cast Its reflection *Aabhaasa*. Failing to discern this prime purport of the *Vedantic* teaching, some protagonists of “*Vyaakhyaana Prasthaana*” (the methodology of the post-Shankara glossators) have presumed, nay misconceived, the two doctrines of “*Avachhedavaada*” (the theory of division) and “*Pratibimbavaada*” (the theory of reflection) and are quarrelling with one another (among themselves). Let it be (and let us ignore their misconceived doctrinaire theories). In the doctrines of the various schools of philosophies like *Saankhya* (propounded by Kapila Rishi), *Vaisheshika* (propounded by Kanada Rishi) etc. who accept *Akalpita Jeevas* (souls are not misconceived but real) because *Atman* is all-pervasive the *Karmas* and their fruits of one *Jeeva* may actually accrue to the other *Jeevas* too. But in the case of *Vedantins* who accept “*Kalpita Jeevas*” (*Jeevatwa* itself to be a misconception) this defect cannot in the least attach itself to their teaching.

27. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-5. p. 273.

29. Su. Bh. 2-3-50. pp. 515, 516.

28. Su. Bh. 2-3-49. p. 515.

30. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-9. p. 280.

139. Yet another doubt which keeps on bothering some seekers is: “The scriptures state that into the created bodies *Parameshwara* Himself has entered as ‘*Jeeva*’. Further, they teach that — ‘Thou art that *Parameshwara* alone.’ It being so, it amounts to saying that *Parameshwara* Himself, having created the world, got embodied and has become a ‘*Samsaari*’ (a transmigratory soul); it is not possible or justifiable to say either that — ‘*Ishwara*, who is independent, has become subservient to, or one controlled by, another; thereby He has become bound’ — or that — ‘*Ishwara*, who is omniscient and extremely, absolutely pure, blemishless, has conceived Himself to be a body, which is impure, full of dross.’ If *Jeeva* is himself verily *Parameshwara*, then he can by himself get rid of his ‘*Samsaara Bandha*’ (Bondage of transmigratory life); but that does not seem to be possible. Therefore, the prime purport of the scriptural teachings cannot possibly be the identity or non-duality of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara*. In order to get this problem solved completely if we say or think that apart from *Jeeva* alone *Ishwara* exists, then there will be refutation of or contradiction to

the scriptural teaching of '*Advaita*' (non-duality) of *Brahman* or *Atman*. If it is contended that because *Jeeva* is imagined or misconceived there is no defect in the teaching of *Advaita*, then how at all can it be proper to say that a misconceived or imagined *Jeeva* (*Kalpita*) and *Ishwara*, who is real and not imagined (*Akalpita*), are one and the same? It should be accepted either that *Jeevatwa* (soulhood) is *Paramaarth*a (really real) or that it is not real at all; but how can it be proper to say both?"

A proper and fully satisfactory, convincing solution for this doubt is: If for the word — '*Jeeva*' — the restricted meaning of '*Chaitanya*' or Pure Consciousness alone is taken, then *Jeeva* is verily the Ultimate Reality alone; but in that viewpoint in '*Jeeva*' there does not exist '*Jeevatwa*' (soulhood) at all. If *Jeeva* connotes — 'One who experiences the miseries of *Samsaara*; '*Kinchijna*' (one who is of limited knowledge or consciousness) and '*Alpa Shakta*' (one who is having limited power or capacity) — then it will have to be per force accepted that the misery, which appears to be experienced by the *Jeeva*, is '*Chidaabhaasa*' (the illusory consciousness), which is in its turn projected by a relationship with the *Antahkarana* (the inner instrument of the mind) and so it is in reality not experienced by, or affecting, *Atman* at all. In order to signify or propound this truth alone Vedantins say that — "*Jeeva* is merely an illusion or a reflection of *Paramaatman*, just as a reflection seen in a mirror." When it is discerned from this viewpoint, *Jeeva* as also the *Sukha* (happiness) and *Duhkha* (misery) that accrue to him are all '*Anrita*' (unreal) indeed. It is quite natural that for an imaginary or misconceived *Jeeva* there are imaginary or misconceived "*Bhoktrutwa*" in keeping with the Sanskrit axiom — "A sacrificial offering fit for a *Yaksha* (a kind of ghost or spirit)." The statements made in certain scriptural texts that — "*Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* are not for *Jeeva* but for the inner instrument of the mind (*Antahkarana*) alone" — is meant for the real purport of teaching that the reckoning of (or the present identification with) *Kartrutwa* and *Bhoktrutwa* is a lop-sided, partial viewpoint projected by virtue of the association with an adjunct (*Upaadhipakshapaati*) alone, but not at all to propound that in reality there exists any experience or enjoyment of *Sukha* or *Duhkha* whatsoever to the *Antahkarana* (the mind), which is misconceived to exist because of *Avidya*. From all these reasonings, the two statements, viz. "*Jeeva* is *Paramaatman* alone" and "*Jeeva* is the *Avidyaa Kalpita Swarupa* (the misconceived form of *Brahman* or *Atman* due to *Avidya*)" — are not at all mutually contradictory; from different viewpoints or standpoints both are correct (if properly reconciled, using the unique methodology of *Adhyaaropa Apavaada Nyaya*).

31. Su. Bh. 1-4-22. p. 286

32. Su. Bh. 1-4-22. p. 291.

33. Ch. Bh. 6-3-2. p. 431.

34. Ch. Bh. 6-3-2. pp. 431, 432.

35. Su. Bh. 1-2-12. p. 126.

36. Su. Bh. 1-4-6. p. 257.

XIX. DELIBERATION ON PANCHAKOASHA (THE FIVE SHEATHS)

140. We are beginning this Chapter with a view to expounding *Atman*, who is of the essential nature of the Witnessing Consciousness of everything, by the methodology of a deliberation of the *Panchakoashas* (the five sheaths). In *Vedanta* which has acknowledged the non-dual identity of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara*, it is propounded that *Jeeva*, who is a transmigratory soul, is *Kalpita* (misconceived) and his absolutely real, essential nature of being, which is "*Chaitanya Saakshi* (the Witnessing Consciousness), is verily *Ishwara*. Though *Jeevas* appear to be many, because that manifoldness is misconceived or false, it becomes quite clear or evident that there is no danger or harm whatsoever posed to the teaching of the non-dual identity between *Jeeva* and *Ishwara*. But there are no valid means of proving that the *Saakshi Anubhava* (Intuitive experience of the Witnessing Consciousness), which is the substrate for determining that *Jeeva* is *Kalpita*, is one and one only. Some people have raised a doubt of the type — "If *Saakshi* (the Witnessing Consciousness) is one and non-dual Reality, how is it that the happiness and misery of one particular *Jeeva* is not illumined or cognized by the *Saakshi* of another *Jeeva*?" — and they have consequently formulated the wrong doctrine of — "The *Jeeva-Saakshis* (the Witnessing Consciousnesses of *Jeevas*) are many; and *Ishwara-Saakshi* (the Witnessing Consciousness of *Ishwara*) is quite different or separate from the manifold *Jeeva-Saakshis*."

But because they have forgotten the real essential nature of *Saakshitwa*, this worthless (perilous) misconception has been formulated by such half-boiled, pseudo Vedantins. It is not proper or justifiable to establish or determine by means of *Anumaana* a doctrinaire teaching in the manner — "*Saakshi* must be one; or *Saakshis* must be many." The word, "*Saakshi*", means "*Aatma Chaitanya*" (the Pure Being-Consciousness of the Self) which illumines or helps cognize even the *Pramaatru* (the waking cognizer). How at all can the characteristics like number (manifoldness) or the distinctions of quality and quantity etc. which invariably are the categories pertaining to *Prameya* (the cognized objects or phenomena) be found in that *Chaitanya*? Even while we imagine or conceive that — "For each body there must be one *Saakshi*" — necessarily and involuntarily the *Pramaatru*, the waking cognizer, who thus imagines or conceives those manifold *Saakshis* is directly and Intuitively illumined by a distinct subtle Consciousness (*Chaitanya*) and that Absolute Intuitive Consciousness alone is the really real *Saakshi per se*. In truth, in the *Saakshya* (the witnessed phenomena) alone, which are illumined by the *Saakshi*, categories like space and time are included or subsumed; and without space and time,

numbers cannot exist or come into the reckoning. Therefore, manifoldness invariably pertains to *Saakshya* and never it concerns *Saakshi*. Because the "*Jeeva-Saakshi*" is really our *Atman* alone, the "*Ishwara-Saakshi*", which is imagined (conjectured) to exist separately or distinctly apart from that *Jeeva-Saakshi* becomes automatically "*Anaatman*" alone. Further, *Saakshi Naanaatwa* (the doctrine of manifold Witnessing Principles) is opposed to *Yukti* and this teaching is not expounded in any of the *Shrutis* at all. This topic has been once discussed previously in section 85. The above doctrine is also contrary to the scriptural teaching which proclaims that — "*Ishwara* is the non-dual *Saakshi Chaitanya*, devoid of any qualities or characteristics, which exists as the one and only Reality in each and every *Jeeva*." Therefore, because *Jeevas* are, like many *Ghataakaashas* and *Soorya Pratibimbhas*, the illusory forms of *Chit* (Pure Consciousness) or *Chidaabhaasa Roopa* alone and those illusory forms are projected or conjured up by *Avidya*, the *Samsaara* which is related to that illusion is also *Aavidyaka*. It means that *Samsaara* is a delusory (illusory) misconception; it does not at all taint or touch *Parameshwara*, who is of the essential nature of the Witnessing Consciousness. To such spiritual teachings of *Advaita Vedantins* there cannot possibly be any objections whatsoever.

1. Up. Sa. Pr. 3-1. p. 84.

2. Sve. Up. 6-11. p. 746.

3. Su. Bh. 2-3-46. p. 511.

4. Mu. Bh. 3-1-1. pp. 144, 145.

141. Yet, there is every scope for a doubt of the following type to raise its head in the minds of some people: "Because *Saakshi* is seeing (or objectifying) the *Pramaatru* (the 'I' notion), just as the *Pramaatru* is separate from the *Prameya*, *Saakshi* can be reckoned to be separate from all objectified phenomena, like the *Pramaatru*, the *Pramaana* and the *Prameya*. But there is no necessity or rule of law to assume that just because *Pramaatru* is distinct from the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect, both the *Pramaatru* (the subject), on the one hand, and the body, the senses, and mind etc. (the objects), on the other, are false or unreal. For, the body, the senses etc. are established to exist on the strength of the valid means of *Pratyaksha*, *Anumaana* etc. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to assume that *Pramaatru* and his adjuncts (*Upaadhis*) like the body, the senses etc. are really existing, just as till the pots, pitchers etc. are there the pot-space, the pitcher-space etc. also are real; or till the adjuncts like the water in the various buckets or vessels are there the reflections in the water contained in those vessels are real only. It will also be reasonable in keeping with every one's experience that because of the reason that apart from, and external to, our body, senses, mind and intellect, the elements like the earth, the air, the fire etc. are also existing, they too are really existing.

If all these are real, then it will never be possible to assert that *Saakshi* is in truth the non-dual *Paramaatman* at all?"

But we have previously mentioned in section 28 that unless and until the nature or characteristics of *Upaadhis* (adjuncts) like the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect are misconceived to be one's own, *Atman* cannot be assumed to be a *Pramaatru* (the cognizer of the waking). Therefore, by virtue of His own innate essential and real nature, *Atman* is not at all a *Pramaatru*, nor is He a *Kartu* or a *Bhoktru*. Had it been true that the *Pramaatru* were really of the essential nature of (an independent) cognizer alone, then the *Shrutis* would not have taught or expounded in the manner — "You are, in truth, *Ishwara*" — and — "One who knows or Intuits *Brahman* becomes (one with) *Brahman* alone" — with all reverence and sanctity. For a being of the innate, essential nature of *Pramaatru* to give up that intrinsic real nature and further to get transformed into the essential, innate and real nature of *Paramaatman* it is not at all possible. We have previously in section 137 stated that the body, the senses, etc. are not really associated with *Atman*. Besides, there is no valid proof whatsoever to establish that the phenomena like the body, the senses etc. really exist. When questioned — from the standpoint of our workaday world experience — as to what are the *Pramaanas* for cognizing the existence of the body, the people generally explain away saying that our senses alone are *Pramaanas*; if questioned as to what proof or evidence is there to say or establish the fact that the senses exist, they will further explain away saying that the mind knowing or cognizing as such is the proof. Further, when questioned as to what proof is there to determine that the mind exists, they will again explain away saying that — "My experience alone is the valid means of proof". Therefore, barring this "experience" (*Anubhava*) of the *Paraagdrishhti* (extroverted outlook or viewpoint) to affirm or prove that the phenomena like the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect etc. do really exist, there are no valid means or evidences whatsoever. For, unless and until the organic conglomeration of the body, the senses, the mind etc. is misconceived to be 'I' the *Pramaatrutwa* (cognizership) does not come into the picture or into the reckoning; unless and until we acknowledge the empirical fact that *Pramaatrutwa* is real we cannot reasonably, plausibly explain away saying that — "The body, the senses etc. are perceived merely by our empirical experiences (consciousness)." In the *Shrutis* it has been affirmed that *Atman* does not at all possess (the adjuncts of) the body, the senses etc. In *Vedantic* parlance the *Saakshidrishhti* (the Absolute, Transcendental viewpoint of the Witnessing Consciousness) is called "*Pratyagdrishhti*" (the introverted, introspective viewpoint) and the empirical viewpoint of the cognizer 'I' is called "*Paraagdrishhti*" (the extroverted, mundane viewpoint). The fact that — "This latter

Paraagdrishti is 'Aavidyaka' (a projection caused by *Avidya*)" — has been mentioned by us previously in section 83.

5. Ka. Bh. 1-3-4. pp. 155, 156.

8. Up. Sa. Pr. 2-59. p. 39.

6. Up. Sa. 15-1. p. 143.

9. Up. Sa. 13-12. p. 124.

7. Up. Sa. 18-4. p. 206.

10. Ka. Bh. 2-1-2. p. 172.

142. The "*Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya*" utilized in the "*Taittiriya Upanishad*" with the prime purport of enabling the seeker to get rid of or rescind, stage by stage, the "*Aatma Buddhi*" (the innate deep-seated identification) with the body, the senses, the mind etc. is called "*Panchakoasha Viveka*" (Intuitive deliberation of the five sheaths). Man, by dint of his natural *Avidya*, is cognizing his body, which is composed entirely of the essence of the food that he takes in (*Annarasamaya*), itself to be "*Atman*" indeed. But, in order to teach that this body is nothing but *Anaatman* (not-self), the scriptural text expounds by a deliberate superimposition of assuming the *Praana* (the vital breath) alone which is inner or subtler than the physical body and is of the form of five *Vrittis* (functions) as *Atman*; the scripture then 'rescinds' the earlier superimposition of the *Annamayakoasha* (the physical body) by preaching that it is *Atman*'s mere body alone. The body really does not exist apart or different from *Praana*, which is predominantly of a dynamic, sentient nature; for, just as an earthen pot is pervaded everywhere by clay alone, the physical sheath, which is full of the essence of the food one consumes (*Annamayakoasha*), is thus full of or pervaded by *Praana* alone. Therefore, just as the earthen pot is really nothing but clay and clay alone in and through, the whole of the physical body (or sheath) is nothing but *Praana* (*Praanamaya*). In the same manner, apart from the various mental concepts or thought forms *Praana* too does not exist; hence the *Praanamayakoasha* (the vital force sheath) is really the *Atman* alone called "*Manoamaya*" (which is full of or pervaded by *Manas*, the mind). But if examined more incisively with the help of Intuitive experience, even in this subtler sheath called *Manoamayakoasha*, the apparent identification as one's own being (*Aatmatwa*) is "*Adhyaaroopita*" (superimposed or misconceived) indeed and it is not really *Atman* at all; in fact, it is full of or pervaded by an *Aatmatwa* called "*Vijnaanamaya*" (of the essence of intelligence or cognitive, reasoning faculty) alone. That "*Vijnaanamaya*" also is a sheath alone; for, it is not apart or separate from the *Atman* of the essential nature of *Aananda* (the happiness), which has enveloped or pervaded it. This "*Aanandamaya*" too is not *Atman* (of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss) in its distinctively (*Vishesha*) form (*Roopa*) with its special characteristics; because in and through that sheath, all over, *Aanandasamaanya* (the genus of Bliss or happiness *par excellence*) alone is pervading, that Bliss Absolute or Transcendental alone is the really real *Atman* indeed.

Here although the seeker (*Jijnaasu*) goes on conceiving the *Annamaya*, the *Praanamaya*, the *Manoamaya*, the *Vijnaanamaya* and the *Aanandamaya Koashas* (sheaths), stage by stage, to be *Atman*, in truth they are not the real *Atman*, of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss at all; they are indeed the sheaths of *Atman* which have pervaded one another in that order. Just as the hard leather sheath of a sword cover it up, these sheaths cover up the Self, as it were, and create the delusion that they themselves are *Atman*. Our physical body which is *Annamaya* is in fact a part of the external gross materialistic world. *Praanamayakoasha* is a part of the *Samasti* (the macrocosmic) *Vaayu* (air or atmosphere), which is of the nature of dynamism (*Kriyaatmaka*); because of this adjunct of this sheath, we are called *Praani* (a living creature). *Manoamaya* is a part of the macrocosmic (*Samasti*) Mind (*Manas*), which is of the essence of thought constructs or concepts as taught or expounded in the *Vedas* (scriptural texts); because of this adjunct we are called "*Mantru*" (one who ratiocinates or Intuitively reasons out). *Vijnaanamaya* is a part of the macrocosmic Intellect (*Buddhi*) which has the essential nature of determining the purport of the scriptural teachings and getting complete certitude or sense of conviction and performing *Karma* stipulated in the *Vedic* texts; because of our association with this adjunct of *Vijnaana* (the intellect) alone we are called "*Jnaatru*" (a knower), *Kartru* (an agent of action). In the same manner, *Aanandamaya* is the adjunct (*Upaadhi*) for our *Bhoktrutwa* (enjoyership). This is a part of the macrocosmic adjunct of the enjoyer who enjoys the fruits of *Karmas* and *Upaasanas*. Thus without reckoning that all the five sheaths from *Annamaya* to *Aanandamaya* are the adjuncts of *Atman* we invariably mix up or blend them with *Atman*, of the essential nature of *Saakshi Chaitanya* and are totally deluded by the misconception (*Bhraanti*) that those adjuncts themselves are the real *Atman*. Because our real *Atman*, who is the substrate for everything, is devoid of all special characteristics like *Sukha* (happiness) and *Duhkha* (misery). He is verily of the essential nature of *Aananda* (Bliss *par excellence*), without any special characteristics whatsoever. Because of the final goal or purport of this *Aananda* alone all the empirical transactions or functions of the *Karana* (instruments of action like the senses, the mind, memory and intellect) of all creatures (*Praanis*) are being carried out; as a consequence of that action alone happiness is accruing. It is explained in the *Taittiriya Upanishad* that if we discern (Intuitively cognize) *Atman*, who is all-pervasive (*Sarvaantara*) and Witnessing Consciousness of everything (*Sarvasaakshi*), as also devoid of any special characteristics whatsoever and of the very essence of Bliss Absolute (*Aanandaswaroopa*) in the orderly manner as stated above, then we Intuit that — "*Atman* does not

have any body, senses, etc. whatsoever, nor any relationship with the five primordial elements (*Panchabhootas*)” — and then ridding ourselves of any fear whatsoever of *Samsaara* we will get fully established in our essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss *per se* indeed and that is, in truth, the goal, the *summum bonum* of all human effort or endeavour.

11. Tai. Bh. 2-2. pp. 308, 309.

13. Tai. Bh. 2-7. p. 344.

12. Tai. Bh. 2-3. p. 312.

14. Tai. Bh. 2-7. p. 345.

143. It has been stated in the *Taittiriya Upanishad* that for the *Annamaya* the *Praanamaya* sheath is the *Atman*; for the *Praanamaya* the *Manoamaya* is the *Atman*; for the *Manoamaya* the *Vijnaanamaya* is the *Atman*; and for the *Vijnaanamaya* the *Aanandamaya* is the *Atman*. Further, for each one of these *Atmans* — just as in the case of *Annamaya* it has been stated that they have left and right sides, a central part and a hind part or tail which is said to be '*Pratishtha Roopa*' (of the nature of a substrate) — in that same manner it has been stated that each of the five *Atmans* has limbs. Therefore, when seen perfunctorily it strikes to our minds that these sheaths really are existing, one within another.

But this conception is not proper. For, when one among these five sheaths is cognized or Intuited as *Atman*, one does not have any *Aatmabuddhi* (the innate identification) with the rest of the sheaths. To say that one person has many *Atmans* (selves), each of which is of the essence of his Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss is a statement without any meaning at all. Therefore, the *Upanishad* begins with the *Annamaya* sheath which is quite familiar and well-known to all of us, and just as one points out the moon as being above the branch of a nearby tree, the scripture points out the other sheaths like *Praanamaya*, *Manoamaya* sheaths. Because we have an innate identification (*Aatmabuddhi*) with each one of these five sheaths at different states or conditions, just as people, who wish to point out a very small or minute star called "*Arundhati*", first of all point out a grossly visible star nearby calling it by that very name of "*Arundhati*" and later on (i.e. when that gross star is easily perceived by the other person) they clarify in the manner — "Near that first gross star alone you can perceive that '*Arundhati*' star existing" — in the same manner the scripture keeps on pointing out the five sheaths up to *Aanandamaya*, saying that each one of them is our *Atman*, one after another, in the beginning, but finally it teaches that the really real *Saakshi* (the Witnessing Consciousness) for all the five sheaths is *Paramaatman* alone. For that reason alone, it has been stated

negatively that — “In *Paramaatman* there does not exist any kind of special features or characteristics whatsoever.”

15. Su. Bh. 1-2-20. p. 137.

18. Tai. Bh. 2-2. p. 309.

16. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. p. 476.

19. G. Bh. 13-22. p. 547.

17. Tai. Bh. 2-1. pp. 304, 305.

20. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-11. p. 282.

144. In the methodology of *Pancha Koasha Viveka* enunciated in the *Taittiriya Upanishad* with regard to the teaching — “That Entity which is innermost to all other things is *Atman*’ — the topic — ‘whether that *Atman* is *Savishesha* (endowed with special characteristics) or *Nirvishesha* (devoid of any special characteristics)’ — is one which deserves a good deal of consideration. While teaching that from *Manoamaya* to *Aanandamaya* sheaths the latter sheath is the inner *Atman* to the former sheath, it should be discerned that after preaching about the *Aanandamaya* sheath another inner *Atman* has not been taught. (At this stage further such teaching of the existence of yet another inner *Atman* is stopped). In the *Phala Shruti* (the scriptural statement pertaining to the fruit or benefit accruing from such deliberation) it is stated that the seeker begins his deliberation of the *Aanandamaya* sheath and this teaching is abruptly rounded up with the statement — “With that alone he attains *Brahma Praapti* (Self-Realization).” Therefore, here in this context *Aanandamaya* itself is taught to be *Brahman*; the scriptural statement that — “*Satyam Jnaanam Anantam Brahmaa*” — meaning, “*Brahman* is the Reality; It is Consciousness; It is Eternity” — which is mentioned at the beginning, is nothing but this “*Aanandamaya*” — Thus one particular *Vrittikaara* (a commentator) had expressed his opinion while interpreting the scriptural statement.

However, this opinion or interpretation is not correct or proper. For, it has been taught that for *Aanandamaya Atman* the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* (*Saakshi Chaitanya*) alone is the “*Putchha*” (the tail) — meaning, the essence of Being or the substrate; and in a specific manner and quite separately too it has been taught that beyond the *Aanandamaya* sheath *Brahman* exists (as the Ultimate Reality); further, it has been taught that it is *Atman* of the essence of Bliss (*Aananda Roopa*) also in *Taittiriya Upanishad* 2-5. Because of the reason that after the deliberation on *Aanandamaya Atman*, without concluding the topic of the description of the *Aanandamaya* sheath the scripture states that — “If one believes or thinks that *Brahman* is *Asat* (unreal or false), then he (the thinker) himself will become unreal or false” — and it becomes quite evident that this scriptural statement is made keeping in mind the prime purport that the common run of people who are ignorant (of the Ultimate Reality of *Atman* or *Brahman*) may have a doubt that because *Brahman* is *Nirvishesha*, it must be a non-existing

thing. Because *Aanandamaya* sheath is universally known and is quite familiar to all the people to be associated with parts full of *Priya*, *Mooda*, *Pramooda* etc. (Section 127), there cannot be possibly any room or scope for any doubt of the type — “Is there a thing like that (an *Aanandamaya* sheath) or not?” — to raise its head at all. It is also stated in the scriptures that *Brahman*, after creating the effects from *Aakaasha*, *Vaayu* etc. up to *Annamaya*, It entered into all these, and further the scriptures state that if that *Brahman*, which is lodged in the cave of the heart (*Hridaya Guha*), is Intuited or cognized, then one attains the *Parama Purushaartha* (the prime purport or goal of human existence). Because it has been stated in the scriptures that — “Beginning with *Annamaya*, *Praanamaya* etc. up to *Aanandamaya* these *Atmans* (both the physical and the psychic) are sublated and in the process the seeker attains a highly sublimated state; in other words, he destroys (or gets rid of) his *Avidya* and Intuits the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality as Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss” — it becomes established without giving room for any doubt that these five sheaths have been exemplified in order to help attain Self-Knowledge (*Brahma Jnaana*) alone. Shri Shankara has determined that because (immediately after the instruction about these five sheaths) in the *Phala Shruti* that follows it is taught about the Ultimate, Absolute Reality of *Brahman* alone as being beyond the ken of words (speech) and the mind, only *Brahman* devoid of any special features or characteristics is propounded.

21. Su. Bh. 1-1-19. p. 72.

24. Su. Bh. 1-1-19. p. 75.

22. Su. Bh. 1-1-19. p. 73.

25. Su. Bh. 1-1-9. p. 74.

23. Tai. Bh. 2-8. p. 365.

XX. DELIBERATION ON THE THREE STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS (AVASTHAATRAYA VIVEKA)

145. In the previous Chapter we have indicated that by means of logical dissertation of the type — “Because the *Saakshi* is beyond the ken of time and space, there cannot possibly be any categories or phenomena like plurality or numbers, special features, relationships etc. in *Brahman* or *Atman* and hence the five sheaths which are the witnessed phenomena are not separate or different from the *Saakshi*; because the extroverted outlook or viewpoint (*Paraagdrishti*) is the root cause for conceiving or perceiving the body, the senses, the mind etc. in that *Brahman* or *Atman* who is the Witnessing Consciousness, if one Intuits with the help of *Pratyagdrishti* (Absolute or Transcendental viewpoint of the Intuitive experience), then these adjuncts of the body, the senses, the mind etc. do not exist at all.” And for the predominance

of the *Paraagdrishti* in all the people the innate identification with the waking state alone is the birth place; hence, in *Vedantic* philosophy the deliberation on the three states of Consciousness called “*Avasthaatraya Viveka*” is taught in order to inculcate in the seekers the *Pratyagdrishti* (*Saakshi Anubhava Drishti*). This *Avasthaatraya Vichaara* or *Viveka* is useful in first (deliberately) superimposing (i.e. *Adhyaaroopa*) on *Atman* the *Saakshitwa* (Witnesshood of the three states of Consciousness) and then rescinding (*Apavaada*) from Him the innate association with the world of duality (*Saprapanchatwa*).

In this methodology based on Intuitive deliberation the first and foremost step is that the aspirant for the attainment of Self-Knowledge (*Aatma Jnaana*, *Moaksha Swaroopa Praapti*) should fully cognize or Intuit the truth (or veracity of the teaching) that each one of the three states of Consciousness, viz. the waking, the dream and the deep sleep, are witnessed by him and him alone. To wit, by means of the *Pratyabhijna* (Intuitive recognition), that the ‘I’ that witnessed the dream state is itself ‘awake’ (as real as the waking ‘I’); the seeker should cognize that his *Swaroopa* (essential nature of *Atman*) is, in truth, quite different and of a queer nature or essence; he should Intuit that his *Swaroopa* is more pervasive or comprehensive than both the waking and the dream states of Consciousness and is *Shuddha* (pure or devoid of any encrustations of duality) and is *Adviteeya* (non-dual, Absolute, Transcendental).

1. Ka. Bh. 2-1-4. p. 175.

2. Ma. Ka. Bh. 1-1-. p. 191.

146. In order to cognize that the innate identification with the waking state consciousness alone is the root cause for *Paraagdrishti*, it is quite necessary for us to reckon as to how, with the innate natural identification with the waking state consciousness, the essential nature of *Atman* appears to us naturally (empirically). To reckon that *Jeevas*, being or existing in the world, keep on experiencing the waking, the dream and the deep sleep states one after another is in itself the essential nature of the innate identification with the waking state consciousness.

On the other hand, to cognize that — “My body, senses, mind etc. which appear in the waking, the entire universe which is seen or perceived by the valid means of *Pratyaksha* (perception), *Anumaana* (inference) etc. and all the *Jeevas* who are of the nature of *Kartrus* (agents of action) and *Bhoktrus* (enjoyers) and who are existing in that universe — are all bound up with or confined to the waking state alone. I am not really an embodied soul; I am indeed of the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness (*Shuddha Chaitanya*) which illumines the whole world and I am of the form of both the external (*Baahya*) and internal (*Aadhyaatmika*) experiences that appear in the waking state”

— is the viewpoint which is beyond the waking state. The essential nature of *Atman* which is innately identified with the body, the senses, the mind etc. which appear in the waking state is called *Shaareera*, *Pindaatman*, *Jeeva*, *Vijnaanaatman*, *Kartru-Bhoktru*. Examining (Intuitively) with the *Shaastradrishiti* (the viewpoint recommended or suggested by the scriptures) our waking state, that nature or form which is described above (in other words) the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness of *Atman* which is eternally illumining the entire universe (*Samasti Prapancha*) within the waking state is called *Viraat* or *Vaishwaanara*.

In order to signify or expound this truth, in the *Maandookya Upanishad* this *Vaishwaanara* has been described as follows: "This *Atman* has extroverted cognition, seven *Angas* (organic parts) like *Dyuloaka* (the stellar region) etc., 19 doorways of knowledge or cognition of the form of ten senses, five vital forces, four aspects (functions) of *Antahkarana* (the inner instrument), enjoyment of gross objects." However, this is one *Paada* (footprint) alone of *Atman* and this is not the description of the essential or real nature of *Atman* as He is, *in esse*.

3. Ma. Up. 3. p. 182.

4. Ma. Bh. 3. pp. 183, 184.

147. The common people quite naturally assume that in the dream state by virtue of the latent impressions of the waking state (*Vaasanas*) an imaginary world appears to the mind alone; and that world appears only to, or exclusively to, the dreamer alone (i.e. the individual who sees the dream), but in the waking state everyone sees or perceives a real world through his senses and in that real world there appear many *Kartrus* and *Bhoktrus*. For this presumption the root cause is one's innate or deep-seated identification with the waking consciousness alone. If we examine (Intuitively) from the viewpoint of the *Shaastra* or *Vedantic* scriptures, there is not an iota of difference whatsoever between the waking experience and the dream experience. To wit, in the dream too, just like the waking, the external (*Baahya*) and the internal (*Aadhyaatmika*) worlds appear; that entire world, just like the entire waking world, is being illumined by *Atman* alone. Therefore, the assumption that the waking world alone, exclusively, is real is a deduction or judgment of the empirical, workaday viewpoint *Vyaavahaarika Drishiti* backed up by (or based upon) the innate, deep-seated identification with the waking experience; but this judgment alone is not the final one. Even if we accept the contention that the dream appears because of the latent impressions (*Vaasanas*) of the waking experiences, since these two states are not existing apart from *Atman* as well as one state is experienced to have left off the other, both are rendered unreal, false. To assume, that the dream world appears

individually to the respective dreamer alone while the waking world especially is real and natural to many people, there is no sustaining valid means or proof whatsoever. Just as the world of the dream appears only or exclusively to the person who sees the dream, the world of the waking state also is seen by one who is awake alone. In the deep sleep state both these worlds equally (and completely) become non-existent. The *Atman* who witnesses (in other words, who pervades and illumines) the dream world is called *Taijasa* or *Hiranyagarbha*. The manner in which this *Taijasa* is described in the *Maandookya Upanishad* is: "This *Atman* has (is endowed with) the internal cognition; He has seven *Angas* (limbs) like the *Dyuloaka*, i.e. the stellar region, as the head, sun and moon as the eyes etc. and 19 cognitive or perceptual doorways of the forms of the ten senses, five vital forces (*Praanas*) and four aspects or functions of the inner instrument of the Mind (*Antahkarana*); He enjoys the subtle objects of the dream world." He is the second *Paada* (footprint) of *Atman*; but this is not the real, self-established, non-dual and essential nature of *Atman*.

5. Ma. Up. 4. p. 186.

6. Ma. Ka. 4-87. pp. 391, 392.

7. Br. Bh. 2-4-7. p. 359.

8. Up. Sa. Pr. 89. p. 50.

8a. Ma. Ka. 2-5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; 4-37, 38, 39. pp. 236, 237, 239, 240,

241, 355, 356, 357.

9. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-37. p. 356.

148. For the Vedantins to affirm that there does not exist any difference whatsoever between the waking and the dream, there are, in the main, two reasons. First, the objects or phenomena that appear in the waking are akin to the dream objects or phenomena; secondly, the *Advaita Jnaana* (the non-dual Intuitive experience, Pure and Absolute) does not exist in both these states. Because when the non-dual, Transcendental Intuitive experience is attained one gets convinced that both these waking and dream experiences are *Mithyaa* (false, unreal), Vedantins call both these experiences "dream" alone; at the time or moment of its occurrence appearing to be as real as the waking and (when the individual self wakes up really) it appearing to be a false appearance — alone is the nature of a dream and hence to say that both these states are "dreams" is quite reasonable or justifiable indeed.

10. Ait. Bh. 1-12. p. 41.

11. Ma. Bh. 4. p. 186.

12. Ma. Ka. 4-61, 62, 63, 64, 65

and 66. pp. 374, 375, 376.

13. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-66. p. 376.

149. The Buddhists too propound that the waking and the dream states are equal to each other. For that reason, they imagine on the basis of *Anumaana* (inference) that — "Just as for the percepts (*Pratyaya*) of the dream state there do not exist any external objects whatsoever, for the percepts of the waking state too there do not exist

any external objects at all." Anyhow, it is their conclusion that because the object for the *Vijnaana* (intellect) does not exist apart from or external to it, *Vijnaana* itself is the *Tattwa* (the Reality). But in their doctrines because no "*Kootastha Chaitanya*" (immutable, steadfast Absolute Consciousness) whatsoever — which is the common denominator for both the states and which witnesses both the waking and the dream states — is accepted, their doctrine mentioned above (merely based on equality of the two states) does not hold water (i.e. it cannot be sustained). Apart from this, when the waking state comes, the dream state becomes falsified or sublated (*Baadhita*) and in the same way, the objection arises to the effect — "In which state does the waking state also gets falsified or sublated?" — but to this objection there is no satisfactory or convincing answer in their philosophy. Neither is there any satisfactory solution to the question — "We remember the dream experience in the waking state and then we say that dream experience is false or unreal; in the same manner, assuming that the waking experience too is a state which has occurred in a previous state in which particular state do we determine or ascertain its *Mithyaatwa* (unreality or falsity)?" On the basis of the solitary reason that the comparison of the dream experience with the waking experience can be adduced in this context, the inference that is deduced or drawn to the effect — "The waking objects do not really exist" — is also not proper and justifiable. (In fact, it looks to be far-fetched). For the same reason, the contention forwarded or the deduction arrived at merely on the strength of the reason or inference that — "Between the percepts like *Maayaa* (magic), the mirage water, the celestial citadel (*Gandharva Nagar*) etc. and the percepts of the waking state there exists an exact comparison or analogy and hence there are no real external objects for the waking percepts" — is not proper at all. Can any one say that — "Just like fire, mist or dew also is an object of perception and hence mist also is hot"? But in the case of Vedantins because they Intuit, from the viewpoint of Self-Knowledge, that both these states are "dream" alone, in their spiritual teachings it can well be asserted that — "The *Sattiyatwa* (the so-called or apparent reality) of the waking experience is falsified or sublated (*Baadhita*)" — and that is fully justifiable; for, in *Atman* alone both the waking and the dream states are misconceived (i.e. both of them are superimposed on *Atman*).

14. Su. Bh. 2-2-29. pp. 423, 424.

17. Ma. Ka. 2-5. p. 236.,

15. -do-

Ma. Ka. 2-11,12. pp. 241, 242.

16. -do-

150. There is no rule of law whatsoever that *Atman* should always be appearing to be associated with or related to the world of duality either of the waking or of the dream. For, in the deep sleep state the entire world of duality is merged in *Atman* alone; the distinct knowledges of

the various objects which appear in the world have also become one with *Atman*; besides, none of the pleasures born out of the external objects exists whatsoever therein and they are all one with *Aananda* (Absolute Bliss) of the essence of *Atman*. In that state *Atman* is devoid of any taint of *Samsaara*. For this reason alone, it has been affirmed in the *Chhaandogya Upanishad* that *Jeeva* in that state has become one with *Brahman*, which is of the essential nature of *Sat* (Absolute Being or Existence); in the *Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* it has been propounded that *Jeeva* has embraced *Prajna* (the Self of the essence of Absolute Being-Consciousness); in *Maandookya Upanishad* it has been vividly described that therein *Jeevaatman* has become *Ekeebhoota* (non-dual, unitary, one and one absolutely); *Prajnaanaghana* (the very embodiment or essence of Absolute Consciousness); *Aanandamaya* (full of, abounding in Bliss). Such a nature of Absolute, Transcendental (i.e. beyond the ken of time-space-causation concepts or categories) Consciousness is called *Prajna*. The essential nature of the *Sushuptaatman* (the *Atman* of the deep sleep state) is the third *Paada* of *Atman*; but it is not the really real essential nature of *Atman*.

18. Ch. Bh. 6-8-1. pp. 453, 454.

20. Ma. Up. 5. p. 187.

19. Br. Bh. 4-3-21. pp. 660, 661.

151. There is a possibility on our part of having (or entertaining) two kinds of misconceptions with regard to the deep sleep experience: (a) 'That while in deep sleep there being (existing) nothing therein, as soon as we are awake there appears a variegated world and hence in the deep sleep state the entire world of duality remains in a seed form' is one misconception; (b) that 'because in deep sleep both the experiences of 'I' and 'the others' do not exist therein at that moment even the essential nature of *Atman* too should be accepted as not to exist' is the other misconception. The first opinion is proper or reasonable only from the waking viewpoint or standpoint; for that reason alone it is described in the scriptural texts that both the *Sushuptaatman* and the *Atman* who is of the nature of unmanifested seed form of the world (*Avyaaakrita Jagadaatma*) are one and the same, as also that *Sushuptaatman* is verily *Parameshwara* (the Supreme Lord) who is the creator of the world alone. But we have previously explained in section 105 that even conceiving or imagining this state of seed form is by virtue of misconception alone. That in deep sleep there does not exist any particular or distinctive knowledge or cognition is true indeed; but it is not proper or justifiable to say that the *Chaitanya*, which is the essential nature of *Atman*, also does not exist in deep sleep. For, therein the Intuitive experience of the type — "I did not cognize or know a second thing or object" — alone exists but not the experience of the type — "I too am not existing" — at all. It is true that therein the particular or distinctive

cognition of the type — 'I', 'this', 'they' etc. — does not exist; but the reason for that is: 'The entire world of duality which has divided itself into its various categories — like the *Antahkarana* (the inner instrument of the mind), the senses and the objects — has become one with (or merged into) *Paramaatman*' — alone and not that there was no existence of *Atman* at all.

21. Ma. Up. 6. p. 190.

22. Ma. Bh. 3. p. 185.

23. Ch. Bh. 6-2-1. pp. 413, 414.

24. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 194.

25. Br. Bh. 4-3-23. pp. 675, 676.

152. The deep sleep state (or experience) can be viewed from two standpoints. If it is compared with the waking experience and the dream experience, what exists (or what is experienced by us) in deep sleep becomes "*Beejaatman*" (the Self of the seed form which is the root cause for the world). From this standpoint alone it has been stated in the *Upanishadic* lore, that — "*Jeeva* (the transmigratory soul) becomes one with *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, in the deep sleep state"; as also, that — "From that *Brahman* the entire universe of duality comprising *Praana* etc. is born in the waking state." But, when viewed from the *Paramaarthā Drishti* (the standpoint of the Intuitive experience of Absolute Being-Consciousness of *Atman*) it becomes evident that — "*Jeeva* is not a *Jeeva* at all; there is no moment of time whatsoever when he has not merged in and become one with *Brahman* (meaning, there are no distinctions of duality whatsoever and his essential nature is eternally unitary, non-dual Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Brahman* or *Atman* indeed)." Because of the reason that in the waking and the dream states, associated with adjuncts, *Atman* appears as though having a different *Jeeva Roopa* (the form of a soul), it has been preached in the scriptures that in the deep sleep state *Jeeva* has merged in and become one with *Sadroopa Brahman*. When Intuitively viewed or cognized from this Absolute standpoint, *Sushupti* is not *Sushupti* (i.e. a state) at all; besides, *Avasthaatraya* (the three states of Consciousness) are merely *Adhyaaroopita* (superimposed upon, or misconceived in, *Atman* alone) and not that these three phenomena are *Paramaarthā* (absolutely, really real). For that reason alone, the scripture states: "All these three states of Consciousness are dreams". When *Avasthaatraya* are assumed to be 'real' from the *Adhyaaroopa Drishti*, we (Vedantins) say that in the deep sleep state there is an absence of the world of duality (*Nishprapanchatwa*) and in the waking and the dream states there is association with the world of duality (*Saprapanchatwa*); further, our statement that — "In *Sushupti Jeeva* does not cognize anything (any object or phenomenon) whatsoever, while in the waking and the dream states he cognizes duality" — is made from this *Adhyaaroopa Drishti* alone. But when *Sushupti* experience is Intuitively cognized purely from the *Sushupti Drishti* (Intuitive experience of deep sleep

in *esse* — meaning, unrelated to the waking or the dream experience but Intuitively), then *Atman*, devoid of the world of duality (*Nishprapancha*), alone exists. Because that *Atman* does not have, or is associated whatsoever with, any of these three *Avasthas* (states of Consciousness), He is totally different (*Vilakshana*) from the above mentioned “superimposed” or “misconceived” forms of *Vaishwaanara*, *Taijasa* and *Praajna* and is said to be *Tureeya* (meaning, the fourth one). When compared to or related to those three states, *Atman* is the fourth. Because in this *Paramaarthā Roopa* which is said to be the fourth comparatively, there does not exist any distinctive, special characteristics whatsoever, It has been described in the scriptures (*Upanishads*) negatively by the exclusive and extra-ordinary methodology of sublating or negating all forms or phenomena which can possibly be imagined or conceived in the three states of Consciousness.

26. Su. Bh. 1-4-18. p. 281.

27. Su. Bh. 3-2-7. pp. 601, 602.

28. Ma. Ka. Bh. 2, 3. pp. 196, 197.

29. Su. Bh. 3-2-34. p. 637.

30. Su. Bh. 3-2-35. p. 638.

31. Ait. Bh. 1-3. p. 40.

32. Ma. Ka. 1-13. p. 214.

33. Ma. Up. 7. pp. 205, 206.

34. Ma. Bh. 7. p. 211.

153. In order to help Intuit that the distinctive or special characteristics of the forms of the three states of Consciousness do not exist whatsoever in *Atman*, the determination of the meaning and purport of *Aumkaara* has been made in the *Maandookya Upanishad*. ***Aumkaara, Brahman, Atman — all these three are the names of one and the same Tattwa (Reality).*** In that *Upanishad* it has been propounded that — “In the waking and in the dream the world of duality is appearing; in the deep sleep state the world of duality exists in a seed form; this world of duality appears to exist in *Atman* as a result of misconception due to *Avidya* (*Avidyaakalpita*); further, when viewed from the Intuitive Absolute standpoint (*Paramaarthā Drishti*) *Atman* is *Prapancha Upashama* (the substrate in which the world of duality has lapsed, merged or become extinct. In other words, *Atman* is devoid of the world of duality). *Atman* has become *Shiva* (an embodiment of auspiciousness, prosperity and Beatitude), as also *Advaita* (non-dual, the one Ultimate Reality without a second)”. Although the world of duality is appearing to be full of or abounding in both names (*Naamaatmaka*) and forms (*Roopaatmaka*), in the Ultimate Reality (*Paramaarthā Tattwa*) neither names nor forms exist whatsoever. In order to teach this subtle truth, the *Tattwa* (the Reality), in which all names are totally merged or have become extinct (*Pralaya*), is called symbolically (*Lakshana*) “*Aumkaara*” and the *Tattwa*, in which all forms or phenomena are totally merged or have become extinct, is symbolically called “*Brahman*” and then it is indicated that — “*Aumkaara* alone is *Brahman*, and *Brahman* means this our innermost, innate nature of

Atman (Pratyagatman) — In that *Upanishad*. “*Aumkaara*” is a “name” signifying everything phenomenal (*Sarvavaachaka*), while “*Brahman*” is the “named” — entire phenomena signified by that *Aumkaara*. *Brahman*, which is the “*Lakshya*” (implicitly or indirectly signified entity) for *Aumkaara* or in other words, *Aumkaara* Itself, being our *Atman* is *Paadatraya Vilakshana* (completely different from the three footprints) as also *Maatraatraya Ateeta* (an entity beyond the three component metres of “*Aumkaara*”). *Atman* who is — from the *Roopa Drishti* or viewpoint of the “named” or form — the footprint (*Paada*) called “*Vaishwaanara*” is — from the *Naama Drishti* (viewpoint of the “Name”) — the component metre called “*A*”; in the same manner, *Taijasa* is the component metre called “*U*” and *Prajna* is the component metre of “*M*”. Just as the “*A*” *kaara* is the primary or beginning source of all letters or alphabets as also the pervading sound in all syllables, “*Vaishwaanara*” is the primary or beginning *Paada* or footprint for the other footprints and by virtue of His *Viraadroopa* or colossal form is all-pervading. Just as the syllable “*U*” *kaara* is *Utkrishta* (raised upwards from “*A*” *kaara* while pronouncing) and is the middle component metre or syllable, between “*A*” *kaara* and “*M*” *kaara*, of “*Aumkaara*” — *Taijasa* is a middle *Paada* which rises upwards from *Vaishwaanara Paada* and is endowed with an *Upaadhi* (adjunct), full of latent impressions (*Vaasanaamaya*), between the other two *Paadas*, viz. *Vaishwaanara* and *Prajna*; to wit, because of the reason that the *Vaasanaamaya Prapancha* (the world of duality full of the latent impressions), which is his adjunct (*Upaadhi*), is invariably and indisputably appearing akin to the world of duality of the waking state, on the one hand, and it is *Asat* (unreal), just as the world of *Sushupti*, on the other hand, that *Upaadhi* of *Taijasaatman* is comparable to both the *Upaadhis* of *Vaishwaanara*, in one aspect, and of *Prajnaatman*, in another aspect (thereby he is seen as the *via media* between the waking and the deep sleep states). Just as “*M*” *kaara* (the third syllable or metre of *Aumkaara*) is appearing to measure out the other two syllables or metres as also is appearing to be the merging ground or place, in the same manner *Prajna* is appearing to measure out the other two *Paadas* or footprints as also to be their merging state or place. For this reason, “***Tureeyaatman*, who is comparatively the fourth and who is *Paadatraya Vilakshana* (quite queer or distinct from the three footprints) is the *Lakshyarth* (the subtly implied or implicit meaning) of *Brahmapada* (the Blissful state, Beatitude of *Brahman*) as also because He is *Maatraatraya Ateeta* (beyond the three syllables or metres), He is the *Lakshyarth* of *Aumkaara*. In this *Brahman* or *Aumkaara* no names whatsoever exist, nor any forms whatsoever exist.**” Thus it has been propounded in that *Upanishad* (*Maandookya Upanishad*), as also in *Shri Goudapaada's 'Aagama Prakarana'* (the first Chapter of his

book of four Chapters called “Maandookya Kaarika”), which is of the form or nature of a Vyaakhyaana (explanatory or expository commentary). The reader or seeker should recall to his memory what we have expounded previously in section 66 that — “*Paramaarthataattwa* or *Atman* cannot possibly be signified by any word whatsoever.”

35. Ma. Up. 1. pp. 180, 181.

37. Ma. Up. 12. pp. 226, 227.

36. Ma. Up. Intr. pp. 178, 179.

38. Ma. Ka. 3-36, 37. pp. 311, 313.

XXI. DEALINGS OF BANDHA (BONDAGE) AND MOAKSHA (LIBERATION)

154. Although *Atman* exists in the same form or essence even when He is either ‘experiencing’ the three states of Consciousness or existing in the ‘*Tureeyaavastha*’ (the state of the fourth), in the waking state He appears — by virtue of *Avidya* — to be obtaining changes or mutations, like a blind person, a lame person etc.; He appears in the dream state to be associated with undesirable hardships, which are ‘*Vaasanaamaya*’ (full of latent impressions), like weeping, grieving etc.; in the deep sleep state He appears to be devoid of any power or capacity of cognizing anything whatsoever and to have been totally destroyed. To be liberated from or to be rid of all these defects and blemishes is itself nothing but to Intuit and get established in our essential nature of *Atman* (*Aatmaswaroopa*) — and this alone is the real, genuine *Moaksha* (Liberation or Emancipation). In this manner, even in the doctrine or teaching of “*Ekaatmavaada*” (that the Self is non-dual Reality) also both Bondage and Liberation are reconcilable. In fact, *Moaksha* is the total or consummate removal of Bondage (*Bandha Nivrutti*) alone and not any kind of attainment of anything anew or afresh whatsoever.

1. Su. Bh. 4-4-2. p. 896.

2. Su. Bh. 4-4-2. p. 897.

155. There is a probability of some people conceiving the teachings of Vedantins, viz. “*Moaksha* is nothing that is to be attained afresh; it is a state which is *Nityapraapta* (eternally attained or existing), meaning that it is one’s core of Being beyond the time-space-causation concepts or categories” — to be contradictory to the scriptural statements and *Yukti* (reason). For, the *Chhaandogya Upanishad* 8-12-3 states: “This enlightened being (*Samprasaada*) rises up giving up this mortal coil and gets established in his essential nature. He alone is the *Uttamapurusha* (the superior, Supreme Self).” On the strength of this scriptural statement it becomes clear that the scripture purports to say: “Apart from the *Sushuptaavastha* (the state of deep sleep), there exists a *Muktaavastha* (the state of Liberation); further, after giving up or leaving off our mortal coil (after death) the *Muktaavastha* is obtained

afresh." Because every one has per force to agree that a state which is quite different or distinct from *Avasthaatraya* alone is *Mukti* (Liberation), to say that while the *Jeeva* is endowed with the three *Avasthas* (i.e. when he is embodied and alive), at that moment alone, there exists *Mukti* — is opposed to *Yukti*. Thus the protagonists of the doctrine of *Mukti* being attained afresh (*Praapya Muktivaadins*) may argue out.

But we can also argue out reconciling in a manner which is in full agreement with *Siddhaanta* (the *Vedantic* teachings), as also with the meaning or purport of the scriptural statements. To wit, we have already clarified that by virtue of *Avidya* alone the three states of Consciousness appear to exist in the (substrate of) *Atman* but they do not really exist. *Aatmaswaroopa*, which appeared to exist as if unmanifested with the adjuncts of the body, the senses, the mind etc. before the dawn or advent of *Vivekajnaana* (Intuitive Knowledge of the form of *Vidya*), appears to the *Jnaani* (Realized soul) who has by virtue of *Viveka* (Intuitive reasoning) given up his innate identification with the adjuncts of the body, the senses, the mind etc. as if his own Absolute essential nature of *Atman* is attained anew. Thus the purport of the scriptural texts can be interpreted to mean that — "What was not attained because of *Avidya* is attained by virtue of *Vidya*." Just because a crystal appears to be red or black as a result of being placed in the vicinity of a coloured adjunct (which is, in truth, red or black) no one believes that the crystal's white colour or clear nature has vanished, is it not? Because it is stated in the scripture that — "He attains his essential nature of Pure Being (*Swaroopa*)" — it amounts to saying that earlier too, i.e. even before a person attained by virtue of *Vidya* or *Vivekajnaana* (Intuitive experience or Self-Knowledge), that essential nature of Pure Being exists as his very core. Therefore, it should be reckoned that apart from the "*Aavidyaka Bandha-Moaksha*" (Bondage-Liberation projected as misconceptions by *Avidya*), there do not exist any real phenomena or entities like Bondage and Liberation whatsoever. For, as *Advaita* (non-duality) alone is the Absolute, Ultimate Reality, all mundane, empirical transactions — whether they are *Loukika* (secular or temporal) or *Vaidika* (sacred, ecclesiastical or religious based on the *Vedic* texts) — are, in truth, *Aavidyaka* (projected as misconceptions by *Avidya*). **What is non-existent cannot be born or created afresh or anew; what is existent cannot be destroyed; therefore, the statement that Bondage and Liberation are not *Paramaarthas* (real in the ultimate analysis) is quite in consonance with logical reasoning indeed.**

3. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 193.

4. Su. Bh. 4-4-1. pp. 895, 896.

5. Su. Bh. 4-4-2. p. 897.

6. Ma. Ka. 2-32. p. 256.

7. Ma. Ka. Bh. 2-32. p. 256.

156. One cannot raise an objection of the type — “If no new result or fruit accrues from *Moaksha* why should one make any effort to attain *Moaksha*?” For, we are bound as a result of *Avidya*; and so, in order to get rid of or destroy this *Avidya* we have necessarily to gain or attain *Vidya*. Similarly, one cannot raise an objection of the type — “If *Atman* is perennially of one and the same form or nature, then don’t the Vedantins affirm that by virtue of *Avidya* and *Vidya* alone Bondage and Liberation take place, respectively? In that case, it amounts to saying that by virtue of *Vidya* and *Avidya* some kind of a change has occurred in *Atman*! At least distinctions like — ‘*Avidya* exists’ or ‘*Avidya* disappears’; ‘*Vidya* is being acquired or attained’ — have to be accepted, is it not?” Just as, even when one misconceives a rope to be a snake out of *Avidya* and later recognizes it to be really a rope alone, one gets anxious and timid as well as fearful, and these disappear later; though this is true, there is no change whatsoever in the thing (the rope in this instance), in the same manner, there is no change or mutation whatsoever occurring in *Atman* because of, or by virtue of, either *Vidya* or *Avidya*. The phenomenon of *Avidya* is nothing but the delusion that occurs as a result of the empirical dealings or transactions of (the adjuncts of) the body, the senses, the mind etc. It is quite reasonable to accept that one who objectifies *Avidya* as an appearance (i.e. external to his essential nature of *Atman*) is not deluded by *Avidya* at all; the scripture too is affirming that in *Atman* there does not exist any *Kartrutwa* whatsoever projected by *Avidya*.

8. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. pp. 723, 724.

10. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. pp. 724, 725.

9. Su. Bh. 1-4-6. p. 257.

157. If *Bandha* and *Mukti* are reckoned or believed to be really occurring, then it amounts to saying that the *Mukti* that is mentioned in the *Shrutis* is taken (assumed) to be in a predominant, primary sense (*Mukhyaartha*). The possibility of the common run of people misunderstanding that they are just now liberated and thereby becoming idle will also be prevented. Therefore, some people argue out that better than the teachings of those who say that — ‘Bondage and Liberation are *Aavidyaka*’ — are the teachings of those who say that they are real.

This argument is not proper. For, those who say or affirm that Bondage and Liberation are real cannot accept that both of them co-exist, because these two states are mutually opposite; if it is contended that they occur one after the other, then also without any cause Liberation cannot occur. Besides, because of the reason — ‘That which occurs or happens by virtue of a *Nimitta* (cause) is not natural or of its essential nature’ — it amounts to saying that it is unreal alone. In addition to this, the protagonists of *Moaksha* as a reality will have to per force accept that — “*Bandha* which is *Anaadi* (beginningless) has

an end, as also *Moaksha* which has beginning is *Ananta* (endless)." This is opposed to what is seen in our workaday world. The logical device (*Yukti*) that — "That entity which is *Anaadi* has an end, just like the '*Beeja Ankura Santati*' (the continuum of the seed and the sprout)" — is not proper or sustainable; for, both the seed and the sprout are '*Saadi*' (with a beginning — meaning, they are born or created). '*Santati*' (continuum) is not another separate thing or entity existing by itself. It is not possible to say that a person, who has gone from a state called 'Bondage' to a state called 'Liberation', is *Nitya* or eternal. If it is asserted that *Moaksha* occurs as a result of *Saadhana* (spiritual practices or disciplines), it amounts to saying that *Moaksha* is *Anitya* (non-eternal) and that it is not the real essential nature of *Atman* also. This too is an undesirable, or an unwanted, predicament. Therefore, the statement that — "Bondage and Liberation are *Satya* (real)" — is opposed to both *Yukti* and *Vedanta Siddhaanta* (philosophical teaching of *Vedanta*). If it is contended — 'that thing which has a beginning can be, just like *Pradhwamsaabhaava* (non-existence subsisting after a thing is destroyed), *Nitya* (eternal)' — then it amounts to saying that *Moaksha* is '*Abhaava*' (a non-existent thing). Because we have previously clarified in section 99 that the special characteristics or categories like *Pradhwamsaabhaava*, *Praagabhaava* etc. do not exist in '*Abhaava*' at all, this argument or contention is not proper and justifiable.

11. G. Bh. 13-2. pp. 504, 505.

13. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-20. pp. 339, 340.

12. Ma. Ka. Bh. 4-30. pp. 351, 352.

14. Tai. Bh. Intr. p. 227.

158. Now it will be quite clear to the seeker that all the various types of arguments or objections mentioned below are verily without any essence or purport at all. For instance: "Although for *Atman*, *Brahmatwa* (all-pervasiveness) is indeed His very essence, that essential nature becomes concealed or oblivious in the state of Bondage (*Bandhaavastha*) owing to any particular cause and then as a result of some spiritual practices or disciplines (*Saadhanas*) when that cause is mitigated that essential nature manifests itself in the state of Liberation (*Muktaavastha*); or in *Atman*, as a result of a particular action, Bondage gets changed into Liberation; or that Liberation gets manifested as a result of some purification or refinement or cultivation (*Samskaara*)." For, in the case of precious metals like gold, silver etc. when in contact with an extraneous matter or object they have lost their brilliance (and thereby have become dull in appearance) after they are cleaned by washing with acid or washing soda etc. (i.e. any cleansing agent) they may regain their original brilliance. Stars and such other shining objects in the stellar region may become dull or invisible because of the brilliance of the Sun or such other extremely brilliant objects, but when those latter brilliant objects do not exist the stars and such other

objects may shine with their own brilliance in the sky as before; but, in that manner the *Chaitanya Swaroopa* (the essential nature of *Atman*) cannot get concealed or covered up by contact with any other object whatsoever; nor It can become dull because of the brilliance of another (second) object whatsoever. For, *Atman* is *Asanga* (unattached), *Adviteeya* (non-dual, one without anything second to It). If *Moaksha*, were *Utpaadya* (a thing which is to be produced or created afresh) or *Vikaarya* (a thing which can be transformed or changed), then some kind of *Saadhana* (spiritual practice or discipline) becomes necessary. But we have already explained that a thing which is produced or born as a result of another external cause becomes *Kritaka* (artificial, false or sham), as also *Anitya* (non-eternal). Therefore, it is not possible to say or affirm that *Moaksha* is either *Utpaadya* or *Vikaarya*. Nor there is any necessity of creating or producing any new *Guna* (quality) in *Atman* or *Brahman*, or of removing, mitigating any defect or blemish in It by means of any *Samskaara* because the eternally Pure, Absolute *Brahman* alone is verily the state of Liberation (*Muktaavastha*). Thus, the doctrine that — “*Mukti* is a resultant fruit or effect which really occurs in the Absolute sense or is obtained, attained” — is not at all in agreement or consonance with any *Yukti* whatsoever.

15. Su. Bh. 1-3-19. p. 192.

17. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 32.

16. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. pp. 720, 721.

18. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 32.

159. Some people argue out in the manner — “If *Atman* were eternally Liberated only, then listening (*Shravana*) to the scriptural texts for the sake of attaining Liberation will be futile; even the *Shaastras* delineating devices or methods of attaining Liberation also will become futile. Therefore, one should reckon that Liberation (*Moaksha*) is a special kind of *Phala* (resultant fruit) to be really attained afresh.”

We have already in section 156 given a fitting answer to this argument. Because the ignorant common run of people do not know the truth that — “We are perennially of the essential nature of ‘*Nitya Shuddha Buddha Mukta Swaroopa*’” — despite the fact that they are eternally liberated or free from Bondage, they are ‘bound’ indeed. In order to remove or sublate that *Avidya* which is of the nature of delusion or misconception, the spiritual instruction by the *Shaastras* becomes necessary. But to those who are fully aware of this Self-Knowledge the teaching by the *Shaastras* is not necessary at all. This fact too we have already mentioned in section 39. The *Dvaitins* (dualists) too have accepted that among the liberated souls there do not exist the distinctions of *Samsaara* (transmigratory existence) and *Samsaaritwa* (transmigratoriness); in their doctrines the futility of the *Shaastras* does not arise at all. In fact, in their doctrines too in the state of Bondage

alone the *Shaastras* become meaningful, purposeful. In the same manner, in the teachings of *Vedanta* philosophy also let it be assumed that for those who have cognized or Intuited the *Aatmaikatwa* (the non-duality or Absolute oneness of *Atman*) the *Shaastras* are futile only; if in the matter of, or region of, *Avidya* the scriptures are *Saarthaka* (purposeful, meaningful), then that is enough.

19. G. Bh. 2-68. p. 115.

20. G. Bh. 13-2. p. 505.

160. Some others argue out in the manner — “If *Samsaaritwa* is real, then by means of Knowledge of the type — ‘I am *Asamsaaree*; I am not a *Kartru* or a *Bhoktru*’ — alone that *Samsaaritwa* should be sublated, is it not? But till death no one ever gets rid of this *Samsaariswaroopa* (this innate nature of transmigratoriness). It being so, how at all can the *Asamsaaritwa Jnaana* (the Knowledge of one being non-transmigratory) accrue? Therefore, till the body exists Bondage really exists and after the body falls off alone Liberation can really be attained.”

This argument is not proper. For, there is no objection or hindrance to accept the fact that just as the knowledge of scriptural rituals like *Agnihoatra* etc. which are said to yield the fruit of *Swarga* (heaven), the Knowledge of *Brahman*, which is of the essential nature of *Atman* (the Self) who is *Akartru* (non-doer), can also be acquired from the valid means of the *Shaastras*. This fact we have already explained in section 72. In truth, *Avidya* (metaphysical ignorance), *Kaama* (desires) and *Karma* (action) — these alone comprise the Bondage of *Samsaaritwa*; although this transmigratoriness appears to be absolutely true in the waking state, it is evident and is established on the strength of everyone’s experience that in the deep sleep state these *Avidya-Kaama-Karma* categories do not exist whatsoever. This truth has been pointed out in the topic dealing with the deliberation on the three states of Consciousness (*Avasthaatraya Vichaara*). The scriptures too are expounding that in the deep sleep state the *Asamsaari Swaroopa* devoid of *Avidya-Kaama-Karma* (categories) alone exists. Therefore, there is every scope for Intuitively cognizing our essential nature of *Asamsaaritwa* while we are embodied itself.

21. Br. Bh. 4-3-19. p. 654.

24. Br. Bh. 2-1-19. p. 285.

22. Br. Bh. 4-3-21. p. 661.

25. Br. Bh. 2-1-19. p. 289.

23. Br. Bh. 4-3-22. p. 666.

161. In the scriptures there are sentences of the type — “He gets established in His real essential form” — (*Chhaandogya Upanishad* 8-3-4); “Being *Brahman*, He merges in *Brahman*” — (*Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-4-6); “Having been Liberated, He becomes or gets Liberated” — (*Katha Upanishad* 2-2-2); “He who is not embodied is not touched or tainted by desirable or undesirable things” — (*Chhaandogya*

Upanishad 8-12-1). On the strength of these scriptural statements, some people argue out that there are two kinds of *Mukti* viz. Liberation after death called "*Videhamukti*", and while alive getting Liberated called "*Jeevanmukti*".

This argument is opposed to both the scriptures and *Vedanta Siddhaanta*. For, the scriptural statements like — "*Tattwamasi*" — meaning, "Thou art that *Sadbrahman* (the Ultimate Reality of the essence of Absolute Being or Existence) alone"; "*Aham Brahmaasmi*" — meaning, "I am verily that *Brahman*" etc. — which state that here and now alone *Atman* is *Brahman*. It is not possible to interpret the scriptural statement — "You are verily that *Brahman*" — to mean that — "You will become *Brahman* after death." The scriptural statement — "*Brahmaiva Sun Brahmaapyeti*" — (*Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad* 4-4-6) is clearly affirming that *Jeeva* here and now itself (i.e. while living in this mortal body) is verily *Brahman*; the scriptural statement does not at all state that in future he becomes *Brahman* and merges in *Brahman*. We have also previously in section 155 mentioned that the scriptures emphatically state that — "*Svena Roopena Abhinishpadyate*" — meaning, He becomes established in His essential form or nature, and this sentence purports to state that — "By means of *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge or Intuitive experience) the *Jeeva* Intuits his ever-existing (*Nitya Siddha*) essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss" — indeed. Further, the *Katthoapanishad* sentence — "*Vimuktascha Vimuchyate*" — meaning, being ever-Liberated he becomes or gets Liberated — (2-2-1) also clearly affirms that *Atman* is "*Nityamukta*" (eternally Liberated) alone. **The antagonists may ask in the manner — "Why then it is once again stated in the scriptures like — '*Brahmaapyeti*' — meaning, he attains *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality; '*Vimuchyate*' — meaning, he gets 'Liberated, freed'? But these statements have been made with the prime purport of teaching that — "Here and now alone (i.e. while alive in the present physical body) the *Jeeva* is Liberated from *Avidya-Kaama-Karma* categories; he does not get embodied or reborn after death as in the case of *Ajnas*, i.e. the ignorant people" — alone. Therefore, as soon as *Jnaana* (Intuitive Self-Knowledge) is attained the *Sadyoamukti* (being Liberated while in the embodied condition), which is attained, is one and one alone; *Mukti* cannot be of two kinds and so the statement or argument that it is of two kinds is not a proper proposition. In fact, *Mukti* means *Brahman*, the Absolute, Transcendental Reality, Itself; there are not, and can never be, many forms of *Brahman* (for, Reality cannot be manifold and varied). For that reason too the statement that — "*Mukti* is of two kinds" — is not proper or reasonable.**

26. Su. Bh. 3-3-32. p. 705.

27. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 720.

28. Ka. Bh. 2-2-1. p. 185.

29. Su. Bh. 3-4-52. p. 810.

162. Some Vedantins are arguing out in the manner — “The *Mukti* that is attained while embodied is *Gouna* (of secondary importance); for, then there exist the body, *Praarabdha Karma* (the fruit of actions which have become ripe enough to fructify) and also sufficient *Avidya-Kaama*. Hence, *Videhamukti* (Liberation without the body, accruing after giving up the mortal coil), devoid of this *Avidyalesha* (remainder or remnant of *Avidya*), alone is the main *Mukti* in the predominant sense or importance.”

This especially is not proper at all. For the belief or concept that *Atman* has a body is caused by *Mithyaabhimaana* (the misconceived, wrong identification), which means that misconceiving *Chaitanya* (Pure Consciousness) to be the body and thereby identifying with the *Adhyaasarooopa* (superimposed or misconceived form or nature of ‘I’ notion or *Pramaatrutwa*); and so, it is not *Paramaarth* (really real). This truth we have previously mentioned in section 137. In the present context, the statement that — “Because at present the body is appearing or is seen to exist, only after death the real, genuine *Ashareeratwa* or unembodiedness accrues” — is not correct; for, in the dream this body of the waking does not exist and in deep sleep there does not exist any relationship with any kind of a body whatsoever. Therefore, *Ashareeratwa* is natural, meaning, it is our essential nature of Being. To a *Jnaani* (Realized soul endowed with Self-Knowledge) there is no scope or possibility of having any *Kaama*, *Karma* whatsoever; for, he has completely got rid of *Avidya*, which really means misconception or wrong identification. To one who does not have the *Vishesha Jnaana* (knowledge of the nature of distinctive cognition or Intuition) of any real entity (*Vastu*) as — ‘such and such a thing’ — to such a person alone misconception or wrong knowledge exists. There is no cause or scope for a *Jnaani*, who has attained the certitude or conviction of the type — “*Atman* is *Brahman* alone” — to have any more misconception or wrong knowledge at all. Of course, by virtue of the latent impressions (*Samskaaras*) of the old or previously existing *Avidya* memories or mental concepts (*Smritis*) which appear to be akin to *Mithyaapratyaya* (false perceptions) may arise. Just as in the case of people who know the four cardinal directions of east, west, north and south, also sometimes get deluded about the cardinal directions, in the same way this *Mithyaajnaana-abhaasa* (the temporary) delusion of the nature of wrong knowledge or misconception) is sublated or destroyed by *Samyag-Jnaana* (correct, Intuitive Knowledge) alone and not that it can ever pose any threat or harm whatsoever to the Intuitive Knowledge. We have also previously stated that there is no room whatsoever for a *Jnaani* to have *Avidya*. Therefore, while alive or embodied in the present life alone one can attain *Mukti* and not after death (or after giving up

one's mortal coil), and this truth Shri Shankara has repeatedly proclaimed in and through his *Bhaashyas*.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 30. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 40. | 34. Mu. Bh. 3-2-6. p. 166. |
| 31. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 169. | 35. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 720. |
| 32. Mu. Bh. 3-2-2. pp. 160, 161, 162. | 36. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 42. |
| 33. Ka. Bh. 2-3-14. p. 213. | 37. Su. Bh. 2-1-14. p. 329. |

XXII. APARA BRAHMAN

163. *Moaksha* is not *Utpaadya*, is not *Vikaarya* and is not *Samskaarya*. Therefore, it is stated previously in section 158 that It cannot be obtained or attained afresh as a result of, or by means of, any *Saadhanas*. Although this teaching is true, there remains a doubt that *Moaksha* can be *Praapya* (that which can be attained afresh)! In *Chhaandogya Upanishad* 8-12-3 the statement that — “*Svena Roopena Abhinishpadyate*” — it has been propounded there that *Moaksha* is not a separate state (*Avasthaantara*) which is attained afresh and that *Moaksha*, which appeared as if it was not attained because of *Avidya*, was attained by means of *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge). Although this truth we had mentioned in section 155 by way of a *Samaadhaana* (tentatively satisfactory answer), there are a few people who may raise a doubt that — “*Moaksha* is a thing which is *Praapya*” — saying that this fact is known directly from some scriptural statements. For, it has been described in detail that — “*Brahma Jnaani* goes (after death) via a particular path and obtains *Brahman*; and that he therein (in that *Loaka* called *Brahma Loaka*) by mere *Sankalpa* (volition) can acquire *Siddhis* (mystic powers), by means of which he can have whatever he desires. Therefore, *Mukti* is a thing which can be attained afresh only.”

But this doubt is not proper at all. For *Moakshaavastha* (the state of Liberation) means *Brahman* alone and not anything else whatsoever. Because *Brahman* means our *Atman* alone, one cannot at all possibly say that It is something which is *Aapya* or *Praapya*. Even in the philosophical teachings of those who affirm that *Brahman* is different or separate from *Atman*, because *Brahman* is accepted to be *Sarvagata* (all-pervading, all-consuming), It is verily *Nityapraapta* (eternally attained); space which is *Sarvagata* need not be touched or reached by any one after going or traversing a distance, is it not? In the same way, here also in the present context we must reckon. Besides, in the scriptural texts phenomena like *Gati* (going from one life, birth or *Janma*, or one world or *Loaka*), *Aishwarya* (the material wealth, assets etc.) have been mentioned as topics pertaining to *Apara Brahman* which is a *Kaarya* (effect). In reality, such phenomena are not related to *Para Brahman* at all. For, as *Para Brahman* is every one's

Atman alone and also is *Sarvagata* there is no possibility whatsoever for any *Gantrutwa* (going, traversing) or *Gantavyatwa* (being reached as the destination) to exist at all. Because *Apara Brahman* does not exist in any known particular space, spot or region too, It is not having any *Gantavyatwa* at all.

1. Su. Bh. 3-4-52. p. 810.

3. Tai. Bh. 1-10-4. p. 276.

2. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 32.

4. Su. Bh. 4-3-7. p. 879.

164. The statement that *Brahman* is two-fold is not merely a vain concept. It has been clearly stated in the scriptures that one should meditate upon *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, of the two types of *Para* and *Apara* as *Aumkaara* alone. *Para Brahman* is described in the scriptures in the manner — “It is not gross; It is not small like an atom; It is not that, It is not this” — etc. by refuting or sublating all the special characteristics superimposed or projected by *Avidya* upon *Atman*. When the scriptures describe *Brahman* with names and forms and such other special features or characteristics for the purpose of *Upaasana* (meditation), that very *Brahman* alone is called “*Apara Brahman*”. In *Vedantic* parlance *Para Brahman* which is to be Intuitively cognized (*Jneya*) is called by the various synonymous terms of *Avikrita*, *Mukhya*, *Kaarana Brahman*, *Nirupaadhika Brahman*, *Nishprapancha Brahman*, *Nirguna Brahman* etc., while the *Para Brahman*, which is to be meditated upon (*Upaasya*), is called by the various synonyms of — *Apara Brahman*, *Kaarya Brahman*, *Soapaadhika Brahman*, *Saprapancha Brahman*, *Amukhya Brahman*, *Savishesha Brahman*, *Saguna Brahman*, *Saakaara Brahman*, *Soappakhya Brahman* etc. In fact, even this difference or distinction of *Para Brahman* and *Apara Brahman* is superimposed or misconceived because of *Avidya* (*Aavidyaka*) and hence this distinction is not harmful or detrimental to the scriptural statements expounding *Advaita* (non-duality).

5. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. pp. 891, 892.

7. Su. Bh. 1-1-12. p. 64.

6. Su. Bh. 1-1-12. p. 62.

165. It is mentioned in the scriptures that if one has attained *Brahman* in the manner of *Gatipoorvaka* (by the via media of meditation), he goes to the region of *Brahma Loaka* and does not return to this world. If *Brahman* is the cause (*Kaarana*) for that world, to call what is an effect (*Kaarya*) as *Brahman* (the cause) will not be reasonable and proper; but, it has been stated in that manner, in the scriptures. It has also been very clearly described in the scriptural texts that those who have departed from a particular region attain *Amritatwa* (immortality). For all these reasons, to some people it may appear that *Brahman* is *Praapya* alone, and that this teaching is in consonance with the scriptural statements. Some others also may doubt in the manner — “Although *Brahman* is *Nityapraapya* (eternally attained or obtained),

just as on the earth which is ever obtained (ever existing and available) from one place or region one can go or traverse to another place or region; or one person passing from his own *Baalyaavastha* (childhood), to his own *Vaardhakaavastha* (state of old age), why cannot *Brahman* be *Praapya*?"

To all such doubts the solution is: "In the scriptural statements like — 'This person does not return to this region'; 'To those people there is nothing like coming back or returning to this world' — the purport implied in them is their returning to the life of mortality or transmigration during another '*Kalpa*' (creation of the world). We have per force to interpret those sentences in the above manner, because the scriptures can never preach anything contrary to a logical argument or device which has necessarily to be in consonance with *Anubhava* (universal Intuitive experience) of the type — 'What is ever *Sarvagata* (all-pervading) cannot ever be got afresh by going or traversing anywhere.' (*Naastyakritaha Kritena* — meaning, *Moaksha*, which is not the resultant fruit of any *Karma*, can never be attained by *Karma* of any kind whatsoever). The scriptures may well propound '*Krama Mukti*' (gradual, graded Liberation), in the sense that — 'In the *Kaarya Brahma Loaka* (the world of the four-headed *Brahma*, the Creator God), which is attained as a fruit of *Upaasanas* stipulated in the scriptures, those who attain the Intuitive Self-Knowledge (*Jnaana*) may become Liberated from that world (*Loaka*) itself and they will not return to this transmigratory life (*Samsaara*).'" In support of this interpretation there are *Smritis* (statements made by Rishis or sages from their memory). There is a *Smriti* statement that — "The *Sthaana* (place or state of existence, till the final dissolution of the world) is called '*Amritatwa*' or immortality." Besides, it is not wrong to call "*Brahma Loaka*" as "*Amrita*" (immortal) relatively when it is compared to other lesser, inferior *Loakas* (worlds, regions) because the former does not get destroyed or dissolved throughout a '*Kalpa*' (the entire duration of the created world). Because of the reasons that — (1) *Kaarya Brahma* is very near *Para Brahman* in many respects or aspects; (2) while *Para Brahman* Itself is being meditated upon (as the *Upaasya Devata*) as if associated with some *Kaarya Dharmas* (special features or qualities seen in the created empirical world of duality), that *Para Brahman* Itself gets the nomenclature of "*Apara Brahman*" or "*Kaarya Brahman*", the *Apara Brahman* may, in a secondary sense, be called "*Brahman*". Therefore, it must be reckoned (discerned) properly that all the terms like — "*Anaavritti*" (non-return to the transmigratory existence or *Samsaara*), "*Amritatwa*" (immortality), "*Brahma*" (the four-headed Creator God called by this name) — are used in a secondary sense with a secondary meaning or purport (*Gounaartha*). Because the scriptures propound that in *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, there are no special characteristics or categories whatsoever like time, space, causation etc.

this *Brahman* is not a thing to be reached or attained afresh or anew just as any spatial region to be reached by travelling or any state like *Vaardhakaavastha*. Therefore, the genuine *Siddhaanta* is: “*Para Brahman*, the Ultimate, Absolute Reality, is not something to be attained, acquired or reached afresh (*Praapya*).”

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 8. Ch. Bh. 5-10-2. p. 357. | 11 Su. Bh. 4-3-9. p. 880. |
| 9. Su. Bh. 4-3-10. p. 881. | 12. Ch. Bh. 5-10-2. pp. 358, 359. |
| 10. Ch. Bh. 5-10-2. pp. 356, 357. | 13. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. pp. 884, 885. |

166. Some people may think in the manner: “In the scriptural texts even in Chapters devoted to, or exclusively pertaining to, ‘*Para Brahma Vidya*’, which the Vedantins have accepted to be so, at many places or in many contexts it has been stated that there are ‘*Utkraanti*’ (departure or exit) through ‘*Naadi*’ (subtle kind of nerves) ‘*Gati*’ (travel, acquiring another state), ‘*Amritatwa Praapti*’ (attainment of immortality). For example, in the *Kathopanishad* (2-3-1) through a *Naadi* a particular kind of ‘*Gati*’ as also ‘*Amritatwa*’ has been mentioned. In the *Chhaandogya Upanishad*, after mentioning *Naama Roopa Nirvahana Kartru* (one who destroys or annihilates the names and forms) as *Para Brahman*, it has been further stated that — ‘I will attain the position of *Prajaapati*’s assemblage’ — i.e. a *Praapya Phala* (a fruit to be obtained afresh). In the *Taittiriya Upanishad* it has been described that one who cognizes *Brahman* departs from this world and in the sequential or progressive order of ‘*Annamaya*’, ‘*Praanamaya*’, ‘*Manoamaya*’, ‘*Vijnaanamaya*’ *Atmans* and finally he attains the ‘*Aanandamaya Atman*’. In addition to this, in the very Chapter devoted to preaching that — “By means of the Knowledge of *Para Brahman* the seeker obtains or attains ‘*Aatmaswaroopa*’ (the essential nature of the Self)” — in the *Chhaandogya Upanishad*, ‘*Aishwarya*’ (rich mystic powers of — eating or enjoying, whatever one wants or wishes; of playing, sporting or revelling in whatever manner one wishes and finally of enjoying copulation with women and such other objects of enjoyment which become materialized by mere volition or willing etc.) is mentioned. Therefore, it is not possible to argue out that all that has been stated about *Gati*, *Utkraanti* and *Aishwarya* is exclusively pertaining to the topic of ‘*Saguna Brahman*’ (the Ultimate Reality with adjuncts or qualities or special characteristics alone), is it not?”

But in all such contexts too we can interpret them to suit ‘*Nirguna Vidya*’ (the Knowledge of the Ultimate Reality without qualities or special characteristics). To wit, what is mentioned in the *Kathopanishad* is the ‘*Gati*’ (transformed state) that is attained or obtained by *Upaasakas* (meditators) on ‘*Apara Brahman*’; that has been preached there in that context in order to or for the ultimate purport of praising, eulogising the ‘*Brahma Vidya*’ (Self-Knowledge), which is the relevant topic. Then it will not be wrong or improper to mention

'Aapekshika Amritatwa' (a relative or comparative immortality) that is attained by means of 'Apara Vidya' in order to, or for the purport of, praising 'Para Vidya' in the same manner as — 'In order to eulogize or praise Apara Vidya comparatively it is stated that by means of Apara Vidya one departs through the *Sushumnaa Naadi* and attains spiritual progress and *Amritatwa* and, at the same time, it is disparagingly stated or preached that those who depart from or through other *Naadis* return to 'Samsaaragati', which is verily *Duhkhamaya* or full of untold and innumerable miseries without let. Or, it may be interpreted that what is mentioned in the *Kathopanishad* is the concluding teachings about the fruits or results of *Agni Vidya*, which is again an 'Apara Vidya' (inferior knowledge pertaining to some rituals). Because what is stated in the *Chhaandogya Upanishad* is the conclusion drawn about Apara Vidya alone, therein the propriety of mentioning a *Gati* is not defective or wrong. There in that *Upanishad* either in conceiving or interpreting the statement which describes or delineates the essential nature of Para Brahman as a separate *Prakarana* (topic or Chapter devoted exclusively for a particular purpose) there is no contradiction whatsoever. The scriptural statement there, viz. "I will become the *Yashas* (fame, reputation) of *Brahmins*" — meaning, 'Sarvaatmatwa' (essential nature of *Atman* in everyone or everything) which is inferred therein also may amount to mean 'Sarva Karma' (all actions or rituals), 'Sarva Kaama' (all desires). In the sentence found in the *Taittiriya Upanishad*, the meaning of the statement — "After giving up this *Loaka* (world)' — is: 'When the seeker becomes *Virakta* (disinterested) in *Drishta* (visible) and *Adrishta* (invisible) *Vishaya* (objects)'; for that reason alone, in this scripture the attainment of *Brahmanhood* or *Brahma Praapti* is described with qualities like *Adrishyatwa* etc. Therefore, here in this scripture too *Utkraanti* and *Gati* have not been mentioned or taught. Further, if there is an objection of the type — "How is it proper to have described in detail *Aishwarya* to be acquired afresh in a Chapter devoted to the Knowledge (Intuition) of Para Brahman?" — raised, it can be conceived, by way of explanation, that — "This description is given in order to eulogize the state of the *Jnaani* (the Realized soul), who has no misery whatsoever; or, it can also be explained that this *Aishwarya* is delineated in a Chapter devoted to Para Vidya for the purposes of praising the *Sarvaatma Bhaava* (the comprehensive outlook of Intuiting everything to be nothing but *Atman*) by preaching that, because a *Mukta* (a Liberated soul) has in reality become 'Sarvaatman', the mystical powers or capacities of *Devas* (various deities) and *Yogis* (mystics) are truly those of a Liberated soul alone."

14. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p. 884.

15. Ka. Bh. 2-3-16. p. 214.

16. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p.884.

17. Tai. Bh. 2-8. p. 357.

18. Su. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 900.

19. Br. Bh. 3-9-28. pp. 567, 568.

167. In order to justify or substantiate specifically the truth that — “Phenomena, like *Utkraanti*, *Gati*, *Aishwarya* etc. have not been mentioned exclusively in the scriptural texts in the sense of or with the meaning that *Para Brahman* is *Praapya* (something that is to be attained afresh)” — we have delineated *Yuktis* (logical devices), in consonance with universal Intuitive experiences like — ‘The dialectic method of expounding that — ‘The *Moakshaavastha* means really *Brahman* alone which is nothing but our *Atman*’ — (sections 161,163); the dialectic method of propounding that — ‘*Brahman* is *Nirvishesha*’ — (section 164); the dialectic method of saying that — ‘Because of the reason that what is attained or acquired as the resultant fruit of any *Saadhanas* becomes *Kritaka* and hence it becomes *Anitya* alone’ — (section 165) and such other dialectic methods. In addition to these, the scriptures themselves are clearly stating that — “His *Praanas* (vital forces) do not depart from here” — to refute the beliefs of *Praana Utkramana*, as also the scriptures clearly affirm that — “Having been *Brahman* (in essence) alone, he becomes one with, or merges in, *Brahman*”; “He attains *Brahman*, here and now (in this very life) itself” — and in such other clear statements that *Sadyoamukti* (also called *Jeevanmukti*) — meaning, Liberation while living in this very body, is possible to attain here and now only. For such reasons too topics regarding *Utkraanti*, *Gati* and *Aishwarya* etc. are related to *Apara Brahman* alone.

20. Ka. Bh. 2-3-16. p. 214.

22. Mu. Bh. 2-2-7. p. 137.

21. Su. Bh. 4-2-13. p. 861.

168. One cannot doubt in the manner — “If it is contended that in order to eulogise the *Sarvaatma Bhaava* (Intuitive experience of seeing everything to be full of Pure Consciousness) of a *Mukta* (a Liberated soul), the *Aishwarya* (abundance of mystic powers) that are found in *Yogis* etc. are described, then does it not amount to saying that the miseries that are seen to exist in *Sthaavara* (immobile objects) and *Jangama* (mobile or moving creatures) also will have to be found in a *Mukta* who is *Sarvaatma* (the essential nature of Being of everything)?” For, since a *Mukta* is the Self of everything he is also the Self of *Duhkha* (misery) too. In fact, all the *Sukha* and *Duhkha* that are seen to be experienced by *Jeevas* are *Adhyaaroopita* but *Jnaani*, by virtue of the *Jnaana* (the Intuitive Knowledge of *Aatmaswaroopa*) has got this *Adhyaaroopa* sublated or falsified (*Apavaada*; *Baadhita*). Therefore, there is no possibility of any *Duhkha*. Even so, because of the reason that in our workaday world all the happiness that accrues from various objects to the people is, in reality, belonging to *Atman*, of the essence of Pure Bliss, alone — (*Taittiriya Bhaashya*-2-5) — it will not be wrong or improper to state that — “The happiness that is enjoyed by *Yogis*, deities etc., who are *Siddhasankalpas* (people or beings endowed with

the mystic powers of readily or instantaneously getting any desires fulfilled or pleasures obtained) are those of a *Jnaani* alone who is established in *Aatmaswaroopa*" — in order to eulogise, praise the merits of *Moaksha* alone.

23. Br. Bh. 3-9-28. p. 568.

24. Ch. Bh. 8-12-1. pp. 649, 650.

169. Now, another doubt may arise and that is: "How at all can the special characteristics, like *Utkraanti*, *Gati*, *Desha Videsha Gamana*, *Aishwarya Praapti*, which do not adhere to or which are not applicable to one who has cognized (realized) '*Para Brahman*', be made applicable to '*Apara Brahman*'? Is it not true that *Siddhaantins* (the proponents of *Vedantic* teachings) affirm that — '*Para Brahman* Itself, by virtue of Its association with certain adjuncts, is called *Apara Brahman*'? It being so, where is the scope for these *Vedantins* to conceive of differences of the type — 'For one the special features like *Utkraanti*, *Gati* etc. are applicable, whereas for another these special features are not applicable or suitable?'"

For such a doubt there is one and only solution, and that is: "If it is said that — 'What is not applicable or suitable in the absolute sense (or in the *Pramaartha Drishti*), even that is applicable from the viewpoint of *Avidya*' — one need not be surprised at all. In fact, even though *Jeeva* is, in his essence of Being, *Ishwara* alone, his *Jnaana* and *Aishwarya* have become hidden owing to *Avidya*, *Kaama*, *Karma* categories. By virtue of *Vidya* (Self-Knowledge) that essential nature endowed with those excellences becomes manifest or explicit. We have previously stated in section 134 that in the realm of *Avidya* alone the divisions or distinctions of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* are appearing because of the association with the adjuncts. Besides, *Jeeva* means 'one who has put on, or who is sustained, supported by, *Praana* (the vital force)'. But to one who has Intuited that — 'I am that *Paramaatman* alone devoid of any kind of special characteristics or distinctions whatsoever' — to such a person neither the *Praanas* (the five types of vital forces functioning in the body) nor his transmigration to any other birth, along with his *Praanas* for the purpose of enjoying the fruits of his actions (*Karmas*), become applicable or suitable. In fact, one who does not have or who is not sustained or supported by *Praanas* is not a '*Jeeva*' at all; a *Jeeva*'s '*Jeevatwa*' (being associated with transmigratoriness) is nothing but his misconceiving his essential nature of the Self (*Atman*) — because of, or by virtue of, *Avidya* — to be having some relationship with *Praana*. But from the standpoint of the Intuitive experience of the Self, because of the reason that *Brahman* is *Sarvagata* (all-pervasive), neither the condition of attaining *Para Brahman* nor the condition of any transmigration for the purpose of

attaining *Para Brahman* becomes valid or suitable; but '*Apara Brahman*' is the name given to '*Hiranyagarbha*' (the primordial Being), the first born who exists in a particular *Loaka* (world), and hence in that context there can be a possibility of transmigration or *Gati*. Because *Para Brahman* is really a *Jeeva's Atman* it does not become valid or suitable to say, in the predominant sense, that one obtains the *Aishwarya* of *Paramaatman*; but because the attainment of the *Loaka* or world of *Kaarya Brahman* associated with special qualities or features, the condition of *Aishwarya Praapti* also becomes valid or suitable in that case or context. Thus although *Brahman* is one and one only (non-dual Absolute Reality without a second entity to It), when we accept the divisions or distinctions of *Jeeva* and *Ishwara* in the realm of *Avidya* or from the standpoint of *Avidya* — then that very *Brahman* alone may be conceived as '*Apara Brahman*' indeed; in that context or from that standpoint a *Jeeva* may attain *Gati*, *Utkraanti*, *Aishwarya Praapti* etc. also.

25. Su. Bh. 2-2-6. p. 596.

28. Su. Bh. 4-3-7. p. 879.

26. Br. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 720.

29. Su. Bh. 4-4-16. p. 907.

27. Ch. Bh. 5-10-2. p. 358.

170. There is a customary practice of calling both those who have obtained the '*Aapekshika Mukti*' (relative Liberation) by means of *Upaasana* and those who have attained the '*Brahma Swaroopa*' (the essential nature of *Brahman*) by means of '*Tattwajnaana*' (Intuitive experience of the Self) by the same name of '*Muktas*' alone in the spiritual texts. But because the *Mukti* that is obtained by means of '*Saguna Vidya*' exists in the realm of *Avidya* alone, therein the *Muktas* do have the body, the senses as also the mind; they enjoy the *Aishwarya* of getting many physical bodies and enjoying through them; they have enjoyment equal to that of *Parameshwara* and they also have the capability or qualification to gain the *Jnaana* in the '*Brahma Loaka*' and the resultant fruit of '*Apunaraavritti*' (not returning to this mundane life). But they do not have the '*Jagat Shrishti Kartrutwa*' (the ability to create the world). In only the case of those who have attained *Mukti* through '*Nirguna Vidya*', on the other hand, the attainment of oneness with the non-dual *Brahmanhood*, which is devoid of all categories or special features, is fulfilled (it has become consummate). Thus though the same word or nomenclature of '*Mukti*' is used in both the cases, there exists a difference between the two.

30. Su. Bh. 4-4-11. p. 903.

34. Su. Bh. 4-4-22. pp. 911, 912.

31. Su. Bh. 4-4-15. p. 906.

35. Su. Bh. 4-4-17. p. 908.

32. Su. Bh. 4-4-18. p. 909.

36. Su. Bh. 4-4-16. pp. 906, 907.

33. Su. Bh. 4-4-21. p. 911.

XXIII. UPAASANA OR MEDITATION

171. We have delineated that *Brahman* is of two types, viz. *Nirupaadhika Brahman* (*Brahman* devoid of any adjuncts and which is *Jneya* — that which is to be Intuited or cognized) and *Soapaadhika Brahman* (*Brahman* associated with adjuncts and which is *Upaasya* — that which is to be meditated upon). Now, it becomes necessary to find out the answer to the question — “**Why is it that Upaasanas, i.e. mental meditations, are stipulated as injunctions (Vidhi) in Jnaana Kaanda?**” For, *Upaasana* means, as per the scriptural statements, ‘to meditate or contemplate’ upon an object mentioned in the scriptures in a manner so as to formulate one singular concept about that particular object without allowing any other concept of any other object to intrude upon or intervene in this continuity of that singular concept. Because this too is a *Kriya* (action) alone (section 76) it is quite proper to stipulate this by way of an injunction in the *Karma Kaanda*. Besides, because the *Upaasanas* are stipulated as injunctions in the *Jnaana Kaanda*, one may doubt that *Upaasanas* are not ‘*Aavidyaka*’ (things projected by ignorance). Therefore, it is quite but natural for a doubt of the type — “Why is it that *Upaasanas* are not mentioned in the *Karma Kaanda* itself?” — to arise in our mind.

Because *Upaasanas* are not possible to be carried out without there being the duality of the nature of — ‘*Upaasaka*’ (the meditator) and ‘*Upaasya*’ (the thing or object meditated upon) — and secondly, because in the non-dual *Absolute Brahman*, devoid of any special features or categories (*Nirvishesha*), this duality is appearing as a result of *Avidya* alone, it becomes self-evident that the empirical dealings of *Upaasana* are ‘*Aavidyaka*’ (phenomena within the realm or ambit of ignorance). Even so, for the most valid or profound reasons like — (1) *Upaasanas* too, like *Jnaana*, are mental concepts alone; (2) they give rise to a fruit or result called ‘*Aapekshika Amritatwa*’ (a relative immortality) which is very near or akin to ‘*Mukhya Kaivalya*’ (the genuine, predominant immortality) of Self-Knowledge; (3) the ‘*Upaasya Brahman*’ is a result or effect which is very close to or akin to ‘*Jneya Brahman*’ — these *Upaasanas* have been mentioned in the *Jnaana Kaanda* alone. This, then, is a satisfactory, nay convincing, answer to the above query.

1. Tai. Bh. 1-3. p. 237.

3. Ch. Bh. Intr. p. 5.

2. Su. Bh. 1-1-12. p. 62.

172. Among the *Upaasanas* there are several varieties like *Karmaanga Upaasanas*, *Prateekoopaasanas*, *Praanaadyupaasanas*, *Brahmoopaasanas* etc. All these are of the form or nature of contemplating continuously with one singular concept which is

pertaining to one particular object mentioned or stipulated in the scriptures and in the same manner as instructed therein (meaning, the meditator cannot opt to meditate upon that particular object as and how he likes or fancies). However, they do not enable us to get rid of the distinctions of *Kriya* (action), *Kaaraka* (the means of actions) — which are superimposed upon, or misconceived in, *Atman* because of an innate *Avidya*, unlike the *Advaita Jnaana* (Intuitive experience of non-duality). Even so, because they are quite helpful aids for *Advaita Jnaana* via *Chittaakraagyata* (one-pointed concentration of the mind which is purificatory in its effect), these *Upaasanas* have been expounded in the *Jnaana Prakarana* (a Chapter devoted for *Jnaana*) alone. Further, because of the valid reason that a mind that is thriving, having been completely immersed in the habit of empirical actions directed extrovertedly towards the materialistic world, cannot all of a sudden enter into, or adapt itself to, any *Upaasana*, the scriptures first of all stipulate '*Karmaanga Upaasanas*' (meditations closer to physical actions); thereafter the scriptures stipulate '*Prateeka Upaasanas*' (meditations spun round a particular object), which are '*Saalambana*' (solely dependent upon an external object); thereafter, the scriptures have recommended '*Saguna Brahmoapaasanas*' (meditations on *Brahman* associated with certain special qualities or features). Only after all these mental meditations are gone through (and the mind is purified or cleansed of its impurities or dross in the form of *Kaamanas* or desires for mundane or materialistic pleasures and possessive or acquisitive egoism) the scriptures deal with *Jnaana* (the Intuitive Knowledge of the Self).

4. Ch. Bh. Intr. pp. 5, 6.

173. Because *Upaasanas* are associated with mental concepts or thoughts (*Vrittis*) which are to be practised continuously and also because they are, like physical actions, '*Purusha Tantra*' (mental actions well within the control or purview of the person concerned), as also are '*Choodana Tantra*' (actions prompted by a scriptural injunction) — (section 76), they are not only extremely different from *Jnaana* but also are having fruits quite different from those of *Jnaana*. In this respect too, it becomes evident that *Upaasanas* are distinct from *Jnaana*. To wit, **to those persons who practise *Karmaanga Upaasanas* the complete progress or growth of the respective *Karma* accrues, while for those persons who are desirous of *Moaksha* (*Mumukshus*) *Jnaana Utpatti* (the attainment of Self-Knowledge) is the fruit. For the *Prateeka Upaasakas*, according to their respective objects kept before them as *Prateeka*, *Drishta* (visible) or *Adrishta* (invisible) fruits will accrue. For the *Saguna Brahma Upaasakas* the fruits are *Brahma Praapti* (the attainment**

of *Brahma Loaka*) and *Krama Mukti* (phased Liberation); but for *Jnaana* there accrues always and exclusively only one kind of fruit at the very instant of Intuition (*Jnaana Samakaala*) itself which is called the genuine *Mukti*, *Sadyoamukti* or *Jeevanmukti* (Liberation, Beatitude here and now in this very life). Although for all kinds of *Upaasanas* *Paramaatman* who is the *Upaasya Devata* (the deity or God to be meditated upon), is one and the same, in accordance with the qualities or special features that are associated with (i.e. superimposed upon) this *Paramaatman* for the purposes of their meditations, the *Upaasakas* will attain those relevant and repective fruits proportionate to those particular qualities or special features (superimposed).

5. Su. Bh. 1-1-12. pp. 62, 63.

7. Su. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 645.

6. Su. Bh. 4-3-16. p. 894.

174. We have stated above that because of the following reasons — (1) In *Upaasanas* there are the distinctions of *Upaasya* (the object on which one has to meditate) and *Upaasaka* (the meditator); (2) *Upaasya Brahman* (*Brahman* that is to be meditated upon) is an external object to oneself; (3) it is *Choadana Tantra* (a thing to be performed as per scriptural injunctions); (4) the fruits or results accrue in due course of time; and (5) these fruits are different for different meditations — *Upaasanas* are, as a rule, quite different (*Vilakshana*) from *Jnaana*. For this reason alone, it becomes evident that *Upaasanas* are within the purview or ambit of *Avidya* alone. Because of reasons like — “It is propounded in the scriptural texts that the object of meditations is not the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*; it is criticized or deprecated clearly in the scriptural texts that *Upaasanas* are practices within the ambit of *Avidya* (*Aavidyaka*)” — it becomes established that — (1) Apart from mental *Upaasanas* there exists exclusively *Jnaana* which is quite different from *Upaasanas*; (2) By means of that *Jnaana* alone the ‘*Mukhya Mukti*’ (the predominant, Absolute Liberation) is attained. This truth we have previously substantiated also in section 65.

8. Ke. Up. 1-5. p. 49.;

Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 171

Ke. Up. Bh. 1-5. p. 51.

10. G. Bh. 12-13. p. 486.

9. Br. Up. 1-4-10. p. 145.;

175. On the strength of scriptural statements like — “That which is meditated upon as ‘this’ is not *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality” — (*Kena Upanishad* 1-5 to 9) — it should not be taken to mean that — “*Saguna Brahman* is not the really real or genuine *Brahman*.” For that scriptural statement the real interpretation is that — “*Upaasana Vishayatwa* (the objectivity or extrovertedness prompted or induced by the means of spiritual practices) of *Upaasanas* is not the essential

nature of Pure, Absolute Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality", that is all. We have previously in section 164 mentioned that in the scriptural texts *Brahman* Itself has been preached as associated with some *Kaarya Dharma*s (special characteristics or qualities suitable for, or which can be addressed to, an object or thing in the external world of duality) so as to enable the seeker to meditate upon as an object for mental meditation. By the usage of adjectives or qualifying words like 'Aatmatwa', 'Paaparahitatwa', 'Sarvakaaranatwa' etc. it becomes evident that in the *Upaasana Vaakyas* (sentences pertaining to mental meditations) alone the Supreme Reality of *Para Brahman* is Itself taught. But the special symbols, characteristics mentioned therein in the *Upaasana Vaakyas* are related only to the *Upaadhis* (adjuncts) and not to the essential nature of *Brahman* at all. A clear crystal of alum or marble is not really associated or blended with the special features like the red colour of a flower placed in its vicinity, is it not? Those *Upaadhis* too are 'Avidya Kalpita' (projected by ignorance) alone; we have already in section 171 delineated that by virtue of *Avidya* alone the empirical dealings of *Upaasya* — *Upaasaka* are being carried out. *Nirguna Vaakyas* (scriptural sentences which mention *Brahman* devoid of any special qualities or characteristics whatsoever) especially, are teaching as their final goal or purport (*Taatparya*) the *Brahma Swaroopa* (the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Brahman*) alone. Therefore, there is no scope whatsoever to reckon that *Brahman* that is taught or preached by the *Shrutis* is of two kinds or are two in number. The prime purport of the *Shrutis* (*Upanishads*) is to teach (propound) in the ultimate analysis the one and only *Nirvishesha Brahman* (the Pure, Absolute Reality, devoid of all special characteristics or features) alone.

11. Su. Bh. 3-2-11. pp. 609, 610.

12. Su. Bh. 3-2-14. p. 612.

176. Although the differentiation as '*Upaasya*' and '*Upaasaka*' is itself a projection of *Avidya*, in general the seeker (*Saadhaka*) should necessarily **believe or conceive** that in whatever manner the scriptures have described the essential nature of the '*Upaasya*' in that very manner that object really exists. If it is not conceived in that manner, then the defect or demerit of reckoning *Vedas* (the scriptural texts) as '*Apramaana*' (invalid, unauthentic means of knowledge) without the proper cause for doing so (*Nishkaarana*) will attach itself. Therefore, the seekers should per force presume (or ardently believe) with full faith — especially when, among the scriptural sentences pertaining to *Upaasanas*, there are sentences which, while describing the essence of *Brahman*, are not opposed to or contradictory to the sentences which propound the essential nature of *Brahman* as Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss (*Tattwa Boadhaka Vaakyas*) — that they describe

the nature of *Brahman* which really exists in that manner. Not only this, but also the seeker should presume, even with regard to sentences which teach *Upaasanas* of objects which are not *Brahman*, that — “When there does not exist any contradiction to *Pramaanaantara* (other, alternative valid means of Knowledge), they are verily sentences teaching or instructing the Reality as It is (*Yatharthha Boadhaka Vaakyas*).” Only when the special qualities or characteristics mentioned in the *Upaasana Vaakyas* appear to be opposed to the *Brahma Swaroopa Pratipaadaka Vaakyas* (sentences which preach the essential nature of Absolute Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Brahman*), then the seeker should discern that they are taught in that manner for the purpose of meditation alone, and not that they too are really the qualities or features belonging to the essence of *Brahman*. For, the ‘*Tatpara Vaakyas*’ (sentences pertaining to the essential nature of *Brahman*) are stronger and predominant in their nature and purport than the ‘*Atatpara Vaakyas*’ (sentences meant for an inferior purport other than preaching the Reality in Its essence); because the *Brahma Vaakyas* are found invariably to signify or teach the essential nature of the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*, they have a consummation (culmination) of their purport in that *Brahma Swaroopa* alone; whereas, because the *Upaasana Vaakyas* are ‘*Upaasana Pradhaana*’ (predominantly meditation-oriented), they do not always have the prime purport of the various descriptions of ‘*Brahma Swaroopa*’ mentioned in them. For this reason alone, if in ‘*Nirguna Vaakyas*’ (scriptural sentences teaching *Upaasanas* devoid of any special characteristics), which agree with or suit the ‘*Saguna Roopa*’ (the Reality associated with adjuncts with special qualities or characteristics), then the seeker should discern that these are meant to signify the ‘*Vibhootis*’, profound and extra-ordinary excellences of the Supreme Lord (i.e. *Ishwara* or *Brahman*) and thereby to praise or eulogise that Reality. For, it cannot be accepted that really, or in the ultimate analysis, *Brahman*, the Absolute, Transcendental Reality, exists both as ‘*Saguna*’ and ‘*Nirguna*’. For this reason alone, although the *Sootrakaara* (Shri Baadaraayanaachaarya) has taught that the ‘*Dahara Vaakya*’ (*Upaasana Vaakya*) pertaining to *Dahara Vidya*, which propounds ‘*Brahma Swaroopa*’ in the *Chhaandogya Upanishad* 8-1-1 and in the *Brihadhaaranyaka Upanishad* 4-4-22, the sentence which teaches the unity of purpose or identity between ‘*Vijnaanaatman*’ and ‘*Nirguna Brahman*’ are one and the same, the *Bhaashyakaara* (Shri Shankaraachaarya) has described (or expounded) that the seeker should discern that — “One should add up the special characteristics found in the *Nirguna Vaakya* to the *Saguna Vaakyas* of the *Chhaandogya Upanishad* and then carry on the meditation, as also conceive that the *Saguna Visheshanas* (the special characteristics) found in the *Saguna Vaakyas* of the *Brihadhaaranyaka Upanishad* do

signify the 'Vibhootis' (profound excellences or manifestations) of *Nirguna Brahman* alone." Although the *Brahman* which is referred to or taught in both these contexts (in *Chhaandogya* and *Brihadaaranyaka Upanishads*) is one and the same, in *Chhaandogya* Its 'Upaasya Roopa' (form that is to be meditated upon) is taught; whereas, in *Brihadaaranyaka* Its 'Jneya Roopa' (the essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss which is to be cognized or Intuited as the Ultimate Reality) is taught.

13. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. p. 45.

15. Su. Bh. 3-3-39. p. 717.

14. Su. Bh. 3-2-14. p. 612.

XXIV. SPIRITUAL PRACTICES (SAADHANAS) FOR AATMA VIJNAANA (INTUITION OF SELF)

177. Although *Atman* is our very core of Being, the common run of people are not Intuiting or cognizing Him as a result of *Ajnaana* (a lack of absence of Self-Knowledge). Therefore, there is an indispensable need of cognizing Him. This Self-Knowledge (Intuition) is called in the scriptural texts by words or terms like — 'Darshana', 'Vijnaana', 'Laabha' etc. Although in the scriptures both — (i) the special Knowledge (*Vijnaana*) that is to be obtained from *Upaasanas* which are of the form of purely conceptual knowledge and endowed with faith or belief and (ii) the Self-Knowledge attained through *Jnaana* (Intuition), which is of the essential nature of the cognition of the Reality (*Vastu*) as It is — are called by the same word or term, there exists a difference between the two. Though in the scriptural texts all the technical terms like *Jnaana*, *Vedana*, *Upaasana*, *Vidya* etc. are used as synonyms (*Paryaaya Shabda*), these words do have the two meanings or connotations of — (i) *Bhaavana* (faith, belief, conceptual knowledge); (ii) *Vastu Tantra Jnaana* (the Intuitive, cognitive Knowledge or experience) of the *Vastu*, i.e. the Entity or Reality as 'It really is' or 'It really exists'. **Following the conventions formulated by the present-day authors of Vedantic texts we will call the 'Vastu Tantra Jnaana' of the Ultimate Reality as It really exists (in Its essential nature of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss) by the term 'Jnaana', and the 'Dhyaana' (mental meditation or contemplation which is of the form of 'Bhaavana Roopa' i.e. concepts, beliefs, emotions, feelings) by the term 'Upaasana'.**

1. Su. Bh. 1-1-17. pp. 69, 70.

2. Su. Bh. 4-1-1. p. 813.

3. Ch. Bh. 1-1-1. pp. 7, 8.

4. Br. Up. 1-4-7. pp. 109, 110., Br.
Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 124, 125.

5. Ch. Up. 8-1-1. p. 572., Ch. Up.
Bh. 8-1-1. pp. 573, 574.

6. Ch. Up. 8-7-1. pp. 616, 617.,
Ch. Up. 8-7-1. p. 618.

178. Shravana (listening Intuitively to the scriptural teachings), Manana (reasoning or deliberating Intuitively upon those teachings) and Nididhyaasana (contemplating Intuitively the Ultimate Reality of Atman) — all these three are the direct, *Saadhanas* which help cognize or Intuit Atman as He is or really exists in His essence *per se* and attain 'Vijnana' which is 'Vastu Tantra', i.e. unlike objective intellectual knowledge it is the Intuition or cognitive Knowledge entirely dependent upon the Reality *in esse*. But in order to attain 'Vijnana', which is of the form or nature of identification (*Abhimaana*) with a particular 'Devata' (deity), as oneself as a result of practising certain *Upaasanas*, it is necessary for the ardent seeker to carry on continuously, to conceive of or to contemplate upon the form of the *Upaasya Vishaya* (the object of meditation), without allowing any alien concept, thought, feeling, emotion etc. to intervene or intrude in between.

7. Br. Up. 4-5-6. p. 776.

9. Br. Bh. 1-3-9. p. 65.

8. Tai. Bh. 1. p. 282.

179. 'Aatma Darshana' does not mean 'to objectify Atman or perceive Him by the valid means of one's sight' at all; it means 'to get established steadfast in the Intuitive Knowledge that — 'I am that Self alone'. Then in that event there does not remain any residual 'Aakaankshaa' (aspiration, innate desire) of the nature of — "I wish to cognize or Intuit Atman" — at all. *Shravana* means listening intently (Intuitively) to the scriptural sentences as also the *Guru's* (the spiritual preceptor's) explanatory sentences and cognize their meaning or purport; *Manana* means to reason out, ratiocinate, discern or deliberate upon (cognitively) what is being heard so as to be in consonance with *Yukti* (logical or dialectical devices or arguments); *Nididhyaasana* means to contemplate (*Chintana*) upon the *Vastu* (the Ultimate Reality of Atman) with all awareness, alertness and attention (*Lakshya*) so as to inculcate upon the mind the Intuitive experience of Atman and get fully established in that Reality (Intuition). Only if all these three aspects of direct spiritual practices are reconciled (all of them become one-pointed, fully in agreement), the *Samyag-Darshana* (the final, consummate Intuition) of the essence of the Absolute, non-dual *Brahman-Atman* Consciousness will accrue, but the 'Darshana' will not accrue to anybody and everybody by mere listening (*Shravana*) to the scriptural or preceptors's statements at all. (In the '*Bhaamati Vyaakhyaana*', i.e. a commentary on *Brahma Sootra Bhaashyas* of Adi Shankara, *Shravana-Manana-Nididhyaasana* have been described, quite contrary to the original *Bhaashyas* of Adi Shankara, to be of the form or nature of *Dhyaana-Dhaarana* —and 'Darshana' as '*Samaadhi*').

10. Br. Bh. 2-4-5. p. 357.

12. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 159.

11. Br. Bh. 4-5-6. p. 776.

180. Some people may think that because *Shravana*, *Manana* and *Nididhyaasana* are *Saadhanas* to attain the '*Darshana*' of *Atman*, they must be stipulations of the nature of scriptural injunctions. Although in words like '*Drishtavyaha*', '*Shroatavyaha*', '*Mantavyaha*' and '*Nididhyaasitavyaha*' the suffix '*Tavya*' indicating or implying an injunction (*Vidhi*) is seen (on the face of them), there is no cause to reckon invariably that these are injunctions. For, the fact that — "To the extent these words beckon the seeker to pay attention towards the subtle subjective aspect of *Atman* (his own Self), after prompting him to turn back from or recede unto himself introvertedly and introspectively away from *Anaatman*, these words are '*Pravartaka Vaakyas*' (inducing or prompting sentences) of the nature of injunctions" — we have already mentioned in section 65. In the absolute sense even in the workaday world too the knowledges that readily accrue from *Shravana*, *Manana* etc. (*Shravanaadi Jnaana*) can never be stipulated as injunctions (*Vidhaana*) by any one; if any one says — "Look at this" or "Listen to this" — they mean thereby only that — "Pay your attention towards this" — and not as a command that — "You shall, do (attain) *Darshana Jnaana*" or "You shall, do attain *Shravana Jnaana*" — at all; for, *Jnaana* (Knowledge) accrues invariably in full consonance or agreement with *Pramaana* (the valid means of knowledge) and the *Vastu* (the object to be known), but not by means of *Manushya Prayatna* (human effort). This fact indeed we have previously mentioned in section 76. From this it becomes evident too that it is not necessary to learn from the scriptural texts the answer to the question — "How many times or how long human efforts like *Shravana*, *Manana* etc. should be repeated or continued?"; just as in the instance of — if it is said — 'Pound the paddy' — it is quite an evident and unequivocal statement which connotes or implies — 'Till such time the rice (grain) is separated from the husk' — alone, similarly it becomes self-evident that if it is asked as to how long or how many times the human efforts of '*Shravana*', '*Manana*', '*Nididhyaasana*' should be performed or carried out, the answer would be — "Till one attains the *Darshana* of the intrinsic nature of '*Aatmaswaroopa Vijnana*' (Intuition of the essential nature of Pure Absolute Being-Consciousness-Bliss of *Atman*)."
Shravana, *Manana* etc. are not, like the *Karmas* which are rites or rituals stipulated in the scriptural texts, *Saadhanas* stipulated by way of injunctions to be performed for the sake of attaining *Adrishta Phala* (invisible fruits, in other births or worlds); but they are verily '*Upadesha*' (spiritual teachings), meant for *Drishta Prayojana* (visible benefits accruing here and now while living in this body). Therefore, the *Vidhi Shabd*as (words appearing to be injunctions), are used in the scriptural texts only to systematise by way of guidance in the manner — "You carry out *Shravana*, *Manana* etc. in such and such a manner."

13. Su. Bh. 3-2-22. p. 622.

15. Su. Bh. 4-1-1. p. 813.

14. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. p. 622.

16. Ch. Bh. 8-7-1. pp. 618, 619.

181. By the repetition of the statement of the type — “You must listen to the scriptural texts, deliberate upon or reason out those statements, contemplate upon the Entity or Reality signified by those scriptural statements” — many times in the scriptures it becomes evident that these spiritual practices (*Saadhanas*) should be repeated over and over again (*Aavrutti*); besides, the literary meaning or connotation of the words — ‘*Upaasana*’ and ‘*Nididhyaasana*’ — are ‘serving another without a break, continuously’, ‘meditating upon something without a break’ alone. In statements used in our workaday world like — “He is performing *Upaasana* of the *Guru*”; “He is doing *Upaasana* of the *Raaja* (the King)”; “She is doing *Dhyaana* of her husband who has gone to another place” — by import, it is meant by these words of ‘*Upaasana*’ that the persons concerned are doing service as also remembrance continuously without a break. Because of the reason that *Upaasanas*, which are performed for the purpose of obtaining a result or fruit in due course of time, become stronger and stronger in accordance with the increase in the number of times they are repeated, those *Upaasanas* invariably need to be repeated. But in the case of ‘*Shravana*’, ‘*Manana*’ and ‘*Nididhyaasana*’, which are to be performed or practised in order to attain ‘*Brahmaatmatwa Darshana*’ (the Intuitive experience of the identity of *Brahman* and *Atman*), why should the seeker perform ‘*Aavrutti*’ or repetition at all? — Such a doubt may arise in the minds of some people.

The solution for this doubt is: Because ‘*Shravana*’, ‘*Manana*’ and ‘*Nididhyaasana*’ are spiritual practices which yield ‘*Drishta Phala*’ they have to be practised per force till such time the ‘*Darshana*’ (Intuitive experience of the Self) is attained. If by performing mere *Shravana* alone one gets ‘*Darshana*’, then that ‘*Uttamaadhikaari*’ (supremely qualified person) does not have to practise any more *Saadhana* at all; but in the case of those who by means of one such mere (singular) ‘*Shravana*’ do not attain *Darshana*, they will have to do ‘*Aavrutti*’ (repetition of those practices). It is in every one’s experience that the meaning or purport of a sentence that is known to a little extent from listening to it once becomes completely and clearly known or understood by repetition of the *Shravana* of it. Because of the reason that through the ‘*Padaartha Jnaana*’ (knowledge or cognition of the purport or meaning of the words) alone the ‘*Vaakyartha Jnaana*’ (the knowledge of the purport or meaning of the entire sentence) accrues — naturally for the sake of ‘*Padaartha Viveka*’, i.e. deliberative thinking on the purport or meaning of the words, *Shravana* and *Manana* have to be repeated. Further, because of the reason that several phenomena like the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect, *Vishaya Vedana* (conceptual knowledge of the external or internal objects) etc. are misconceived in, or superimposed upon, *Atman*, the possibility of rescinding or sublating one each such superimposition by means of one each *Avadhaana* (attention

paid or directed towards each one of them) progressively might be availed of also. Therefore, in the case of those who attain the Intuitive experience of the Reality (*Jnaana*) by merely listening to the scriptural sentences (*Vaakya Shravana*) once only — because they get rid of *Avidya*, there is nothing to be done or practised by them at all. But in the case of such people who do not attain *Jnaana*, they will have per force to do or practise repeatedly *Shravana*, Intuitive listening etc. prior to their attainment of Intuitive experience of the Self. We have previously in section 74 refuted the theory of *Prasankhyaana* and such other theories which propound that such practices have to be continued even after the attainment of *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge).

17. Su. Bh. 4-1-1. pp. 813, 814.

19. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. p. 816.

18. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. p. 815.

20. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. pp. 816, 817.

182. Some protagonists used to argue out in the manner — “Even after the *Vedaanta Vaakya* has signified *Brahman*, in order to enable the *Saadhaka* to attain the *Vijnaana* as also help sublimate or nullify (*Pravilaya*) the world of duality, the scriptures may restrain or bind, by way of a command, the seeker.” But this doctrinaire theory is shown to be not in consonance with reason by Shri Shankara. For, if it is contended that the world of duality (*Prapancha*) exists in reality and that the scriptures command or bind the seeker to sublimate or nullify it, then because of the reason that no one can ever destroy or sublimate what really exists, the scriptures will become invalid (*Apramaana*). Further, because of the reason that there will not, or cannot, be any scope or possibility for the world of duality to remain or survive even after it is sublated or nullified by one who is a Realized soul (*Jnani*), even before this act of sublation now, at the present juncture, none of the external phenomenon of the world as also the physical body, the senses, the mind, the intellect etc. can possibly exist. On the other hand, if it is accepted that the world of duality is ‘*Avidya Krita*’ (projected as a result of ignorance; to wit, of the nature of misconception), then because of the reason that by ‘*Brahmoapadesha*’ (spiritual teaching or instruction about the Reality) alone both the ‘*Brahma Vijnaana*’ and the destruction (sublation) of the world of duality which is projected as a result of ignorance (*Avidyakalpita*) is made possible, there does not remain anything whatsoever to be done or performed after the spiritual instruction or teaching by the scriptures. Besides, in the argument propounding that the ‘*Nityojjya Jeeva*’ (the soul who is charged or enjoined with a duty by the scriptures) is belonging to the world of duality, because of the reason that he too gets destroyed or sublated along with the world of duality, the defect or predicament that — “*Mukti* does not accrue to any one at all” — will have to be faced. But in the case of the spiritual teaching that — “*Brahman* Itself is misconceived as *Jeeva* because of *Avidya*” — because of the reason that by virtue of

the spiritual teaching or instruction (*Upadesha*) itself of the type — “*Brahman* alone thou art” — the *Jeevatwa* which is projected by *Avidya* gets sublated or rescinded (to wit, the basic misconception or delusion itself is rooted out), once again there is no scope for the ‘*Niyoaga*’ (enjoined duty) of ‘*Prapancha Pravilaya*’ (sublation of the world of duality) to arise at all. Because of the reason that *Jnaana* (Intuition) is ‘*Pramaanajanya*’ (a resultant product of valid means of Knowledge) as also ‘*Vastu Tantra*’ (invariably and inviolably dependent upon the reality of the object or the entity as it is or exists), neither that *Jnaana* can be attained by hundreds of empirical efforts or assertions nor by hundreds of sublations or refutations (*Nishedha*) to the effect that — “*Jnaana* can be destroyed or got rid of.” Therefore, in this context **there is no room or scope for a command (*Niyoaga*) for ‘*Prapancha Pravilaya*’**. Not only that but also if the scriptural lore is entirely ‘*Niyoaganishtha*’ (devoted exclusively in stipulating actions or rituals by way of injunctions), then the spiritual teaching that — “*Jeeva* is verily *Aniyoajya Brahman* (Metaphysical Reality beyond any stipulations)” — will be flouted. Further, if the scriptures themselves preach on the one hand that — “Thou art verily *Aniyoajya Brahman*” — and advise as a stipulation (*Niyoaga*) in the manner — “You make an effort to attain *Brahma Vijnaana* (Intuition)” — on the other hand, then it becomes tantamount to saying that the scriptural sentences have a purport of signifying or teaching two meanings mutually contradictory, and thereby the scriptures lose their validity or authenticity. Not only that, but again the defects of — (i) giving up or discarding the spiritual teachings regarding the Ultimate Reality which are clearly seen to have been enunciated in the *Upanishadic* lore or *Shrutis*; (ii) imagining or misconceiving ‘*Niyoaga*’ (mandatory stipulation of effort), as also (iii) the defect of imagining or misconceiving Liberation (*Moaksha*) to be *Adrishta Phala* and, in addition, to consider it to be *Anitya* (non-eternal) also will attach itself to the protagonists of ‘*Prapancha Pravilaya Vaada*’. Therefore, it can never reasonably be accepted that — “*Jeeva* is bound by mandatory stipulations or injunctions (*Niyukta*) by the scriptures so as to be able to achieve ‘*Prapancha Pravilaya*’.” Hence, just like the doctrinaire teaching that — “The job or duty of the *Shaastras* is to stipulate by way of injunctions particular *Kriya* to be performed invariably” — the doctrinaire teachings of ‘*Niyoaga Vaadins*’ (protagonists of the theory of mandatory stipulation of injunctions of the type) — “The scriptural responsibility is only either to stipulate a particular action or ritual (*Karma*) for the sake of *Pravritti* (continued progress in active worldly life) or to stipulate a particular action or ritual for the sake of *Nivritti* (retiring from the world)” — are also *Avaidika* (contrary to the *Vedic* teaching). Besides, it is seen in our workaday world by mere ‘*Vastu Nirdeshana*’ (pointing out towards an object of Knowledge) in the manner — “This is a rope, not a snake” — one gets

Jnaana (cognition of the object) and therefrom attaining one's desire fulfilled too.

21. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. pp. 620, 621.

22. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. p. 621.

23. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. pp. 621, 622.

24. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. p. 622.

25. Su. Bh. 3-2-21. pp. 622, 623.

26. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 35.

27. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 39, 40.

183. Now it becomes quite evident that there is no content or strength in the argument — “Because of the fact that even after ‘*Shravana*’, ‘*Manana*’ and ‘*Nididhyaasana*’ are stipulated as injunctions — (i) the ‘*Brahma Jnaana*’ (Intuition) is necessarily ‘*Vihita*’ (that which is stipulated by mandatory injunction alone); (ii) *Jeeva* is invariably ‘*Niyukta*’ (one who is directed to be engaged) in attaining ‘*Brahma Jnaana*’ as per the scriptural injunctions alone; and not that merely by the *Vedas* mentioning or stating the ‘*Brahma Swaroopa*’ they become ‘*Krita Kritya*’ (the valid means or authentic sources which have fulfilled their purport or goal).” For, we have already stated in section 180 that — **“In the direct, Intuitive spiritual practices (*Saadhanas*) of *Shravana*, *Manana* and *Nididhyaasana* it is taught that the seeker should re-direct or concentrate his full attention (*Lakshya*) towards his own Self (*Atman* or *Brahman*) alone and not that in the *Vedas* (i.e. *Upanishads*) *Jnaana* (Intuition) Itself is stipulated by way of injunctions.”** We have also elucidated in the previous sections 181-182 above that — “Just like *Shravana*, both *Manana* and *Nididhyaasana* too are meant for attaining *Brahma Vijnaana* (Intuition of *Brahman*) alone and not to teach or preach that even after the attainment of Self-Knowledge there remains any *Kartavyaantara* (other duty, action or responsibility remaining to be performed or discharged).” Therefore, for a true seeker (*Saadhaka*) after the attainment of ‘*Brahma Vijnaana*’ there does not remain or subsist any duty or responsibility whatsoever, nor any *Kritya* (actions, obligations) for the *Shaastras*.

28. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 43.

29. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 44

184. Although ‘*Nididhyaasana*’ (Intuitive contemplation) taught by the scriptures for the ultimate purport of attaining ‘*Samyaga Jnaana*’ (Intuitive experience, in other words, Self-Knowledge) is also ‘*Dhyaana*’ (a mental meditation) indeed, there is a great difference between this Intuition and *Upaasana*, of the nature or form of a conceptual belief, faith or feeling (*Bhaavana Roopa*). If examined in their fundamental essence ‘*Nididhyaasana*’ is an effort to contemplate Intuitively in accordance with the very essence of Being of the object of contemplation, i.e. the Self or Pure Consciousness, culminating in the consummate Intuitive experience of this Pure Consciousness *per se*; but, on the other hand, *Upaasana* is a mental process

or action based on, or backed up by, belief or faith as stipulated or directed by the *Shaastras*. Further, by *Nididhyaasana* here and now while living in this body Self-Knowledge is attained (*Jnaana Praapti*) as also *Kaivalya* (the consummate non-dual experience of getting established, rooted in or *Brahma Swaroopa*) is attained. (In fact, this is the *summum bonum* of all human existence). This alone is called '*Dhyaana Yoga*' in the *Bhagavad Geeta*. In the *Kathopanishad* what is called '*Adhyaatma Yoga*' is this '*Nididhyaasana*' alone. For *Upaasana* the posthumous fruit of the form of attaining '*Apara Brahman*' or '*Brahma Loaka Praapti*', also called '*Krama Mukti*', along with the resultant fruit of getting or obtaining '*Jagadaishwarya*' (all the worldly riches, pleasures) etc. accrues; all that too is invariably acquired in the '*Samsaara Kshetra*' (the region of transmigratory existence) alone. But the *Aishwarya* (riches or excellences) that is acquired by the '*Mukta*', by virtue of his attaining '*Jnaana*' (Intuition), is — from the *Vyaavahaarika Drishti* (empirical viewpoint) — unbridled and infinite; for, '*Brahma Jnaani*' has verily become one with *Brahman* alone. But the '*Aishwarya*' (worldly riches, powers) etc., that is acquired by *Upaasakas* is invariably limited and finite. In fact, all of them obtain or acquire their *Aishwarya* as the Supreme Lord's dispensation, having been under His control; however, they will not gain the *Aishwarya* (power) of creating, sustaining and destroying the world of duality; that supreme power ever rests exclusively with the Supreme Lord, the Creator. One who has attained Liberation through the doorway of (or by virtue of) *Jnaana* is devoid of a body (*Ashareeri*); for, '*Sashareeratwa*' (embodiedness) is '*Mithyaa Jnaana Krita*' (a resultant projection of misconception or a delusion). But for the *Jnaani* the mind does not exist as a separate entity or phenomenon at all; he has attained by virtue of *Jnaana* a supra-state of '*Amanastha*' (no-mind-ness; in other words, his mind has lost all its content and substance to merge or become one with its very source, *Atman*). But one who has gained '*Mukti*' (Liberation of the inferior kind, one that is stipulated in the scriptures, in a secondary sense) has a body caused by his *Itchha* (desire) as well as a mind alone. All these are differences in respect of the results or fruits accruing afresh. *Nididhyaasana* is a spiritual pursuit culminating or having its fruition, consummation in '*Swaanubhava*' (one's own innate Intuitive experience of *Atman* or the Self).

30. G. Bh. 6-29. p. 300.

31. Ka. Bh. 1-2-12. p. 138.

32. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p. 892.

33. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 40.

34. Br. Up. 4-4-7. p. 728.

35. Ma. Ka. Bh. 3-32. p. 307.

36. Su. Bh. 4-4-10. p. 903.

37. Su. Bh. 4-4-12. p. 904.

38. a) Su. Bh. 4-4-5. p. 899.

b) Su. Bh. 4-4-6. p. 900.

c) Su. Bh. 4-4-7. p. 901.

39. Su. Bh. 4-4-11. p. 903.

40. Su. Bh. 4-4-17. p. 908.

41. Su. Bh. 4-4-18. p. 909.

42. Su. Bh. 4-4-19. p. 910.

185. *Brahman* is one and one only, Its Knowledge or Intuition too is one and one only; for, if there are many Knowledges or Intuitions, then barring one of them all the rest become delusions alone. Therefore, till one attains '*Vijnaana*' (Intuitive experience of the Self) the seeker should keep on deliberating upon the '*Brahma Swaroopa*' as propounded in the various sentences of the *Upanishads*. Whether the sentences are of the apparent form of '*Vidhi*' (injunctions) indicating special features of the type of — '*Aanandatwa*', '*Vijnaana Ghanatwa*', '*Sarvagatatwa*', '*Sarvaatmatwa*' etc. or sentences indicating by way of '*Nishedha*' (refutation of the various qualities or special features) of the type of — '*Asthoolatwa*', '*Ananutwa*', '*Ahriswatwa*', '*Adheergatwa*' etc. — all of them the seeker should reconcile with *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, which is non-dual and Absolute in Its essence. Thus all the '*Shravana*', '*Manana*' and '*Nididhyaasana*' collectively or collaterally understood will help cognize or Intuit the Self as the Ultimate Reality. In the case of *Upaasana*, the seeker should collect together all statements or details pertaining to a particular kind of *Upaasana* from all the *Upanishads* and meditate upon it.

43. Su. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 644.

45. Su. Bh. 3-3-33. p. 706.

44. Su. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 663.

46. Su. Bh. 3-3-5. pp. 651, 652.

186. Because it is propounded that the *Upaasya Brahman* is one and the same, it is not possible to meditate upon *Brahman* by blending all the '*Brahmoopaasanas*' (meditations stipulated in the scriptures about *Brahman*). For, as in different *Upaasanas* different *Dharmas* (special qualities or features) have been stipulated and by virtue of those various features, the *Brahman* which is to be meditated upon or objectified also is different (for each one of such *Upaasanas*). In addition to this, to meditate by combining or blending all these *Upaasanas* also is futile. **For each one of these *Upaasanas* the fruit that accrues is '*Brahma Saakshaatkaara*' (materialisation of *Brahman* in the form in which It is meditated);** so, when by means of one meditation or *Upaasana*, the fruit of '*Saakshaatkaara*' is attained, where is the need for another? Further, it is not possible to blend or combine in this manner and then meditate. **For, to achieve *Saakshaatkaara* it is necessary for attaining concentration of the mind (*Aikaagrya*) by means of a singular type of *Pratyaya* (steadfast concept),** but if all the *Upaasanas* are combined or blended, then '*Chitta Vikshepa*' (dispersal, scattering of the mental attention) takes place. (Thereby, the practice will defeat the very purpose for which meditations are prescribed as spiritual practices or disciplines to be carried out for a long time). Hence, by choosing any particular *Upaasana* and adding up all the special features or details of that particular *Upaasana* which are

stipulated in the various scriptures (*Upanishads*), the seeker should keep on meditating till '*Saakshaatkaara*' is attained.

47. Su. Bh. 3-3-58. p. 750.

48. Su. Bh. 3-3-59. p. 753.

187. There is no rule of law as regards the question — "When, at which time, where, at which place and in which direction when the seeker sits with his face towards that particular direction, does the Knowledge (*Jnaana*) of that '*Brahma Vastu*' (the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*) accrue?" For, that Intuitive Knowledge is '*Vastu Tantra*' dependent upon the *Vastu* (the Ultimate Reality) as It really is. In the case of '*Karmaanga Upaasanas*' (meditations subservient to the scriptural *Karmas* or rituals), because they have to be necessarily carried out subject to *Karma Vidhi* (stipulations as injunctions in the form of certain rites or rituals), in order to practise or carry out those meditations there is no need to consider separately details like *Aasana* (postures), *Sthaana* (place), *Dik* (direction) etc. But **in the case of the other remaining *Upaasanas* — whether it is *Nididhyaasana* for attaining *Jnaana* or whether it is *Upaasana*, which is '*Purusha Tantra*' (within the purview and control of the seeker or person so practising) for the sake of *Saakshaatkaara* — both *Saadhanas* will have to be per force done or performed in a squatting position or posture alone.** For, the mind of one who keeps moving gets distracted or dispersed or scattered; if one does it standing, it will not be possible for the mind to concentrate and deliberate upon a subtle matter or phenomenon; if the seeker does it in a sleeping posture, he may get into sleep. For that reason alone, in the *Smritis* it has been advised that for performing *Upaasanas* a steadfast or steady posture (*Sthira Aasana*) should be practised for a long time. However, **there are no rules or regulations whatsoever with regard to *Dik* (the cardinal directions), *Desha* (place) and *Kaala* (time of performance); it is sufficient if the mental state and temperament are congenial or helpful for the mind to be one-pointed or with full concentration. For, in order to carry out *Upaasana* successfully concentration or one-pointedness of the mind alone is necessary.**

49. Su. Bh. 4-1-7. pp. 830, 831.

51. Su. Bh. 4-1-11. p. 832.

50. Su. Bh. 4-1-10. p. 832.

188. We have stated in section 181 that the technical terms of '*Nididhyaasana*' and '*Upaasana*' themselves suggest or signify that they are 'repetitions of the mental concepts (*Manoavritti Aavritti*), is it not? Because '*Nididhyaasana*' is to be practised over and over again for attaining '*Samyag Darshana*' (Self-Knowledge or Intuition), as soon as '*Darshana*' (Intuitive experience) is attained the seeker may stop it or discontinue it. On the other hand, *Upaasanas* — especially which yield

results or fruits of the form or nature of '*Abhyudaya*' (material progress and prosperity), occurring in due course of time and bearing fruits of '*Apara Brahma Praapti*' etc. and which are of the nature of '*Bhaavanaa*' (emotional feelings or beliefs) — have to be practised continuously till death. For, **by virtue of, or based on, the '*Antya Pratyaya*' (the singular concept or steadfast emotional feeling that the seeker had practised ardently prior to death) alone the '*Adrishta Phala*' (the invisible, unknown future result or fruit) has to accrue post-humously.** Even for '*Karmas*' if they have to yield their respective fruits in future lives or births, they desiderate '*Bhaavanaa Vijnana*' (conceptual knowledge) which is held on to steadfastly, continuously till the time of death; therefore, for *Upaasanas* too '*Bhaavanaas*' (beliefs, emotional feelings etc.) are invariably needed in the form of '*Aavritti*' (repetitions) indeed.

52. Su. Bh. 4-1-12. p. 833.

53. Su. Bh. 4-1-12. p. 834.

189. Just as by practising *Upaasanas* till death an '*Adrishta Phala*' in another birth accrues by virtue of '*Bhaavanaa Vijnana*' (the conceptual knowledge), which in turn is of the form or nature of the last steadfast '*Pratyaya*' (conviction or settled belief) alone, it is not possible to stipulate by way of an injunction that the seeker has per force to practise repeatedly '*Aatma Pratyaya Santaana*' (continuous cognitive or Intuitive Knowledge of the Self). For, when the *Mithyaa Jnaana* (false, delusive knowledge pertaining to *Atman*) is sublated by means of *Aatma Pratyaya* (Intuition of the Self) as neither the conceptual, cognitive knowledge of *Anaatman* (not-self) nor their memories can possibly subsist or continue; further, because the Intuitive (cognitive) experience of the type — "All this *Anaatman* is non-eternal, full of *Duhkha* and impurity, but, on the other hand, *Atman* is of the essential nature totally different from that *Anaatman*" — then, there is no scope or cause for the occurrence of '*Anaatma Smriti*' (the memory of the not-self). Therefore, **to a *Jnani* the memory of '*Aatmaikatwa Vijnana*' (Intuition of the non-dual essence of the Self) keeps on occurring or gushing forth continuously. Hence, there is no need for the scriptures to stipulate by way of injunctions (*Vidhi*) for the *Jnani*.**

Some people are of the opinion that — "To one who has attained '*Aatma Pratyaya Santaana*' (continuous cognitive knowledge of the Self) alone by virtue of the '*Antya Pratyaya*' it is possible to get rid of *Avidya* or destroy it, and for this reason the seeker should practise repeatedly and continuously '*Aatma Jnaana*' or Self-Knowledge (Intuition)." But this opinion is not correct; for, if by means of the first *Jnaana* (Intuitive Knowledge) *Ajnaana* (ignorance) is not sublated or removed, then that

Intuitive Knowledge is not the true *Jnaana* at all; if, on the other hand, ignorance is removed, there is no purpose whatsoever to be served by the second *Jnaana*. Therefore, that *Aatma Pratyaya* — whether it is the first *Jnaana* or the final *Jnaana*; whether it is continuous or discontinuous — that which sublates, falsifies or removes *Avidya* alone is the true, genuine *Jnaana* (Intuition). After the attainment of that *Jnaana*, there does not remain anything whatsoever to be done or performed for a *Jnaani* (a Realized soul). But in the case of *Upaasanas* the scriptures themselves affirm that the *Antya Pratyaya*, at the time of death, is necessary for the fruit of the *Upaasana* to accrue. Because of the reason that at the time of death the final belief or conceptual knowledge (*Bhaavanaa*) that is uppermost or prevalent in the mind of the dying *Upaasaka* is necessary for attaining the invisible fruit in that case, it is not possible to imagine or conceive that after performing or practising *Upaasana* for a particular period of time the *Upaasaka* may give up or stop that practice.

54. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 131.

56. Su. Bh. 4-1-12. p. 834.

55. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. pp. 166, 167.

57. Su. Bh. 4-1-12. p. 834.

190. We have previously stated in section 167 that — “Because to a *Brahma Jnaani* at the very moment of attaining *Jnaana* itself ‘*Jnaana Praapti*’ accrues, once again for its sake there is no *Gati*, *Utkraanti* etc.” But in the case of an *Upaasaka*, because of the reason that for the meditations the end fruit or result to be acquired is ‘*Kaarya Brahman*’ which is to be found in a specified place (like *Svarga Loaka*, *Brahma Loaka*), for the *Upaasaka* there is every possibility of *Gati*, *Utkraanti* etc. At the time of death he leaves the body through the *Sushumnaa Naadi* alone which is situated in the cerebral region. Besides, it is stipulated by way of an injunction in the scriptures as part of certain *Upaasanas* the *Upaasaka* should constantly be contemplating upon the path by which he has to traverse or transmigrate via the doorway of the *Naadi*. Hence constantly practising the contemplation on that particular *Gati* (path of transmigration), in accordance with the directives or instructions stipulated in the scriptures, the *Upaasaka* traverses via the doorway of the subtle nerve (*Naadi*) alone — called ‘*Devayaana Maarga*’ — and attains *Brahman*.

58. Su. Bh. 4-2-17. p. 865.

XXV. MUKTI SAADHANAS

191. There are scriptural sentences stipulating in the manner — “One should perform *Karma* till one is alive.” There are *Smriti* statements to the effect — “One should never give up *Karma*.” Therefore, if

in case *Moaksha* is not gained by means of *Karma*, the purpose for which *Karmas* are stipulated by way of injunctions will be futile. For these reasons, some people were believing that *Karmas* alone are the valid means for *Moaksha*. This doctrinaire theory is opposed to *Shrutis* and *Yukti*. The scriptures affirm that Liberation which is eternal cannot be attained by means of *Karma* by statements like — “Because *Moaksha* is *Akritaka* (not a resultant fruit of action), it is not the effect of *Karma*” — (*Mundaka Upanishad* 1-2-12); “The world that is won or gained by means of *Punya* (religious merits) gets destroyed” — (*Chhaandogya Upanishad* 8-1-6); “When the fruits of *Karma* get exhausted, the person returns to this world to do or perform actions” — (*Mundaka Upanishad* 1-2-7, *Brihadaraanyaka Upanishad* 4-4-6). **The effect or resultant fruit of *Karma* is one of the four types, viz. *Utpaadya* (produced), *Vikaarya* (transformed or changed), *Samskaarya* (refined, cleansed) and *Aapya* (acquired); but *Moaksha* is not one among these four at all.** We have mentioned previously in section 158 that, for that reason too, *Moaksha* cannot accrue from *Karma*. The scriptures reiterate that — “By means of *Brahma Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge) *Anritatva* (immortality), which is the *Parama Purushaartha* (the *summum bonum*, destination of all human effort and existence) in attained or comes to fruition” —(*Taittiriya Upanishad* 2-1). Therefore, the *Vaidika Siddhaanta* (the final spiritual teaching of all the *Vedic* lore) is that — “By means of *Jnaana* (Intuition) alone *Moaksha* is attained.”

1. Mu. Up. 1-2-12. pp. 109, 110.

Mu. Bh. 1-2-12. pp. 109, 110.

2. Su. Bh. 1-1-1. p. 9.

3. Br. Up. 4-4-6. p. 717.

Br. Bh. 4-4-6. pp. 717, 718.

4. Tai. Bh. Shik. Concl. p. 273.

5. Tai. Bh. Shik. Concl. p. 275.

192. Some people may ask the question: “If *Moaksha* does not accrue from *Karma*, then why at all *Karma* has been stipulated in so many ways in the scriptures?” The fruits or benefits alone are the goal kept in view for *Karma*; those who do not have any *Kaama* (desire) will invariably not need any fruit or benefit. Therefore, in order to instruct (stipulate) various *Saadhanas* (spiritual practices or disciplines) to gain or acquire their own respective fruits needed or desired by the ‘*Kaamis*’ (desirous people) *Karmas* have been stipulated in the *Vedas*. In our workaday world *Kaamis* are in great numbers, whereas *Mumukshus* (those people desirous of Liberation) are small in numbers. We should not doubt in the manner — “Because in the scriptures no fruits or benefits have been mentioned for ‘*Nitya Karmas*’ (the daily routine rituals or duties), from those *Nitya Karmas*, *Moaksha* may accrue.” But, if no fruits or benefits have been mentioned for any particular kind of *Karmas* (in the scriptures), there is no authoritative or valid support to conclude that for such *Karmas* only *Moaksha* is the fruit. Of course,

both the *Shrutis* and the *Smritis* mention that for *Nitya Karmas* too '*Punya Loaka*' (worlds of merit) are the fruits that accrue; because *Moaksha* is '*Nityasiddha*' (eternally or ever existent), it is not a fruit or benefit to be acquired afresh by means of *Karmas*, and this truth we have mentioned previously in section 158.

6. Tai. 1 Concl. pp. 281, 282.

8. G. Bh. 18-66. p. 745.

7. Br. Bh. 3-3-1. pp. 452, 453.

9. G. Bh. 18-45. pp. 706, 707.

193. Without properly understanding the purport of the Vedantins' statement that — "*Moaksha* means being established in, or becoming one with, the *Aatma Swaroopa*" — some *Meemaamsakas* (who used to uphold that *Karma Kaanda* portion of the *Vedas* is to be given predominance over the *Jnaana Kaanda*, which, they used to say, is secondary or subservient to *Karma Kaanda*, i.e. *Arthavaada*) used to argue out that this *Phala* (fruit of Liberation) accrues from *Nitya Karma* alone. Their argument was as follows: "If *Kaamyas Karma* (actions or rituals done or performed for achieving the fruit of a particular desire) and '*Nishiddha Karma*' (actions or deeds forbidden by the scriptures) are or avoided, then both the good and the bad fruits of actions are prevented or eliminated; if one keeps on doing or performing *Nitya Karmas*, then the resultant '*Pratyavaaya*' (bad effect of not performing one's duties or discharging responsibilities stipulated by the *Dharma Shaastras*, i.e. *Karma Kaanda* of the *Vedas*) will be necessarily avoided. If '*Praarabdha Karma*' (the duties or responsibilities that the present birth is intrinsically tied up or associated with) is once experienced and exhausted, then there will remain no other cause for getting a body once again or for rebirth, at all." Those *Meemaamsakas* were eventually concluding that — "***Moaksha of the form or nature of remaining established in the essential nature of Atman Himself will be effortlessly (Ayatna) attained by means of or through the performance of the Karmas stipulated in the scriptures alone.***"

This argument is not proper or reasonable. To wit, first of all it is not possible at all for any one to give up or avoid *Kaamyas* or *Nishiddha Karmas*; for, it is seen in our workaday world that even extremely wise or intelligent people repeatedly committing or performing small, trivial actions of demerit or mistakes; the *Karmas* done or performed in many previous births (*Janmas*) will remain (and they will per force have to be taken into the reckoning); at least, their resultant fruits must necessarily accrue. Apart from this, *Moaksha*, which is getting established in (or becoming one with) the essential nature of *Atman* without getting another body and eternally Liberated from *Samsaara* (transmigratory existence), is not a thing or matter to be achieved by means of *Karma*; *Moaksha* is quite naturally and invariably the very Being or existence of every human being as his essential nature *in esse*.

By virtue of *Ajnaana* (the innate ignorance) alone we all human beings have believed in the manner — “We are embodied beings (*Shareeri*), who have to perform or discharge certain duties (*Karmas*)” — that is all. Because of the reason that *Karma* is the resultant effect of *Kaama* which in turn is caused by *Avidya*, *Karma* can never remove or help sublate *Avidya* or *Ajnaana* at all (to wit, since *Ajnaana* in accordance with this sequence is the prime cause for all *Karmas* or actions, whether they are physical or mental, the effects cannot possibly sublate their respective cause). The scriptures are proclaiming that — “Without attaining *Aatma Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge or Intuition), the destruction or sublation of *Samsaara*, which is ‘*Karmakrita*’ (a product or effect of action), can never possibly be attained at all.” For all these reasons, the argument or contention (of the opponents) that — “By means of *Nitya Karmas* one can attain *Moaksha*” — is a mere figment of imagination alone; besides, by dint of the fact that — ‘There is no scriptural support whatsoever for this doctrine’ — Shri Shankara, in his *Bhaashyas* on *Taittiriya Upanishad*, the *Geeta* and the *Brahma Sootras*, has refuted this doctrine of the *Meemaamsakas*.

10. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p. 889.

11. Tai. Bh. Intr. pp. 224, 225.

12. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. p. 27.

13. Br. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 451.

14. G. Bh. 18-66. pp. 744, 745.

15. Su. Bh. 4-3-14. p. 888.

194. There is no room for a doubt of the type — “Even a *Jnaani* (a Realized soul) is not exempt from ‘*Pratyavaaya*’ (the ill effect of not performing or discharging one’s stipulated duties or responsibilities) if he does not perform the *Nitya Karmas*. If *Karmas* are not the cause for *Moaksha* somehow or other, then the purpose of stipulating those *Karmas* by way of injunctions in a *Jnaana Shaastra* (scriptural text devoted to or pertaining exclusively to *Jnaana* or Self-Knowledge) will become futile.” It becomes quite reasonable to believe or conceive that *Karmas* are stipulated by way of injunctions in order to remove or mitigate the *Durita* (sin, evil propensities) which are a hurdle or obstruction on the path to ‘*Jnaana Utpatti*’ (the attainment of Self-Knowledge). **In truth, by means of *Karmas* performed with a deep devotion as an offering to *Ishwara* (the Lord) via *Chitta Shuddhi* (cleansing or purification of the mind) the right qualification or capability for *Jnaana Nishtha* (steadfast establishment in Self-Knowledge) as also the final culmination in *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge, or, in other words, Intuitive experience *par excellence*) *per se*, will accrue. Blending the *Karmas* with *Upaasanas* (mental meditations) if the *Saadhaka* performs such *Karmas* invariably, those *Karmas* will become more effective and stronger. Therefore, the purport of stipulating by way of injunctions *Karmas* and *Upaasanas* in the *Jnaana Prakarana* (Chapter devoted to Self-Knowledge) is to**

teach significantly that not only do those *Upaasanas* and *Karmas* yield their respective fruits (as stipulated in the scriptures) but also to indicate that they indirectly or sequentially (*Parampara*) give rise to *Jnaana*. The doctrinaire teaching that — “If one does not perform *Karmas* he suffers the ill effects like *Pratyavaaya*”— cannot reasonably be accepted because of it being opposed to the axiomatic truth that — “From an *Abhaava* (non-entity, non-existent thing) *Bhaava Utpatti* (the birth or creation of an entity or existent thing) can never occur.” The *Smriti* statement — “One who does not discharge or perform his duties or responsibilities (*Karmas*) becomes a *Patita* (a sinner or reprobate)” — (*Manu* 11-14) — is only or merely indicating that to one who does not perform *Karmas* the *Durita Kshaya* (removal or cleansing of sins, evil propensities) does not accrue. Besides, it is also mentioned in the *Shrutis* and the *Smritis* that for *Jnaana Utpatti* (the attainment of Self-Knowledge or Intuition) *Karma* as stipulated in the scriptures become the cause (in a sequential, indirect manner, *Parampara*).

16. Tai. Bh. 1. Concl. p. 279.

17. G. Bh. Inter. pp 6, 7.

18. Su. Bh. 3-4-26. p. 783.

19. Su. Bh. 3-4-26. p. 783.

20. Su. Bh. 4-1-18. p. 844.

21. Tai. Bh. Intr. pp. 225, 226.

195. Some other people were arguing out in the manner — “If *Karma* is not exclusively a means (*Saadhana*) for *Mukti*, then *Karma* associated with *Jnaana* can be the valid means. Even though curds is an enemy (to wit, it is not congenial or helpful food) for illness with high temperature, when it is mixed with sugar it serves as a *Pathya* (permissible diet). Poison too, when associated with *Mantra* (a *Vedic* verse addressed to a deity), does not cause death; in the same way, ***Karma* blended with *Jnaana* may help attain, or give rise to, eternal *Moaksha*.**”

This doctrine too is not proper. And Shri Shankara has established and elucidated this fact. The *Yukti* or logical device that — ‘A thing, which is a *Kaarya* (an effect), is *Anitya* (non-eternal)’ — is applicable to this doctrinaire theory mentioned above. The *Samuchhayavaadins* (protagonists of the theory of blending of *Karma* with *Jnaana*) have not clarified as to what is meant by ‘*Jnaana*’. If it is contended that *Upaasana* (mental meditation) alone is *Jnaana* then, in that event, ***Karma* will only, at best, get the power or strength to yield another fruit or benefit by the association with *Upaasana*, but to affirm that *Karma* will get the strength or capability of yielding another (superior) eternal fruit or benefit, there is no valid means or evidence (*Pramaana*) at all.** Because we have previously shown and exemplified in section 165 that the effect (or end product) of *Upaasana* too is a relative immortality (*Aapekshika Amritatwa*), *Upaasana* which is blended with *Karma* will yield the *Amritatwa* (immortality), which is

its own fruit or effect alone, faster or earlier, but it cannot at all falsify or refute the *Nyaaya*, i.e. axiomatic (or logical) truth, that — “That thing which is an effect is always non-eternal.” It is never possible to establish or prove that — ‘*Karma* will produce or yield a thing which is eternal (i.e. real or immortal)’ — quite contrary to this above axiomatic truth or teaching merely by means of the support or on the strength of any (scriptural) sentence or statement whatsoever. On the other hand, **if it is contended that *Vastu Tantra Jnaana* (the Intuitive Knowledge of Reality as It is) is Itself *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge), then because of the reason that co-existent with such Self-Knowledge there is no possibility or scope for the existence of any conceptual knowledge of *Kriya* (action), *Kaaraka* (the valid means of action), and *Phala* (the fruit of action), the theory of *Jnaana Karma Samuchhaya* (a blending of Self-Knowledge with physical or mental action itself) will not be proper, reasonable; besides it cannot be sustained by any logical argument whatsoever.** The scriptures too affirm that by virtue of *Jnaana* the ‘*Kriya-Kaaraka-Phala*’ triad is destroyed or sublated. Even after one gets the Intuitive Knowledge or conviction based on, or culminating in, one’s own Intuitive experience of the type — “This is surely unreal” — to insist or assert that a conceptual knowledge will be born in the manner — “This is real, I should now perform an action” — is opposed to *Pratyaksha* (perceptual knowledge or experience) as also to the *Shruti Vaakyas* (the scriptural texts or statements). Any one may here in this context argue out in the manner — “We can say that though *Moaksha* is eternal, *Jnaana Karma Samuchhaya* will remove or destroy the *Pratibandha* (the obstructions, hurdles) in the path of *Moaksha*”; but that argument too will not be proper or reasonable. For, the fact that — ‘*Karma* and *Vidya* (*Jnaana*) have their respective but different fruits or benefits’ — is stated in the scriptures; but nowhere in the scriptural lore it is stated that their fruit is *Moaksha Pratibandha Nivritti* (removal of the hurdles or obstructions for Liberation). Therefore, *Samuchhayaavaada* (the doctrinaire theory of blending *Jnaana* and *Karma*) itself is not proper or justifiable.

22. Tai. 1 Concl. pp. 274, 275.

23. Br. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 449.

24. Su. Bh. 4-1-16. p. 841.

25. Su. Bh. 4-1-18. p. 844.

26. Tai. Bh. Shik. Concl. pp. 276, 277.

27. Su. Bh. 3-4-16. p. 769.

28. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. p. 150.

29. Tai. Bh. 1 Concl. p. 275.

30. a) Isa Bh. 10. p. 19.

b) Isa Bh. 11. pp. 19, 20.

XXVI. UTILIZATION OF JNAANA SAADHANAS

196. In the *Shrutis* not only has it been stated that by ‘*Aatma Jnaana*’ alone the seeker attains *Mukti* but also it has been affirmed

clearly that without Self-Knowledge (Intuition) '*Brahma Praapti*' is not possible at all by any other means or spiritual practices (*Saadhanas*). But it appears as though at several places or in several contexts there are statements in the scriptural texts which imply that *Karma*, *Upaasana*, *Yoga* etc. are *Mukti Saadhanas* (spiritual practices for the attainment of Liberation or Beatitude). Therefore, it becomes quite necessary to know clearly without mixing up one spiritual practice with another as to what exactly is the proper place and status of each of these *Saadhanas*. If we at the outset understand or discern that — "Because of the reason that all the rest of the *Saadhanas* are either pragmatically helpful as aids or accessories (*Sahakaari Saadhanas*) or indirectly helpful in a sequential order (*Parampara Saadhanas*) in our efforts to attain *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge), which is the *summum bonum* of all human existence and endeavour, and because *Jnaana* (Intuition) is the direct and immediate *Saadhana* which helps attain *Moaksha* here and now while alive in this body — these other *Saadhanas* (i.e. *Sahakaari* and *Parampara Saadhanas*) are treated in a secondary sense (*Gouna*) by way of *Vyavahaara* (purely from an empirical viewpoint), in a general scheme of *Moaksha Saadhanas*" — then the mutual contradictions among these scriptural sentences will disappear to a great extent as also many misconceptions in this regard will be totally removed.

1. Su. Bh. 3-4-1. pp. 758, 759.

3. Su. Bh. 4-1-16. p. 841.

2. Su. Bh. 2-1-3. p. 306.

197. *Karmas* are stipulated by way of injunctions in the *Karma Kaanda* for the sake of directing a seeker that he should necessarily perform those *Karmas* which pertain to '*Aashrama Karmas*' (duties or responsibilities related to or enjoined upon persons belonging to the respective four *Aashramas*, viz. *Brahmacharya*, *Gaarhastya*, *Vaanaprastha* and *Sannyasa*); those stipulations mentioned in the *Upaasana Prakarana* (a Chapter devoted to mental meditations) are *Karmas* performed in association with *Upaasanas* meant as aids helpful for the achievement of '*Brahma Praapti*' (going, after death, to the other world of the Creator *Brahma*), which is the resultant fruit of *Upaasanas*; the *Karmas* which are stipulated in the beginning of the *Jnaana Prakarana* (the Chapter devoted to teaching *Jnaana*) are meant for the sake of '*Jnaana Utpatti*' (attainment of Self-Knowledge or Intuition). One and the same *Karma* being stipulated in the scriptures as an '*Aashrama Karma*' as well as for *Jnaana Utpatti* is not contradictory; for, in general the *Aashrama Karma* is stipulated in the manner — "The seeker should perform the *Karma* till death" — but in the case of '*Mumukshus*', there is a scriptural stipulation that those very *Karmas* like *Yajna* (sacrifice), *Daana* (charities), *Tapas* (penance) etc. become the cause (instrumental) for *Jnaana Utpatti*. If the scriptural teaching which we

have previously mentioned in section 194 is kept in mind by the readers and that is — “*Karma* is thus instrumental for *Jnaana Utpatti* only via or by virtue of their efficacy in destroying the demerits (*Durita Kshaya*) which one has acquired by previous acts but not directly (*Saakshaat*) i.e. not intuitively and instantaneously (here and now)” — then the fact as to what exactly is the place or status of *Karmas* among the *Moaksha Saadhanas* becomes very clear.

4. Su. Bh. 3-4-32. pp. 789, 790.

7. Tai. Bh. 1-11. pp. 264, 265.

5. Tai. bh. 1-9. p. 259.

8. Su. Bh. 3-4-33. p. 791.

6. Su. Bh. 4-1-16. p. 842.

9. G. Bh. 18-45. p. 707.

198. Because of the reasons that by means of *Karma* alone the *Durita Pratibandha* (the impediments or obstructions of demerits like psychic bad propensities) have necessarily to be got rid of, and further, because of the reason that without those *Pratibandhas* being destroyed there is no scope or possibility whatsoever for any one — whosoever he may be — to achieve *Chitta Shuddhi* (psychic or mental purification or refinement in the form of introvertedness capable of introspection), and therefrom attain *Jnaana Utpatti*, the true seekers should not get deluded to believe that *Karma* alone exclusively is the *Moaksha Saadhana*. For, there is no rule of law that through the means or path of *Pratibandha Kshaya* (the destruction of the impediments) alone *Jnaana* accrues; *Ishwara Prasaadah* (the Supreme Lord's grace), *Tapas* (penance, austerity), *Dhyaana* (meditation) etc. are also suitable spiritual practices or *Saadhanas* for *Jnaana*. Apart from this fact, by virtue of *Karmas* performed in previous births themselves *Chitta Shuddhi* might have been acquired culminating in *Pratibandha Kshaya* and thereafter leading the seeker further on in the path of spiritual progress. For that reason alone, we have previously pointed out in section 13 that — “Even those people who have not performed ‘*Aashrama Karmas*’ may also be *Adhikaaris* (the qualified people) for *Vedanta Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge taught by *Vedanta* philosophy). Besides, because of the reason that the scriptures have stipulated *Jnaana* for people like *Sannyasins* etc. also, it has to be deduced that — “*Karmas* are not, in the ultimate analysis or in the absolute sense, necessary for *Jnaana* (Intuition).” The human virtues or excellences like *Ahimsa* (non-injury), *Brahmacharya* (celibacy with consummate dedication for Self-Knowledge), *Satya* (speaking the truth always) etc. found in people in such *Aashramas* are very helpful aids for *Jnaana*. Especially with regard to *Shravana*, *Manana* and *Nididhyaasana* we have previously stated in section 178 that they are the direct and immediate spiritual practices for the attainment of *Jnaana*.

10. Tai. 1 Concl. p. 282.

12. Su. Bh. 3-4-17. p. 770.

11. Su. Bh. 4-1-18. p. 845.

199. It should not be reckoned that because there are many Saadhanas for Jnaana, any person, whosoever he may be, may undertake or practise any one of those Saadhanas. For, by virtue of *Adhikaara Bheda* (differences in qualifications; to wit, people have different innate propensities or capabilities and in accordance with them suitable Saadhanas are prescribed or recommended in the scriptures) the Saadhanas to be undertaken or practised may vary from person to person. In other words, **one who is Bahirmukhi (an extrovert) has necessarily to practise Karma Yoga. One who has achieved Chitta Shuddhi but aspires to get rid of Chitta Chaanchalya (fickle-mindedness or psychic capriciousness, waywardness) should necessarily perform Karma associated with Upaasana (mental meditations) or practise Karma Sannyasa (total renunciation of Karmas born out of discrimination on spiritual truths or teachings) and then undertake spiritual devices or disciplines like Shama (control over the mind), Dama (control over senses), Uparati (introvertedness), Titeeksha (psychic equipoise or equanimity in the face of either adverse or favourable environmental conditions) etc. One who has attained Chitta Shuddhi as well as Chitta Ekaagrata (mental concentration) should listen to Vedantic teachings (Shravana) as propounded by the Shrutis (Upanishads). If by mere Shravana the seeker does not become Krita Kritya (a Realized soul having achieved every thing that is to be achieved as the Supreme Goal of human existence), then he should undertake or practise Manana and Nididhyaasana.**

13. G. Bh. 5-27. p. 267.

15. Br. Bh. 3-3-1. pp. 455, 456.

14. Su. Bh. 3-4-27. p. 785.

16. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. p. 815.

200. Any one may get a doubt of the type — “Why should not any person (whosoever he or she may be) without having had practised Shravana, Manana and Nididhyaasana, as taught in the Shaastras, acquire independently by himself (to wit, depending upon his own capabilities or excellences physical as also intellectual or psychic) the qualification or capacity to know or Intuit the ‘Tattwa’ (the Ultimate Reality of Brahman or Atman)?” He may also further ask the question — “If he can do so, then the Jnaana Saadhanas which are stipulated in the scriptures are rendered futile, is it not?” But for these questions or doubts also the answer is provided very clearly by the explanations or elucidations given above. One who is extremely meritorious, pious or virtuous may on the strength of the spiritual practices of Jnaana or Karma performed in his previous births without the help of any Saadhanas now (i.e. in the present birth) attain Jnaana (Self-Knowledge). Even so, merely on this count the Jnaana Saadhanas stipulated or expounded in the scriptures do not become futile. For *Naimittika Kaaryas* (effects or results produced by a particular cause like

Saadhanas), the means may be one or more than one in number for each effect; to some people common Saadhanas alone may be sufficient; to some others Saadhanas which are *Saguna* (associated with some virtue or quality) alone may be needed. Although human beings need the physical eyes, which can only see in sunlight or any light, in order to perceive a form (*Roopa*) for creatures like a cat or an owl etc. mere eyes alone without the help of light are sufficient for the purpose (because such creatures have been endowed with eyes which can inherently see in the dark too); for *Yogis* (contemplative saints endowed with magical or mystic powers) merely their minds alone are sufficient. In the same manner, for a primordial *Prajaapati* (the first born or Supreme Person) the *Jnaana* and the *Karmas* performed in previous births (aeons) may be sufficient. But for the rest of the people, one or more than one *Saadhana* among, say — *Tapas*, *Guru's Anugraha* (grace of the spiritual preceptor), *Shraddha* (devotion, dedication), *Aachaarya Seva* (service of the preceptor), *Shama-Dama-Uparati* etc. and *Shravana*, *Manana* etc. — may be required. **Among all these Saadhanas, Shravana, Manana, Nididhyaasana directly and immediately (here and now), while the rest via or by way of Pratibandha Nivrutti in the spiritual path or progress become the right means for the attainment of Jnaana (Self-Knowledge or Intuition).**

17. Br. Bh. 1-4-2. pp. 97, 98.

201. There is scope for those who have not discerned or realized the purport or secrets of the proper utilization of the various Saadhanas as delineated above to believe that if along with *Karmas* the other Saadhanas are performed conjointly *Jnaana* may accrue quickly in a shorter period of time. This doctrine is apparently in consonance with the *Shruti* statement that — “One should perform *Karma* as long as he is alive”; the *Smriti Vaakya* that — “*Gaarhastya* (householdership) alone is the genuine *Aashrama* (stage of life)” — too is seemingly in consonance with the above teachings; they may further reckon that this is in agreement with the *Geeta* statement — “By virtue of *Karmas* alone Emperor *Janaka* and others attained *Samsiddhi* (Beatitude).”

But this conception is contradictory to *Shruti Vaakyas*, *Smritis*, as also *Yuktis* (logical arguments, reasoning). To wit, *Karma* (either physical or psychic) is permissible, valid or suitable till the qualification or eligibility for ‘*Dhyaana Yoga*’ (*Nididhyaasana*) is acquired only; but thereafter, the aspirant should practise the spiritual discipline of ‘*Shama*’ (control over the mind) alone — This teaching is very clearly propounded in the *Geeta*. The *Shrutis* teach that — “To a *Brahma Samstha* (one who is established in Pure Consciousness or *Brahman* here and now in this very life) alone *Amritatwa* (immortality, Beatitude) accrues, while by the rest of the spiritual seekers stationed in, or

practising the duties or responsibilities meant for, other Aashramas, *Punya Loaka* (meritorious worlds) is obtained." Both in the *Upanishadic* lore and historical or mythological texts '*Sarva Karma Sannyasa*' (the total, consummate renunciation of all *Karmas* or all religious as well as mundane acts) has been stipulated as a '*Jnaanaanga Saadhana*' (a spiritual discipline subservient, as an aid or accessory to *Jnaana*). **Therefore, it is not possible at all to perform or practise the introspective *Dhyaana* (meditation or contemplation) etc., which are internal at the psychic level (*Antaranga Saadhanas*) along with or associated with the *Bahiranga Saadhanas* (like external, extroverted) *Karmas* (physical acts, religious rites or rituals) etc.** Because the *Smriti* statement pertaining to *Ekaashrama* (one of the four Aashramas, viz. *Brahmacharya*, *Gaarhastya*, *Vaanaprastha* and *Sannyasa*) is opposed or contradictory to the *Shrutis*, the former *Smriti* teachings should necessarily be discerned to have been mentioned only for the purport of eulogising or praising the merits of *Gaarhastya*. For the *Geeta* statement — "By means of *Karma* alone these people attained *Samsiddhi*" — it will have to be reckoned to mean either that those people gained a *Siddhi* which was of the form or nature of qualification for *Jnaana*, or although it was associated with *Karmas*, because the misconception of the form of distinctions like '*Kriya*', '*Kaaraka*' and '*Phala*' was sublated or falsified by *Jnaana* (Intuition of the Self), the statement should be understood to be in praise or to eulogise *Jnaana* in the manner — "Those people were not bound by or affected by *Karmas*." We have previously clarified in detail in section 195 that there is no scope or possibility whatsoever for *Karmas* to co-exist with *Jnaana*. Therefore, the *Shruti* statement that — "One should keep on performing *Karmas*" — can be alternatively interpreted as praise-oriented in the manner — "Although he is performing *Karmas*, because the *Jnaani* (Realized soul) has the Intuitive Knowledge of the Self, he, not having identification with his *Kartrutwa* (*Akartraatma Buddhi*), has no taint or blemish of being affected by those *Karmas* at all."

Therefore, the following creamlike, churned-out interpretation or meaning with regard to *Saadhanas* become established or determined: Whether they are mere *Karmas* or whether they are '*Upaasana Sahita Karmas*' (actions associated with meditations), these *Karmas* if performed by a *Mumukshu* (aspirant for immortality) with an ardent desire to attain *Moaksha* (Liberation), either in this his present birth or in previous births but before the dawn of *Jnaana Utpatti*, become the principal means or root cause for *Brahma Jnaana* through the sublation or removal of the demerits — which are impediments on the spiritual path of Intuiting *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality, and which were acquired in the past — commensurate with their intensity and strength; thereafter, those *Karmas* become, by virtue of *Parampara* (indirectly

and in a sequential order), the cause for *Mukti*, the final goal of human existence, which is attained actually as a result of *Brahma Vidya*, which in turn is attained by practising *Antaranga Saadhanas* (internal, introverted mental disciplines) like *Shravana*, *Manana* and *Nidhidhyaasana*, *Shraddha*, *Taatparya* (having exclusively Self-Knowledge as the final goal, destination).

18. G. 6-3. p. 278.

19. G. Bh. 6-1. Intr. p. 271.

20. G. Bh. 6 (Intr.) p. 271.

21. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. pp. 145, 146.

22. Su. Bh. 3-4-20. p. 776.

23. G. Bh. 3 Intr. p. 126.

24. G. Bh. 2-10. pp. 43, 44.

25. Su. Bh. 3-4-14. p. 768.

26. Su. Bh. 4-1-18. p. 845.

202. In ancient times some people were arguing out in the manner — “If one gives up or renounces (*Sannyasa*) the religious rites or rituals *Karmas*, which he has always to perform or observe till his death, then he gets the sin or demerit called *Pratyavaaya*; there is a *Smriti* statement that one should not take to *Sannyasa* without discharging, or absolving himself from, *Runatraya* (three kinds of debts) towards (i) sages, (ii) deities and (iii) manes. Therefore, *Sannyasa* is meant for people who are not qualified for performing *Karmas*.”

This argument is contradictory to *Shrutis* and *Yukti*. For, in the scriptures *Sannyasa Aashrama*, viz. is stipulated by way of an injunction, and it is considered and judged on par with, or on similar grounds of, the other *Aashrama* (*Grihasthaashrama* or *Gaarhastya*). Because there is a *Shruti* statement saying that — “One who is free from all attachment (*Virakta*) may become or take to asceticism (*Sannyasa*) right from the first stage of a celibate (*Brahmacharya*), who has observed continence” — for such a person who has the virtue of continence or celibacy there is no room or cause for the sin or defect of giving up any *Karma* can attach itself. If such a sin (of *Pratyavaaya*) can affect him, then for every one the sin of giving up the *Karmas* (stipulated duties or responsibilities) of others in the other *Aashramas* (stages of life) will per force attach themselves; for, then in that event it will amount to saying that for every one every *Karma* is stipulated as an injunction by the scriptures. No one ever raises an objection of the type — “A *Brahmachari* (celibate youth) attracts the sin or defect of renouncing the *Karmas* of a *Grihastha*.” To a recluse, if he gives up his *Dharma* of practising virtues like *Shama*, *Dama* etc., the demerit or sin of *Pratyavaaya* may accrue; but if he gives up the *Karmas* which are stipulated for a *Grihastha*, there is no cause at all for his getting *Pratyavaaya*. If *Pratyavaaya* really accrues, then the *Dosha* (the defect or sin) stipulated in the scriptures may well attach itself. It is the same case with regard to ‘*Runatraya Dosha*’, mentioned above. There is no *Runatwa* (indebtedness) attaching itself to a *Brahmachari* (a celibate);

therefore, he may take up *Sannyasa* (asceticism) directly from his present stage of life of a *Brahmachari* by giving up or renouncing all scriptural *Karmas*. Even to a *Grihastha*, *Sannyasa* (the fourth stage or *Aashrama* of asceticism) is stipulated by way of an injunction in the scriptures and so he too may renounce all *Karmas* and take to *Sannyasa*. This being the case, it should be discerned that '*Yaavajjeeva Shruti*' (the scriptural statement stipulating performance of *Karmas* as long as one is alive and till death) is meant for '*Amumukshus*' (people who are not *Mumukshus* or those who do not aspire for Liberation or immortality).

In truth, if we seriously deliberate with insight, **then there is no cause or room for *Pratyavaaya* which is *Bhaavarooopa* (of the form or nature of an existing thing or entity) being born or produced from *Abhaavarooopa* (of the form of nature of non-existent thing or phenomenon) of renouncing or giving up a *Karma*, attaching itself to any one at all.** Even in the case of a *Grihastha* we may deduce that the '*Akarana*' (scriptural injunction about non-performance or renunciation of a *Karma*) suggests or signifies only that if he gives up or renounces *Nitya Karma* (his daily routine duties), he will not be able to get rid of the demerits or sins acquired or accumulated in the past (*Durita Kshaya*). This fact we have mentioned previously in section 194. *Sannyasa* is not a thing or a subject-matter desiderating no qualifications or capabilities (which are stipulated in the scriptures); for, in addition to, or apart from, the scriptural sentences stipulating as injunctions *Sannyasa* of all *Karmas* for both classes of people, viz. *Jnanis* (Realized souls) and *Mumukshus* (aspirants for Liberation or immortality), there exist separately scriptural sentences which describe the manner or method in which even the '*Anadhikrita*' or unqualified people (to wit, those, who either by virtue of birth or stage of life, are not qualified for *Sannyasa*, i.e. the fourth stage of life or *Aashrama*, at the present juncture) can take up or practise *Sannyasa* (renunciation). **If we deliberate upon the comparative merits of strength or weakness of the various *Saadhanas* stipulated by way of directives or injunctions in the scriptures for *Ajnanis* (the ignorant people), then it will be self-evident and thereby self-established that more than the *Grihastha Karmas* (a householder's duties as stipulated in the scriptures), which are associated with or involving *Himsa* (injury or cruelty to other beings) and such other demerits — the meritorious human excellences or virtues — like *Amaanitwa* (modesty, humility), *Adambhitwa* (pridelessness) etc. which are found in a *Sannyasin* (a recluse or an ascetic), who is predominantly (in a pronounced manner) full of *Yama* (*Yamapradhana*) and who does not give any quarter or scope for the functioning of desires (*Kaama Pravritti*) — are immensely beneficial, helpful. Therefore, for**

Mumukshus, *Paarivraajya* (a recluse's or monk's style of a wandering life) alone is *Prashasta* (excellently or admirably suited).

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 27. Br. Bh. 4-4-22. p. 749. | 31. G. Bh. 3-1. Intr. pp. 128, 129. |
| 28. Su. Bh. 3-4-19. pp. 772, 773. | 32. Ait. Bh. Intr. p. 17. |
| 29. Su. Bh. 3-4-20. pp. 777, 778. | 33. Br. Bh. 4-5-15. pp. 794, 795. |
| 30. Su. Bh. 3-4-20. pp. 776, 777. | |

203. In ancient times some people had argued out in the manner — “Because it is stipulated in the *Smritis* that — ‘*Sannyasins* too should wear sacred thread and possess *Tridanda* (a pole or stick with three knots) and *Kamandalu* (begging bowl used by recluses or monks), which are symbolic accessories significant for the fourth stage of *Sannyasa*’ — *Sarva Karma Sannyasa* (renunciation of all *Karmas*) is opposed to *Shrutis* and further that if *Sannyasins* (ascetics) give up or renounce *Karmas* meant for them, they too will attract the demerit of *Pratyavaajya*.” But this ‘*Smaarta Sannyasa*’ (asceticism stipulated in *Smritis*) is not ‘*Jnaana Anga*’ (a constituent part or essential requisite for Self-Knowledge) and it has fruits of the type of *Brahma Loaka*; but Shri Shankaraachaarya has taught that — “Quite different from this there exists one ‘*Parama Hamsa Paarivraajya*’ (an ascetic way of life of a sect of *Sannyasins* which enjoins upon the practitioner to be contemplating continuously on the Ultimate Reality and be wandering about without any possessive or acquisitive propensities) alone as the ‘*Vedoakta Jnaanaanga Sannyasa*’ (the genuine ascetic way of life which is the essential requisite for *Jnaana* and which is propounded in the *Vedas*); further, for a *Parama Hamsa* (an ascetic or recluse who is engrossed in the Intuition of the Self) barring human virtues or excellences like *Shama*, *Dama* etc., no other *Karmas* attach themselves or are enjoined in the scriptures.” A *Parama Hamsa* who is a ‘*Mumukshu*’ (an aspirant for Liberation) should, without performing any other *Karmas*, always and daily be immersed in, or occupied with, the practice of Intuitive contemplation on the essential nature of the Self (*Dhyaana Yogapara*). This is the teaching of the *Geeta*. The injunction that — ‘Renouncing the *Tridandi*, *Kamandalu* etc. the recluse should become a *Parama Hamsa*’ — is stipulated in the *Jaabaala Upanishad*.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 34. Su. Bh. 3-4-20. pp. 776, 777. | 37. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. p. 487. |
| 35. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. p. 152. | 38. G. Bh. 18-52. pp. 725, 726. |
| 36. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. pp. 154, 155. | 39. Jab. Up. 6. p. 899. |

204. There is every possibility of some people misinterpreting and misconceiving the purport of the *Geeta Bhaashya* statement that — “For a *Sannyasin* the spiritual practice or discipline which he has to

observe is to remain engrossed in 'Dhyaana Yoga' and there is no need for him to perform any other *Karma* whatsoever." They may get deluded by misconceiving this statement to mean either that — (i) *Yoga* denotes *Chitta Vritti Niroadha* (as taught in *Patanjali's Yoga Shaastra* or *Darshana*), which means suppression or repression of mental concepts as a spiritual practice; or (ii) emotionally-motivated *Upaasanas* of the type of '*Daharavidya*', '*Shaandilya Vidyā*' etc. We have indeed mentioned previously in section 173 that various *Upaasanas* have different fruits or benefits and that indirectly in a sequential order (*Parampara*) they too may serve as (*Parampara Saadhanas*) spiritual practices which lead in due course to *Jnaana*. But **whether he is a Mumukshu or whether he is a Sannyasin, the Dhyaana Yogas which they have to practise as spiritual disciplines quite necessarily and exclusively are — (i) Aatmachintana (Intuitive contemplation); (ii) Nididhyaasana which is of the form or nature of Ekaagrata (one-pointed concentration), on the real essence of Atman to attain Self-Knowledge (Aatma Jnaana) and not Upaasanas (mental meditations).** We have previously refuted in section 65 the doctrinaire theories of those who were preaching that — (i) the *Jnaana Vaakyas* are there only to expound the object for the *Upaasana Vidhi* (scriptural stipulations by way of injunctions for the sake of mental meditations) and further that (ii) by means of *Upaasanas* alone *Avidya* is sublated or falsified. **Here in this context the Yoga of the form or nature of 'Chitta Vritti Niroadha' especially is not in the least relevant; for, that 'Yoga' is not stipulated or taught in the Vedas. Without the attainment of Aatma Jnaana (Intuition of Self) Chitta Vritti Niroadha does not reach its fruition or consummation in toto at all. Merely by means of Yoga, Mukti does not accrue also.** Mere *Yoga* philosophy (of *Patanjali*) too, like *Saankhya* (that school of philosophy founded by *Kapila Rishi*) is necessarily a '*Dvaita Siddhaanta*' (spiritual teaching culminating in duality) alone and hence for such *Yoga Siddhaanta* there is no scope or room given in *Vedantic* (spiritual) teaching.

40. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 128.

43. Su. Bh. 2-1-3. p. 306.

41. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. p. 130.

44. Br. Bh. 4-4-9. p. 735.

42. Br. Bh. 1-4-7. pp. 131, 132.

205. We have previously clarified here and there in sections 171, 195, 196 and 197 that — (i) because of the reason that *Karmas* and *Upaasanas* are *Pravritti Roopa* (of the nature of going in pursuit of an object), while *Jnaana* is *Nivritti Roopa* (of the form or nature of receding away from all empirical transactions and towards Liberation) there is no scope for blending or mixing these two disciplines, viz. *Karmas* or *Upaasanas* and *Jnaana*, and (ii) because of the reason that, although *Karmas* and *Upaasanas* are responsible for yielding their respective

fruits which are different, they are indirectly in a sequential order responsible to help attain *Jnaana* too, *Karmas* and *Upaasanas* are propounded in the *Upanishads* too, and this is quite reasonable or justifiable. But showing indifference to this distinction, some people had begun to unify both these *Saadhanas* expounding in the manner — “*Jnaana Vaakyas* are virtually *Upaasana Vaakyas* alone” — because of either a logical inference (*Adhyaahaara*) or because of treating the *Jnaana Vaakyas* as subordinate or secondary to another *Upaasana Vidhi*; we have previously in section 65 shown that this is not proper or reasonable.

In the past some other *Advaitins* had expounded that — “All *Vedas* are *Nivrittipara* (Liberation-oriented alone) and hence for that reason alone they stipulate as injunctions all *Vaidika Saadhanas* instructing that the seeker having enjoyed the fruits of the preceding *Karmas* or *Upaasanas* should consider that they are all leading to mortality (repeated births and deaths) and thereby aspire for Liberation.” But to make a statement mixing up everything in this manner in a confused way is not proper. For, there is no valid evidence to say or assert that the *Karmas* or the *Upaasanas*, which have been stipulated by way of injunctions in the scriptures to be performed to achieve respective fruits, are, in truth, stipulated for *Moaksha*. If it were so, fruits of the type of *Svarga* (Heaven, the abode of Gods), *Graama* (a region), *Pashu* (cattle wealth) etc. should not have been mentioned at all. Besides, in this standpoint, because of the reason that either by means of *Karmas* alone *Moaksha* would have been attained or by means of *Upaasanas* alone *Moaksha* could be possibly attained, the scriptural sentences pertaining to *Jnaana* would have been rendered futile indeed. Therefore, it is reasonable or justifiable to reckon that the scriptures have stipulated various *Kaamiya Karmas* (actions, rites with respective desires in accordance with respective fruits desired). We have stated in section 194 that for *Nitya Karmas* (daily routine duties) a *Punya Loaka* (going to a celestial region of great merit) is the corresponding fruit, but if the same *Karmas* are performed without any desire or hankering after the fruit, the benefit accruing out of it is ‘*Chitta Shuddhi*’ (mental equipoise, purity, concentration). To exemplify the truth that — “The aspirants after Liberation, who have got rid of all desires (*Nishkaama Mumukshus*) by performing their respective *Varnaashrama Karmas* (rites or duties attached to their respective caste and stage of life) with a mental temperament of offering all of them with their respective fruits worshipfully to *Parameshwara* attain *Aarsha Darshana* (sacred, holy and profound Intuition) of the essential nature of *Aatma Jnaana*” — we come across instances or examples of sages, seers like *Trishanku*, *Vaamadeva* etc. in the *Vedas*.

On the other hand, in the *Upaasana Vaakyas* some forms have been stipulated for *Brahman*, the Ultimate Reality; we have already in section

182 refuted the doctrinaire theory of "*Prapancha Pravilayavaadins*" (protagonists of the theory of dissolving totally the world appearance), who were arguing out in the manner — "Those *Upaasana Vaakyas* too are in truth *Jnaana Vaakyas* alone meant to help know *Brahman* devoid of any forms through the means (or doorway) of *Prapancha Pravilaya* and they do not have any other purport at all." As regards those scriptural sentences in which first distinctions or special characteristics are described as being superimposed upon *Brahman* and later on those very distinctions or special characteristics have been sublated or rescinded, then in such contexts it may be feasible to argue or affirm that by virtue of *Adhyaaroapa Apavaada Nyaaya* those sentences are meant for or having the ultimate purport of teaching or propounding '*Aakaara Pravilaya*' (dissolving completely the various forms or distinctions). But as regards those scriptural sentences in which special characteristics have been deliberately superimposed on *Brahman* exclusively for the purposes of *Upaasana* if in such contexts the meaning of *Pravilaya* (complete dissolution) is inferred or imagined, there will be the predicament of contradicting *Shrutis* because it will amount to our having given up the '*Mukhyaartha*' (predominant meaning) and having imagined a '*Laxanaartha*' (a symbolic meaning) only. Especially in contexts where special features of benefits or fruits have been stipulated or signified explicitly it is quite evident or clear beyond any doubt that *Upaasana Vaakyas* are not *Advaita Boadhaka* (sentences purporting to teach non-duality); because of the reason that the scriptural sentences which preach or propound *Moaksha* too are teaching '*Krama Mukti*' (phased or graded Liberation), Shri Shankara has established that it is quite reasonable, justifiable to separate the *Upaasana Vaakyas* as a different category altogether. By this exposition, it is quite clear indeed that there is no harm rendered to the spiritual teaching (*Siddhaanta*) that — "**Both *Karmas* and *Upaasanas* are indirectly in a sequential order (*Parampara*) aids or accessorial complements for *Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge or Intuition), which is the main *Saadhana* for *Avidya Nivritti* (sublation, falsification of ignorance, delusion).**"

45. Br. Bh. 3-2. Intr. pp. 430 to 432.

47. Su. Bh. 3-2-2. p. 619.

46. Tai. Bh. 1-10. pp. 263, 264.

XXVII. JNAANI'S SENSE OF FULFILMENT

206. All spiritual practices or disciplines like *Karma*, *Upaasana*, *Shama*, *Dama*, etc. and *Shravana*, *Manana*, *Nididhyaasana* — are the valid means alone for *Aatma Jnaana* indeed, but once the Self-Knowledge (Intuitive experience of the Self) is attained there does not remain

anything to be done or performed whatsoever. To believe that even after Self-Knowledge (*Aatma Jnaana*) is attained there exist or remain certain duties or responsibilities to be discharged is contradictory to the *Shrutis* and *Smritis*. Besides, the viewpoint or argument that even after the Intuition (*Anubhava*) of the type — “*Atman*, who is *Nitya Mukta* (eternally, perennially Liberated, free) and who is not either a *Kartru* (an agent of action) or a *Bhoktru* (an enjoyer) — that *Atman* Himself I am” — there still exists or remains something to be done or performed — is (a misconception or delusion) opposed to *Yukti* (logical argument, reasoning).

1. Br. Bh. 4-4-12. p. 738.

3. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 39, 40.

2. G. 15-20. p. 613.

4. Su. Bh. 4-1-2. pp. 817, 818.

207. In *Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad* (3-5-1) it is stated that — “Even after acquiring *Paanditya* (scholarly erudition), which is of the form or nature of cognizing the essence of the Self (*Aatma Jnaana Roopa*), without anything left out of reckoning (*Nissessa*), the seeker should pursue spiritual practices like ‘*Baalya*’ and ‘*Mouna*’”. Besides in the *Geeta* (18-54,55) it is taught that — “One who is established in *Brahman* (*Brahma Bhoota*) should attain *Parabhakti* (Supreme devotion), know or cognize *Paramaatman* after clearly identifying Him and then should enter into Him.” If one examines all such statements, it will have to be acknowledged that — “Even after one attains *Aatma Jnaana*, there remains something to be done or practised.”

But, as we have clarified above, because this opinion (or conclusion) is opposed to *Shruti* and *Smriti* texts, *Nyaaya*, the ardent student of *Vedanta* should infer the meaning of such sentences (or interpret them) in a different manner altogether. As stated previously in section 181, only in the case of those aspirants who do not attain *Aatma Vijnaana* (Intuition of the Self) merely by *Shravana* the repetition (or continuation) of spiritual practices (*Saadhanas*) like *Manana*, *Nididhyaasana* etc. will have to be preached. As regards the statement in the *Brihadaaranyaka Upanishad*, the word ‘*Paanditya*’ means — “After completing without any remainder *Aatma Vijnaana* from both the spiritual preceptor (*Guru*) and the *Aagama* (the traditional methodology of teaching that is implicit in the *Upanishadic* texts, handed down in *Paarampariya* from the *Guru* to the *Shishya*), eventually one should practise *Sarva Karma Sannyasa* (renunciation of all *Karmas* entirely)”; the word ‘*Baalya*’ means — “Having acquired or being fully equipped with *Jnaana Bala* (the spiritual strength gained from *Jnaana*), the true aspirant should be rejecting disdainfully ‘*Anaatma Pratiyaya*’ (any perceptual or conceptual knowledge of the not-self); or in the alternative, like a *Baala* (an innocent child who does not usually exhibit pride, egoism, conceit etc.), the ardent seeker should practise *Amaanitwa*

(absence of egoism), *Adambhitwa* (humility, modesty, without exhibiting his *Jnaana*), *Adhyayana* (learning or study of the scriptural texts), *Dhaarmikatwa* (his being endowed with spiritual virtues or excellences) etc."; the word '*Mouna*' means — "Getting fully established or rooted in Intuition (*Anubhava*) of the Self which is the natural fruit of *Anaatma Pratyaya Tiraskarana* (total rejection with disdain the perceptual or conceptual knowledge of the not-self)." In truth, the purport of the *Shruti* statement is — "Only if the seeker attains this *Mouna*, he can be said to have become a *Brahma Nishtha* (the one established or rooted in Intuitive experience of the Self, a genuine, consummate *Jnaani par excellence*)." For the *Geeta* sentence too we must have a similar interpretation. *Para Bhakti, Jnaana Nishtha* — both these philosophical terms are nothing but Intuitive conviction (*Anubhava*), which is the natural product or fruit accruing as a result of human excellences or virtues like *Amaanitwa*, *Adambhitwa* etc. which are in turn the *Sahakaari Kaaranas* (complementary causes), which are spiritual practices or disciplines attained through *Sarva Karma Sannyasa* (total rejection with disdain of all physical and mental actions) needed invariably for the ripening or consummation of *Jnaana Ulpatti* (attainment of Self-Knowledge). The true seeker clearly and correctly Intuits *Paramaatman (Brahman)*, by means of *Bhakti* (devotion) alone which is verily of the essential nature of that *Jnaana Nishtha*. In order to significantly teach this *Viveka* (Intuitive deliberation, discrimination), the traditional teachers call this Intuitive Knowledge, born out of the study of the scriptural texts and which is of the form or nature of *Paanditya* (scholarly erudition), initially '*Jnaana*', but in the ultimate analysis after the culmination or consummation in *Jnaana Nishtha* comes to fruition here and now they call that '*Anubhava*' (Intuitive experience) by the name of '*Vijnaana*' (Supreme Knowledge). After the seeker attains *Paanditya* and *Baalya*, although the third discipline of *Mouna* by itself — and quite naturally — accrues, as a result of *Praarabdha* (the *Karma* which has ripened already and has yielded its fruits) *Bheda Darshana* (appearance of variegated or distinctive objects or phenomena) may become quite strong or imperative, the scriptures in these contexts stipulate, rather alert, the seeker that he should immerse himself and stabilise his mind in *Aatmaanubhava* (Intuitive non-dual experience of the Self) alone. **As all these spiritual practices or disciplines are meant exclusively for the *Sannyasin* (a recluse, ascetic), who is necessarily a *Vividishaa Sannyasin* (one who aspires to attain the Intuitive experience of the '*Tattwa*' or the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman*) alone it need not be gainsaid that such a *Vividishaa Sannyasin* has no duty or responsibility of performing any other mundane *Karma* whatsoever (pertaining to the *Avidya Kshetra* or region of ignorance or delusion). Especially when the seeker (*Saadhaka*) attains Self-Knowledge or Intuition**

(Jnaana) these Saadhanas too become, or are rendered invariably, 'Mithyaa' (false, unreal).

5. Ma. Ka. 4-90. pp. 394, 395.

7. Su. Bh. 3-4-50. p. 807.

6. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. p. 491.

8. G. Bh. 18-55. pp. 730, 731.

208. Because of the reasons that *Paanditya*, *Baalya*, *Mouna* etc. are described in the scriptural texts as exceptional, distinctive hallmarks of *Jnaana* and words like *Jnaana Utpatti*, *Jnaana Paripaaka*, *Jnaana Nishitha* etc. are used in *Vedantic* texts, some people have misconceived that in Self-Knowledge (*Jnaana*) too there are extremely subtle differences. Some others have even misconceived classes, categories like *Brahmavit*, *Brahmavidvara*, *Brahmavid Varishtha* among *Jnaanīs* (Realized souls). But from the detailed explanations and clarifications that we have given above themselves it will be quite clear, evident and indubitable that — “In *Vijnana* (Intuitive experience) of the essential nature of *Anubhava* (also called *Saakshi Anubhava*) there does not exist any big or small difference whatsoever.”

Because of the reason that the *Saadhanas* to be practised by the seekers for *Jnaana Utpatti* like (i) *Varna Aashrama Dharma*; (ii) *Upaasanas*; (iii) *Sannyaasa*; (iv) the practice of *Shama*, *Dama*, *Uparati*, *Titeeksha*, *Shraddha* and *Samaadhaana*; (v) *Dhyaana* etc. — are many, and secondly, because it has been stated in the scriptures that if *Karma* are blended or conjoined with *Upaasanas* the spiritual practices become stronger, more fruitful and successful (*Chhaandogya Upanishad* 1-1-10), some people may think or believe that there are differences in *Jnaana* also; some others may even think or believe that by virtue of the differences as well as their grades and respective calibre of *Jnaana*, there may be differences or grades in *Mukti* also.

But these beliefs or conceptions are without any scriptural support and are illogical to boot. For, if it is stated that — “By virtue of the intensity or immensity of spiritual practices there would be proportionate increase in *Jnaana*” — it can plausibly mean to have the special features, relatively, of earlier or faster attainment as against belated attainment in other or future births, but there is no scope or cause for the statement to have any other special characteristics at all. **Even if we imagine or surmise that there are differences or grades in *Jnaana* (Intuition), we may do so in dividing them only into *Paroaksha* (that which is beyond the range of sight or invisible) and *Aparoaksha* (direct and immediate); but that which is *Aparoaksha Anubhava* (Intuitive innate experience) superior to all else, that alone will be fit to be called *Jnaana*, and not anything else — whatsoever it may be. Apart from this, just as in *Karma* there are differences, there are no differences or grades whatsoever in *Jnaana*; therefore, in *Moaksha*, which is the resultant effect or fruit of *Jnaana***

too there do not exist any differences or grades of any kind whatsoever. In truth, **Moaksha** means **Brahman** (the Ultimate Reality), which is **Nitya Siddha** (eternally, perennially existing, self-established) Entity alone; **Jnaana** falsifies or sublates **Ajnaana**, the ignorance pertaining to **Brahman-Atman** (one's own Self) but **Jnaana** never gives rise to any non-existent **Mukti**. Hence, on the dawn of **Jnaana**, **Ajnaana** is got rid of completely and **Mukti** accrues, instantaneously, so to speak, and there is no scope or possibility for any one to imagine in the manner — "In due course of time **Jnaana** will yield a particular fruit." Therefore, it is illogical to imagine or infer that there are differences or grades in the manner — **Mukti** of ordinary human beings, **Mukti** of Rishis or sages, **Mukti** of deities etc. But as regards **Prateekoapaasanas** and **Sagunoapaasanas**, because there are differences with regard to the qualities or characteristics as 'big' and 'small' of the **Upaasya Brahman** (the Reality which is meditated upon), evidently there is room or scope for inferring or imagining differences and grades in **Vidyas** (psychic or mental knowledges), as also in their respective fruits or resultant effects.

9. Su. Bh. 3-4-52. p. 810.

11. Su. Bh. 3-4-52. p. 811.

10. Su. Bh. 3-4-52. p. 811.

12. Su. Bh. 1-1-24. pp. 92, 93.

209. If the **Jnaana Saadhanas** (spiritual practices) like **Karma** and **Upaasana** are undertaken, here and now immediately one may attain **Jnaana** or may attain It in due course. But **Mukti**, which is the fruit of **Jnaana** is not like that at all. Just as the very moment light comes or is brought the various forms of external objects are seen by the eyes, similarly the moment **Jnaana** dawns or flashes **Avidya** (**Ajnaana**) gets destroyed or sublated, and thereby **Mukti**, which is eternal and self-established and which is the very essence of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss of the **Mumukshu** gets manifested. (To wit, It is not the effect or fruit of any action either physical or mental, but beyond both, Intuitive). In truth, this **Mukti** is not even the resultant effect of **Jnaana**; rather, being ever-existent and eternal It gets manifested by **Jnaana**. From the empirical viewpoint, since it is believed that Bondage of the form of impediments like **Avidya**, **Kaama**, **Karma** etc. is sublated or falsified (**Nivritti**), only as a courtesy, convention or formality the scriptures mention **Mukti** to be a **Jnaana Kaarya** or **Jnaana Phala**; that is all. In fact, even **Devatas** (celestial deities) are not capable of hindering or coming in the way of the seeker attaining **Mukti**; for, when the seeker attains **Mukti**, because **Ajnaana** or **Avidya** is rooted out without the least remnants or even an iota of it, the **Jnaani** (Realized soul) becomes the **Atman** (Self) of the **Devatas** themselves.

13. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 165.

14. Br. Bh. 3-3-1. p. 451.

210. The *Vyaavahaarika Phala* (the empirical benefit) that accrues from *Aatma Darshana* (Self-Knowledge or *Aatma Jnaana*), is described in the scriptural texts in the following manner: “First of all, the *Kaamas* (desires), which are fed and sustained by *Avidya*, have got entrenched in our heart and have clung on to it — they get rooted out; *Samshayas* (doubts, suspicions or uncertainties), which were continuously raising their ugly heads in matters pertaining to the ‘*Tattwa*’ (the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*), get cut asunder; all *Karmas* (actions of merit and demerit) get emaciated and destroyed. **Therefore, for a *Jnaani* nothing whatsoever remains to be done henceforth; he remains ever an *Aatma Nishtha* (one who is eternally established in the Self).**

15. Mu. Up. and Bh. 2-2-8. pp. 138, 139.

211. Some people argue out in the manner — “Even though it is true that by means of *Jnaana* *Avidya* is destroyed, as long as the body — belonging to a particular *Janma* (birth) in which *Jnaana* was attained lasts — to that body of that particular *Janma* there exists a good deal of ‘*Avidyaa Lesha*’ (remnants of ignorance).” The fact that this ‘*Avidyaa Lesha*’ theory is not proper or reasonable has been already clarified by us in section 162. Those who have misconceived this ‘*Avidyaa Lesha Vaada*’ and have put it into circulation, so to speak, are the protagonists of ‘*Adhyaasa Upaadaana Moolaavidyaa Vaada*’ (the theory that there exists a ‘*Moolaavidyaa*’ or the root cause for *Avidya* for which *Adhyaasa* or misconception, delusion, is the *Upaadaana Kaarana* or the material cause). *Avidyaa Lesha*, *Avidyaa Chhaaya*, *Avidyaa Gandha*, *Avidyaa Vaasana*, *Avidyaa Samskaara* — all these are synonymous terms (used by these protagonists). Because of the reason that previously in section 30 itself we have explained that the ‘*Moolaavidyaa Vaada*’ (the theory of a root cause for *Avidya*) is totally opposed to *Vedanta Siddhaanta* (genuine teachings of *Vedanta* spiritual science), contradictory to Shri Shankara’s original *Bhaashyas* and to *Yukti* (logical arguments) in consonance with everyone’s experience in the empirical sphere — in the light of that explanation itself it becomes evident that this doctrinaire theory of *Avidyaa Lesha* too is not proper or reasonable. For that reason alone, **Shri Shankaaraachaarya has very distinctly and markedly delineated that a *Jnaani* does not have or possess *Vipareeta Pratyaya* (misconception), *Samsaaritwa* (transmigratoriness) and has further reverentially acknowledged ‘*Jeevan Mukti*’ (being Liberated while living in a particular physical body) and that this *Jeevan Mukti* (also called *Sadyoamukti*) alone is devoid of *Avidya*. To argue that both *Vidya* and *Avidya* are existing simultaneously (i.e. co-existing) in one and the same person is as ridiculous as to say that light and darkness exist together or co-exist at the same time and same place. Even if one knows**

(or has cognized) *Aatma Swaroopa* in a general, perfunctory manner and if he has not Intuited the Self distinctively in Its essence *per se*, it may be quite possible to entertain a misconception of the type of taking a sea-shell (nacre) to be silver; but in the case of those who have Intuitively established themselves in the essential nature of *Atman* (the Self) there is no scope or possibility whatsoever of any kind, or any variety, of *Avidya* existing or remaining as '*Avidyaa Lesha*' at all. It is truly a figment of imagination, which is, in itself, *Avidya*. This truth clearly looms large before us now.

16. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. p. 485.

18. Su. Bh. 1-1-4. pp. 39, 40.

17. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 169.

19. G. Bh. 14-20. p. 583.

212. "If *Avidya*, *Kaama* and *Karma* — all these are totally destroyed by means of *Jnaana*, how is it possible at all for the body to subsist? If the *Jnaani* does not remain embodied, how is it possible for him to teach or preach about the '*Tattwa*' of *Atman*?" — such doubts have raised their ugly heads in the minds of some present-day Vedantins, and as a result they have given rise to two different and opposing opinions or doctrinaire theories with regard to *Mukti*. One of these opinions (belonging to a school of thought) says: "A *Jnaani* does possess a small quantum or measure of *Avidya*; he is a *Jeevanmukta* all right. In fact, one who has attained this kind of '*Gouna Mukti*' (secondary Liberation, not the real one in the predominant sense) alone is the *Aachaarya* (preceptor) and only when he gives up his mortal coil he attains the real '*Mukhya Mukti*' which is called '*Videha Mukti*' (Liberation devoid of a body)." This theory has been refuted by us already in sections 162 and 211. The protagonists of the second doctrinaire theory have propounded in the manner — "If *Ajnaana* is destroyed by means of *Jnaana* the *Jnaani*'s body falls off immediately, instantaneously and *Mukti* is attained. This kind of *Mukti* is called '*Sadyoamukti*'." Especially this '*Sadyoamukti Vaada*' is a ridiculous one, a laughing stock. For, a staunch belief in the phenomenon of the body existing is accepted from the standpoint of *Avidya* alone and not in reality. Therefore, when *Jnaana* dawns, no body-consciousness whatsoever remains or subsists, and this very teaching we have previously expounded in sections 137 and 162.

Here in this context the true, genuine spiritual teaching is: **By virtue of *Jnaana*, *Avidya* is completely falsified, sublated (*Baadhita*), — meaning, the seeker gets the conviction that *Avidya* does not really exist at all; only this much, and not that *Jnaana* does actually and literally destroy *Avidya*, like an axe cutting asunder a tree or like fire burning away or consuming firewood.** Therefore, even after they become *Baadhita* by virtue of *Jnaana*, categories like *Avidya-Kaama-Karma* as also the physical body, which is caused as a result of '*Praarabdha Karma*' and which is the supporting adjunct (*Aashraya*)

all of them carrying on their respective functions, just as when a potter rotates the wheel fast and allows it to turn on its own momentum (in consonance with the 'Law of Inertia') till its speed of rotation is destroyed — becomes quite but natural. There is no defect or blemish whatsoever in *Mithyaa Jnaana* (misconception, delusion) etc. — to wit, all the three types of *Ajnaana*, *Mithyaa Jnaana* (*Adhyaasa*) and *Samshaya* — which are falsified by virtue of *Jnaana* (*Jnaana Baadhita*) remaining effective for some time — just like a second moon (*Dwiteeya Chandra*), the false notion or misconception of sea-shell-silver (*Shukti Rajataabhaasa*) or the confused notion as regards the cardinal directions of east, west, north and south (*Dik Moaha*) etc. By virtue of or as a result of this *Baadhitaanuvritti* (falsified mental concepts) there does not arise any flaw or lapse whatsoever in so far as a *Jnaani's Krita-Krityata* (the Realized soul's fulfilment of life's goal, its consummation) is concerned. Therefore, by the word — "*Nasha*" (destroyed) — if it is meant or interpreted to signify that — "Just as a fried seed is not able to sprout and give out a fruit" — then, it will have to be per force accepted that — "In the case of a *Jnaani* all his '*Sanchita Karmas*' (accumulated, totality of merits and demerits or *Punya* and *Paapa Karmas*) are destroyed or cancelled by *Jnaana*, and that the fruits of '*Aagaami Karmas*' (deeds of merit or demerit which are yet to ripen and fructify in future births) will not taint or touch him; further, because the '*Praarabdha Karma*' (ripened or ensuing or present *Karma*) has already resulted in the present birth endowed with the present body and thereby has given rise to its effect this resultant fruit of the present birth has to be per force (unavoidably) enjoyed and exhausted. *Nitya Karmas* stipulated by way of injunctions in the scriptures, like *Agnihoatra*, *Yajna*, *Hoama*, *Gaayatри Japa* etc., are exclusively responsible or instrumental, indirectly and in a sequential order (*Parampara*) for *Moaksha*. If the word — '*Naasha*' — is interpreted to connote '*Baadhita*' (rendered false or sublated), then it will have to be per force accepted that — "A *Jnaani* gets the steadfast conviction (to wit, culminating in his Intuitive experience here and now) to the effect that neither the body nor the *Karmas* performed with it as the medium ever exists in the least." In truth, **Shri Shankaaraachaarya has called the Liberation (or the release from) the clutches or bonds of Karma which accrues or is caused by virtue of the Nischaya (steadfast conviction) culminating in the Intuitive experience of the type — "I was never in the past a Kartru or a Bhoktru; I am not either of them even now; nor will be in the future too; I cannot ever become a Kartru or a Bhoktru" — alone by the name 'Sadyoamukti' (Liberation, Beatitude, here and now while alive in the present body).**

20. Su. Bh. 4-1-14. p. 838.

24. Su. Bh. 4-1-15. p. 840.

21. Su. Bh. 4-1-15. pp. 839, 840.

25. Br. Bh. 1-4-10. p. 169.

22. Su. Bh. 4-1-16. p. 841.

26. Su. Bh. 4-1-13. p. 837.

23. G. Bh. 4-37. pp. 225, 226.

27. G. Bh. 5-27. p. 267.

213. After Karmas (results of actions) in the form of merits (Punya) and demerits (Paapa) are totally and eternally (Aatyantika) destroyed by virtue of or by means of Jnaana, when the aspirant (Mumukshu) gets rooted or established firmly in the Intuitive Knowledge of the type — “Paramaatman (the Supreme Self), devoid of all actions or functions (Nishkriya) alone is myself” — then that Intuitive experience is Itself the true, genuine Sarva Karma Sannyasa (renunciation of all actions). This kind of Sannyasa can accrue to Grihastas (householders) too; because of the reason that after that renunciation accrues there is no purpose whatsoever served or no benefit whatsoever accruing from their earlier Aashrama Karmas (duties, responsibilities stipulated for a particular stage of life), those householders too will per force give up or renounce their Grihasta Karmas, just like Yaajnavalkya and such other Realized souls mentioned in the Upanishads. This truth becomes self-evident and self-established now. But, if for some reason or other that consummation does not take place, even if those people appear, as before, to be engaged and engrossed in performing or pursuing their respective Karmas as in the past, their so-called Karmas, in reality, have become falsified or sublated (Baadhita) by Jnaana and have become mere semblances of action (Karmaabhaasa); for them the Intuitive Knowledge of the type — “Kriya (action) — Kaaraka (the means of action) — Phala (the fruits of action) — are all Brahman, the Ultimate Reality, alone” — has accrued. Then, all the Karmas they perform are indeed for Loaka Sangraha (for the purpose of guiding, or showing the spiritual path to, Ajnas or the ignorant people). Therefore, in whatever Aashrama (stage of life) they may be, they are truly ‘Krita-Kriyas’. The Sannyasa, which the Jnanis or Realized souls observe because of the reason that there is no more purpose or benefit whatsoever to accrue from any kind of Karma, is called by the present-day Vedantins ‘**Vidvat Sannyasa**’. There is a second grade of people who, though they are Ajnas (in the ultimate analysis), because of their having acquired Chitta Shuddhi (cleansing or purification of the mind stuff of its innate proclivities, by discharging their respective Karmas that have befallen to their lot) and in due course through the acquisition of human excellences or virtues like Shama, Dama, Uparati, etc. give up or renounce the Grihasta Karmas for the sake of practising ‘Dhyaana Yoga’ which is ‘Kartrutva Vijnana Poorvaka’ (through the discrimination on the essence of the ‘I’ notion) are said to practise a ‘Sannyasa’ called the ‘**Vividishaa Sannyasa**’. Further, for those who are not yet qualified for this Vividishaa Sannyasa, the Geeta recommends ‘Karma Yoga’ alone which is called (in Vedantic parlance) ‘**Karma Phala Sannyasa**’ (renouncing or giving up the hankering after the fruits or benefits of all Karmas) alone as the best, or the most suited, spiritual practice (Saadhana). **Thus to enumerate in an ascending order and**

based on their calibre and attainment it can be succinctly said that there are the following three '*Sannyasas*': (i) *Karma Phala Sannyasa*, (ii) *Karma Sannyasa* and (iii) *Sarva Karma Sannyasa*. Among these, *Sarva Karma Sannyasa* alone is possible to attain for a *Jnani* exclusively. Barring these three categories of *Sannyasa*, all the other varieties — whatever they may be — are not genuine or real *Sannyasas* at all. For example, those who have believed or misconceived *Kriya-Kaaraka-Phala* as real entities or phenomena; *Shoonya Vaadins* (Nihilists) or idlers, lazy-bones giving up or 'renouncing' *Karmas* can never be reckoned to be '*Sannyasins*' at all.

28. G. Bh. 5. Intr. p. 236.

31. G. Bh. 18-48. p. 716.

29. G. Bh. 5. Intr. pp. 238, 239.

32. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. p. 155.

30. G. BH. 4-20. pp. 199, 200.

214. *Jnana* may dawn (accrue) at any moment. *Vaamadeva* attained It while in the mother's womb; although *Prajaapati* was alone existing at the beginning of a *Kalpa* (an aeon or a measure of the duration of the world), *Jnana* accrued to him without anybody's spiritual instruction whatsoever. For this, the *Karmas* or *Upasanas* and such other spiritual *Saadhanas* practised in previous births alone are instrumental. Here in this context a doubt may arise, and that is: "The one and only cause for any one taking to *Sannyasa* is the fact that there is no purpose served by, nor any benefit accruing from, *Karmas*; therefore, it amounts to saying that *Sannyasa* is not stipulated as necessary for a *Jnani*. So, where is the question of a person who has attained *Jnana* in his *Grihastha Aashrama* itself practising *Sannyasa* (renunciation) and thereby going to a forest at all? Besides, because he has achieved what is to be achieved in his life (*Krita Kritya*) henceforth he need not perform any *Karma* whatsoever; he can remain at home, maintaining quiet, is it not? Or, in the alternative, because he is not bound by either the scriptural injunctions or prohibitions it may amount to saying that he can behave as he likes (i.e. according to his whims and fancies)!"

The solution for this doubt is: "To desire to remain quiet at home alone is tantamount to having a '*Kaama*' (for, it is a subtle desire indeed); because a *Jnani* does not have any *Kaama*, he cannot think in the manner — 'I will remain at home quiet.' Similarly, whether he is a *Brahmachari* (a celibate) or a *Vaanaprastha* (one who spends his last days in seclusion in a forest), if that particular person attains *Jnana*, there is no possibility for him thereafter to think in the manner — 'I will remain in this same *Aashrama* (stage of life).' Because he has realized the truth that there is no benefit whatsoever accruing from any of the *Karmas* of these *Aashramas*, the *Jnani* attains *Paarivrajya*

(the wandering life of a religious monk or recluse), of the nature of *Eshanaa Vyutthaana* (giving up all desires exhaustively and rise to sublime heights in spiritual *Saadhanas*). **Because *Paarivraajya* is an *Abhaava* (a non-existent phenomenon), of the form of *Eshanaa Tyaaga* (giving up or renunciation of all desires exhaustively) and not any *Kriya* (action or function), there is no scope for any one to raise the objection of the type — ‘Why exclusively *Paarivraajya*?’ — or to compare it with other *Karmas*, whatever they may be. In case there is any impediment for the *Jnaani* to take recourse to or adopt the way of life of *Paarivraajya*, the *Jnaani* will invariably be performing the respective *Karma* for the sake of *Loaka Sangraha* (general welfare of or well-being of the society around him), but he will never behave as he likes, according to his whims and fancies. For *Yatheshtha Pravritti* (the behaviour as one likes according to his whims and fancies) *Dehaabhimaana* (the innate identification with one's body) is the root cause; but in a *Jnaani* this *Dehaabhimaana* (called in *Vedantic* parlance ‘*Adhyaasa*’) does not exist. A *Jnaani*, who has renounced *Dharmas* (scriptural rites and duties) themselves considering them to be too heavy or arduous — why should he dabble or meddle with *Adharma* (acts which are prohibited by the scriptures and are sinful)? To doubt that a *Jnaani*, who has renounced both *Dharma* and *Adharma* even when he was a *Mumukshu* (a lower stage in the spiritual ladder of *Saadhanas*) as such, may commit sinful acts of *Adharma* even after his attainment of *Jnaana* and his becoming a ‘*Jnaana Tripta*’ (one who has attained consummate satisfaction, of the nature of *Krita Kritiyata*) is not justifiable at all. To wit, when a person is hungry he will never consume any poisoned food; then, where is the question of a person, who has got rid of his hunger by eating dainty savoury food, consuming such a poisoned food? One who has not fallen into a well and has avoided doing so during the night — can he or will he fall into the well after sunrise? The *Karmas* that a *Jnaani* performs for the sake of *Loaka Sangraha* are, in reality, not *Karmas* at all; for, then the *Jnaani* does not have either *Ahamkaara* (egoism or selfishness) or *Phalaabhisandhi* (hankering after the fruits or benefits). Just as when a person is performing *Kaamyagnihoatra* (a sacrifice offered into the fire with the desire to obtain a particular benefit or fruit), if he gets rid of his *Kaama* (desire), the remainder of that *Kaamyagnihoatra* will not continue to be *Kaamyas* (associated with or backed up by any desire for fruit) any more — similarly, the *Nitya Karmas* performed after the attainment of *Jnaana* will not continue to be *Karmas* at all. Therefore, the *Karmas* that a *Jnaani* performs — whether they are *Vaidika Karmas* or *Loukika Karmas* — because he does not have any sense of agentship whatsoever in those *Karmas* and because everywhere, at all times he is besieged by *Brahma Buddhi* (sense of Reality of**

the Self (to wit, a sort of divine or God-intoxication), those *Karmas* can never be reckoned to be real *Karmas* at all.

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 33. Su. Bh. 3-4-51. p. 809. | 38. Ait. Bh. Intr. p. 18. |
| 34. Br. Bh. 1-4-2. p. 96. | 39. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. p. 153. |
| 35. Br. Bh. 2-4-1. p. 351. | 40. Up. sa. 18-231,232. p. 272. |
| 36. Ait. Bh. Intr. pp. 11, 12. | 41. G. 2-11. pp. 42, 43. |
| 37. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. p. 152. | 42. G. Bh. 5-8. pp. 247, 248. |

215. There is a big question raised by protagonists of '*Jnaana-Karma-Samuchhaya Vaada*' (the theory of blending *Jnaana* and *Karma*) and that is: "Though there are no other *Karmas* to be performed by *Sannyasins*, who are *Jnanis*, they have certain spiritual disciplines like *Bhikshaacharana* (leading the way of life of a mendicant), *Shoucha* (cleanliness, purity) etc. They will have to per force perform acts like eating food and drinking water etc. Similarly, the other people in the other stages of life like *Grihasthaashrama*, *Vaanaprasthaashrama* also, after the attainment of *Jnaana*, may be performing *Karmas* like *Agnihoatra* etc., is it not? Just as the *Sannyasins* necessarily get prompted into actions like eating food etc., in the same manner why should it not be accepted that *Grihasthas* too get prompted, as a matter of necessity, into their respective (old, habitual) *Karmas*?"

Although it amounts to our having given an answer to this question already, here in this particular context with a view to elucidating and highlighting that answer we will repeat it. The regulations like the adoption of the way of life of a mendicant etc. which are seen to be practised by a *Sannyasin* are akin to, or analogous to, *Pratipatti Karmas* (conventional practices or rites) of the type of injunctions like — "After performing a *Hoama* (sacrificial fire) one should eat food." As a result of *Pratipatti Karmas* the invisible or subtle benefit of *Purusha Samskaara* (subtle impressions at the psychic level) accrues. But by virtue of *Bhikshaatana* etc. such *Samskaaras* do not at all occur. Besides, a *Bhikshu's* (monk's) apparent acts of *Bhikshaatana Karmas* are not *Niyama Karmas* (actions stipulated by way of injunctions) at all; neither is there any rule of law whatsoever that one should necessarily observe such *Bhikshaatana*; they are, in fact, *Pravrittis* (naturally prompted actions at the physical level) because of physical wants or defects like hunger, thirst etc. but they are not subject to or controlled by rules or regulations of time, space and causation just like those of *Shaastreeya Pravritti Karmas* (the scriptural rites, rituals stipulated by way of injunctions as 'musts'). **Therefore, it is not possible or proper at all to state *Bhikshaatana* and such other *Karmas* as examples analogous to a *Grihastha's Pravrittis* (behaviour patterns of a householder), which are prompted by and due to *Kaama* (desires), *Vaasana* (subtle impressions at the psychic level) etc.**

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 43. Ch. Bh. 2-23-1. pp. 151, 152. | 45. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. p. 53. |
| 44. Br. Bh. 1-3-1. pp. 52, 53. | 46. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. pp. 488, 489. |

216. Some people had in the past argued in the manner — “For *Sannyasins* too *Karmas* like *Adhyayana* (study of the scriptural texts), *Devataarchana* (worship of deities) and such other *Karmas* were stipulated by way of injunctions as written in some *Smritis* composed by *Rishis* or seers. But in the *Smritis* it has also been stated that in performing *Karmas* like *Guroopaasana* (contemplation on one's spiritual preceptor), *Adhyayana*, *Bhojana* (consumption of food), *Aachamana* (a religious rite of sipping water before or after meals etc. taken in the palm of the right hand, etc. accessories like the sacred thread etc. are invariably necessary. Therefore, the aspirants (i.e. here in this context *Sannyasins*) should per force renounce these accessories like *Yajnopaveeta* (the sacred thread), as also the *Karmas* which are performed with their aid, *Linga* (the symbolic badge, mark or some such adjunct pertaining to the *Sannyasa Aashrama*) and then perform *Eshanaatraya* (renunciation of desires of the three kinds, viz. *Putreshana*, *Vitteshana* and *Loakeshana*), but it is not proper to give up or renounce all *Karmas* and the relevant *Karma Saadhanas* (the accessories required for their performance).”

But apart from the *Paarivraajya*, described above with *Eshanaatraya*, there is another distinct kind of *Paarivraajya*, which is of the form of *Sannyasa Aashrama* (the fourth stage of life) but devoid of *Eshanaatraya*. For this latter *Paarivraajya* there is a fruit like *Brahma Loaka Praapti* etc. In that particular *Aashrama Sannyasa* it is quite necessary to possess accessories like *Yajnopaveeta*, *Niveeta* (wearing the sacred thread round the neck and making it hang down like a garland), *Praacheenaaveeta* (the sacred thread being worn over the right shoulder and passed under the left arm as during a *Shraaddha* ceremony) and all the *Karmas* like *Daiva*, *Maanusha* and *Pitrya* (scriptural rites pertaining to offerings to deities, all human beings and *Manes* or paternal ancestors) taken collectively and performed with their aid, as also the wearing of *Sannyasaashrama Linga* (symbolic marks of *Sannyasa Aashrama*) — all these are necessary adjuncts. But what is the most relevant and necessary qualification (*Anga*) for *Aatma Jnaana* (Self-Knowledge) is *Paramahansa Paarivraajya* (*Sarva Karma Sannyasa* mentioned above) alone; in this type of *Paarivraajya* all *Eshanas* (desires), have per force to be renounced or banished *in toto*. For, all *Eshanas* are matters or phenomena within the realm or purview of *Avidya* alone. Hence, Shri Shankara has provided a satisfactory reason or solution to this problem by saying that — “Acts like wearing of *Yajnopaveeta* and such other symbolic marks of adjuncts ignifying *Sannyasa* (asceticism) is a matter concerning quite a different kind of *Paarivraajya* which pertains to *Amumukshus* (people not desirous of Beatitude) and which invariably pertains to egoism or agentship of action born out of ignorance which is,

in truth, a lack of or absence of Self-Knowledge (*Avidwat Kartrutwa*). Hence those who are *Mumukshus* — whosoever they may be — must per force adopt this *Paramahansa Paarivraajya* exclusively; the final spiritual teaching of *Vedanta (Siddhaanta)* is: “**After the attainment of *Jnaana* especially, there is nothing whatsoever to be done or performed by the *Jnaani* at all**”.

47. Br. Bh. 3-5-1. pp. 487, 488.

50. G. Bh. 5-13. p. 251.

48. Ait. Bh. Intr. p. 14.

51. G. Bh. 5-13. p. 253.

49. Br. 3-5-1. p. 489.

217. For one who is a *Jnaani* there are no empirical or scriptural — *Loukika* or *Vaidika* — transactions or dealings at all; for, all such transactions are invariably *Avidyaa Kaarya* (the resultants or projections of ignorance, delusion alone). Because a *Jnaani* is *Nitya Trupta* (eternally content), he is *Jitendriya* (one who has completely conquered and thereby exercises full control over his senses); he has acquired a perspective of treating all things, like a lump of clay or a stone or an ingot of gold, with equal value; in fact, he is full of *Adwesha* (absence of hatred), *Maitree* (friendship or camaraderie) and *Karuna* (compassion, kindness). In him no defects like anxiety, agitated or perturbed mental state and fear, whatsoever, are to be found. Because he has surpassed or gone beyond the realm of *Gunatraya* (the three psychic qualities of *Sattwa*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*), the effects of these three *Gunas* cannot ever affect or taint him. In truth, his psyche is fully established or rooted in *Paramaatma Swaroopa* (the essence of the Supreme Self, *vinculum substantiale*). **In the *Geeta*, *Jnaani* alone is being described by names like *Sthitaprajna*, *Yukta*, *Bhakta*, *Trigunaateeta*, and thereby the essential hallmarks of a *Jnaani* are taught. Those very special characteristics (*Laxanas*) become the ideal spiritual practices or *Saadhanas* to be adopted and the ends to be achieved for those who are yet *Mumukshus* (aspirants for Beatitude).**

52. G. Bh. 2-69. p. 116.

55. G. Bh. 2-55. pp. 101, 102.

53. G. Bh. 6-8. pp. 283, 284.

56. G. Bh. 12-20. p. 493.

54. G. Bh. 12-13. p. 486.

57. G. Bh. 14-26. p. 588.

218. There are a few people who raise a doubt of the type — “If a *Jnaani* is always ‘*Krita Kritya*’ then because thereafter there does not remain anything whatsoever to be done by him, his body should immediately fall off; then, in that event the *Guru Sampradaaya* (the legacy or traditional system of *Guru-Shishya* dissemination or propagation of spiritual teaching) itself will vanish. Hence, we should accept that for the sake of salvaging or preserving that legacy the *Jnaani* too has something left to be done, is it not? Besides, because it is

mentioned in the *Shrutis* and the *Smritis* that people in the *Grihastaasrama* taught the Ultimate Reality to their pupils, it amounts to saying that for *Jnaanis* too there remains some *Karma* to be performed. Apart from this, because it is also stated in the *Shrutis*, *Smritis* and *Puraanas* (mythology) that some *Jnaanis* got rebirth, one is constrained to say that by mere *Jnaana* alone *Parama Purushaartha* (the Supreme goal of human life) cannot possibly be attained, is it not?"

But there is no basis whatsoever to support or substantiate this doubt or argument. For, whether it is the existence of the physical body or whether it is the falling off of the body, either of them is to be reckoned from the *Mithyaa Jnaana Drishti* (the viewpoint of misconception alone). Although in the case of a *Jnaani* this *Mithyaa Jnaana* is sublated or falsified, just like the *Dwichandraadi Jnaana*, there is a possibility of that *Mithyaa Jnaana* to follow on or to continue (*Anuvritta*). This fact we have already explained in section 212. Therefore, it is quite possible and reasonable to say that by virtue of *Baadhitaanuvritti* (the law of inertia operating for some time even after a misconception is falsified or sublated) the mundane or empirical transaction of teaching between the teacher and the taught may continue. The *Shruti* statements to the effect that — "Because a *Jnaani* has got rid of (falsified) the viewpoint (perspective) of treating *Kriya*, *Kaaraka*, *Phala* as real, the *Grihastaashramis* too were *Gurus*" — cannot at all invalidate or cancel out the *Nyaaya* (aphorism) that — "There is no *Samuchhaya* (blending) of *Jnaana* and *Karma*." In fact, because there are *Shrutis* also to the effect — "Without desiring the benefits of *Karma*, *Jnaanis* practised '*Eshanaatraya*'" — we should discern that — "*Jnaana* does not desiderate the aid of *Karma* at all."

In the case of *Jnaana*, of the form or nature of *Upaasana* because it is, in the ultimate analysis, *Kriya* (action) alone, it may need the help of *Karma* indeed. Even when *Jnaanis* were *Grihastaas*, because their *Karmas* were, in reality, *Akarma* (inaction) from the viewpoint of *Paramaarth* (the viewpoint of the Ultimate Reality of the Self), *Karma* cannot exist along with *Jnaana*. This truth we have mentioned in section 214. If it is questioned as to — "What about the *Shruti* statement that there is *Punaraavritti* for *Jnaanis* also?" — the answer is that all such people are *Aadhikaarika Purushas* (superior personalities). These individuals, having been authorised or appointed by the Almighty, so to speak, with the powers of *Vedapravartana* (promoting or propagating the Vedic teachings) are posted in their respective positions till their *Praarabdha Karmas* are exhausted; they acquire many bodies with facility invariably endowed with the memory (*Smriti*) that — "That alone I am." None of them is affected by the rule of law of — "One *Karma* ends and another *Karma* begins yielding its fruit." In their case, only one *Karma* yields many bodies. Those bodies as also

their respective *Karmas* — both having been falsified by *Jnaana*, those individuals have attained a steadfast conviction that all such phenomena are unreal only. Therefore, there is no scope whatsoever for the doubt of the type — “Even after the attainment of *Jnaana*, one cannot become *Krita Kritya*.”

58. Ch. Bh. 8-12-1. p. 647.

59. Mu. Bh. Intr. 4. pp. 80, 81.

60. Su. Bh. 3-4-9. p. 765.

61. Su. Bh. 3-4-9. p. 765.

62. Su. Bh. 3-3-32. p. 703.

63. Ch. Bh. 6-14-2. p. 491.

XXVIII. CONCLUSIONS

In our country as well as in foreign countries several philosophical texts have been published. In the pre-Shankara period too in the olden times many *Aachaaryas* (spiritual preceptors), who were erudite scholars, intellectuals, philosophers and thinkers, had presented before the common run of people many systems of philosophy. Among those systems some have already disappeared; some of the rest have become exhibits merely to satisfy the curiosity of people, just like the exhibits of ancient manuscripts, remnants or skeletons of animals or birds displayed in a museum.

But the *Siddhaanta* (spiritual, philosophical teachings, particularly with regard to the essential nature of the Ultimate, Absolute Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*) which Shri Shankara had presented before the aspirants have remained extant even to this day without any change or mutation, despite the fact that he expounded them nearly a thousand years ago on the basis or strength of the *Prasthaana Traya*. His teachings (*Upadesha*) are relevant at all times and in all countries and climes. The reason for this is: **The subject-matter of *Vedanta*, which this great spiritual colossus expounds, is *Parabrahman* which is beyond the purview of time and space and which is the very essence of the entire universe itself. That *Brahman* is the *Atman* (to wit, the innermost core of Being) of all human beings of all times and all nations or races, as well as of all creatures other than human beings. Teaching this *Paramaarthata* in a clear-cut manner on the strength of *Saaratvika Anubhava* (universal Intuitive experience) — which is never affected or vitiated by differences in either time or space — is one unique, uncommon or extra-ordinary feature of Shri Shankaraacharya's methodology of teaching or propounding the Universal Spirit.**

Although the *Upanishads*, *Bhagavadgeeta* and *Brahma Sootras* are spiritual texts which have been composed and expounded in India, because of the reason that the *Paramaarthata* which they teach is beyond the purview of time and space for the purpose of knowing or

Conclusions

cognizing that Reality, one need not be under the obligation of any *Shaastra* or spiritual (philosophical) text whatsoever. Although this Reality is to be known or Intuited by virtue of *Aagama* (the traditional methodology of teaching or imparting spiritual instruction) alone — which is a specialised system of spiritual education adopted by a genuine, true preceptor — no spiritual teacher, whosoever he may be and worth his salt, can possibly monopolize or preserve this Reality as his own special and secret prerogative at all. Although *Vedantic (Spiritual) Science* eulogises the benefits of *Chitta Shuddhi* which accrues to one who practises the spiritual disciplines stipulated for the four *Varnas* (castes) and the four *Aashramas* (the four stages of life of an individual), there is no coercion, compulsion or constraint whatsoever of the type — “Only if one has any one special, extraordinary adjunct like a particular *Varna*, a particular *Jaati*, a particular *Aashrama*, a particular *Kaala*, a particular *Varna* (pigment of the skin), a particular *Linga* (sex), a particular age, a particular class of economy etc. — he alone can attain this Intuitive experience of the *Brahmaatma Tattwa*.”

In this traditional methodology of spiritual instruction (*Siddhaanta*) the other-worldly fruits of deeds, viz. *Janmaantara*, *Loakaantara Phala*, etc., have not been rejected at all. But because the *Jnaana* that this *Vedantic Science* teaches or expounds as also the fruit or benefit that accrues from It can be attained in this very life span, this spiritual teaching cannot and will not detract or dislodge the belief, faith one may have in any religion, whatever it may be. In fact, the auspicious message about *Sadyoamukti* (Beatitude, Immortality here and now in this very life span), which assures in the manner — “At the very instant of *Jnaana* Itself the Bondage of *Karma*, *Kaama* will be removed, sublated; a mortal becomes Immortal” — is an exclusive hallmark of this sacred Science of *Vedanta*, the Science *par excellence*.

The spiritual instruction about *Jeevanmukti* which says: “Man gets Liberated from all calamities, miseries of transmigratory life (*Samsaara*) by means of the *Vedantic Self-Knowledge* while he is alive here and now itself” — provides a supremely excellent optimism to the present-day human society at large which is suffering from acute agony, distress from various elemental calamities and other ecological, economic calamities of life. Because a *Jeevanmukta* has acquired a superlative, steadfast conviction of the type — “Everyone's *Atman* (Self) is my own Self” — he has an equal love towards all human beings, nay all creatures, alike. A person who has attained such a state has been called in the scriptural texts by names like *Sthitaprajna*, *Yukta*, *Trigunaateeta*, *Para-Bhakta*, *Ativarnaashrami*, *Braahmana* etc. **If we realize or discern the special qualities of a *Jeevanmukta* as described in the scriptural texts, we may well affirm boldly that — “Not only in proportion to the increasing number of such people all problems of**

our present-day life style or way of life will be solved, redressed, but also to that extent peace and happiness all around are assured to our human society all over the world."

It is possible for all those, who have acquired human excellences, virtues like *Sadaachaara* (good code of conduct and right living), *Shama*, *Dama*, *Uparati*, *Titeeksha* etc. as also a steadfast, burning desire for Self-Knowledge like that of a *Mumukshu*, to gain invariably this profound Knowledge of this *Vedanta Siddhaanta* (the Spiritual Science of *Vedanta*). Therefore, the pressing need of the times of having more and more of such spiritual preceptors or instructors who are adepts in propagating the genuine message of *Vedantic Science* as also who are *Brahma Nishthas* (those who are rooted, established in the Intuitive experience of the Ultimate Reality) and who can adopt a style of language and methodology to suit the present times of scientific progress is very great at the present juncture. Let us all pray that *Shreemat Naaraayana*, who is everyone's Self (*Sarvaatman*) and who is a veritable storehouse of compassion, may provide us with such holy men and grant His Grace to all of us.

Om Tat Sat

BOOKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR ALREADY PUBLISHED

1. The Scientific Approach Of Advaita Vedanta

A succinct description of the unique methodology that is utilized in and through the *Upanishadic* lore to expound the Ultimate, Absolute Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*, as explained by Shri Shankara in his extant, original *Bhashyas* on the *Prasthaana Trayi*, viz. the ten principal *Upanishads*, *Bhagavadgeeta* and the *Vedanta Sootras (Brahma Sootras)*. It will not be euphemistic if it is stated that without the knowledge of the six fundamentals mentioned in this booklet a true seeker of the Reality of the Self or student of *Advaita Vedanta* will invariably get confused and confounded by the apparently contradictory statements of the *Upanishads*. The author has used 14 diagrams to drive home the subtle teachings of pristine pure *Advaita Vedanta* of Adi Shankara in keeping with the modern trend of audio-visual methods of presentation of a topic.

Pages - 98

Price - Rs. 10

2. The Principal Teachings Of Bhagavadgeeta

It contains two parts, one comprising — “The Purport of *Bhagavadgeeta*” — and the other being — “The Quintessence of *Bhagavadgeeta*”. The first part elucidates the subtle teachings of *Geeta*, including the *Dharma Dvaya* or the two paths of *Pravritti* or *Abhyudaya* and *Nivritti* or *Nishreyas*, as also the Ultimate Reality of *Vasudeva Parabrahma Tattwa*. The second part contains the gist of the 18 Chapters, progressively based on the verses of the *Geeta*.

Pages - 102

Price - Rs. 6

3. The Magic Jewel Of Intuition

This *magnum opus* explains in detail the subtle and secret teachings implicit in the *Maandukya Upanishad*, using the *Avasthaa Traya Prakriya* or the profound methodology implicit in the examination of the three states of consciousness, viz. waking, dream and deep sleep. This methodology is a sure clincher for the genuine seeker of Self-Knowledge and will be of immense help in Intuiting *Atman* or the *Self* as the very essence of his *Pure, Absolute Being-Consciousness-Bliss*, i.e. *Sat-Chit-Aananda Swaroopa*. Many doubts and objections which are raised in

spiritual circles and by scholars and academicians are answered quite clearly so that they get dissolved, so to speak. At the end of the book, an Appendix on “Science and Spirituality” — which is a comparative study of the two formidable “sciences” — running into 83 pages is given.

Pages - 476 + 83

Price - Rs. 50

4. The Relevance Of Vedanta In This Modern Age Of Civilization

A perspective study of the modern civilization with its consequent changes in life styles, beliefs and goals as against the *Vedantic* teachings recommending a simple, contented spiritual way of life and its relevance today for the wise, discriminative people. This booklet brings into focus the burning topic of the day, viz. “Can *Vedanta* provide a solution, nay a panacea, for all the miseries and ills of the present times?” — and it provides satisfactory solutions to the ardent seekers. This booklet is the first of a series of eight booklets being published under the head — “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*” — which covers the whole gamut of *Vedantic* teachings from scratch to its consummation in a thematic sequence.

Pages - 66

Price - Rs. 8

5. A Broad Outline Of Vedanta

This is the second of the series — “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*”. It explains in a simple style the technical terms of *Advaita Vedanta* treated in a thematic sequence to provide an outline of the *Vedantic* teachings leading to *Brahman Vidya* or Self-Knowledge. The printing of this booklet is done neatly in the modern style of printing using the process of “Desk Top Publishing”.

Pages - 22

Price - Rs. 5

6. The Reality Beyond All Empirical Dealings

This book is the third in the series entitled — “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*”. It explains as to how all our empirical and even religious rituals, including the study of the scriptures, i.e. all mundane dealings in general, start on the first premise of the mutual superimposition of *Atman* or the Self and *Anaatman* or the not-self — which in *Vedantic* parlance is called *Adhyaasa*. It drives home the *Vedantic* teaching that one who cognizes or Intuits the Ultimate Reality of the non-dual *Atman*, who is of the very essence of Pure Being-Consciousness-Bliss, comes to realize that our Self Itself is beyond all empirical, mundane dealings and enables us to get rid of *Adhyaasa* (*Avidya*).

Pages - 44

Price - Rs. 8

7. Deliberation On The Ultimate Reality Culminating In Intuitive Experience

Fourth booklet of the Series — “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*”, it contains six chapters delineating the unique methodology of Vedanta as handed down, generation after generation, in its own inimitable, nay unrivalled, manner using an extraordinary logic in consonance with Intuitive experience so as to culminate in one's own cognition and steadfast conviction.

Pages - 82

Price - Rs. 12

8. Brahma Vidya Or Knowledge Of The Ultimate Reality

This booklet — the fifth of the series called “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*” — unravels the secrets of both the Siddhaanta, i.e. spiritual science, and the Saadhana, i.e. spiritual disciplines or practices, pertaining to Self-Knowledge. The former scientific part delineates the unique methodology of Intuiting the Ultimate Reality of Brahman or Atman, while the latter practical aspect deals with the necessary disciplines and mental conditions, rather purifications, which a true seeker should possess in order to be able Intuit the Reality of Vedanta utilising its subtle methodology.

Pages - 50

Price - Rs. 10

9. The Quintessence of Pristine Pure Vedanta

The Quintessence of Pristine Pure Vedanta: This is the sixth number of the “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*” — and as the name of the book itself suggests this contains the quintessence of pristine pure Vedantic teachings culled out of the original Bhaashyas of Adi Shankara, devoid of all extraneous and alien accretions and interpolations which are likely to confuse a true seeker. By a meticulous study of this booklet it is hoped that a persistent hunger to pursue this ‘Aadhyaatmika Vidya’ as also to know more about it from bigger and more comprehensive texts will be generated.

Pages - 40

Price - Rs. 8

10. The Philosophical Science of Vedanta

The Philosophical Science of Vedanta: Being the seventh number of the “*Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series*”, this booklet gives a foretaste of Adi Shankara's famous ‘Brahma Sootra Bhaashyas’, which are highly

dialectical in their approach in teaching the Ultimate Reality of Brahman or Atman of Vedanta. Two brief appendices are also adduced to compare and contrast the interpretations of 'Brahma Sootras' by the other schools of philosophy, viz. Vishisthaadvaita of Ramanujaachaarya and Dvaita of Madhvaachaarya.

Pages - 44

Price - Rs. 8

11. Vedanta: The Only Consummate Spiritual Science

Vedanta: The Only Consummate Spiritual Science: This is the eighth and last of "Satchidaananda Vaak-Jyoti Series" and projects a profound and comprehensive perspective to enable a genuine student of this spiritual science to weigh its teachings and truths against all the other physical and psychic sciences as also other incomplete schools of philosophies, both Western and Indian. Taking a holistic viewpoint of Intuitive experience (Pure Consciousness of Atman) one can judge for himself that Vedanta is truly the ultimate and final in all epistemological and metaphysical pursuits.

Price Rs. 12

It is a well-known fact in spiritual circles that one cannot by himself comprehend the genuine *Vedantic* teachings by a study of '*Prasthaana Traya Bhaashyas*' of Adi Shankara without the help and guidance of a preceptor well-versed in the traditional methodology of utilizing the '*Adhyaaroopa Apavaada Nyaaya*' which is implicit in and through those *Bhaashyas*. Even the avowed followers of Adi Shankara, scholars, academicians and anchorites have miserably failed to bring about a convincing reconciliation among all the teachings or doctrines of the triad of the original *Bhaashyas* as well as between the spiritual teachings pertaining to '*Dharma Jijnaasa*' and '*Brahma Jijnaasa*'. Consequently, their interpretations and commentaries — verbal or written — bristle with contradictions and inconsistencies. Besides, the traditional or *Saampradaayic* methodology handed down from the teacher to the taught and subtle pedagogics utilized by that world teacher (Adi Shankara), who even to this day shines like a brilliant sun on the *Vedantic* firmament, have been virtually lost sight of or denied to the true seekers of the Ultimate Reality of *Brahman* or *Atman*.

The modern educated intellectuals with their professed 'scientific temperament' take every opportunity and use every forum to decry and denigrate the time-honoured and time-tested *Vedantic* philosophy and question its very relevance in this Nuclear Age of scientific progress. Suffice it to say that 'Reality' has per force to be universal and invariable in all climes, times and ages. This hard fact cannot be denied by any empirical scientist worth his salt. If the *Vedantic* 'Absolute Reality' of *Atman* is beyond all empirical transactions and phenomena and, at the same time, if the '*Science of Vedanta*' brings home this Ultimate Reality as one's own essential Being of *Atman* using an immaculate and infallible methodology of teaching, then it becomes evident to any ardent seeker of this all-comprehensive and all-pervasive Reality that this '*Aatma Vidya*' is in truth the '*summum bonum*' of all human endeavour and prosperity. It deserves to be given the pride of place in all educational institutions and academies.

This book comes in handy as an excellent reference book and a constant guide for the genuine student of *Vedanta* as also to a seeker and will invariably create a spiritual hunger to know more details and secrets hidden in the vast *Upanishadic* lore. In that event, the students and seekers alike can take recourse to many such gems of *Vedantic* literature published by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Thyagarajanagar, Bangalore 560 028.