

# Vedanta Jijnasa

वेदान्त-जिज्ञासा

\* \* \* \* \*

नमामि शङ्कराचार्यं ब्रह्मज्ञं करुणानिधिम ।  
भाष्यं प्रसन्नगम्भीरं येन मोहमयं कुर्वते ॥

\* \* \* \* \*



JNANANANDENDRA SARASWATI SWAMI



# Vedanta Jijnasa

## वेदान्त-जिज्ञासा

**SRI JNANANANDENDRA SARASWATI SWAMI**

[Author ( H. H. in his Purvasharma )

Vedanta Shiromoni, Vedantavisharada

Vidyavachaspati and Asthanavidwan

**SRI S. VITTALA SHASTRI]**



*To be had of :*

**ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA**

**BANGALORE-560028**

**[ Price : Rs. 8/- ]**

*Published and Edited by :—*

**MANAS KUMAR SANYAL**

182, S. N. Roy Road,  
Calcutta-700038.

*First Publication in 1939.*

Books are available at :—

1. Adhyatmaprakasha Karyalaya (Branch).  
68 II Block, Post—Thyagarajanagar.  
Bangalore— 560028.
- 2 Sri Shankarasharma  
Yelahanka, Bangalore North—562116.
3. Sarvodaya Book Stall  
Howrah-Station, Howrah—711101.
4. Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar  
38, Bidhan Sarani, Calcutta—700006.

*Printed at :*

**G. D. Enterprise**

29, Sitalatala Road, Sahapur  
Calcutta --700038.  
West Bengal



## PUBLISHER'S NOTE

सम्प्रदाय विदा येन शङ्कराचार्यसन्मतः ।  
मूलाविद्यां तिरस्कृत्य वेदान्तार्थः समुद्धृतः ॥  
सच्चिदानन्द पूर्वेन्द्र सरस्वती समाख्यकम् ।  
योगीन्द्रमीप्सितं प्राप्त्यै ज्ञानिनं तं नमाम्यहम् ॥

Sri S. Vittala Shastri, Vedantashiromoni (Madrass Univ), Vedantavisharada, Vidyavachaspati, who later on entered into the ascetic order under the name of *Swami Jnananandendra Saraswati* had given a series of postal correspondence discourses to me on Sri Shankara's Advaita Vedanta in the year 1978-79. I was very much fascinated by the discourses of Sri S. Vittala Shastriji as well as his writings on the topic of '*Mulavidya is against Shankara's Advaita.*' Now I have decided to publish his valuable teachings on genuine Shankara's Vedanta in a booklet under the title '*Vedanta Jijnasa.*' He gave the answers of the question/doubts etc. put by me in English as well as in Sanskrit, according to my choice. His teachings have been arranged and grouped in three chapters : (i) *Sri Shankara's Advaita Vedanta.* (ii) *Mulavidya opposed to Shankara's Advaita.* (iii) *Clarification of certain vedantic concepts according to Shankara.*

Sri Shastriji takes a stand that Sri Shankara, an elaborator and systematiser of the Advaitic thought, has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by two camps of his sub-commentators as expounded in their commentaries on Shankara's original commentary, like Panchapadika, Vivarana and Tatwapradipta in one

series and Bhamati, Kalpataru and Parimala in another series. The very unpleasant thing is that the views of all these sub-commentators have been propagated as Sri Shankara's views. The real views of Shankara have not been understood even by great Sanskrit Scholars of these days. Therefore, in order to know the differences between the original views of Sri Shankara and those of the sub-commentators, this small book will be of immense value.

It should be said, to the credit of Sri S. Vittala Shastri, that the entire discussion was carried on with a genuine academic approach. As a scholar of Advaita philosophy, he was a strict adherent to the teachings of Sri Shankaracharya as expounded in his '*Prasthanatraya*' Bhashyas and faithfully interpreted by Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji of Holenarshipura. Sri Shastriji was also an ardent disciple of the Revered Swamiji of Holenarshipura. He adduced proper evidences for his stand from Sri Shankara and Sri H. H. Swamiji of Holenarasipura while replying my queries. He threw much light on several subtle points of Shankara Vedanta and clarified our understanding of some basic position of Sri Shankara.

Dedicated to H. H. Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji of revered memory.

18th July, 1989.

MANAS KUMAR SANYAL

Guru Purnima

Calcutta-38.

# VEDANTA JIJNASA

( बेदान्त-जिज्ञासा )

CHAPTER—1.

## SRI SHANKARA'S ADVAITA VEDANTA

*Query :* I want to know the fundamental doctrines of Sri Shankara's Advaita vedanta (the genuine teachings of Sri Shankaracharya as expounded in his *Prasthanatraya Bhashyas* and faithfully interpreted by the Revered Swamiji of Holenarsipura ).

*Answer :*

### SRI SHANKARA'S ADVAITA VEDANTA.

( i )

Sri Shankaracharya say's : There is only one Absolute Reality without a second, which is pure 'Being', pure 'Consciousness' and pure

'Bliss'. It is changeless, infinite and eternal without reference to time, space and causation. It is without notion, without attributes, without name, without form and without parts. The *Upanishadas* have categorically declared that the Absolute cannot be apprehended by the mind and the senses. "न बाह्यं गच्छति नो मनः" *Kena—1/3*; 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह—*Ta—2/9*. *Brahman* or the ultimate Reality, being devoid of all specific features cannot be referred to by any of the categories conceivable by us. It can never be known in the sense we know 'the yonder tree', because It can never become the object of knowledge. The words often used in the *Upanishadas* to designate It are *Brahman*, *Atman*, etc by the Adhyaropa view adopted for the purpose of teaching. 'अध्यारोपितनामरूप कर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म निर्दिश्यते 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म' 'विज्ञानघन एवं', 'आत्मा' 'ब्रह्म' इत्येवमादिशब्दैः—*Briha-Bhashya-2/3/6* *Brahman* is described through name and form superimposed on it by words like 'Consciousness and Bliss is *Brahman*', 'He is conscious throughout,' '*Brahman*' '*Atman*' etc. The method

adopted by the *Vedas* to express the highest Reality is 'negation' i. e, 'not this, not this'. "अथात आदेशो नेति नेति"—*Bri-2/3/6*. Sri Shankara says: "यदा पुनः स्वरूपमेव निर्दिदिक्षितं भवति निरस्त-सर्वोपाधिविशेषम्, तदा न शक्यते केनचिदपि प्रकारेण निर्देष्टुम्, तदा अयमेवाभ्युपायो यदुत प्राप्तनिर्देशप्रतिषेधद्वारेण नेति नेतीति निर्देशः ।" ( *Briha-Bhashya-2/3/6* )—"whenever the essential nature of *Brahman* alone is intended to be pointed out free from all specific features due to the conditioning associates, then it is impossible to express It in any way whatever. Then this is the only device left, viz to point It out by negating all conceivable specifications'. Thus the highest Reality is indicated in *advaita* philosophy not by defining It but by eliminating what It is not.

( ii )

It is admitted on all hands that the Infinite cannot be conceived by the human mind, which is bound by the laws of time, space and causation. Yet It is the inmost Self of the seeker of Truth. This real Self is misunder-



stood as the individual or false self due to the identification of the body and senses with *Atman*. This identification of *Atman* with the mind and senses is really an *adhyasa* or mistaken knowledge and is in the experience of every one. This false identification has no beginning or end, but can be sublated by the right knowledge of the real Self. “अयं अनादिः अनन्तः नैसर्गिकः अध्यासः मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृवप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः । अस्य अनर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ताः आरभ्यन्ते ।”—*Adhyasa Bhashya*.

In the very first Badarayana Sutra, ‘*Athatho Brahma jijnasa*’ (—now, therefore, the enquiry into *Brahman*) the word ‘*Jijnasa*’ is explained as a desire to know the Reality ( *Brahman* ). Knowledge is defined as that which culminates in intuition of the highest Reality as *I am Brahman*. Absence of correct knowledge, doubtful knowledge and mistaken knowledge i.e to mistake *Atman* for body and vice versa are *avidya*. “यदि ज्ञानाभावः, यदि संशयज्ञानं, यदि विपरीतज्ञानं (=मिथ्याज्ञानं) वा उच्यते अज्ञानमिति सर्वं हि तत् ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्येत”—( *Briha-Bh-3/3/1* ) ‘अविद्या विपरीतग्राहकः, सं-

शयोपस्थापकः अग्रहणात्मको वा, विवेकप्रकाशभावे तदभावात् ।’  
*Gita Bh-13/2.* ) So the main theme of *adhyasa*  
*Bhashya* is to explain the true nature of *Vidya*  
*and avidya*. It has been clearly defined by  
 Shankara that between the self and non-self  
 to mistake one for the other and one’s qua-  
 lities for the other’s qualities, is *avidya*. This mis-  
 taken knowledge of the Self and non-Self is con-  
 sidered to be *adhyasa* by the *Bhashyakara*. This  
*adhyasa*, which is an ordinary natural experi-  
 ence, is without a beginning and without an  
 end. By its very nature, it is not the out-  
 come of any other matter. In fact it is the  
 propelling force within everyone giving rise to  
 to the feeling of doership and enjoyership.  
 This *adhyasa* which is in the experience of  
 all is expressed as ‘I’ and ‘mine’ in the world.  
 “देहादिषु अनात्मासु अहमस्मीति आत्मबुद्धिः अविद्या”  
 ( *Sutra-Bh-1/3/2* ). This *adhyasa* or misunderstan-  
 ding ( mistaking one for the other ) is experie-  
 nced by everyone, right from four-headed  
*Brahma* down to the smallest of creatures  
 like the ant. *Adhyasa* does not require any

means of knowledge or external proof to prove its existence. It is directly intuited by all. “न हि दृष्टे अनुपपन्नम् नाम”—*Brahma-Sutra Bh-4/1/2* and *Briha - Bh - 1/4/10*. On the basis of this fundamental mistaken tenet or *avidya*, all our versions and activities - secular or vedic, based on perception, inference and the veda-are undertaken. And again all our *Shastric* injunctions, prohibitions and sciences dealing with liberation are based on this *avidya*. “तमेतं अबिद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मानोः इतरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे व्यवहाराः प्रवृत्ताः”—*Adhyara-Bhashya*. All our concepts of ‘bondage’, ‘salvation’, ‘cause and effect, etc. arise from this misunderstanding.

( iii )

What is the cause of the identification of the *Atman* with the body, mind and senses and vice versa? The cause is not knowing the substratum upon which the phenomenon of the body, mind and senses is superimposed. Mistaking one thing for other is the result of not knowing the real nature of that thing.



For example, if one knows the rope as it is, he cannot mistake it for a snake. In this sense not knowing the real nature of a thing is the cause for knowing it otherwise. Thus, first there is not knowing the Reality as the cause, out of which misunderstanding the Reality i.e, the effect arises. This is known as '*prathipattikrama*, ( प्रतिपत्तिक्रम ). It must be noted here that the process is not like the mud being the cause of the pot, but it is like the rope being the cause of the snake's appearance. No where does *adhyasa* ( misunderstanding ) require an indescribable matter as its material cause. This *adhyasa*, namely misunderstanding the Self for non-self and vice versa, is called *avidya*. "तमेतमेवं लक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मम्यन्ते",-(*Adhyasa bhashya* ). Due to this *avidya* one mistakes himself as an individual. As the individual jeeva is the outcome of *adhyasa*, he cannot think of the causes of *adhyasa*. This mistaken knowledge is the cause of individuality. It is in the experience of all. The knowledge of pure

self which can stultify or nullify this ignorance must also end in intuition. Mere book-knowledge is not capable of nullifying it, as it proceeds from the Me-notion.

( iv )

Individuality comes only as the outcome of *adhyasa*. As soon as we consider ourselves as individuals or false selves on account of this *adhyasa*, we begin to see the world outside and immediately search for a material cause of this world. That matter (primordial matter) which is concocted by *adhyasa* is called, *maya*, *akshara*, *avyakruta*, *avyakta*, *prakruti* and *shakti*. Shankara has also said that *maya*, which is concocted by *avidya* is the material cause of the world. “अविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते मायाशक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते ।”—( *Sutra—Bh-2/1/14* ), Now this *maya* is not real, itself being concocted by *adhyasa* or misunderstanding. *Maya* means that which does not exist at any time or at any place, but appears as existent.

*Mandarkya-karika-Bhashya—2/31—* “या असद्व-

स्त्वात्मिका सद्वस्त्वात्मिकेव अवभासमाना सा माया ।”  
 “माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि ? न, सा च माया न विद्यते, माया इति  
 अविद्यमानस्य आख्या” (*Man-karika-Bh-4/58.*) When  
 the primordial matter itself is concocted by  
*adhyasa*, its product, i. e. the world, is sure to be  
 a concocted one too. If *maya* itself is unreal  
 the world which is its product must also be  
 unreal. The world exists as long as *adhyasa*  
 operates i. e. in waking and dream states. It  
 does not exist when *adhyasa* does not operate  
 i. e. in deep sleep as well as in trance (*Samadhi*).  
 The process of concoction cannot take place  
 without a substratum. This substratum, it  
 must be admitted, is *Brahman*. Both the cause  
 and the effect, viz *maya* and the world are  
 merely concocted in *Brahman* by *avidya*. “लोक-  
 प्रसिद्धं त्विदं रूपद्वयं ब्रह्मणि कल्पितं परामृशति प्रतिषेध्यत्वाय  
 शुद्धब्रह्मस्वरूपप्रतिपादनाय ।”—(*Brahma-Sutra Bh-3/2/22*).  
 —‘These two aspects viz, world and *maya*, which  
 are popularly well recognized, are superim-  
 posed on *Brahman*; and this is done for the  
 sake of denying them and establishing the real,

pure nature of *Brahman*'.

( v )

How can the world which is irrefutably established by means of knowledge such as *Vedas*, perception and inference be called as non-existent or as mere appearance? The question of creation and the existence of the world arises from the point of view of the *Jiva* and not from the stand point of *Brahman*. The categories of *Jiva*, God, *Maya* and world have relevance only within the empirical domain or the *Vyavaharika drishti*. The infinite *Brahman*, the changeless Reality cannot become the finite world or the *Jiva*. There exists no part in *Brahman*. Therefore, It is indivisible. It is not a thing, but is pure Consciousness. There cannot be any will or desire in *Brahman* to create the world, for there can be no desire in the Infinite. What is there other than itself for the Infinite to desire for? The *advaitins* do not admit of any real creation. The world is,



according to them, comparable to the mirrage or the city of clouds or the objects seen in the dream. “क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मितहस्तिस्त्रप्रदृष्ट-वस्तुगन्धर्वनगरादिवत् असदेव सदिव अवभासते ।” (*Gita-Bh-13/36*) All these phenomenon are only seen but not real. Therefore, the conclusion is that world as well its material cause have no existence or *Satta*. It exists only as long as there is *avidya* (*adhyasa*). For example, *avidya* exists in waking and dream states only. In these states the world and its seed also exist. The *adhyasa* does not exist in deep sleep and in trance and the world with its cause then does not exist. Therefore, it is concluded that the world is concocted in *Brahman* by *adhyasa* or ignorance.

(vi)

If the world has no existence, what is this creation which you and I see ? The *advaitin* replies that the creation which is seen through the adjuncts of the *Jiva* is *Brahman* itself. “सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म”—(*Chandogya-3/14/1*)—All this is veri-

ly *Brahman*. The *advaitin* says, if world exists, *Brahman* is both the material and efficient cause of it. Sri Shankaracharya says *Brahman*, which is changeless, partless, pure Consciousness, pure Being and pure Bliss is both the material and instrumental cause of the world, on the authority of *Upanisadas* such as “यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जिवन्ति यत् प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति...तद् ब्रह्म” (*Tai—3/1*) and also on the authority of the *Brahma—Sutra—प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्—* (*Sutra-1/4/23*)—*Brahman* must be the material cause as well, so as not to contradict the proposition and the illustration.

*Brahman* is changeless, partless; it is not a matter but pure Consciousness etc. How can such *Brahman* become the material cause of the world? The *advaitin* replies that the world is concocted in *Brahman* by our ignorance. Whenever a thing is concocted then its substratum is held to be the material and instrumental cause of that thing. For example, the material and instrumental cause of the rope-snake is

rope only. Similarly the material and instrumental cause of the world is *Brahman*, as the world is concocted in it.

(vii)

Although, in the ultimate analysis, the individual Jiva, the world and God dissolve into single Reality viz. *Brahman*, when one realises oneself as *Brahman*, an explanation as to the questions why the world is created and how the world is created, is sought by the individual as long as he sees it. When people, who are identified with body and mind, see the world, they suppose that there must be a material cause for the world and believe that the world must be an effect of that cause. To satisfy them, the *advaitin* once again graciously condescends to answer the query by saying, well, the material cause of the world you are looking for is '*maya*'; nevertheless, that *maya* is concocted by *avidya*. It is said to be the seed or the potential form of the world. But it

must never be forgotten that the theory of *Maya-Satkaryavada* is put forth by Sri Shankara from the Jiva's point of view. *Maya* is a matter concocted by *avidya* and it has no real existence. Sri Shankara once again defines *maya* as that which does not exist. “माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि ? न, सा च माया न विद्यते, माया इति अविद्यमानस्य आख्या ।”—(*Mandukyakarika-Bh—4/58*). Thus both the world and its cause *maya* are held to the illusory.

No sooner we become the individual due to ignorance than we begin to see the world and presume its creator, God. Let the *Jiva* shed its *jivahood* or the individuality by attaining knowledge and the world will shed its creator, God. “अपिच यदा ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति एवं जातीयकेन अभेदनिर्देशेन अभेदः प्रतिबोधितः भवति, अपगतं भवति तदा जीवस्य संसारित्वं ब्रह्मणश्च सृष्टृत्वं, समस्तस्य मिथ्याज्ञान-विजृम्भितस्य भेदव्यवहारस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाधितत्वात् ।”—(*Sutra-Bhashya—2/1/22*). Let the *Jiva* shed its *Jivahood* or the individuality by attaining knowledge and the world will shed its worldliness



too, and there will neither be the knowing subject nor the known object ; but the one undivided homogeneous infinite Existence will shine by itself. The *Jiva*, *Jagat* (world) and *Ishwara* will then dissolve into *Brahman*, the only one Reality without a second.

( viii )

Most of the thinkers of religion and philosophy, identify themselves with the mind, senses and body and begin to think as individuals. Each and everyone, except the *Jnanins* or the illumined ones, misunderstands himself as a different entity from God. They think that they are helpless and not capable of doing great things. But God or Reality is great and is capable of doing anything and everything. He knows all (everything). He is all-knower, the creator etc. They say they must get salvation by meditating upon Him, surrendering themselves to Him and getting grace of Him, How do we account for these various philo-

sophies vis-a-vis the *Advaita*-philosophy ? As philosophers, they have not distinguished there real Self from the *upadhis* or the conditions of the superimpositions and apprehended the real nature of the Self. It is to be understood that when the thinkers do not free themselves from the influence of mind and body and remain as conditioned selves, their conclusions in determining the ultimate facts of philosophy must also necessarily remain imperfect. These persons, who are identified with mind, body etc. ( मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धः ) see the world through their eyes and other senses and say that the world is real, because they see it through their senses. They do not consider that the mind and senses are products of food and therefore they belong to the world. The senses cannot say that the world is a mere appearance as they themselves are the outcome of the world. The individual will be making a futile attempt to realise the highest Reality so long as he keeps clinging to his little individuality. Therefore,

so long as one is identified with the body and senses, he is not the right man to find out the reality and unreality of the world. He must say that the world is real because he is identified with the mind and senses which are the products of the world. No one can say, 'My mother is a barren woman.'

The man who has sublated the identification and stands as pure Being, pure Consciousness and pure Bliss, is the proper man to judge the nature of the world and he says that the world seen before us with the help of the mind, senses etc., is mere concocted by *adhyasa*, really it is nothing but *Brahman*. The ignorant man who has the mistaken knowledge believes in the existence of the world, but world apprehended by him does not exist as it is really *Brahman* itself. The existence of the one with the existence of the other and the disappearance of one with the disappearance of the other affirm the relationship of cause and effect between the

two. By this law, it is proved that the apprehension of the world is the effect of *avidya* ( or *adhyasa* ) because the world exists when *avidya* exists. Besides when this false understanding of the nature of mistaking the self for the non-self and vice-versa is sublated by the true knowledge of the wise which is in the nature of the direct intuition. '*I am Brahman*,' then the duality is not at all seen. Such wise persons no longer see the world but experience their *Atman* as *Brahman* having no second to it. Therefore, it is established that the apprehension of the world is the result of mistaking the Self for non-self and vice-versa and that it is not a real one. The great sages including Shankaracharya, who had sublated their identification with the body and mind and stood as pure Being, did not consider themselves as individuals but saw themselves as the Highest Reality. Furthermore, they saw the world as *Brahman* Itself which is secondless and all pervading.

( ix )

Then arises the objection : How is it that *Brahman* which constitute ; our very self is not universally apprehended where as the world which is said to be non-existent is perceived by every one ? The answer is as follows :

*Atman* ( in other words pure Being, pure Consciousness and pure Bliss ) is always the subject and it can never be reduced in the state of object i.e., It can never become the object of knowledge. It cannot be perceived by the mind or senses, for it preside over the mind and senses. *Shruti* says : That which the eyes cannot see, but that by which the eyes are seen, that which the speech cannot express, but that from which speech itself arises, that which the mind cannot comprehend, but that by which the mind is comprehended, that is *Atman'*—*K : no-panisad*—1/1-5. It is impossible to deny its existence because he who denies is himself the Self. Shankara says in *Brahma—Sutra Bhāshyas*.



“य एव निरार्कता तस्यैवाऽत्मत्वात् ।” (सूः भाः—1/1/4)

“य एव हि निरार्कता तदेव तस्य स्वरूपम् ।”—(सूः भाः—2/3/7).

This *Atman* has to be intuited as one's own Self by negating all superimpositions viz, the body, the senses, the mind, the intellect and the ego—the world and its seed which are concocted by mistaken knowledge and not by pursuing It as if it is a phenomenal object. The *Shastras* establish *Atman* by merely eliminating the distinctions projected by *avidya* (ignorance) in It. Shankara says this in S. Bh-1/1/4—“न हि शास्त्रमिदन्तया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति । किं तर्हि ? प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादि भेदमपनयति ।” So *Brahman* cannot be established in any other manner.

It has already been said that the world is merely concocted by *avidya* on *Brahman* and is perceived as such by the ignorant only. The apprehension of the world is the result of mistaking the Self for the non-self and non-self for the Self and that it is not a real one.

( x )

*Atman or Brahman* is always free from all taints of duality namely the body, senses, mind, ego and the world. But, no sooner we are identified with the body and senses than we become false selves or individuals and the pure Being is thought to be different from us and is called God by the ignorant persons. Just as space is misunderstood to be limited by a pot even though it is unlimited. We think that this space is small and the other space is big. Space which cannot be divided into two as it is partless, is said to have been divided as hall-space and outside big space by ignorant persons who do not know the nature of space. So is the case with Reality too—the one indivisible, all-pervading, pure Consciousness is thought to be divided into a number of souls and God. Shankara says, 'सत्यम् नेश्वरादन्यः संसारी । तथापि देहादि संघातोपादिसंबन्ध इष्यत एव घटकरकगिरिगुहाद्युपाधिसंबन्ध इव व्योम्नः । तत्कृतश्च शब्दप्रत्ययव्यवहारो लोकस्य दृष्टो

‘घटच्छिद्रं करकादिच्छिद्रम्’ इत्यादिः आकाशाव्यतिरेकेऽपि, तत्कृता चाकाशे घटाकाशादिभेदमिथ्याबुद्धिर्दूषिता । तथेहापि देहदिसंघातोपाधिसंबन्धाविवेककृतेश्वरसंसारिभेदमिथ्याबुद्धिः ।”

( S. Bh-1/1/5 ). The individual *jiva* normally holds that he is born on such and such a date, in such and such a place and he is going to die some day. He also feels that he is either caught in the calamities of *samsara* or he is enjoying all the pleasures thereof. This notion is quite against the declaration of the *Shruti*. Because *Shruti* says : *Tatvamasī*—तत्त्वमसि—*Chandogya-6/8/7*.—That thou art. As long as the individual is identified with the body mind etc., it is impossible for him to understand the real meaning of this great truth. Therefore, in Shankara-Vedanta, the true renunciation means the renunciation of “I” and “mine” or the *Jivahood*. Similarly surrendering oneself to God means renouncing one’s false individuality and standing firmly rooted in one’s own essential nature.

What is salvation or *Moksha* according to *Shruti* and Shankara ? Shankara says : It is by



the identification of the body and senses etc., with *Atman* that the Reality is misunderstood as the individual. If this identification is sublated by true knowledge which ends in Self-realization by the advice of the *Shruti* and the *Guru*, then the *Atman*, which is thought to be the *Jiva* reveals Himself as pure Being, pure consciousness and pure Bliss. The stultification of the mistaken knowledge of taking the Self for the non-self and the non-self for the Self and the birth of the new knowledge of one's own being—the all-pervading *Atman*, are two events that happen simultaneously.. “विद्याकालानन्तरितत्वात् ब्रह्मप्राप्ति-फलस्य । आत्मविषयं विज्ञानं यत्कालं तत्काल एव तद् विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावः ।”—*Brihadaranyaka-Bhashya-1/4/10*) The meaning of the *Upanisadic* declaration ‘You are *Brahman*’ is thus justified.

Therefore, when it is realised that the world consisting of the animate and inanimate objects whether manifested or unmanifested, is a concoction of *Avidya* and therefore does not exist

really in its own (perceived) form or as world but ever exists in its real nature as *Brahman* and that ignorance is sublated by knowledge then salvation is in one's hand, that is, he stands as *Brahman* or Reality which is pure Being, pure Consciousness and pure Bliss. *Brahman* is the only *Sat* or entity. This is established by Sri Shankaracharya.

## CHAPTER—II

### MULAVIDYA-VADA OPPOSED TO SHANKARA'S ADVAITA

*Query* : It has been said in “मूलाविद्याभाष्यवार्तिक-विरुद्धा” that the post-Shankara sub-commentators' *Mulavidya-vada* is against Shankara's Advaita Vedanta. I shall be grateful to you if you send an abridged version of that book, composed by you, in English as far as possible.

*Answer* :

May I request you to read the article ‘Moolavidya is against Shankara's Advaita’ ?

( July 1977, No 7 Vol XXVIII, Bulletin of the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture. )

### THEORY OF MULAVIDYA

*Mulavidya-vada*, interpolated by post-Shankara sub-commentators like. *Panchapadikakara*, *Vivaran-acharya*, *Bhamathikara* etc., into Shankara's commentaries, is against *Advaita Vedanta*. According to them '*maya*' is '*avidya*'. Both are synonymous terms. *Maya* is the material cause of the world as well as of three types of *avidya* viz, absence of knowledge, the mistaken knowledge and the doubtful knowledge. This *maya* or *avidya* is beginningless. It is called by the name *mulavidya* ( original ignorance ) as it is the material cause of both the world and *adhyasa* or mistaken knowledge. *Adhyasa* is also called as *Karyavidya* whose material cause is *mulavidya*. It is an indescribable matter as it cannot be described as *Sat* ( existence ) or *Asat* ( non-existence ). It exists in Reality ( *Brahman* ) making the Reality as its object. It is subordinated to *Brahman* and

so it can be stultified by the knowledge of *Brahman* ( *Jnana-Badhyatwa* ). It exists extensively in all the three states of Consciousness-waking, dream and sleep. It envelopes *Brahman* and is the projector of doership and enjoyership in the Reality. It takes shelter in *Brahman* even though it is a matter outside It. It possesses three qualities namely—*sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* ( here '*guna*' means matter ). It goes by the names of *maya*, *avidya*, *mulavidya*, *prakriti*, *avyakta*, *avyakrita*, *shakti*, *tamas*, *akshara* etc. According to Vivaranacharya, *maya* is concocted by *adhyasa*. Therefore it can, be sublated by knowledge even though it is accepted as the material cause of concoction or *adhyasa*.

\*

\*

\*

Now I shall show the differences between the original views of Shankara and those of post-Shankara sub-commentators to convince that *moolavidya-vada* is against Shankara's Advaita Vedanta.

## MULAVIDYA-VADA OPPOSED TO SHANKARA'S ADVAITA

1. *Sri Shankara* says : *Adhyasa*, in other words, ignorance (*avidya*) is mistaking *Atman* for *anatman* and vice-versa. It is the cause of all our activities and of the world. He starts his system from mental wrong form, namely '*adhyasa*'—the subjective ignorance.

*Mulavidya-vadin's* say :

*Mulavidya* is an indescribable primordial matter and is called by the name of *avidya*. It is the material cause not only of the world but also of *adhyasa* or mistaken knowledge. They say that this primordial matter rests on *Brahman*. According to them *avidya* is not subjective ignorance, but something objective covering the essential nature of *Atman*. They start their system from outside matter like other *Dvaitins*.

2. *Shankara* says : *Adhyasa* is beginningless and endless. 'अयं अध्यासः अनादिः अनन्तः'—*Adhyasa Bhashya*. It is in the experience of all. *Adhyasa*



is the cause of individuality as well as of the world. Therefore, nothing can be known before *adhyasa*. *Adhyasa* does not require any material cause for its occurrence since it is only a form of ignorance.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Mulavidya* is *anadi* (beginningless) and it is the material cause of *adhyasa* (*Karya vidya*) as well as of the world.

3, *Shankara* says : “अध्यस्य इतरेताविवेकेन...मिथ्या-ज्ञाननिमित्तः”— (*Adhyasa Bhashya*). “*Mithyajnana nimittah*” means *Mithyajnana* (i.e, mistaken knowledge of the non-self for the self and the self for the non-self) is ‘*nimi tah*’ i.e, the efficient cause of our individualization. The absence of knowledge also is a concoction, so it comes with *adhyasa* and it goes with *adhyasa*.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : The word ‘*Mithyaj ana*’ has to be split up into ‘*Mithya ajnana*’. ‘*Mithya*’ means indescribable (अनिर्बचनीय). ‘*Ajnana*’ means an indescribable matter (प्रपञ्चबीजभूतम् अनिर्बचनीयं वस्तु) and ‘*nimittah*’ means the material

cause ( उपादानकारणम् ).

4. *Shankara* says : *Avidya* and *maya* are quite different. *Avidya* is in three forms : wrong knowledge, absence of knowledge and doubtful knowledge. All are mental wrong forms. *Maya* is a matter concocted by ignorance (*\*avidyakalpita\**). This matter i.e., *maya* which causes the appearance of the world of names and forms, is always held as conjured up by nescience. It is said to be the seed or the potential form of the world. It has no real existence. *Maya* means that which does not exist but appears as if it were an existent one. ( 'या असद्वस्त्वात्मिका सद्वस्त्वात्मिकेव अवभासमाना सा माया'—*Mandukya Karika Bh-2/31* ).

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Maya* is an indescribable matter, as it cannot be described either as '*Sat*' or '*Asat*'. It is the material cause of both the world and the three forms of ignorance viz, wrong knowledge, absence of knowledge and doubtful knowledge. *Maya* and *avidya* are

one and the same.

5. *Shankara* says : The material cause called '*Prakriti*' or '*Maya*' or '*Avyakta*' is born of *Brahman*. It is not *anadi*.

‘तस्मादव्यक्तमुत्पन्नं त्रिगुणं द्विजसत्तम ।  
अव्यक्तं पुरुषे ब्रह्मन्निर्गुणे संप्रलीयते ॥ ’

—‘From that arose the unmanifested, possessed of three *gunas* and the unmanifested gets merged in the attributeless *Parusha*.’ [S. Bh-2/1/11]  
“परमेश्वरात् उत्पन्ना भूतग्रामस्य प्रकृतिभूता इयं अजा प्रतिपत्तव्या”—*Aja prakriti* which is the source of elements sprang from the Supreme Lord.  
[Sutra Bhashya—1/4/9]

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Prakriti* or *Maya* is *anadi* (without origin).

6. *Shankara* says : *Maya* is ‘तत्त्वान्यत्त्वाभ्याम् अनिर्वचनीय’ (S. Bh-2/1/14. S. Bh-2/1/27). i.e, it can never be defined either as *Brahman* or other than *Brahman* and so is inexpressible.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Maya* is ‘सदसद्भ्याम्



अनिर्वचनीय' i.e. it is an indescribable matter, as it cannot be described either as 'Sat' (existent) or as 'Asat' (non-existent).

7. The *Shruti* and *Shankara-Bhashyas* say : There was *Brahman* alone before creation ('ब्रह्म वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्'-बृह-1/4/10 ; There was *Atman* alone before creation (आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्-ऐत-1/1).

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Mulavidya* was there before creation as it is *anadi* (beginningless) and '*Bhavaropa*' (positively existing.)

[This amounts to the admission of *Dvaita* (duality) and the Reality or *Brahman* becomes '*Vasthuparichinna*' that is, limited by another thing.]

8. *Shankara* says : *Brahman* is the material and instrumental cause of the world. 'The universe is concocted by *adhyasa* in *Brahman*, for a concocted matter '*aspada*' or '*adhara*' is the material cause as well as the instrumental cause

For the example, rope is the material and instrumental cause of a rope-snake. The cause is real and its effects or products are mere names. So *Brahman* is real and all effects being mere names.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : *Moolavidya* is the material cause of the world as well as of *adhyasa*. Then *mulavidya* must be real one and its effects are mere names. They say—*Brahman* is the material cause through *mulavidya*. Therefore, *Brahman* is real and all effects are mere names.

9. *Shankara* says : There is only one 'Satta' or Reality and there are no grades of existence 'तथा च ब्रह्म त्रिषुकालेषु सत्त्वं न व्यभिचरति । एकं च पुनः सत्त्वम्'—S. Bh-2/1/16). The world is comparable to the mirage or the city of clouds or the objects seen in the dream. (क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मितं हस्तिस्वप्नदृष्टवस्तुगन्धर्वनगरादिवत् असदेव सदिव अवभासते'—G. Bh-13/26), All these phenomena are only seen, but not real. Therefore, the conclusion

is that the world has no existence or '*Satta*'.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : There are three '*sattas*'  
—*Paramarthika satta* (the Absolute reality),  
*Vyavaharika satta* (the empirical reality) and  
*Pratibhasika satta* (the apparent reality).

10. *Shankara* says : Rope-snake is only a wrong notion.—the rope has not changed into the snake. It is the substratum on which the imaginary snake is superimposed by the perceiver on account of illusion. There is no 'serpent. "न हि रज्ज्वां भ्रान्तिबुद्ध्या कल्पितः सर्पो विद्यमानः सन् विवेक्तो निवृत्तः"—*Man-karika Bh-1/17* ; "न हि मनो विकल्पनायाः रज्जुसर्पादिलक्षणाया रज्ज्वां प्रलय उत्पत्तिर्वा, न च मनसि रज्जुसर्पस्य उत्पत्तिः प्रलयो वा, न चोभयत वा"—(*M n-Karika Bh-2/32*),

*Mulavidya-vadins* says : In the place of rope-snake an indescribable serpent is born at that time.

[They created it to give an example for the destruction of *moolavidya*—a beginningless positive matter by knowledge]

11. *Shankara* says : Ignorance is in ~~these~~ forms : wrong knowledge, absence of knowledge and doubtful knowledge. Among these, wrong knowledge is harmful, so it is ignorance in main. All these are mental wrong forms. Knowledge also is a mental (right) form. Both are opposed to each other. Both cannot stay in one place at the same time. Therefore, knowledge sublates ignorance. Knowledge does not destroy a thing whether it is describable or indescribable, dependent or independent. It brings it into light as it is. “ज्ञानं तु ज्ञापकं न कारकमिति ... न हि क्वचित् साक्षाद्वस्तुधर्मस्यापोद्री दृष्टा कर्त्री वा विद्या, अविद्यायास्तु सर्वत्रैव निवर्तिका दृश्यते ।” —बृहभाष्य-1/4/10.

( *Mulavidya-vadins* says : *Mulavidya* can be stultified by knowledge as it an indescribable dependent matter just like a rope-snake. Knowledge rises in individual person. *Mulavidya* has taken shelter in *Brahman*. Even then knowledge can sublate *mulavidya* as it is called by the name of *avidya*. We (*moolavidya-vadins*) accept *moolavidya*

as opposed to knowledge.

12. *Shankara* says : In deep sleep an individual person loses his individuality and merges in *Brahman* or he has become one with *Brahman* without knowing that he has become one such. He is always *Brahman* by nature. One's own nature cannot be given up or taken in. Due to *upadhi* (attribute) he appears as if he were different in waking and in dream. No *upadhi* exists in deep sleep, so he is said to be one with *Brahman*. “स्वप्न जागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिव अपेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते ।” — S. Bh-3/2/7. Really he is always *Brahman*, but he has mistaken himself as if he is an individual due to *Adhyasa*.

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : Individual exists as individual—he does not merge in *Brahman* in deep sleep. *Mulavidya* (causal ignorance) also exists in its *suksma* (subtle) form in deep sleep. Therefore, it makes one to awake to the same individuality.



13. *Shankara* says : 'I did not know anything in deep sleep' ; 'I slept soundly'—these statements express the existence of Reality in deep sleep.

*Mulavidya-v. dins* say : These sentences are authorities to say that there was positive matter like *Mulavidya* existing then to prevent the oneness of the *Jiva* with *Brahman*.

14. *Shankara* says : No sooner is the knowledge of Reality achieved than salvation or *moksha* is in one's hand i.e, he stands as pure Being, pure Consciousness and pure Bliss. “विद्याकालानन्तरितत्वात् ब्रह्मप्राप्तिफलस्य । आत्मविषयं विज्ञानं यत्कालं तत्काल एव तत्विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावः ।”—(*Briha-Bhaysa-1/4/10*).

*Mulavidya-vadins* say : Salvation, while one is living (i. e, जीवन्मुक्तिः) is secondary. The state of real salvation ( i.e, विदेहमुक्तिः ) is attainable only after the death ( “विदेहताकालीन एव मोक्षो मुख्यो मोक्षः जीवन्मुक्तेर् गौणत्वात्—*Advaita-siddhi* ).

[This position of *moolavidya-vadins* is unacceptable to Shankara who maintains that the state of real salvation ( सद्योमुक्तिः ) is attained the moment *adhyasa* (*avidya*) disappears and the Self-knowledge ( अहं सच्चिदानन्दस्वरूपः परमात्मैव इति अनुभवावसानं ज्ञानम् ) dawns.]

### CONCLUSION

Had *mulavidya* been accepted by the *Bhasyakara*, it should have been stated clearly by him. He should have mentioned its distinctive features and the tests of its validity and how it could be sublated by true knowledge like *Panchapadikakara* and *Vivaranacharya*. There is no mention of it at all. On the contrary, it has clearly demonstrated that mistaken knowledge ( *i.e.*, *adhyasa* ) alone is *avidya* and it can only be sublated by true knowledge and that it is in the experience of all. There is no mention of *avidya* or *maya* in the sense of *mulavidya* in Shankara's commentaries. Hence it is impossible to accept that the *Bhasyakara* has ever recognized *mulavidya*

still less approved of it.

We say that if one does not read the views of the post-Shankara scholars into Shankara's writings, one would call Shankara as a *Brahma-vadin* and not as a *mayavadin* or *moolavidya-vadin*. For Shankara, whatever existed or exists or will ever exist is only *Brahman* and not *maya* or *moolavidya*. Shankara says : *Maya* does not exist—"माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि ? न सा च माया न विद्यते । माया इति अविद्यमानस्य आख्या इत्याभिप्रायः"—*Mandukya-karika Bh-4/58*. He who clearly disapproves and denies the existence of *Maya* (*moolavidya*) and calls it false appearance (concocted by *avidya*) or non-existent, cannot be called as *mayavadin* or *moolavidya-vadin*.

CHAPTER—III  
CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN  
VADANTIC CONCEPTS ACCORDING  
TO SHANKARA

1. *Question/doubt* : What are the nature of *avidya* and *maya* according to Shankara ?

*Answer* : Sri Shankara has clearly stated that *avidya* (अविद्या) is misunderstanding. That is to mistake *Atman* for body and body for *Atman*. This misunderstanding i.e, mistaken knowledge of Self for non-self and non-self for Self which is directly experienced by all is *avidya* or *adhyasa*. In all *prasthanatraya bhashyas* he has used the word *avidya* in the same meaning even though he has accepted not knowing the Reality and doubting the Reality also as *avidya* and in no other sense.

“तमेतमेवं लक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिताः अविद्येति मन्यन्ते ।”  
(—अध्यासभाष्यम् ) ; “देहादिषु अनात्मासु अहमस्मीति आत्म-  
बुद्धिः अविद्या”—(सू भा-1/3/2), “अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिन्  
तद्बुद्धिः”—( अध्यासभाष्यम् ) इत्यादि भाष्यवचनैः अविद्यायाः

अन्तःकरणधर्मत्वम् प्रतीयते । गीताभाष्येऽपि (2/21) “बुद्धिर्वृत्त्या अविवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्या” इति अविद्यायाः बुद्धिवृत्तित्वम् प्रकाशितम् ।

He has used the word ‘*maya*’ (माया) in the sense of root of names and forms ( i.e, the material cause of the world ) concocted by अविद्या । मायायाः लक्षणं भाष्यकारैः—“अविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते माया अक्षरं इत्येतैः शब्दैरभिलप्यते ।” (—सूत्रभाष्य-2/1/14) ; “माया नाम सा या असद्वस्त्वात्मिका विद्यमानेव अवभासमाना (सद्वस्त्वात्मिकेव लक्ष्यते अविवेकिभिः) सा माया, (—माः काः भाः-4/58) इति मायायाः असद्वस्त्वात्मकत्वम् उक्तम् । “या मा (=नास्ति) सा माया” इति माण्डूक्य (—4/58) कारिकाभाष्ये ‘मायेत्यविद्यमानस्य आख्या’ इत्युक्तम् ।

It is important to mention here that wherever there is a reference to *maya*, the so-called material cause of the world, Sh nkarā invariably mentions it as concocted by nescience (*avidya-kalpita, avidyapratyupasthapita, avidyathmika, avidya krita etc.*)

2. *Question/doubt* : Is जीव is the आश्रय of अविद्या or, ब्रह्म is the आश्रय of अविद्या or ब्रह्म is the आश्रय of



अविद्याकल्पिता माया ? (Sri Shankara has said in his *Sutra-Bhashya-1/4/3*—‘परमेश्वराश्रया’ ) ।

*Answer* : जीव एव अविद्याश्रयः नेश्वरः । अविद्या नाम जीवस्य भ्रान्तिरूपा अन्तःकरणवृत्तिः । Due to this *avidya* one mistakes himself as an individual. Individuality (जीवत्व) comes only as the outcome of *adhyasa*.

‘अविद्याकल्पिता प्रपञ्चबीजभूता माया’—It is a matter concocted by *avidya*. अविद्याकल्पित मायोपाधिः ईश्वरः । परमेश्वराश्रया माया, न अविद्या । ‘अविद्याकल्पिता माया परमेश्वराश्रया’—this statement is correct.

3. *Question/doubt* : वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा—page 219, वार्तिककार has said : अविद्या हि स्वाभाविकी...एवं च स्वाभाविक्येवेयमाविद्या आगन्तुकेन ज्ञानेन निवर्त्यते .. । But Sri Shankara has said in *बृह-Upanisad-Bhashya-4/3/20* that ‘सा च अविद्या न आत्मनः स्वाभाविको धर्मः etc. at the end ..‘आगन्तुकत्वं ततो विमोक्ष उपपद्यते’ (आभास-भाष्यम्) ।

Please clearly explain whether *avidya* is स्वाभाविकी or not.

*Answer* : अविद्या नैसर्गिकी । अध्यासभाष्ये—‘एवं अयं

अनादि अनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासः' इति । जीवाश्रया अविद्या स्वाभाविकी इत्यर्थः । अविद्या न केनचित् कृता, इत्यर्थः । न मूलाविद्या कार्या इत्यर्थः ।

In *Briha-Bhashya-4/3/20*—'सा च अविद्या न आत्मनः स्वाभाविको धर्मः' इत्यत्र आत्मनः इत्यस्य परमात्मनः इत्यर्थः, सर्वात्मभावं गतस्य आत्मनः इत्यर्थः । Hence there is no contradiction here.

4. *Question/doubt* : "कस्याविद्येति, जीवानामिति ब्रूमः । ननु न जीवो ब्रह्मणो भिद्यते । सत्यं परमार्थतः । कल्पनया तु भिद्यन्ते । कस्य पुनः कल्पनाभेदिका ? न तावद् ब्रह्मणः । तस्य विद्यात्मनः कल्पनाशून्यत्वात् । नापि जीवानाम् । कल्पनायाः प्राक् तदभावात् । इतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसङ्गात् कल्पनाधीनो हि जीव विभागः जीवाश्रयाकल्पनेति"—What will be the actual solution of this problem ?

( अत्र केचिदाहूः—'अनादित्वादुभयोरविद्याजीवयोः बीजाङ्कुर-संतानयोरिव नेतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसङ्गः—Is this statement logical ? )

*Answer* : सर्वत्र भ्रान्तिस्थले कल्पना कल्पितं वस्तु च सहैव अनुमूयेते । मायानिर्मितधेनुतद्वत्सयोरिव युगपदेवोभयोरपि प्रतिभाससंभवात् । प्रथमं कल्पना अनन्तरं कल्पितं वस्तु इति वा

प्रथमं कल्पितं वस्तु अनन्तरं कल्पना इति वा न कस्यापि अनुभवो वर्तते ।

अध्यासरूपाविद्यायाः पूर्वं कालो वा देशो वा कार्यकारणं वा किमपि नास्ति । इतरेतराविवेकेन अध्यासः इति भाष्यकारैरेव प्रतिपादितम् । तस्मात् अविद्या पूर्वा वा तदाश्रयो जीवः पूर्वो वा ? इति प्रश्न एव असाधुः । सहैव भ्रान्तिरुत्पद्यते ।

5. *Question/doubt* : I cannot fully understand the significance of the sentence ; “अविद्या हि सर्व-व्यवहारप्रयोजिका सर्वोऽपि व्यवहारोऽविद्यैव अप्रविहायाविद्या-व्यवहारमपीति स्थिते किं कुत्र चोद्यते ? (वेदान्तप्रक्रिया-प्रत्यभिज्ञा—page 187. )

*Answer* : सर्वो व्यवहारः “इयं अविद्या” इति व्यवहारोऽपि अविद्यापुरःसर एव । भ्रान्तिपूर्वक एव इत्यर्थः ।

अविद्या पूर्वा वा जीवः पूर्वो वा इति व्यवहारोऽपि अविद्या-पुरःसर एव इत्यर्थः ।

एतेन इतरेतराश्रयत्वप्रसञ्जनम् अनादित्वकल्पनम् प्रत्युक्तं भवति ।

6. *Question/doubt* : In the example of rope-snake whether the knowledge of rope is first necessary to destroy the knowledge of snake or whether

by negation of snake, उदकधारा etc., (अविद्याध्यस्त सर्पादिप्रत्याख्यानेन) रज्जुस्वरूपविज्ञानम् भवति । This is the doubt which has arisen in my mind.

*Answer :* अस्य अनर्थहेतोरध्यासस्य प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्व-विद्या प्रतिपत्तये इति भाष्यकारैरुक्तम् ।

*Adyasa* means भ्रान्तिज्ञानं ।

भ्रान्तिज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाध्यते इत्येतत् सर्वानुभवसिद्धं तथैव भ्रान्तिकल्पितमपि ज्ञानेन बाध्यते इत्येतदपि सर्वानुभवसिद्धम् । यथा शुक्तौ रजतज्ञानं भ्रान्तिज्ञानं तत्तु शुक्तिज्ञानेन बाध्यते, तथैव भ्रान्तिकल्पितरजतमपि बाध्यते । तथा ब्रह्मणि कल्पितं प्रपञ्चज्ञानं कल्पित प्रपञ्चश्च ब्रह्मज्ञानेन बाध्यते, इत्यर्थः ।

अध्यासे बाधिते, ब्रह्मणः स्वात्मस्वरूपत्वात् स्वयमेव ज्ञानं उत्पद्यते इत्यर्थः । ज्ञानोत्पत्तौ प्रयत्नः नावश्यकः किन्तु अध्यास निवर्हण एव प्रयत्नः आवश्यकः इत्यर्थः ।

The realisation of the nature of the rope generates automatically after negating the wrong notion such as snake etc. Similarly in the case of Self-knowledge, it is necessary to remove only the false identification with the not-selves, as *Atman* is self-established. If the nature of not-self which is superimposed on

*Atman* or misconceived in *Atman* is removed, then it means that the knowledge of non-dual *Atman* will dawn by itself.

7. *Question/doubt* : I cannot fully understand the significance of the *Bhashya* statement “रज्जु-स्वरूपप्रकाशनेन एव हि तत्स्वरूपविज्ञानम् अविद्याध्यस्तसर्पादि प्रपञ्चप्रविलयश्च भवति ।” ( S. Bh-3/2/21 ).

*Answer* : ‘विलयणम्’ is explained in two ways :

In the first way :

Matter is indestructible—अग्निसम्बन्धेन घृतकाठिण्यं विलीयते द्रवरूपेण घृतं वर्तते । काठिण्यं नश्यति । एवं प्रपञ्च-नाशे प्रकृतिरूपेण प्रपञ्च वर्तते एव, इति भवति अस्मिन् पक्षे ।

In the second way :

रज्जौ सर्पः कदापि नासीत् । आसीदिति बुद्धिरेव केवला । रज्जुज्ञानेन यदा सर्पो बाध्यते तदा सर्प नासीत् नास्ति न भविष्यति इति ज्ञानं उत्पद्यते ।

तथैव यदा ब्रह्मज्ञानेन व्यक्ताव्यक्तात्मकः अविद्याकल्पितः प्रपञ्चः बाध्यते तदा सकारणः प्रपञ्चः नासीत् नास्ति न भविष्यति इति ज्ञानं उत्पद्यते ।

If the world is an effect of an indescribable



matter such as *moolavidya*, it can change only in the form. It must exist in the form of *moolavidya*. Then there is no question of *advaita*

If the world is concocted by ignorance (अध्यास) then the knowledge can stultify it completely. Then *advaita* becomes real.

8. *Question/doubt* : It has been said that 'मिथ्याज्ञानं or अध्यास or अविद्या... जातमात्रस्य प्राणिनो मनोधर्मः । It has also been said that अध्यास or अविद्या अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरेव... । Is अध्यास generated from मनः (mind) ? If so, how can it be said that mind is the product of food ? Clearly explain whether mind is the product of *adhyasa* or *Adhyasa* is the product of mind or mind is same as *adhyasa*. If mind be the product of world or primordial matter, then how *maya* or *prakriti* will be *avidyakalpita* ?

*Answer* : Which comes prior—'avidya' or 'mind' ? To raise such a question is either futile or irrelevant.

*Bhashyakara* has said, अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिन्

तद्बुद्धिः । इति अनुभवरूपाध्यासः सर्वप्राणिसाधारणः  
भाष्यकारैः (Su. Bh-1/1/5) 'दृश्यते चात्मन एव सतो देहादि-  
संघाते अनात्मनि आत्मत्वाभिनिवेशो मिथ्याबुद्धिमात्रेण पूर्व-  
पूर्वेण' —इत्येतद्वाक्येन एतत् सूचितम् ।

The post-Shankara vedantins say *buddhi* (बुद्धिः) is a mental form. For the existence of mind there must be a body. For the existence of body, the five elements must exist. For the existence of five elements, there must be some one as their material cause. That cause is *moolavidya*. So first is *moolavidya*, then comes *avidya* or *adhyasa* (misconception). This process is necessary for the real evolution of matter.

According to Shankara, the order of evolution is fixed and immutable—first, *avidya* or ignorance then, intellection. He says, all human dealings start with misconception at first. First is *avidya* and then come the body, mind and the world etc. In experience also *Atman* is first identified with body, mind etc., and becomes *Jeeva*. Due to this *avidya* one

mistakes himself as an individual. Afterwards comes the question of time space and causality. Before *adhyasa*, there is no time, no space, no causality. Nothing exists except the Real *Atman*. From the stand point of this witnessing principle, there is no cause and effect etc. All the notions of cause and effect etc., are in *avidya* i.e., in the Me-notion (individual soul). This me-notion is called *avidya* and that which is concocted by it is called *maya*. In all concoctions, whatever is necessary for concoctions all come simultaneously. So *Jeeva*, mind, concoction, body etc., come simultaneously. Such doubts like—अविद्या पूर्वा वा मनो पूर्वा वा (whether *avidya* or *adhyasa* comes first or whether mind comes first) have no place here. First is *adhyasa* or *avidya* (ignorance), and then comes other *vyavahara*. Causation cannot precede ignorance, since it presupposes intellection. Sankara has clearly said in his introduction to *Vedanta-mimansa* that *avidya* or the mutual superimposition of the Self and the not-self is the

presupposition of all *vyavaharas* including causation.

9. *Question/doubt* : It has been said that “तच्चा-  
न्तःकरणं मनआदिशब्दैरभिधीयमानमवस्यमस्तीत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् ।  
अन्यथा नित्योपलब्धिर्नुपलब्धिर्वा प्रसज्येतेति शारीरके सूत्रयिष्यते  
(S. Bh-2/3/32)—What is meant by this state-  
ment ?

*Answer* : In addition to senses, pranas etc.,  
the inner organ (mind) must be admitted to  
exist as otherwise we should be driven to the  
repugnant conclusion of having to face eternal  
perception or eternal non-perception.

10. *Question/doubt* : I cannot understand the  
significance of the statement “तत्त्वज्ञानेन अविद्या-  
निवृत्तौ न कोऽपि दृष्टान्तः” of *Moolavidya-Bhashya-Vartika*  
*Biruddha* (page-97) Please clearly explain this.

*Answer* : The sub-commentators (*Moolavidya-  
vadins*) have said माया & अविद्या are one and the  
same. माया or मूलाविद्या is an indescribable matter  
and also it is a material cause of *adhyasa* (*avidya*)  
that is, misunderstanding of *Atman* for body and  
vice versa. Now the quotation ‘तत्त्वज्ञानेन अविद्या-

निवृत्तौ न कोऽपि दृष्टान्त ( of मूलाविद्या निरासः ) means :  
 the knowledge sublates mistaken knowledge.  
 It never sublates a thing which is *anadi* and is  
 called *avidya*. It can sublimate a thing if it is  
 concocted by ignorance. This *maya* or मूलाविद्या  
 cannot be concocted as (according to them) it  
 is the material cause of concoction. But *mool-*  
*vidya* as a figment of *adhyasa* can never be put  
 before the latter as its cause. The sub-commen-  
 tators give the rope-snake as an example. They  
 say, the rope-snake is born out at the time of  
 mistake. It is a matter. It is destroyed by  
 knowledge as it is called by the name of *avidya*.  
 So माया or अविद्या can be destroyed by know-  
 ledge. It is opposed to Shankara's statement.  
 In *Sutra-4/1/5 Bhashya*, Shankara says, "प्रत्येत्येव हि  
 केवलं रजतमिति न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति"—one only mistakes  
 it as silver. It is only a wrong notion. There  
 is no silver there.

Therefore, there is no example (दृष्टान्त) for a  
 matter sublated by knowledge. Shankara says,



“ज्ञानं तु ज्ञापकं न कारकमिति” (बृहभाष्य-1/4/10). If one says that knowledge can sublate a matter as it is named as *avidya*—it is not possible. Knowledge brings it into light as it is. Knowledge does not destroy a thing whether it is describable or indescribable, dependent or independent matter.

*11. Question/doubt :* It has been said that अविद्या or अध्यास is beginningless and endless. Is it possible to destroy अविद्या or अध्यास which is अनादि and अनन्त ?

Clearly explain this.

*Answer :* The words ‘नाश’ and ‘बाध’ have got different meanings.

*Nasa* ( ‘नाश’ ) means destruction of a thing which exists in time and space. The destruction of a matter means change of form of it. It is said in physical science “Matter is indestructible.” If a pot is destroyed, it becomes mud. Similarly if you say—the world is destroyed, it means that it has become one with its material

cause. It leads to *Dvaita*—spirit and matter.

*Badha* (‘बाध’) means stultification (falsification) of concoction and the matter concocted. The world is concocted by *adhyasa*. See *Bhagavad-geeta-Bhashya-13/26*, भाष्ये—अयं अध्यासरूपः संयोगः मिथ्याज्ञानलक्षणः । अध्यासात् जगत् जायते इत्युक्तम् ।

When *adhyasa* is stultified by real knowledge the concocted world as well as the concoction including time, space and causality are all stultified. The world is like a thing seen in dream etc. It is the process of the mind.

So even though *adhyasa* is beginningless and endless in view of time and space i.e. in view of *avidya*, it can be stultified by real knowledge as it is a concoction and not a matter which really exists. For *adhyasa* there is no नाश (destruction), but there is बाध (removal of false identification with the not-self). A concocted thing may be understood as beginningless and endless, but it may be stultified as it has no real existence. Sri Shankara defines *maya*

as that which does not exist.

12. *Question/doubt* : किंकृतेयमविद्या ? न हि कारणान्तरमस्ति येन स्वप्नादिवदागन्तुकी स्यादविद्या शुद्धब्रह्मसंसर्गिणी । कारणान्तराभ्युपगमे च द्वैतवादप्रसङ्गः । नैसर्गिकी त्वविद्या ब्रुवाणस्य कथमस्याः प्रहाणमुपपद्यते, न हि नैसर्गिक्याः समुच्छित्तिरवकल्पते । अविद्याप्रहाणिश्च कीदृशी ? किमविद्यारूपीण्येव, किं वा विलक्षणा ? यद्यविद्यारूपीण्येव न तर्हि तस्याः प्रहाणिः । विलक्षणा चेत् तस्यां परमार्थप्रसङ्ग इति सिद्धान्तहानिः स्यात्— इति चेत् ?

*Answer* : अध्यासरूपाविद्या अनादिः अनन्तश्च इयं न कालकृता तथापि ज्ञानबाध्यः । कालसहिता नासीत् नास्ति न भविष्यति इति बाध्यते । इयम् प्रमात्राश्रिता, न शुद्धब्रह्माश्रिता । न केनापिकृता अविचारसिद्धा । आत्मानात्मनोरविवेकसिद्धा विवेकेन बाध्या । अविवेकवृत्तिः अविद्या, विवेकवृत्तिः विद्या । विद्याविरोधित्वात् बाध्यते । शुक्तिरजतभ्रान्तिः शुक्तिज्ञानेन यथा बाध्यते तथा ब्रह्मात्मज्ञानेन इयं बाध्यते ।

अविवेकनिमित्त स्वरूपिणी । इयं न वस्तुभूता । नैसर्गिकीत्युक्ते अविचार सिद्धा इत्यर्थः । तस्मात् अद्वैतहानिः न सम्भवति । तस्याः भ्रान्तिरूपत्वात् न वस्तुत्वापत्तिः अतएव न द्वैतापत्तिः ।

13. *Question/doubt* : भाष्यकारैरनादेरन्तवत्त्वं न्याय-

विरुद्धमिति गीताभाष्ये (G-Bh-13/2) उक्तम् । किञ्च जनिमतो नाशो दृष्टः । But Sri Shankara said in *Adhyasa Bhashya* that 'एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो...प्रहानं आत्मैकत्वविद्यया' इति । So how can अनादिरनन्तोऽध्यासः be destroyed by विद्या ? How is it possible ?

*Answer :* अध्यासः अनादिः अनन्तः । कालात्पूर्वमेव अध्यासस्य सिद्धत्वात् । यावत्कालस्थितिः तावदध्यासस्य सत्त्वम् । कालदेशकार्यकारणव्यवहारः अध्यासानन्तरं सम्भवति । अध्यास is beginningless and endless but it can be stultified by correct knowledge of *Atman* as it is a concoction and not a thing.

*Adhyasa* cannot be destroyed in time, but it can be nullified by real knowledge of *Atman*. 'नाश' is an action in time, but 'बाध' is psychic. अध्यासस्य कालकृत नाशो नास्ति । किन्तु सम्यग्ज्ञानकृत बाधो भवति ।

14. *Question/doubt :* अध्यासस्यानादित्वम् अनन्तत्वञ्च प्रवाह्यतः—Is this statement of post-Shankara *advaitins* correct ? If not, why ?

*Answer :* अध्यासस्य अनादित्वं अनन्तवत्त्वञ्च न प्रवाह्यतः,

किन्तु वस्तुत एव ।

गङ्गाप्रवाहः गच्छति । स एव प्रवाह भ्रान्तिरेव । अध्यासस्य तथा न भवति । कदा अध्यासः प्रवृत्तः कदा निवृत्तो भवति इति ज्ञातुं वक्तुञ्च न कोऽपि समर्थः । *Adhyasa* cannot be explained by reason, because reason comes after *adhyasa*. Time, space and causality come after *adhyasa*. So it cannot be ascertained that this misconception ( अध्यासः ) first manifested at such and such a time and this will end at such and such a time. This misconception without desiderating any cause manifests itself in all people quite naturally.

अध्यासेन प्रमाता भवति । अध्यासभाष्ये—देहेन्द्रियादिषु अहं ममाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तेः । प्रमातृत्व प्राप्ति-कारणभूतस्य अध्यासस्य सादित्वं अनादित्वं वा पश्चात्भूतः प्रमाता कथं जानीयात् ?

The sub-commentators have twisted the meaning as *pravahathah* (प्रवाहतः). They say that *adhyasa* is कार्य ( *Karyaavidya* ) and its material cause is *moolavidya*. It is wrong. Because to say *adhyasa* is कार्य, one must be *adhyastha* (अध्यस्त),



i.e., one should first become individualized, due to *adhyasa*. Moreover, *adhyasa* does not require any material cause for its occurrence, since it is only a form of ignorance, which is in the experience of all.

So *adhyasasya* कार्यत्वम् मूलाविद्यायाः कारणत्वम् प्रदर्शयितुं न कोऽपि समर्थः । मूलाविद्या अध्यासोपादानकारणं इति वक्तुं अध्यस्तेन भवितव्यम् । तस्मात् अध्यासः अनादिः अनन्तः तथापि ज्ञानबाध्यः इति भाष्यवचनमेव साधुः ।

15. *Question/doubt* : What are कार्याध्यासः and कारणाध्यासः ? Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji Maharaj clearly said in his शङ्करवेदान्त-मीमांसाभाष्यम् (page 48) that “सोऽयमध्यासो द्विप्रकारः” इत्यादि । Please clearly expl in this also.

*Answer* : Doubtful knowledge of the Reality ( संशयज्ञानम् ), not knowing the Reality (ज्ञानाभावः अग्रहणात्मको वा) and misunderstanding the Reality (मिथ्याज्ञानम्) are *avidya* according to Shankara (See बृहभाष्य-3/3/1 and G. Bh-13/2). Mistaking one thing for the other is the result of not knowing the real nature of that thing. For

example, if one knows the rope as it is, he cannot mistake it for a snake. In this sense, 'not knowing' the real nature of something is the cause for knowing it otherwise. So कारणाध्यासः तत्त्वाग्रहणं ( not knowing the real nature of a thing ) कार्याध्यासः मिथ्याज्ञानं (misunderstanding the real nature of the thing) इति भवेत् ।

The cause is not-knowing the real nature of *Atman*—the substratum upon which the phenomenon of the body, mind and senses is superimposed. Thus, first there is 'not-knowing' the Reality as the cause, out of which 'misunderstanding' of the Reality i.e., the effect arises.

'सोऽयम् अध्यासः द्विप्रकारः'—(शङ्करवेदान्तमीमांसाभाष्यम्)—  
ब्रह्मणि कारणत्वम् प्रपञ्चे कार्यत्वम् च अध्यस्तमिति अभिप्रायः  
स्यात् इति मन्ये तत्पुस्तकं मम निकटे नास्ति ।

16. *Question/doubt* : It has been said in मूलाविद्याभाष्यवार्तिकविरुद्धा (Page 35) that अध्यासस्य कारणं तत्त्वाग्रहणमेव । रज्जुतत्त्वस्याग्रहणम् is निमित्तकारणं उपादान-

कारणं च of सर्प, उदकधारा, दण्ड इति । Again it has been said in page 105 of the same book that जगत्कारणं अद्वितीयं ब्रह्मैव । एतादृशं ब्रह्मैव उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च । Then it is apparent that निर्गुणं अद्वितीयं ब्रह्म is same as 'तत्त्वाग्रहणम्' something—Is it correct ?

*Answer :* अग्रहणे सति अन्यथाग्रहणं स्यात् । असति च अग्रहणे अन्यथाग्रहणं न स्यात् । यथा रज्ज्वग्रहणे सर्पग्रहणं भवति । रज्जुग्रहणे सर्पग्रहणं न भवति । तस्मात् रज्ज्वग्रहणमेव सर्पग्रहणस्य उपादान कारणं निमित्तकारणं च नान्यत्कारणं विद्यते इत्यर्थः । अन्यस्य कारणस्य अभावात् इदमेव अपेक्षित सर्वविधकारणं इत्यर्थः ।

सर्वत्र कल्पितस्थले अधिष्ठानमेव कल्पितवस्तु<sup>र्जः</sup> उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणञ्च इति प्रतिपाद्यते । अन्यत्कारणस्य अभावादेव । यथा ब्रह्मणि जगत् कल्पितं इत्येतत् स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारात् संप्रसादे प्रपञ्चपरित्यागात् प्रसाधितम् । (See S. Bh—2/1/6). कल्पितस्य प्रपञ्चस्य आस्पदभूत ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तकारणस्य असम्भवत्वेन ब्रह्मैव उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणञ्च इत्येतत् प्रतिपादितम् । न तु मृदादिवत् यत् परिणामि, तदेव उपादानकारणं इत्यर्थेन ।

According to *advaita*, *Brahman* is misunder-

stood as the world on account of *adhyasa* or *avidya*. Therefore, there is only one Reality and no other. But when the *advaita* is obliged to speak in terms of cause and effect, he would say that since *Brahman* is the only Reality without anything second to it, it must be admitted that *Brahman* alone is both the material and efficient cause of the world. But does *Brahman* transform itself into the world as milk is transformed into curds? No, because, *Brahman* is beyond change. It is described as immutable. There exists no cause and effect relationship between *Brahman* and the world, although *Brahman* is said to be the material and efficient cause of the world. To make this paradox intelligible, the example of the serpent "born" out of a rope in semi-darkness is given. The rope is mistaken to be a serpent, which is an instance of misapprehension of the reality. The rope is not the evolutionary cause of snake. The rope has not changed into the snake. But without the rope there would not have been

any idea of snake. It is the substratum on which the imaginary snake is superimposed by the perceiver on account of illusion. Once the rope is seen as rope the snake disappears—it is realised that there is only the rope and the snake has never been created. Similarly on realising the *Atman* or *Brahman* as one's own Self, the world concocted in *Brahman* by *avidya* disappears and there remains *Brahman* alone shining by itself as the Eternal Reality.

17. *Question/doubt*: It has been said in मूला-विद्याभाष्यवार्तिकविरुद्धा that 'जगत्कारणं शुद्धं निष्क्रियम् अद्वितीयं ब्रह्मैव...उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च ।' But Sri Shankara said in his *Sutra Bhashya*-2/1/14—'अविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरः भवति । स च अविद्या-कल्पित संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूतम् ।

How can it be said that निर्गुणब्रह्मैव जगतः उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च ?'

*Answer*: The whole world whether it is manifested or unmanifested is concocted by *adhyasa* in the Reality ( ब्रह्म ). Therefore, *Brahman*



is said to be the material as well as the instrumental cause of the universe. Regarding concocted things the आस्पद ( substratum ) is both the material and instrumental cause.

जगत् अध्यासरूपाविद्यया ब्रह्मणि कल्पितम् । कल्पितं वस्तु परमार्थतो नास्ति एव । अतः ब्रह्मणः कारणत्वमपि कल्पितमेव । यथा कल्पितस्य रज्जुसर्पस्य उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च रज्जुरेव तथैव कल्पितस्य जगतः आस्पदभूतं शुद्धं ब्रह्मैव उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च । जगतः अध्यासकल्पितत्वात् शुद्धब्रह्मकारणत्वेऽपि न कोऽपि दोषः प्रसज्यते कल्पितत्वस्य अभावात् ।

In *Sutra Bhashya*-2/1/14—‘व्यवहार विषये’—it is said नामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरः । कार्यकरणसङ्घातानुरोधिणः जीवाख्यान् विज्ञानात्मनः प्रतीष्टे व्यवहारविषये इत्युक्तम् । कार्यभूतं जगत् अनुभूयते, तस्यादस्त्येव, तस्यकारणमपि वक्तव्यम् इति वक्तृणां अविद्यावतां समाधानार्थं तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीया ईश्वरशक्तिरूपा अविद्याकल्पिता ‘माया’ जगतः कारणमित्युक्तं भाष्यकारैः । एतन्मूलकमेव ब्रह्म कारणादि सर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते ।

The first (i.e., निर्गुणब्रह्मैव जगतः कारणम् ) is a fact. The second (i.e., *maya upadhi Ishwara* जगतः कारणम् ) is a belief of *adhyastapurasaah*. There-

fore, there is no contradiction at all in stating this fact.

*18. Question/doubt :* What is विवर्तवादः ? Did Shankara say anything about विवर्तवादः in his *Bhashyas* ?

*Answer :* According to Shankara ब्रह्मैव जगदुपादानकारणम् । सूत्रभाष्य-1/4/23—‘प्रकृतिश्च’=उपादानकारणञ्च निमित्तकारणं च ब्रह्मैव । छान्दोग्य—‘सर्वाणि ह्येवा इमानि भूतानि आकाशादेव समुत्पद्यन्ते । आकाशं प्रत्यस्तं यन्ति ।’ ( छा-1/9/1 ).

अध्यासेन ब्रह्मणि जगत्कल्पितम् । कल्पितस्य वस्तुनः कल्पनाया आस्पदभूतं शुद्धं अद्वितीयं ब्रह्मैव उपादानकारणं निमित्तकारणं च इत्यर्थः ।

कल्पितं वस्तु परमार्थतो नास्ति एव । अतः ब्रह्मणः कारणत्वमपि कल्पितमेव । अध्यासेन ब्रह्मैव अविद्यावताम् जगद्रूपेण भासते, इत्यर्थः ।

विवर्तकारणं नाम स्वस्वरूपे विकारं विना अध्यासेन अन्यथा प्रतिभासनम् विवर्तः । ‘*Maya-Satkaryavada*,—(illusory existence of the effect in the cause) is the accepted view of *advaita vedantins*, ब्रह्मणः निरवयवत्वात् निर्विकारित्वाच्च ।

19. *Question/doubt* : Did Shankara mention 'about प्रातिभासिक सत्ता' in his *Bhashyas* ? If not, why ?

*Answer* : Shankara did not think of प्रातिभासिक सत्ता or व्यावहारिक सत्ता । He has mentioned in *Sutra-Bhashya-2/1/6*—'एकं च पुनः सत्त्वम्' इति ।—There is only one *Satta*. सत्तात्रयाङ्गीकारः भाष्यविरुद्धः । भ्रान्ताः जगतः सत्त्वं पश्यन्ति । तत्र सत्त्वं नास्ति । यदि सत्त्वं स्यात् विद्यावद्भिरपि दृष्टं स्यात् । नैव ते ब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तं किञ्चन वस्त्वन्तरं पश्यन्ति । See माण्डूक्य-कारिका-2/5—स्वप्नजागरितस्थाने ह्येकमाहुर्मनीषिणः and माण्डूक्य-कारिका-1/17—'प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत...' । किञ्च भाष्यकारैरेव गीताभाष्ये (13/26)—'क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मितहस्तिहर्म्यादिवत् स्वप्नदृष्टवस्तुवत् गन्धर्वनगरादिवत् असदेव सदिव अवभासते', इति उद्घोषितम् । तादृश प्रपञ्चस्य व्यावहारिकसत्यत्ववचनं वर्तते किम् ? सर्वथा नास्ति । अतः प्रपञ्चस्य व्यावहारिक सत्त्वम् नास्ति । यद्यङ्गीक्रियते तस्य मिथ्यात्वं कथं वक्तुं शक्यते ? तथैव शुक्ति-कारजतस्य प्रातिभासिक सत्यत्वम् नास्ति । प्रत्येत्येव हि केवलं रजतमिति ( रजतज्ञानमेव केवलं ) न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति (=सत्ता विद्यते) [See *Sutra-Bhashya-4/1/5*].

व्याख्यातृभिः स्वाभ्यूहमात्रलब्धशरीरायाः मूलाविद्यायाः ज्ञान-बाध्यत्वोपपत्तिप्रदर्शनार्थं दृष्टान्तत्वेन प्रातिभासिकरजतादुक्त-

पत्तिविनाशौ परिकल्पितावेतौ ।

गौः काः भाः-2/32-‘न हि मनोविकल्पानाया रज्जुसर्पादि-  
लक्षणायाः रज्ज्वां प्रलय उत्पत्तिर्वा’-इत्यत्र अनिर्वचनीयवस्तुत्-  
पत्ति-निषिद्धा ।

20. *Question/doubt* : (a) What is ब्रह्माकारावृत्ति ?  
Can अविद्या be destroyed by it ? Did Shankara  
mention about this वृत्ति in his *Bhashyas* ?

(b) “शुक्तिज्ञानं तदज्ञानं निवर्तयतीत्यत्र बुद्धिवृत्तिज्ञानम् ।  
तन्निर्वर्त्यं तु शुक्तिरजतकारणमज्ञानम् । ब्रह्मज्ञानमज्ञानं निवर्तय-  
तीत्यत्रापि ब्रह्माकारा बुद्धिवृत्तिरेव ज्ञानम् ।”—Is this state-  
ment of sub-commentators correct ? Please  
clearly explain this.

*Answer* : (a) *Sutra-Bhashya-4/1/3*—“पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्व-  
भोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं  
ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ताभोक्ता वा अहमासम् नेदानीं नापि  
भविष्यत् काले इति ब्रह्मविद्वगच्छति ।” ‘The knower of  
*Brahman* conclusively knows thus : as opposed  
to the nature of being a doer and experiencer  
of the fruit of actions known to me previously,  
I am that *Brahman* which is really no doer or  
experiencer in its nature in all the three divi-

sions of time. I was never a doer or experiencer ever before this, nor am I such now, nor shall I be such even in the future time'—इदं तु ब्रह्मज्ञान-स्वरूपम् ।

If you mean *avidya* (—to take *Atman* for the body and body for *Atman* ) as a mistaken knowledge, surely it will be stultified or sublated by the knowledge of *Brahman*. If you mean *avidya* as an indescribable matter as sub-commentators say, it will never be destroyed by knowledge. If you call your sister as *Maya*, can she be destroyed by knowledge? Certainly not. Knowledge can never destroy a thing whether it is describable or indescribable. It brings it into light as it is.

Shankara did not mention 'ब्रह्माकारा वृत्ति' in his *Bhashyas*. ब्रह्म has no form or *akara* ( आकार ). Therefore ब्रह्माकारा वृत्ति is not possible, : ब्रह्मणः निराकारत्वात् । *Brahman* cannot be attributed with any qualities known to human mind. Because qualities are objects and *Brahman* is always the



subject and the knower of the objects. This *Brahman* has to be intuited as one's own Self by negating all the superimpositions and not by pursuing it as if it is a phenomenal object. The *Shastras* establish *Brahman* by merely eliminating the distinctions concocted in It by ignorance. It cannot be established in any other manner.

(b) “शुक्तिरजतज्ञानं...बुद्धिवृत्तिमात्रम्”—इदं समीचीनम् । अन्तःकरणस्य सम्यग्बुद्धिरेव ज्ञानम् । तत् भ्रान्तिरूपं अज्ञानं नाशयति ।

‘तन्निवर्त्य’ तु शुक्तिकारजतकारणमज्ञानम्—अत्र शुक्तिकारजतज्ञानकारणं अज्ञानम् शुक्तिकाज्ञानाभाव एव, न तु मूलाविद्याशक्तिः । अध्यासभाष्ये—इतरेतराविवेकेन अध्यस्य इत्युक्तम् । माण्डूक्यकारिकाभाष्ये (2/17)—“यथा लोके स्वेनरूपेण अनिश्चिता रज्जुः मन्दान्धकारे सर्पः उदकधारा दण्ड इति अनेकधा विकल्पिता भवति पूर्वं स्वरूपानिश्चयनिमित्तम्... एवं स्वेन विशुद्धविज्ञप्तिमात्रसत्त्वाद्वयरूपेण अनिश्चितत्वात् जीव प्राणाद्यनन्तभावभेदैः आत्मा विकल्पितः इत्येष सर्वोपनिषदाम् सिद्धान्तः” इति भाष्यकारैरुक्तम् ।

गीताभाष्येऽपि (G. Bh—13/26) “क्षेत्र क्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवे-

काभावनिवन्धनः अध्यासः” इत्युक्तम् । In all these *Bhashyas* ‘not knowing’ the reality is the cause of knowing it otherwise (अध्यासस्य तत्त्वज्ञानाभाव एव प्रतिपत्तिक्रमेण कारणम् यथा रज्ज्वज्ञाने एव सर्पज्ञानं संभवति तद्वत् ) It is absurd to say that misunderstanding requires some material cause for its birth.

21. *Question/doubt* : “निर्गुणब्रह्म न तु अज्ञाननाशकम्, किन्तु अज्ञानस्य भासकम्—Is this statement of विवरणप्रस्थानम् correct ? Explain this clearly.

*Answer* : “निर्गुणब्रह्म सर्वस्य भासकम् न तु अज्ञान-नाशकम्” इतीदं समञ्जसम् । निर्गुणब्रह्मज्ञानं तु अज्ञाननाशकम् । सगुणब्रह्मज्ञानन्तु अविद्यावतामेव उत्पद्यते । यदा अहमिति देहादिषु अध्यासः, तदेव सगुणब्रह्मज्ञानं उत्पद्यते । तस्मात् निर्गुणब्रह्मैवाहम् इति अनुभवरूपं ज्ञानमेव अनुभवारूढस्याज्ञानस्य बाधकं भवति ।

22. *Question/doubt* : It has been said that विद्या is the destroyer of अविद्या । Now the doubt is whether this विद्या is अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरूपा or anything else ?

*Answer* : विद्या यथार्थज्ञानरूपा अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरेव । गीता-

भाष्ये (2/21)—“यथा बुद्ध्याद्याहृतस्य शब्दाद्यर्थस्य अविक्रिय एव सन् बुद्धिवृत्त्या अविवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्यया ‘उपलब्धा’ आत्मा कल्प्यते । एवमेव आत्मानात्मविवेकज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या विद्यया असत्यरूपयैव परमार्थतः अविक्रिय एव आत्मा ‘विद्वान्’ उच्यते”—‘In the same way as *Atman* is presumed to be the ‘knower’ of objects like sound etc. which are conveyed by intellect etc., because of *avidya* or the modification of the mind of the nature of non-discriminating knowledge, *Atman* himself which is really changless is called “the wise one” because of the modification of the mind, which is unreal likewise, viz knowledge discriminating the Self and the non-self.’

This *Brahmavidya* ( ब्रह्मविद्या ) is a correct knowledge or *vritti* of *antahkarana*. Real knowledge and misunderstanding—both are *antahkarana vrittayah* (अन्तःकरणवृत्तयः). Both are opposed to each other. Therefore, if correct knowledge (*vidya*) comes, *avidya* cannot stay there at the same time and the same place. Therefore knowledge sublates ignorance. According to sub-commentators, *avidya* exists in *Brahman* and

knowledge comes to *Jeeva*. How can knowledge which arises in *Jeeva* sublate *avidya* which exists in *Brahman* ?

23. *Question/doubt* : अविद्या ( mistaken knowledge ) is sublated by विद्या ( knowledge ). Now three types of knowledge are encountered :

- i) ज्ञानम्-वेदनम् ( अन्तःकरणवृत्तिः )
- ii) ज्ञानम्-चैतन्यस्वरूपम् ।
- iii) ज्ञानम्-अनुभवः ।

Which type of knowledge is necessary for the sublation of अविद्या ?

You have said, अन्तःकरणस्य सम्यग्वृत्तिरेव ज्ञानम् तत् भ्रान्तिरूपं अज्ञानम् नाशयति । Elsewhere you have said—निगुणब्रह्मैवाहम् इति अनुभवरूपं ज्ञानमेव अनुभवारूढस्याज्ञानस्य बाधकं भवति । Please clearly explain whether *Jnana* ( विद्या ) is अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरूपा or whether it is अवगति or अनुभवरूपा ।

*Answer* : See सूत्रभाष्य-4/1/14.

“पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम् नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काले, इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति”—

इदन्तु ब्रह्मज्ञानस्वरूपम् ।

ज्ञानं अन्तःकरणस्य सम्यग्बृत्तिरेव । सा बृत्तिः अनुभवावसानरूपा । अनुभवस्तु ब्रह्मैवाहमस्मि इति । एतादृशानुभवावसानरूपज्ञानेन अध्यासरूपाज्ञाने बाधिते अनृतरूपमन्तःकरणमपि ब्रह्मैव भवति । एतदेवानुभवरूपं ज्ञानम् ।

Mind cannot objectify *Brahman*. It can know him only by intuition, when it is merged in him. ( गौडपादकारिका-3/32 ).

Every thing other than *Brahman* is concocted by *avidya* ( अध्यास ). When *adhyasa* is sublated by the real knowledge of *Brahman* as 'I am *Brahman*,' then everything must disappear.

First the *Jnana* ( knowledge of *Brahman* ) is a modification of the mind then it has to culminate in a final intuition and relates to an already existing entity ('Self evident' 'Existential Truth') i.e., finally it becomes *Brahman*. *Brahma-jnana* begins as बृत्ति of mind but it culminates in experience i.e., in the intuition of Reality. Hence there is no contradiction.

Shankaracharya also has said this :



“यथा अद्वैतज्ञानं मनोवृत्तिमात्रम् ।”—(Chandogya Bhashya Avataranika ), “ननु ज्ञानं नाम मानसीक्रिया... मानसत्वेऽपि ज्ञानस्य महद्वैलक्षण्यम्” ( S. Bh-1/1/4 ), “आत्मानात्मविवेकज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या विद्यया असत्यरूपयैव”—(Gita-Bh-2/21), “अनुभवावसानत्वात् ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य”—(S. Bh-1/1/2), “अनुभवारूढमेव विद्याफलम्”—(S. Bh-3/2/18), “अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम्”—(S. Bh-3/3/32), “अनुभवावसानं च ब्रह्मविज्ञानम् अविद्यायाः निवर्तकं”—( S. Bh-2/1/4).

“अवगतिपर्यन्तं ज्ञानं...ज्ञानेन हि प्रमाणेनावगन्तुमिष्टं ब्रह्म ।”—(S. Bh-1/1/1),—*Jnana* culminating in intuition...*Brahman* is desired to be intuited by means of *Jnana*, the valid means of knowledge.

Here in S. Bh-1/1/2 partial intuitions (अनुभवादयश्च) such as those of waking, dream, and deep sleep are the means of knowledge (प्रमाणम्) and the final intuition of the secondless *Atman* is the resultant knowledge ; ‘etc’ here refers to reasoning based upon intuition (श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते ) ।

24. Question/doubt : In the Sutra Bhashyārtha

*Tattavavivechani part II* (page-44-47). “न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव...अनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवम् इह प्रमाणम्...अनुभावसानत्वात्...ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य” (S. Bh-1/1/2)—here H. H. Swamiji of Holenaraispura, has criticized the doctrine : “अनुभवोऽन्तःकरणवृत्तिभेदो ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारः ; तस्य अविद्यानिवृत्तिद्वारेण ब्रह्मस्वरूपाविर्भावः फलम् इति केचित् । एवं च वृत्तिरूपानुभवस्य प्रमाणत्वम् ब्रह्मस्वरूपाविर्भावलक्षणानुभवस्य फलत्वम्...‘अनुभवादयः’ इत्यादि शब्देनानुमानार्थापत्ती गृह्येते इत्यभिप्रायास्तेषां व्याख्यातृणामिति...।’ वयं तु पश्यामो नैतत् समीचीनं व्याख्यानमिति ।

I cannot fully grasp the answers given by Swamiji. Please clearly explain this.

*Answer* : “अनुभवादयः”—इत्यत्र आदिशब्देन अनुमानार्थापत्ती उच्येते इति केषाञ्चिदभिप्रायः । इमम् अभिप्रायं खण्डयित्वा आदिशब्देन श्रुत्यनुगृहीत तर्कः अङ्गीकर्तव्यः इत्याह । अनुभवशब्देन प्रमात्रनुभवं भ्रान्तिरूपं तिरस्कृत्य साक्ष्यनुभव (*Saakshi Anubhava*) एव गृह्यते । अनुभवशब्देन न प्रमात्रनुभवः गृह्यते, अनेकरूपत्वात् प्रमातुः अविद्यावत्वाच्च । देहेन्द्रियादिषु अहंममाभिमानरूपाध्यासवर्जितः साक्षी यः तद्रूपेण स्थितस्य अनुभवः प्रमाणत्वेन इह गृह्यते । Shankara has said this in his *Bhashyas* (S. Bh-1/1/4).—

“न हि अहंप्रत्ययविषयकर्तृव्यतिरेकेण तत्साक्षी सर्वभूतस्थः समः एकः कूटस्थनित्यः पुरुषो विधिकाण्डे तर्कसमये वा केनचित् अधिगतः सर्वस्यात्मा ।” “देहेन्द्रियादिषु अहंममाभिमान-रहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तेः ।” (*Adhyasa Bhashya*). ‘Other than the agent who is the object of the notion ‘I’ (i.e., the individual ego), there is the witness thereof residing in all beings, the same in all, the one unchanging eternal *Purusha*, the self of each and everyone, who is never known to any one from the vedic-portion enjoining, religious works or from speculative schools.’

साक्ष्यनुभवप्रमाणसिद्धः अद्वैतसिद्धान्तः ।

Here ‘*Anubhava*’ (अनुभव) is not criticized. It has been criticized that ‘*arthapatti*’ and ‘inference’ (syllogistic reasoning) are not the meaning of the word ‘आदिः’ but *Shrutyanyugruhita tharka* (श्रौततर्कः) which leads to experience (in the intuition of Reality) is the meaning of the word ‘आदिः’ ।

25. *Question/doubt* : Please clearly explain the following part of the *Brahma-Sutra Bhashya-3/2/21*.

अथ अविद्याध्यस्त ब्रह्मणि एकस्मिन् अयं प्रपञ्चः विद्या प्रविलाप्यते इति ब्रूयात्...” (What is the nature of विद्या here ? What type of विद्या is indicated here ?)

“ततः ब्रह्मैव अविद्याध्यस्तप्रपञ्चप्रत्याख्यानेन आवेदयितव्यम् ‘एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म’ ‘तत् सत्यं सः आत्मा तत्त्वमसि ।’ तस्मिन् आवेदिते विद्या स्वयमेव उत्पद्यते, तथा च अविद्या बाध्यते...”

What is the nature of विद्या here ? What type of विद्या is indicated in the second case ? Is it same as in the first case ?

*Answer :* In the 1st case : “अहम् ब्रह्मास्मि” इति अनुभवरूपा विद्या, अपरोक्षरूपा विद्या ।

In the 2nd case : ‘विद्या स्वयमेव उत्पद्यते’—

अत्रापि आत्मावगतिरूपा अपरोक्षरूपा विद्या अभिमता । विद्या द्विप्रारा नास्त्येव ।

उपासनारूपा विद्या अनेकप्रकारा स्यात् । ब्रह्म एकरूपमेव ब्रह्मविद्यापि एकरूपैव । “तत् सम्यग्ज्ञानम् एकरूपं वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात्”

—S. Bh-2/1/11.

अविद्यापि अध्यासरूपैव (of the nature of mistaken knowledge). This mistaken knowledge of *Atman* for *Anatman* is sublated by the knowledge of *Brahman* culminating in the intuition of the Self.

अनिर्वचनीयवस्तुरूपा अविद्या सर्वथा नाङ्गीकृता ।

26. *Question/doubt* : A doubt arises in my mind-whether 'अविद्या-निवृत्तिः' is same as ब्रह्म (or मोक्ष) or whether अविद्या-निवृत्ति-उपलक्षित something is equal to ब्रह्म or मोक्ष । (Anandagiri said, द्वैताभावोपलक्षितम् ब्रह्म ।)

*Answer* : “अधिष्ठानावशेषो हि नाशः कल्पितवस्तुनः” । ब्रह्मणि कल्पिते प्रपञ्चे ज्ञानेन बाधिते सति, ब्रह्मैव शिष्यते । इत्यनेन अविद्या-निवृत्ति-उपलक्षित ब्रह्मैव मोक्षः इत्यर्थः ।

27. *Question/doubt* : You have said in मूलाविद्याभाष्यवार्तिकविरुद्धा (page 97) that प्रस्थानत्रये भाष्ये सुषुप्तौ सर्वथा अविद्यानिराकरणेन तद्विनिर्मुक्तं आत्मस्वरूपमद्वैतमेव दर्शितम् । But, श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्र सरस्वती महाराज said in his 'माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः' (page-140) that 'सा चाविद्या द्विविधाः कारणरूपा कार्यरूपा चेति । तत्र कारणाविद्यानाम आत्मतत्त्वाग्रहणं येन सुषुप्तिस्थानस्थानिधर्मा आत्मनि समारोप्यन्ते...। Sri Shankara said—‘अतः सवीजतयैव सत्संपत्तिः’ ।

So, how can it be said that there is no *avidya* (अविद्या) existing in सुषुप्ति (deep sleep)? तत्र कथं



अद्वैतसिद्धिः ?

*Answer :* अविद्या is in three forms :

(i) अग्रहण—absence of knowledge (ii) अन्यथाग्रहण—mistaken knowledge (iii) संशय-ग्रहण—doubtful knowledge. These are psychic. These are called as *upadhis* (उपाधि) of *Jeeva*. Due to these *upadhis* one mistakes himself as an individual. These *upadhis* come and go without any reason. The question of reason and cause comes only after these *upadhis*. As the individuality is the outcome of these *upadhis* (called *adhyasa*), he cannot think of the cause of *adhyasa*. If these *upadhis* are sublated by real knowledge of *Atman*, they do not come again. The absence of these *upadhis* is experienced by each and everyone in deep sleep. Similarly the presence of these *upadhis* is experienced by all in waking and in dream. ‘न हि दृष्टे अनुपपन्नं नाम’—(*Sutra Bhashya-4/1/2*). The individual is always *Brahman*. Due to these *upadhis* It is misunderstood as *Jeeva*. “स्वप्नजागरितयोः उपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिव अपेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते ।”—S. Bh-3/2/7—

The individual appears as different from *Brahman* in waking and dream states due to *upadhi*. In deep sleep there is no *upadhi* and therefore, he is said to be one with *Brahman*. Really he is always *Brahman*, but he has mistaken himself as if he is an individual due to *adhyasa*. Therefore it is wrong to say that the individual merges in *Brahman* at one time and does not merge at another time. He is always *Brahman* by nature. One's own nature cannot go out or come in “आत्मैव सुप्तिस्थानम्” (S. Bh-3/2/7)—The individual's deep sleep means *Brahman* or *Atman*. This answer is from the transcendental stand point (अपवाददृष्ट्या).

The individual *Jeeva* did not know that he was *Brahman* before he goes to deep sleep i.e., before merging in *Brahman*. ‘Not knowing’ of *Atman* was not sublated by real knowledge of ब्रह्म in the waking state. This ‘not knowing’ is the ‘seed’.

“अतः सबीजतयैव सत्सम्पत्तिः” इति—*Bhashyakara* has

said this. This 'not knowing' cannot belong to the Reality. It belongs to *Jeeva*. Whenever the individual turns back to the waking or dream states, these namely 'not knowing' ( अग्रहण ) and 'knowing otherwise' ( अन्यथाग्रहण ) come of their own accords as his *upadhis*.

छान्दोग्योपनिषत् (-6/9/2)—‘सति सम्पद्य न विदुः सति सम्पद्यामहे’ इति । सूत्रभाष्य-3/2/7—“उपाधेरूपशान्तत्वात् सत्येव सम्पन्नः न विजानाति इति युक्तम् ।”—The individuals become *Brahman* but they are not aware that they are *Brahman* Or *Sat*,

This answer is given from the thought position of deliberate attribution (अध्यारोपदृष्टा) of states to *Jeeva*. The other answer is from the transcendental stand point given above.

*Upadhis* do not exist in deep sleep. Therefore it is right to say that he does not know anything as he is one with *Sat* that is *Brahman*. It is in the experience of all that there is no ignorance in deep sleep. The ignorance which is the projector of duality does not exist in

deep sleep. Shankara has said this in his *Briha-Bhashya*-4/3/32—‘वस्त्वन्तरप्रत्युपस्थापिका अविद्या सुषुप्ते शान्ता ।’ इति बृहदारण्यकभाष्ये अविद्यायाः शमनमेव उक्तम् सुषुप्तौ । “देवतारूपं जीवत्वविनिर्मुक्तं” (छाः भाः-6/8/1) इति भाष्यवचनमपि सुषुप्तौ उपाधिं वारयति ।

No statement against the experience becomes valid. सार्वत्रिकानुभवानुसारेणैव जाग्रदाद्यवस्थाः विचार्याः । Waking, dream and deep sleep should be taken according to their experience in their respective places and one should not imagine or infer the other two states from the stand point of the waking state.

28. *Question/doubt* : किं स्वरूपा इयं सुषुप्ति ? सुषुप्त्यवस्थां यः गतः स कः ? न जीवस्तावत् । न जीवो नाम बुद्ध्यापाधिपरिकल्पितस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेण कश्चित् पदार्थोऽस्ति । बुद्ध्यादुपाधिनिमित्तं हि जीवत्वम् । उपाधिलयसमकाल एव तस्य लयः इति स्फुटम् । If there is no *Jeeva* ( जीवः ) there, then who will return when deep sleep is over ? तत् कथं जीवः स्वदेहं प्रत्यागच्छति ?

*Answer* : Sri Shankara has said :

“ब्रह्मैव सुप्तिस्थानम्” (S. Bh-3/2/7) अज्ञात ब्रह्मैव सुप्ति-

स्थानम् इत्यर्थः ।

There is only पर एव आत्मा स एव स्वप्नजागरितयो-  
रुपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् जीवरूपापत्तिमिव अपेक्ष्य स्वरूपापत्तिं भजति  
इति वक्ष्यते । सदा जीव ब्रह्मैव । अध्यास एव उपाधिः  
अग्रहणमपि उपाधिः । सुषुप्तौ उपाधिः स्वयमेव नश्यति, न तु  
ज्ञानेन बाधितः । यावदुपाधेर्बाधो ज्ञानेन न भवति, तावत्  
स्वयमेव नश्यति, पुनरागच्छति च । इदं तु अनुभवसिद्धम् ।

Everyone sees nothing in deep sleep. He  
exists in his nature. He comes as *Jeeva* in  
waking and in dream. माण्डूक्यकारिका—“जीवं  
कल्पयते पूर्वम्” ( माः काः—2/16 ). I have already  
said that oneness of *Jeeva* with Reality exists  
always and I (*Jeeva*) did not know it before I  
go to sleep. This not-knowing comes with  
*adhyasa* and goes with *adhyasa*. *Adhyasa's* going  
and coming is experienced by all and there is  
no reason for it and no reason can be adduced  
for it. ‘न हि दृष्टे अनुपपन्नं नाम’ ‘दृष्टत्वादेव’—बृहभाष्यं—  
1/4/10 and सूत्रभाष्यं—4/1/2.

The people who are in waking are अविद्यावन्तः ।  
They imagine the existence of the ‘seed’ of the.



world in deep sleep. Really there is no seed there. If there were no seed when the individuals become one with *Brahman* (*Sat*) in deep deep sleep and in *pralaya* (प्रलयः), they could not have come to the waking state and creation again. When they come so, one should admit that there was 'seed' in deep sleep and in *pralaya*. That 'seed' is only 'not-knowing' the Reality. Not knowing the Reality and the existence of the Reality are not opposed to the doctrine of non-duality, because 'not knowing' is not a thing but it is a mental form, which comes and goes with *adhyasa*.

See *Sutra-Bhashya*-2/3/30—“मिथ्याज्ञानपुरःसरोऽयं आत्मनोबुद्ध्युपाधिसम्बन्धः” । व्यवहारदृष्ट्या बीजसद्भावः कल्प्यते । वस्तुतः ब्रह्मैव । ज्ञानेन उपाधेः अबाधित्वात् यदा आगच्छति तदा उपाधिसहित एव जीवरूपेण आगच्छति । इदमपि अनुभवसिद्धम् ।

29. *Question/doubt* : भवतु नाम सुषुप्ते जीवस्य सत्-सम्पत्तिः । सुप्तोत्थितस्य पुरुषस्य साभिकृत कार्यनिर्वर्तणेन पूर्ववृत्तस्मरणेन च यः सुप्तः स एव उत्थितः इत्यनुमीयते । तत्कथं

बाह्यात् प्रविशामि - इति बुद्धिरेव अविद्या । तत्कृतजीवभाव  
व कदाचित् ब्रह्मसो बहिरासं, न नाइदानीं, सन्दि  
ब्रह्मैवास्मि - इति ज्ञानम् भवति ।

82

VEDANTA JIJNASA

सत्सम्पन्नतया अविभागापन्नोऽपि जीवः पुनरुत्थानाय  
प्रविभक्तो भूत्वा स्वदेहं प्रत्यागच्छति ? If the individual  
loses his individuality, how does the same man  
come back to the waking state ?

9 | Answer: यस्मात् स्वस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वम् अज्ञात्वैव तद् ब्रह्म  
प्रविशति । तस्मात् स्वेन रूपेणैव पुनरागच्छति । इति छान्दोग्ये  
स्पष्टमुक्तम् । (See छा:—6/9/3).

ज्ञानं सुषुप्तिगमनात् पूर्वं न लब्धम् तस्मादज्ञानं न बाधितम्  
आसीत् । तस्मात् यावत् न बाधः तावत् उपाधिः स्वयमेव  
गच्छति पुनरागच्छति च । ज्ञानं अज्ञानं वा मनोवृत्तिरूपम् ।  
सुषुप्तौ मनसः अभावात् तत्र तयो<sup>र्</sup>स्तित्वम् वा नास्तित्वम् वा  
वक्तुं प्रसक्तिरेव नास्ति । यदा ब्रह्मैव उपाधिवशात् जीवरूपेण  
जागरिते आगच्छति तदा पूर्वस्थितोपाधेरबाधितत्वात् पूर्वरूपेणैव  
आगच्छति । इदमपि अनुभवसिद्धम् ।

The *Jeeva* or the individual soul is in fact  
always identical with *Brahman*. But on account  
of *upadhis* such as the mind, body etc., he  
appears to be different from the Reality. As  
these *upadhis* do not exist during deep sleep, it  
is said that the soul merges in *Brahman* during  
deep sleep. This wrong identification of *Atman*

with the body, mind etc. is in the experience of all in the waking and dream states and the absence of this misidentification is also in the experience of all in deep sleep state. There is no reason for it. If it is sublated by the knowledge ending in Self-realization it never comes again. Since the very notion of time, space and causality rise only after *adhyasa* manifests. Moreover the states are not events that happened in the common series of time which endures throughout. So it is futile to ask how or why *Brahman* has become the *Jeeva* and the how same *Jeeva* returns to waking from deep sleep where he was identified with *Brahman*. I have already said that one should not imagine or infer the two other states—dream and deep sleep, from the stand point of waking state.

30. *Question/doubt* : जीवब्रह्मविभाग सिद्धयर्थमेव सुषुप्तौ अविद्या कल्पया भवति । 'मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते' ; 'मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात्' ( सू: भा:-2/1/9 ) इत्यादि भाष्यवचनैः तथा प्रतीतेः तादृश विभागभावे तत्रैव

विमुक्तिः स्यादिति अनिष्टं प्रसजेत्, इति चेत् ?

*Answer :* ज्ञानेनैव उपाधिभूताया अविद्यायाः बाधः स्यात् नान्येत । तथा च सुषुप्तौ ज्ञानस्य संभवो नास्ति । तस्मात् सुषुप्तिमात्रेण अज्ञानस्य बाधः न संभवति । अध्यासस्य तत्त्व-ज्ञानाभाव निमित्तं विना नान्यत् कारणमस्ति । अनुभवसिद्धं तत् । सुषुप्तौ जीवब्रह्मविभागः नास्ति एव । सुषुप्ति तु अज्ञात-ब्रह्मस्वरूपा । एतादृशस्वरूपं सर्वैरनुभूयते । कथं तत्र जीवब्रह्म-विभागः कल्प्यते ? इदं तु विवरणवाक्यम् ॥ भाष्यसंमतं न भवति । अन्यानि वाक्याणि अध्यस्तपुरुषैः व्यवहारे कारणं विना कार्यं न भवति इति अनुभवानुसारेण प्रपञ्चरूपकार्यं दृष्ट्वा, कारणं सुषुप्तावपि कारणं भवेदिति मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिः अनुमास्यते । वस्तुनः विभागशक्तिः नास्ति । विभागस्तु अध्यासकल्पित एव । तस्य कारणं अग्रहणं विना अन्यत् नास्ति एव । अध्यासकल्पित-विभागः अध्यासेन सह गच्छति, अध्यासेन सह आगच्छति ।

तत्र ज्ञानस्य असंभवात् मुक्तिः स्यादिति शङ्का न संभवति । सर्वदा जीवः ब्रह्मस्वरूप एव, तथापि ब्रह्मस्वरूपापरिज्ञानात् बद्धः तत् स्वरूपपरिज्ञानात् तु मोक्षः ।

There is a vast difference between deep sleep and salvation even though *Brahman* only which is secondless exists in both the states. There is



ignorance in deep sleep in the form of 'not knowing' the Reality and there is no ignorance in salvation even though one has become one with *Brahman* in both states. Before going to deep sleep, the individual did not understand the oneness with *Brahman*. Everyone without knowing that he is one with *Brahman* becomes one with *Brahman* in deep sleep naturally. Even though there is a natural non-duality in deep sleep, the misunderstanding of *Brahman* as *Jeeva* is not nullified by correct knowledge. Therefore it makes one to awake to the same individuality. This misunderstanding exists in mind which is concocted by *adhyasa*. When *adhyasa* is stultified by real knowledge of *Brahman*, it never comes again,

31. *Question/doubt* : It has been said that 'अग्रहणरूपा अविद्या सुषुप्तौ वर्तते' इति । Again अग्रहणरूपा अविद्या is a वृत्ति of 'मनः' or "अन्तःकरणम्" । So the presence of 'अन्तःकरणम्' must be admitted in deep sleep. *Bhashyakara* has also said—'सबीजतया सत्सम्पत्तिः...' । ननु ब्रह्मान्यत् बीजमन्यत् ( a part of अन्तःकरणवृत्तिः ), द्वयोः सद्भावे कथं ब्रह्मणः अद्वितीयत्वम् ?



*Answer :* मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धेन बीजेन परमार्थभूततत्त्वस्य न कोऽपि विरोधः स्यात् । Without being aware of their identity with *Brahman* in deep sleep, the *Jeevas* enter into *Brahman*. This 'not-knowing' the Reality is the seed, which is concocted by ignorance. This seed, concocted by अध्यासः, does not really exist. Therefore it is not opposed to the doctrine of non-duality. Not-knowing the *Brahman* is not against oneness with *Brahman*.

वस्तुतः अद्वितीयतत्त्वं सुषुप्तौ सर्वैरनुभूयते । अनुभवविरुद्धस्य अध्यस्तपुरुषकृतानुमानस्य प्रामाण्यं नैव संभवति ।

32. *Question/doubt :* 'I know nothing in sleep' cannot be a real memory—why ? What are the reasons behind it ? “नाज्ञासिषम् इत्येष विकल्पः न तु स्मृतिः”—What is meant by 'विकल्पः' ? Please clearly explain this.

*Answer :* अनुभवजन्य संस्कारजन्या स्मृतिः ।

'I know nothing' in sleep—this, to become स्मृति, requires the experience in the form of 'I know nothing' in deep sleep. But this is impossible, as mind does not exist in deep sleep. Moreover the states are not actual happenings

in any particular series of time and the time experienced in waking cannot be regarded as the substrate of all the three states. So the waking memory of sleep is no real memory from the paramartha view point. Therefore, it is called *vikalpa* (विकल्पः). *Vikalpa* means 'वस्तुशून्यो-विकल्पः'—just as rabbit's horn or barren woman's son. These are mere *vikalpas* or misconceptions for a rabbit does not have horns at all or it is not seen in experience that a barren woman begets children.

In deep sleep the misidentification of the Self with the mind does not exist, because the mind is absent there. The *Atman* alone remains in sleep, which fact is borne out by our statements on waking, 'I slept happily' ( सुखमहमस्वाप्सम् ). 'I did not know anything' ( 'न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्' ). The *Jiva* had indeed been one with its essential and blissful nature which is pure Consciousness. If he were not *Ananda* (आनन्दम्) itself he could not have come out with statements testifying to the blissful experience he has had during the deep sleep.

—इति सर्वं शिवम् ।

The following philosophical books prepared by

*Brahmajna Kavi*

**Sri Devarao Kulkarni, Bangalore**

will be soon published :

1. TEACHING OF BRAHMAN THROUGH THE  
ATTRIBUTIONS OF AVIDYA & MAYA.  
*(under print)*
2. DIRECT MEANS OF SELF-KNOWLEDGE  
*( it is being serially published in 'the religious  
monthly journal 'SA DHAN-PATH' from  
March-April, 1989. )*
3. AVASTHATRAYA VIVEKA.
4. GUIDE-LINES TO SHANKARA VEDANTA
5. THE INTUITION OF ATMAN.