

दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी (स्मरणसञ्चिका)

DakṣiṇaBhārata-ŚāṅkaraVedānta- VidvadGoṣṭhi

(Commemoration Volume)

5, 6 and 7 March 2011

Editors:

Shri Swami Prakashanandendra Saraswati

श्री स्वामी प्रकाशानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती

Shri Swami Advayanandendra Saraswati

श्री स्वामी अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती

Shri Dr. K.S.Ramanatha Sharma

श्री डा॥ के.श्री.रामनाथः शर्मा



Publishers:

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Holenarasipura-573211

site:www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

2011

वेदान्तग्रन्थावलि:

दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी

(स्मरणसञ्चिका)

DakṣiṇaBhārata-ŚāṅkaraVedānta- VidvadGoṣṭhi

(Commemoration Volume)

5,6 and 7 March 2011

Editors:

Shri Swami Prakashanandendra Saraswati

श्री स्वामी प्रकाशानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती

Shri Swami Advayanandendra Saraswati

श्री स्वामी अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती

Shri Dr. K.S.Ramanatha Sharma

श्री डा॥ के.श्री.रामनाथः शर्मा

Serial no.248

Publishers:

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya,

Holenarasipura-573211

site:www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

2011

दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी (स्मरणसञ्चिका) DakṣiṇaBhārata-ŚāṅkaraVedānta-
VidvadGoṣṭhi (Commemoration Volume) Editors- Shri Swami Prakashanandendra
Saraswati, Shri Swami Advayanandendra Saraswati, Shri Dr. K.S.Ramanatha
Sharma. Published by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipura-573 211.
[Phone- +91-08175-273 820] website: www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

© Adhyatma-Prakasha-Karyalaya
Year of Publication: 2011-500 copies

Pages: 22+326

Price: ₹300/-

All rights reserved by AdhyatmaPrakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipura

Typesetting by:
Satchidananda Graphics,
Bengaluru-560 022
Ph:9972664523
email:ramaprakashak@gmail.com

Printed at:
Ganeshmaruthi Printers
No. 76, IIIrd Block, 6th main
Thyagarajanagar,
Bengaluru-560 028
Ph.+91 080 26766 342

Publishers Note

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya is very happy to place in the hands of the readers the Commemoration Volume of the Vidvadgoṣṭhi , which was held for three days on march 5,6 and 7, 2011 at Holenarasipura. The Goṣṭhi itself was an extremely important event in the history of the Karyalaya. During the decade of 1960, the Founder of the Karyalaya, Sri Swami Satchidānandendra Saraswathi, had invited many of the renowned Vedāntins at that time to respond by writing in Sanskrit, to some of his searching questions relating to the concept of Avidyā, Māyā, and the nature of Prātibhāsika vastu, according to Śāṅkara Vedānta. The Karyalaya had published a book by name Vedāntins Meet, containing the responses received along with Sri Swamiji's interpretation of the Bhāshya, in Sanskrit and English.

During the last century , Sri Swamiji devoted his life time to recover and propagate the Śāṅkara Vedanta in its pristine pure form, and the Vedāntins Meet that he had planned was one significant event towards that objective. It must be said here that his attempts did not meet with the desired success as most of the Vedāntins were following the Vyākhyāna prasthānas, and they did not appreciate the need for directly going to the Bhāshyas. They continued to understand the Bhāshyas in the light of the sub-commentaries like Bhāmati and Vivaraṇa, which according to Sri Swamiji had several fundamental deviations from the Bhāshyas of Sri Śāṅkara .

The Vidvadgoṣṭhi that was organized recently had this difference that several traditionally trained advaita vedāntins were invited to participate in the Goṣṭhi and present their interpretation of the Bhāshyas on a pre-assigned topic. The participants in the Goṣṭhi would then discuss in depth with a view to bring out concurrence or differences in the interpretation of the Bhāshyas. The Vidvans were also requested to submit papers in Sanskrit.

The Goṣṭhi was held in a very cordial manner and was a success in a general sense. However, the discussions during the Goṣṭhi brought out the deep rooted difference in the way of interpreting and understanding of the Bhāshyas. These differences, however, had been brought to light by Sri Swamiji himself during the last century. Some of these differences that came to light again during the Goṣṭhi, are presented by the editors in this Volume.

The papers written in Sanskrit by the Vidvans are printed here without any modifications. The editors had also invited several advaita vedāntins from India and abroad, to write papers for the Volume in English on the same topics that

were discussed In the Goṣṭhi. A number of them sent their papers and this has enhanced the value and usefulness of the Volume. These papers also have been printed without any modifications except for attempting to bring in uniformity in the transliteration of Sanskrit words in English by affixing diacritical marks.

The editors have chosen to include in this Volume excerpts from the Books written by Sri Swamiji in Sanskrit and in English. These excerpts on the very same topics selected for the Goṣṭhi will surely help the writers of papers and all the readers to compare and confirm for them the correct way of interpreting the Bhāshyas. A number of relevant Bhāshyas vākyas on various topics is also provided at the end. Considering the great interest in the advaita Vedānta of Sri Śaṅkara being shown in the various Universities across the Globe and by individual scholars, sādhakas and mumukshus, young and old, as is evident in the various discussion groups over the internet, it is our fond hope that the present volume would be of benefit to them all.

The Karyalaya expresses its profound gratitude to all the vidvans who participated in the Goṣṭhi and all the authors of papers. A deep sense of gratitude is also due to the editors of the Volume, the saints, scholars, Brahmacharis, devotees and all those who have rendered selfless service in organizing and conducting the Goṣṭhi and in bringing up this Commemoration Volume. A special word of thanks is also due to the various donors for their munificent donation and to the type setter Sri Ramaprasanna Karanth of Satchidananda Graphics and Sri Ganesh Maruthi Printers for a job done well.

Holenarasipura

Publishers

28.07.2011

DakshinaBhārata-ŚāṅkaraVedānta-VidvadGōṣṭhi
Adyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipura-560 022

Donors List

Sl.No.	Name	Place	Amount
1.	B.L.Mahesh	Bengaluru	₹50,000
2.	S.I. Cultural Welfare Association	Mumbai	₹25,000
3.	Sri Ganapathi Satchidananda Ashram	Mysuru	₹25,000
4.	J.V.Purnachandra Rao	Guntur	₹20,000
5.	B.Krishnappa	Shimoga	₹20,000
6.	Ve. Markandeya Avadhanigal	Mattur	₹17,000
7.	Sri. Brahma Chaitanya Sthira Padukashrama	Hebballi	₹13,000
8.	Rajarshi Sri Virendra Hegde	Dharmasthala	₹10,000
9.	B.C.Lakshmayya	Bengaluru	₹10,000
10.	Smt. K.Janaki	Bengaluru	₹10,000
11.	K.Anjanappa	Bengaluru	₹10,000
12.	B.N.V.Subramanyam	Bengaluru	₹10,000
13.	Smt. Lalita Hegde	Bengaluru	₹10,000
14.	N.Nanjundayya	Ramanagara	₹10,000
15.	J.V.Hanumantaha Rao	Guntur	₹10,000
16.	Ashok Venkataram	Chennai	₹10,000
17.	K.Sundara Raman	Chennai	₹5,000
18.	Rajaram	Mumbai	₹5,000
19.	Anantanarayana	Mumbai	₹5,000
20.	Venkatesh	Mumbai	₹5,000
21.	K.M.ChandraShekar	Mysuru	₹5,000
22.	T.M.Mahadevamurthy	Bengaluru	₹5,000
23.	Antaranga Bhaktaru	Bengaluru	₹5,000
24.	Smt. Vanamala Joshi	Bengaluru	₹5,000
25.	From other devotees		₹41,203

AdhyātmaPrakāshaKāryālaya expresses profound gratitude to the donors who have donated liberally for the Vidvadgoṣṭhi.

विद्वद्भिः पत्रव्यवहारः

ॐ

॥ दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी ॥

केन्द्रस्थानम् - अध्यात्मप्रकाश कार्यालयः, होळेरसीपुर, हासन जिल्ला, कर्नाटकम्, पिन्-

५७३२११

एतैः,

समितिवर्यैः,

एतेभ्यः,

.....

श्री शङ्करभगवत्पादानाम्, श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामिपादानां च प्रभूतानुग्रहेण अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालये दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठीम् आयोजयितुं कृतसंकल्पा वयम्। स्वस्ति श्री विकृतिनामसंवत्सरस्य फाल्गुणमासे शुक्लपक्षे प्रतिपद्-द्वितीया-तृतीयातिथिषु (५,६,७-३-२०११तम दिनाङ्केषु) त्रिदिनात्मिका दान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी' निर्वर्तितव्येति समितिवर्यैः निश्चयः कृतः। गोष्ठ्यामस्याम् (व्याख्यानप्रस्थानानि विहाय) केवलप्रस्थानत्रयशाङ्करभाष्यमुपजीव्यैव (द्वितीयसंयोजितपत्रं द्रष्टव्यम्) वक्ष्यमाणकतिपयविषयान् अधिकृत्य भाष्यतात्पर्यं निश्चेतुं चर्चा प्रतायते। तदेतत् विशेषतया मनसि निधेयमिति पण्डितप्रकाण्डाः प्रार्थ्यन्ते।

अस्यां गोष्ठ्यां कर्नाटकान्ध्रतमिळकेरळमहाराष्ट्रेभ्यो राज्येभ्यः त्रिंशदधिका विद्वांसः सानिध्यं कुर्वन्ति। भवता अत्र समागत्य गोष्ठ्यां भागं वोढुं दिनत्रयं समुषितव्यमिति अभ्यर्थ्यते। भवतः गमनागमनाय मार्गव्ययः ₹...../- दीयते। भवता साकं शिष्यमेकमानेतुम् अवकाशोऽस्ति। तस्मै मार्गव्ययमात्रं दीयते। यदि बहवः शिष्याः आगच्छन्ति तेषामपि निवासभोजनमात्रस्य अवकाशोऽस्ति।

गोष्ठ्यां भागग्रहीतृभिः अधोलिखितनियमाः अवश्यं पालनीयाः-

- १) स्पष्टतया सरलेनैव संस्कृतेन चर्चा सम्भाषणं च कार्यम्।
- २) अवश्यं प्रत्येकेन दिनत्रयमुषितव्यमेव, तदर्थं पूर्वस्मिन्नेव दिने प्राप्तव्यम्।
- ३) चर्चायां न कस्याप्यवहेलनं, न्यक्करणं, रागद्वेषासूयादीनां वा प्रकटनं कार्यम्।
- ४) तत्त्वनिर्णयात्मको वादः आश्रयणीयः।
- ५) सभायां शान्ती रक्षणीया।

अत्र ये विद्वांसः आजिगमिषन्ति तेषां परिचयपूर्वकं अङ्गीकारं कृपया पृथक् संयुज्यमानपत्रमुखेन देयमिति संप्रार्थ्यन्ते। गुरुमुखेन अधीतशाङ्करप्रस्थानत्रयभाष्याणां मेव अधिकारः भागग्रहणे। अतः तैरेव पत्रमिदं प्रपूर्य प्रेषणीयम्। भागग्रहीतुमिच्छुः डिसेम्बर् मासस्य दशम(१०)दिनाङ्कात् प्रागेव दूरवाण्या सूचयेत्। पञ्चदशात् प्राक् प्रपूरिताङ्गीकारपत्रं (वक्ष्यमाणलेखनसमेतम्) यथा अस्मान् प्राप्नुयात् तथा प्रेषणीयम्।

प्रत्येकविषयस्य चर्चायाः आरम्भे तमेव विषयमधिकृत्य प्रस्तुतिर्भवति। इमं विषयमधिकृत्य भवता प्रस्तुतिः कर्तव्या इति प्रार्थयामहे। तमेव विषयमधिकृत्य चतुःपृष्ठात्मकं लेखनं स्मरणसञ्चिकार्थं डिसेम्बर् १५-तम दिनाङ्कात् पूर्वमेव प्रेषणीयमित्यपि संप्रार्थ्यते। लेखनान्ते भवतां नाम हस्ताक्षरं च भवेत्। अनेन सह भवतो भाचित्रमपि (passport size photo) संयोजयेत्। भवता प्रेषितं लेखनं यथावन्मुद्राप्य, तदभिप्रायान् विमृश्य टिप्पणीरूपेण स्वाभिप्रायः संयोज्यते संपादकैः।

समधिकपरिज्ञानावाप्तये अधोलिखितजनाः दूरवाणीमुखेन सम्पर्काय लभ्यन्ते।

(१) प्रदीपः शर्मा - ०९४८०५४४२२५

(२) रामप्रकाश-शर्मा - ०९९७२६६४५२३

(३) वेंकटेश-शर्मा - ०९४४९९७६४०१

भवता साकं कति जनाः आगमिष्यन्तीति दिनद्वयपूर्वमेव दूरवाणीमुखेन सूचयन्तु। मार्गदर्शनसूचीपत्रमपि योजितम्। संयुक्तपत्राणि दर्शनीयानि।

इति,
समितिवर्याः

संयुक्तपत्राणि:

(१) अङ्गीकारपत्रम्।

(२) चर्चाविषयाः।

(३) स्वामिपादानां तथा अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयस्य परिचयः।

(४) मार्गसूचिका।

(पत्रम् - १)

ॐ

॥ अङ्गीकारपत्रिका ॥

॥ दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी ॥

॥ श्री श्री सच्चिदानन्दसंस्कृतवेदान्तपाठशाला ॥



॥ अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयः होळेनरसीपुरम् ॥

(१) शुभनामधेयम्-

(२) सङ्केतविवरणम्-

दूरवाणी संख्या-

(३) गुरूणां नामधेयम्-

(४) अधीतशास्त्राणि-

(५) अध्यापितानां शिष्याणां (सामान्य)संख्या-

(६) ग्रन्थाः रचिताश्चेत् तेषां नामानि

(७) वर्णाश्रमविशेषः -

(८) प्रशस्तिपत्राणि, उपनामानि -

हस्ताक्षरम्-

(पत्रम् -२)

चर्चा विषयाः

१. अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियायाः स्वरूपम्
 २. अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः
 ३. विद्याऽविद्ययोः स्वरूपम्
 ४. शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्
 ५. परमार्थदृष्टिव्यवहारदृष्टिभेदः
 ६. अन्वयव्यतिरेकलक्षणम् तर्कस्वरूपम्
 ७. कार्यकारणप्रक्रिया अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण
 ८. मोक्षस्वरूपम्
 ९. अवस्थात्रयस्वरूपम्
 १०. सुषुप्तात्मविचारः
 ११. मायास्वरूपम्
 १२. द्रष्टृदृश्यविचारः
 १३. पञ्चकोशप्रक्रिया अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण
 १४. प्रातिभासिकवस्तुविचारः
 १५. श्रवण-मनन-निदिध्यासनस्वरूपम्
- (एतेषां विषयसंबद्धानां भाष्यवाक्यानि स्मरणसञ्चिकान्ते 172 पृष्ठे प्रत्तानि)

(पत्रम्-३)

श्री स्वामिपादानां अध्यात्मप्राकशकार्यालयस्य च परिचयः

श्री श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः आ उदयाचलात् अस्ताचलपर्यन्तम् अभिनवशङ्कराचार्या इति सुप्रसिद्धम्। शाङ्करवेदान्तार्थस्य अस्मिन् विंशतितमशताब्दे प्रमाणीभूताः अधिवक्तारश्चेति अत्र निर्मत्सरतया तद्ग्रन्थावलोकिनां नास्ति विप्रतिपत्तिः। भाष्याणां तत्कृतकन्नडानुवादग्रन्थाः, तेषां टिप्पणयः, विषयविभागेन तत्तद्भाष्यभागस्य युक्तशिरोनामानि, विमर्शात्मकपीठिकाः, भाष्यसारश्चेत्येवमादयः विशेषाः संस्कृतभाषानभिज्ञानाम् जिज्ञासूनां वररूपेण विराजन्ते। संस्कृताभिज्ञानां च विदुषां कृते जिज्ञासुजनमनश्चकोरचन्द्रिकायमाणां सुगमासूत्रभाष्यताविवेचिन्यौ, माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः, नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धेः क्लेशापहारिणीव्याख्या - इत्यादीनि मेरुकृतिरूपव्याख्यानानि, स्वतन्त्राश्च वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा, शङ्करहृदयम् अथवा

मूलाविद्यानिरासः, गीताशास्त्रार्थविवेकः इत्येवमादयो ग्रन्थाः विरचिताः। तेषां च पठनचिन्तनाभ्यां करतलन्यस्तामलकवत् सर्वात्मभूतं परमार्थतां जिज्ञासूनां हृदयङ्गमो भवतीति न पृथग्वक्तव्यम्। एते महान्तः ५-१-१८८०तमे वर्षे अवतीर्णाः, १०-६- १९४८तमे च संन्यासदीक्षामधिगम्य, ५-८- १९७५तमे ब्रम्हीभूताः।

अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयः इत्येषा संस्था तैस्संस्थापिता। तथा एतेषां परशतद्वयाधिकाः ग्रन्थाः कन्नडाङ्गलसंस्कृतभाषाभिः प्रकटिता वेदान्तप्रपञ्चे अध्यात्मामरज्योतिषमुद्दीपयन्ति। इदानीमपि होळेरसीपुरे तैस्स्थापितेयं संस्था नैरन्तर्येण तत्प्रदर्शिततदुपदिष्टमार्गानुसारेण च अध्यात्मविद्यापठनपाठनप्रचारान् तद्ग्रन्थानां च मुद्रणं कुर्वती अन्ताराष्ट्रीयकेन्द्रत्वेन विराजते। निर्मत्सरास्सन्तः विद्वांसः सकृदत्रागम्य अनुभवन्तु तेषां विभूतिमाहात्म्यातिशयम्।

॥ब्रह्मनिष्ठाय विद्महे संयमीन्द्राय धीमहि। तन्नः सच्चिदानन्दः प्रचोदयात्॥

AdhyatmaPrakashaKaryalaya.

Holenarasipura. Pin-573211

About Swamiji.

Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji (1880-1975) the Founder of AdhyatmaPrakashaKaryalaya, Holenarasipur, was the celebrated authority on Shankara Vedanta during the twentieth century. He researched and worked with profound dedication and a missionary zeal throughout his life for bringing out and present to the seeker the pristine pure Advaita Vedanta according to the tradition of Gaudapda, Shankara and Sureshwara. He is reverentially hailed as Abhinava Shankara of the twentieth century. Shri Shri Swamiji was an erudite scholar, a prolific writer and a great organizer. He wrote over 200 books in Kannada, English, and Sanskrit, including Kannada translations of all the original and genuine works of Shankara. All his writings are characterized by precision, lucidity and erudition. Many of his independent books like MulavidyaNirasa, Sugama, Vedanta Prakriya Pratyabhijna, Mandukya Rahasya Vivriti and Kleshapaharini (commentary on Naishkarmya Siddhi) in Sanskrit, Essays on Vedanta and Salient Features of

Shankara Vedanta in English, Paramartha Chintamani and Shankara Vedanta Sara in Kannada are real master pieces. Sri Sri Swamiji's life is an inspiration and a model and his writings are a real boon for all the earnest seekers.

About Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

The Kāryalaya was founded by Sri Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswathi Swamiji in the year 1920. This institution was nurtured and developed by the revered Swamiji and it became recognized as the very fountain head of pristine pure Vedānta as propounded by Adi Śāṅkara. The Kāryalaya has so far published more than 235 books in Kannada, English and Sanskrit. It has arranged for frequent discussions, discourses, public lectures, Vedānta classes and Vedānta camps in Holenarasipura, Bengaluru and other places. It is publishing a monthly magazine called 'Adhyātma Prakasha' from the year 1923 and a quarterly magazine called 'Śankara Bhaskara' from the year 1988. The Kāryalaya runs a Vedāntic College for imparting Vedānta knowledge to students in the traditional Gurukula manner, and train them to later engage themselves in the dissemination of the same.

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALAYA

(Head Office)

Holenarasipura, Karnataka,
India - 573211
Ph. 08175-273820.

(Branch Office)

#68, (New No. 6), A.P.K Road,
II Block, Tyagaraja Nagar,
Bengaluru-560028.
Ph-080-26765548

(पत्रम्-४)

मार्गसूचिका

सर्वतः बस्-यानं तु साक्षात् लभ्यते ।

धूमशकटवाहनानां वेलापट्टिका एवं वर्तते ।

मैसूरुतः प्रतिदिनं प्रातः -


(१) ०७.०० प्रस्थाय ९.३० होलेनरसीपुरम् प्राप्नोति ।

(२) ०९.४० प्रस्थाय ११.३० होलेनरसीपुरम् प्राप्नोति ।

प्रतिदिनं सायं

(३) ६.३० प्रस्थाय ०८.३० होलेनरसीपुरम् प्राप्नोति ।

बस्स्थानतः रैल्स्थानतश्च आटोयानेन १५रूप्यकाण्येव स्वीक्रियते ।



Shankaracharya



Satchidanandendra



Participating Vidvans and organisers



Goshti Views



२०११तम-सामान्यशकस्य मार्चमासस्य ५,६,७,तमदिनाङ्केषु अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालये,
होलेनरसीपुरे सम्पन्नायाः दक्षिणभारतशाङ्करवेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठ्याः कार्यक्रमपट्टिका -

०५-०३-२०११ मन्दवासरे प्रथमे अहनि उपस्थापिताः विषयाः

कार्यकारणप्रक्रिया	श्री.रा.कृष्णमूर्तिशास्त्रिणः, चेन्नै.
विद्याऽविद्ययोः स्वरूपम्	डा ॥ श्रीमणिद्राविडशास्त्रिणः
अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः	श्रीअश्वत्थनारायणावधानिनः, मत्तूरुग्रामः
परमार्थदृष्टि-व्यावहारिकदृष्टि-भेदः	डा ॥ श्रीरामकृष्णभट्टाः,केरलः

०६-०३-२०११ भानुवासरे - द्वितीये अहनि उपस्थापिताः विषयाः

दृग्दृश्यविचारः	श्रीहितलहल्लिसूर्यनारायणभट्टाः, बेङ्गळूरु
शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्	श्रीअरुणावधानिनः, मत्तूरुग्रामः
अध्यारोपापवाद-प्रक्रिया	श्रीअश्वत्थनारायणावधानिनः, मत्तूरुग्रामः
मोक्षस्वरूपम्-मुक्तलक्षणम्	श्रीअद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामिपादाः,होलेनरसीपुरः.
सुषुप्तात्मविचारः	श्रीहरिब्रह्मानन्देन्द्रस्वामिपादाः, उत्तरकाशी.

०७-०३-२०११ इन्दुवासरे - तृतीये अहनि उपस्थापिताः विषयाः

अवस्थात्रय-प्रक्रिया	श्रीकेशवावधानिनः, मत्तूरुग्रामः
पञ्चकोशप्रक्रिया	श्रीशर्वानन्दस्वामिनः, उत्तरकाशी.
प्रातिभासिकवस्तुविचारः	श्रीप्रमोदशास्त्रिकुलकर्णिनः, पर्वनि
श्रवणमनननिध्यासनस्वरूपम्	श्रीकिरणावधानिनः, मत्तूरुग्रामः

पूर्ववाणी

अत्यानन्दभरिता स्मो वयं यतोऽस्मत्प्रार्थनानुरोधेनास्मत्सूचितविषयानुगुण्येन चानेके विद्वांसः स्वाभिप्रायान् लेखनप्रेषणद्वारा निःसङ्कोचतया प्रेषयामासुः। वयमपि तत्सर्वं लेखनजातं किञ्चिदपि परिवर्तनमकृत्वा यथावन्मुद्रापितवन्तः। श्री शङ्करभगवत्पादानां परिशुद्धप्रक्रिया-निर्धारणव्याजेनायोजितायां वेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठ्यामपि नैके विद्वांसः स्वाभिप्रायानाविश्चक्रुः। तस्यां ये ये विद्वांसः यं यं विषयमधिकृत्य स्वाभिप्रायान् प्रकटयामासुः प्रायेण त एव विषयाः अत्र लेखनरूपेण विराजन्ते। अत्र सर्वोऽपि महाभागः व्यक्तं स्वाभिप्रायाणां स्वयं प्रतिभूरिति न वयं तन्मुद्रापणेऽधिकं भारवोढारः, मुद्रणदोषपरिमार्जनप्रयतनं विहायेति निवेदयामो वाचकमहोदयान् ॥

परमेकस्यैव महाशयस्यानिवार्यतया सङ्कोचः कृतोऽस्ति लेखनस्य। पूर्वमेवास्माभिरावेदितं यत् पृष्ठचतुष्टयात्मकं भगवत्पादाभिमतं लेखनं सर्वैः प्रेषणीयमिति। परं हित्तलहल्ली सूर्यनारायणमहोदयेन सप्तपृष्ठात्मकं मानसोल्लासग्रन्थसम्बद्धं तत्रापि केवलश्लोकानामेव पृष्ठत्रयं लेखनं प्रेषितम्। तत्पृष्ठत्रयमात्रमनिवार्यतया निष्कासितवन्तः इति सखेदं निवेदयामः, क्षन्तव्यः च वयमिति शास्त्रिवर्यान्प्रार्थयामः।

अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे अन्यूनाधिकं पञ्चदश लेखनानि गैर्वाणमयानि संयोजितानि, तथाङ्गलमयान्यपि लेखनानि दत्तानि। अन्ते अस्मत् श्रीचरणानां सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वमिनां लेखनानि च प्रत्तानि। तानि तु प्रत्येकस्य विदुषः लेखनस्य भगवत्पादाभिमतानभिमतप्रदर्शनदर्पणतया विराजन्त इति कृत्वाऽयोजितानि। तदपि निर्मत्सराणां पाठकानां मुमुक्षूणां कृते, न तु आत्मानं विदितवेद्यमन्यानां पण्डितानामित्यन्यदेतत् ॥

अयमपरोऽवधेयः मुमुक्षुजनैर्यत्, निर्वृत्तगोष्ठ्यां बहवोऽशा अस्मदभिप्रेतभाष्यभिन्ना विषयाः चर्चिताः क्वचित्साग्रहेणैव विषयप्रतिपादनं चाभूत्। तद्यथा--

(१) मायाशबलस्यैव ब्रह्मणः कारणत्वं स्रष्टृत्वं वाङ्गीकार्यं न निर्गुणस्य ब्रह्मण इति तत्रत्यैः पण्डितपुण्डरीकैराग्रहेण प्रतिपादितम्, जन्मादिसूत्रेऽपि तदेवोक्तमिति च।

(२) तथा - मायापरशब्दस्याव्याकृतस्य कार्यत्वं न सङ्गच्छत इति।

(३) आत्मन आकाशः सम्भूत इत्यत्र सम्भूतशब्दस्य गौणार्थकत्वं कर्तुं न शक्यते इति।

(४) अविद्या माययोस्समानार्थकमिति

(५) अध्यासस्यापि, अविद्या मायाशब्दवाच्या कारणमिति स्वीकरणम्।

(६) अध्यासस्य साक्षिरूपस्यात्मनः विषयत्वं नास्तीति साग्रहेणैव तैरुक्तम्।

(७) मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः इत्यत्र निमित्तशब्दः निमित्तोपादानशब्दयोः साधारणत्वेनोक्तः इति।

(८) साक्ष्यनुभवः न कस्मैचित् प्रमाणमित्युक्तम्।

(९) सुषुप्तावस्थारूपापि काचन वृत्तिरूपेति अङ्गीकारः।

(१०) सुषुप्ते न किञ्चिदवेदिषमिति यत् जागरिते स्मरणं सा यथार्थस्मृतिरेव न तु भ्रमः इति।

(११) विकल्पशब्दस्य भ्रमार्थकत्वं नास्तीति च उक्तम्।

(१२) अध्यासनिराकरणमात्रेणात्मनि यथार्थज्ञानं नोत्पद्यते किं तु आत्मविषयकस्य ज्ञानमप्यपेक्षितम् इत्येवमादयो बहवो विषयाः तैः प्रतिपादिताः।

परं तु तैरुद्धादिता विषयाः भाष्यानुक्ताः भाष्यविरुद्धा इत्यस्मन्मतिः। यतः - यदि

१) मायाशबलमेव ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं, न निर्गुणमिति आग्रहः तर्हि “न विलक्षणत्वादस्य तथात्वं च शब्दात्” (२-१-४) इत्यस्य शारीरिकसूत्रस्य विषयः संशयः पूर्वपक्षादिकमेव न सिध्यति। यतः तत्र हि चेतनं निर्गुणं (शब्दादिहीनं) ब्रह्म जगतः कारणं चेत् इति खलु पूर्वपक्षः उपस्थापितः। अतः एव च सिद्धान्तोऽपि न भजते।

(२) मायाशब्दव्यपदेश्यस्याव्याकृतस्य कार्यत्वमपि सङ्गच्छते, यतः “तपसा चीयते ब्रह्म ततोऽन्नमभिजायते” (मुं) इत्यत्र स्पष्टमेवोक्तम् अव्याकृतं कार्यमिति। भगवतापि क्षेत्राध्याये “महाभूतान्यहंकारो बुद्धिरव्यक्तमेव च” इति अव्यक्तस्य क्षेत्रत्वमुक्तम्। क्षेत्रं च सर्वं कार्यमेवेति स्पष्टमेव।

(३) तथा “आत्मनः आकाशः सम्भूतः” (तै.) इत्यत्र गौणार्थक एवेति स्वीकार्यः। यतः “ननु गौणमुख्ययोः मुख्ये शब्दार्थप्रतिपत्तिर्युक्ता। न। अन्यथा सृष्टेरप्रसिद्धत्वात्” (गौ. का. ३-२३) इति भाष्यकारैरेवोक्तत्वात्। अविकृतं कूटस्थं च ब्रह्माकाशादिरूपेण जायते इत्येतद्युक्तिविरुद्धमेतत्। अतः सृष्टिश्रुतयः आत्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनपरा इति व्याख्येयम्।

(४) अविद्या माया शब्दावपि न पर्यायवाचकौ- यतः “सर्वो ह्ययं व्यक्ताव्यक्तलक्षणः संसारः अशुद्धः ... अविद्याविषयः इति” (बृ.भा. १-५-२) “सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे प्रपञ्चस्य बीजभूते ... माया शक्तिः प्रकृतिरिति ... अभिलष्येते” (सू.भा. २-१-१४) इति स्पष्टतयैवाविद्याकल्पितत्वमुक्तं मायायाः। अतः माया अध्यासस्य कारणमिति न कुत्रापि प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्ये उक्तम्। अपि तु मायायाः अविद्याकल्पितत्वं नामाध्यासकल्पितत्वं बहुत्र भाष्ये उक्तम्। अपि च आत्मविषयेऽध्यासातिरिक्ताविद्या नैवोपपद्यते, यतः मामहं न जानामीति अहन्तोऽल्लेखनसमसमये एवाध्यासस्य सद्भावात्। न हि अध्यासं विना अहमित्युल्लेखः कस्यचन भवति। अहंकारमूले एवाध्यासो वर्तते। अतः अध्यासनिवृत्तिव्यतिरेकेण नान्या ज्ञानोत्पत्तिरत्रावकल्पते। परःसहस्राणि स्युरध्यासाः परं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिप्राणाध्यासमन्तरेण नान्योऽध्यासोऽवतरितुं शक्नोति व्यवहारकाले आत्मनः एतेष्वेवोपाधिषु अहन्तारूपोऽभिमानः जीवभावः। स एव जीवत्वाभिमानः सर्वाध्यासकारणम्। एतदेव श्रीगैडपादाचार्यैरुक्तम्- “जीवं कल्पयते पूर्वम्” इति (गौ.का. २-१६)। अतः ये नैकेनाध्यासापगमनेनात्मतत्त्वस्य ज्ञानं भवतीति आहुः ते दूरतः एव परस्ता भाष्यकारेणेति ज्ञेयम्। यतः जीवत्वाध्यासनिवर्तनेनावश्यमात्मविषये ज्ञानं उत्पद्यत एव।

(५) अत एवाध्यासस्य अविद्यामायावाच्यत्वं न स्वीकार्यम्।

(६) यत्तूक्तम् अज्ञानमात्मनः न विषयभूतमिति तदतीव तुच्छम्, यतः भाष्ये- “भवत्वज्ञो मुग्धः यस्त्वेवं दर्शी तं ज्ञं अमुग्धं प्रतिजानीमहे” (बृ. ४-४-६) “विद्याविद्ययोः तद्धर्मत्वमिति चेत्। न। प्रत्यक्षत्वात्। विवेकाविवेकौ रूपादिवत् प्रत्यक्षौ उपलभ्येते अन्तःकरणस्थौ। अविद्या स्वानुभवेन निरूप्यते” ‘मूढोऽहं अविविक्तं मम विज्ञानम्’ ... (तै. २-८) इति स्पष्टतरेणैव भाष्यकारेणोक्तत्वात् अज्ञानं नात्मनः विषयो भवतीति कथनं साहसमेतत्।

(७) निमित्तशब्दः निमित्तोपादानयोः साधरणशब्दः इति तु कथनं स्वाभिलषितविषयप्रति-

पादनायैव न तु शाङ्करीयो मतः । न क्वचिदपि प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्ये निमित्तशब्दः निमित्तोपादानयोस्साधारणत्वेनोपदिष्टोपलभ्यते । अतस्स्वाभिप्रायप्रवेशनप्रयासमात्रं न तु शास्त्रभाष्ययुक्त्यनुभवसम्मतम् ।

(८) साक्ष्यनुभवं न कस्मैचित् प्रमाणमिति कथनं भाष्यानुभवविरुद्धमिति स्पष्टमेव । यतः श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणमित्यत्र साक्ष्यनुभवमेवानुभवशब्देनोक्तमिति स्पष्टम् । “अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूरिति” (बृ. २-५-१९) इत्यत्र भाष्यं “सर्वात्मना सर्वमनुभवति” इत्यतः तेनैवानुग्रहेणान्तःकरणस्य विवेको जायते इत्यङ्गीकार्यम् । तथान्यत्र गीताभाष्ये “अवगतिनिष्ठा अवगत्यवसादनैवेति” (गी.भा. ९-१०) इत्यत्राप्येतदेव दृढीकृतम् ।

(९) सुषुप्तिरपि काचनवृत्तिरूपेति कथनं तथैव भाष्यानुभवविरुद्धः यतः “सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीवः एकतां गच्छति” (सू.भा. १-४-१८) “... उपाध्युपशमे यः उपरमः सः परमात्मना सम्बन्धः ... उपचर्यते” (सू.भा. ३-२-३४) अयं तु (जीवः) स्वेन सर्वात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तः स्वेन परेण प्राज्ञेनात्मना ... तेन न पृथक्त्वेन व्यवस्थितानि करणानि विषयाश्च । तदभावात् विशेषदर्शनं नास्ति” इति (बृ. ४-३-२३) इति ब्रुवन्भाष्यकाराः स्पष्टमेव निराकुर्वन्ति वृत्तिरूपत्वं सुषुप्तस्य ।

(१०) सुषुप्तेः स्मरणं यथार्थस्मरणमेवेति प्रतिपादनमपि न समीचिनं, यतः स्मरणस्य समानदेशकालप्रमातृणामवश्यं भावात् सुषुप्ते देशकालाद्यभावात् । जाग्रति जनैस्स्मर्यमाणं तु विकल्पमात्रत्वात् जाग्रद्दृश्येन तोलयित्वोक्तत्वात् केवलं भ्रममात्रमेतत् इति ज्ञेयं ।

(११) विकल्पशब्दस्य भ्रमार्थकत्वे श्रीगौडपादकारिकाभाष्ये बहुत्र प्रयोगो दृश्यते । तद्यथा १-२८, २-१७, २-१८, २-१९ इत्यादिषु विकल्पशब्दः भ्रमार्थे प्रयुक्तः ।

(१२) अध्यासनिराकरणमात्रेण न निवर्ततेऽज्ञानमिति तु अनात्मवस्तुविषये सम्भवति, आत्मविषये तु जीवत्वाध्यासनिराकरणेन सर्वोऽध्यासो निवर्तितो भवतीत्यतः आत्मविषये अध्यासनिवर्तनव्यतिरेकेणान्यत्कर्तव्यम् नावशिष्यते ।

इत्थं बहवो विषयाः चर्चिताः परं नैकाभिप्रायः विद्वत्स्तु सञ्जातः । अतः अत्र निपुणतरं येऽधिजिगांसन्ते तेऽवश्यमन्ते दत्तानि श्रीचरणानां लेखनानि अवलोकयेयुः पूर्वप्रतिविदुषां लेखनेन साकमिति प्रार्थयामः पाठकजनान् ।

तद्विद्यैस्सह संवादेन विपरीतग्रहणनाशोऽपूर्वविज्ञानोपजनः संशयनिवृत्तिश्च प्रयोजनम् । अतस्तद्विद्यासंयोगः कर्तव्यः इति प्राचीनाः । इममेव हेतुं कृत्वास्माभिर्गोष्ठी आयोजिता लेखनान्यपि संग्रहीतानि । अस्माकं तु महद्भागधेयमिदं यत् वेदान्तविदुषां मतानि संगृह्य तेषामाशयाविष्करणपूर्वकं ग्रन्थोऽयं सम्पादित इति । अतोऽस्माकं हार्दिकं भगवन्नारायणस्मरणपूर्वकमभिनन्दनं प्रकटयामो येऽस्मभ्यो लेखनप्रेषणेनास्माकं सहकारमकार्षुः । अन्यच्चेदमाशंसामहे यदन्ते प्रत्तानि श्रीचरणलेखनानि स्वलेखनेन तोलनं कृत्वा युक्तायुक्तविमर्शनविचक्षणचणाः भगवत्पादैरादर्शित-सत्सम्प्रदाये बद्धादरा भूयासुरिति । सर्वं शिवम् ।

इति- अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामी

FOREWORD.

It is a matter of great happiness to us that many Vedāntic Scholars sent their views whole heartedly through their articles on the topics we suggested and as we requested them to. We too published all of them as they are without making any changes whatsoever. In the Vedantins Meet too which was organised with an intention to ascertain the pure method of teaching of Shri Śāṅkarācārya, there were many participant Vedāntic scholars who expressed their views. The topics which were presented for discussion by various scholars- were also the topics that are dealt with in the articles. It is obvious that the various views expressed there belongs to those respectable scholars and we are not responsible to their personal views in any way except correcting the spelling mistakes by way of proof reading; we request the readers to note this.

However we were constrained to delete a certain portion of a single honorable scholar. Although we have requested them to confine their four page article to the views of Śāṅkarācārya alone, honorable Shri Hittalhalli Suryanarayana made his essay run for seven pages out of which three pages contained only shōlka quoted from Manasollasa (which is nothing to do with Shri Śāṅkara's). We have deleted helplessly those additional three pages with a pain in our heart and we plead for Shri Shastri's forgiveness.

Around fourteen essays in Sanskrit are included in this volume and many in English find place in it. Moreover Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji articles are appended at the end. They are included in order to show in what respect the views of each scholar agree or disagree with those of Shri Śāṅkara; even this is for unprejudiced readers and the seekers of truth, and not for those scholars who style themselves to be the knowers of truth.

In the Vidvadgoṣṭhi there were several points in the discussion of topics which, according to our opinion, were deviating from the Bhāshyas. Some of these were presented quite forcefully. These points are to be borne in the mind by the seekers after Truth. These deviations are:

1. The cause of the world should be accepted as Brahman with Maya (Saguṇa Brahman) and not as Nirguṇa Brahman. This is what is conveyed by the Janmādi Sūtra 1.1.2., insisted the revered Vidvans.

2. Considering avyākṛta, also called by the name Māyā, as an effect (kārya) is not appropriate.

3. In the Śruti statement ātmana ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ (Tai.), giving a secondary meaning (gauṇārtha) to the word sambhūtaḥ would not be appropriate.

4. The words avidyā and Māyā have the same meaning.

5. Even for adhyāsa (superimposition), avidyā, synonymous with Māyā, is accepted as the cause.

6. Adhyāsa is not an object of Witnessing Atman (sākshi), they insisted.

7. In the compound word mithyājñānanimittaḥ, the word nimitta (cause) is stated to mean upādāna (material cause).

8. Sākshyanubhava can not be considered to be a pramāṇa.

9. The 'form' of the deep sleep state (sushuptyavasthārūpaḥ) also is some form of vṛtti of the mind.

10. The so called memory during waking that 'I was not aware of anything during deep sleep' is in fact memory only and not bhrama (false/erroneous impression).

11. The word vikalpa does not have the same meaning as bhrama.

12. By merely negating the superimposition (adhyāsa-nirākaraṇa-mātreṇa) true knowledge is not produced, but knowledge of Ātman also is required (yet to be attained).

The above and many more points were propounded by them. However, according to our understanding, these are opposite to what is stated in the Bhāshyas. We give the reasons:

1. If it is insisted that Māyā-shabala-brahma only is the cause of the world and not nirguṇa Brahman, then the matter, opponents view, conclusion (siddhānta) etc., in respect of the Sūtra 2.1.4 'vilakṣaṇatvādasya tathātvam ca śabdāt' will not be fulfilled. Because, it is here indeed that the opponents view 'in case the sentient, featureless (Nirguṇa, sabdādiḥinam) Brahman is the cause of the world' is presented. For the same reason, even the conclusion cannot be established.

2. It is consistent to say that avyākṛta, also represented as māyā, is kārya. Because, in the Bhāshya for the Muṇḍaka mantra 'tapasā cīyate brahma tattonnamabhijāyate' it is clearly written that avyākṛta is kārya. Even the Lord has said that avyakta is kshetra in the ślōka 'mahābhūtānyahamkāro buddhiravyak-tameva ca' in the kshetrādhyāya. It is obvious that all kshetra is kārya only.

3. In the Śruti statement Ātmana ākāśah sambhūtaḥ, only a secondary meaning is to be accepted. Because, the Bhāshyakāra himself has stated in Ma.Ka. Bha.3.23 : For the objection that 'of the two possible meanings-primary and secondary-it is reasonable to understand a word in its primary sense' he says-'not so, for we have said earlier that creation in any other sense is not recognized'. That the changeless Brahman takes birth in the form of ākāśa etc., is unreasonable. Therefore, the Śrutis that talk of creation have to be interpreted as propounding the unity of Atman.

4. Avidyā and Maya do not have the same meaning because: In Br.Bha.1.5.2 it is said that "This entire manifest and un-manifest world ... is due to avidyā". In Su.Bha.2.1.14 - "Name and form which constitute the seed of the world, and which are conjured up by ignorance, are, as it were, non-different from the omniscient Lord, ... are mentioned in Śrutis and Smṛtis as ... Māyā, power, Nature etc." Therefore, it is nowhere written in the Prasthānatraya Bhāshyas that Māyā is the cause of adhyāsa. That it is conjured up by avidyā, meaning conjured by adhyāsa is written in many places. Also, in the matter pertaining to the Self, no avidyā other than adhyāsa holds because, adhyāsa is in play simultaneously with the thought/statement I do not know myself. Without adhyāsa it is not even possible for anyone to think/say 'I exist'. adhyāsa has its play at the root of 'ahamkāra'. Therefore, other than removing of adhyāsa, no other emergence of Jñāna can be imagined. Other than the superimposition of body, senses, mind, intellect and life force (prāṇa), no other adhyāsa manifests during human transaction. The superimposition of the form of identification with these adjuncts is jīvabhāva. It is this identification that is the cause of all superimpositions. This is what is said by Sri Gauḍapādācārya in the kārikā "jivam kalpayate pūrvam" (2.16). Therefore it may be understood that those who say that Self knowledge is not attained by the removal of this adhyāsa, have distanced themselves from the Bhāshyakāra. Self knowledge necessarily is produced on the removal of this superimposition of jīvatva.

5. For the same reason Avidyā-Māyā, cannot be accepted as the cause of adhyāsa.

6. The statement that ajñāna is not an object for the Self is too improper. In the face of unambiguous statements in the Bhāshyas- "bhavatyajño mugdhah yastvevam darshī tam jñam amugdham pratijānimahe" (Br.4.4.6), "vidyāvidyayoh taddharmatvam iti cet; na; pratyakshatvāt; viveka"vivekau rupādivat pratyakskau upalabhyete antahkaranasthau; ... avidyā svānubhavana nirūpyate"; "mudhoham aviviktam mama vijñānam ... " (Tai.2.8), it is too daring to say that ajñāna is not an object for the Self.

7. The statement that the word nimitta (cause) has been used to mean upādāna (material cause) is only to propound their own theory and does not conform to the opinion of Śāṅkara. No where in the Prasthāna traya Bhāshyas the words nimitta and upādāna are taught to have a common meaning. Therefore this only an exercise to propagate ones own theory and not according to the Śāstra, Bhāshya or reason.

8. To assert that Sākshyanubhava is not a pramāṇa is clearly against anubhava as well as Bhāshyas. The Bhāshya for "Ayamātma sarvānubhuriti" (Br.2.5.19) it is stated that "Sarvātmanā sarvam anubhavati". Therefore it has to be accepted that by His Grace only the discriminating knowledge is born in the mind. The same idea

is confirmed in the Gītābhāshya for 9.20: "avagatinishthā avagatyavasādnaiveti".

9. The assertion that deep sleep, sushupti, is some kind of vṛtti of the mind, is against Bhāshyas and experience. In the statements "Sushuptikāle ca pareṇa Brahmanā jivah ekatām gacchati" (Su.Bha.1.4.18), " ... upādhyupashame yaḥ uparamaḥ saḥ paramātmāna sambandhah ... upacaryate" (Su.Bha. 3.2.34), "ayam tu (jīvah) svena sarvātmāna samparishvaktah svena pareṇa prājñenātmanā ... tena na pṛthaktvena vyavasthitāni karaṇāni vishayāśca. Tadabhāvat viśeshadarshanam nāsti" iti (Br.Bha. 4.3.23), Bhāshyakāra has clearly rejected vṛttirūpa for the sushupta.

10. To state that the 'memory' of deep sleep while waking is actually memory only, is not proper. Because, memory necessarily implies common frames of space and time and a common empirical knower. What people remember during waking is only an erroneous impression (vikalpamātra) and is said in comparison with the waking view.

11. The words vikalpa and bhrama have same meaning. Such an usage may be seen in the Gauḍapādiya kārikābhāshya: 1.28, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, etc., where the word vikalpa has been used to mean bhrama.

12. Removal of adhyāsa, superimposition, may not remove ignorance only in the case of objects that are non-self (anātmavastu). However, in the case of Self, by negating the superimposition that one is a jīva (jīvatvādhyāsa), all superimpositions are removed. Therefore, nothing remains to be done other than removing the jīvatvādhyāsa.

In the above manner, several topics were discussed in the Vidvadgoṣṭhi but unity of opinion did not emerge among the vidvāns. Therefore the readers are requested to peruse the writings of Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswathi Swamiji on various topics appended to this Volume, along with the papers of the distinguished vidvāns.

Discussion with the knowers of truth corrects ones misunderstanding, gives rise to new understanding and also clears many doubts. Hence it is recommended by the learned. With the same intention this Vedāntins meet was organised and articles were sought. We feel immensely fortunate to collect the views of the Vedāntic scholars compile and edit them in this volume. Therefore we express our heartfelt congratulations along with the Lord Nārāyaṇa Smaraṇams to those who cooperated with us by sending their essays. At the end we hope confidently that the people of discrimination would compare their own essays with the writings of Shri Swamiji appended at the end and would become devoted to the tradition shown by Shri Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda.

Swami Advayanandendra Saraswathi.

विदुषां भाचित्राणि



Sri Swami Advayanandendra Saraswati



Sri Dr V Ramakrishna Bhat




Sri Dr Manidraavid Shastry




Sri Arunavadhani



Sri V Ganesha Bhat



Sri Ashwathanarayana Avadhani



Sri Dr Krishnamurthy Shastry



Sri Swami Sharvananda



Sri Swami Hariharabrahmendrananda



Sri Hitlalli Suryanarayana Bhat

ग्रन्थविभागक्रमः

Pulishers Note	iii
Donors List.....	v
विद्वद्भिः पत्रव्यवहारः	vi
पूर्ववाणी	xiv
Foreword	xviii

विदुषां लेखनानि

अध्यारोपापवाद-प्रक्रिया-स्वरूपम्.....	१
श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः	
परमार्थदृष्टि-व्यवहारदृष्टि-भेदविचारः	३
डा ॥ वि. रामकृष्णभट्टाः, कालडि	
विद्याविद्ययोः स्वरूपम्, अविद्यानिवृत्तिप्रकारश्च	७
डा ॥ मणिद्राविडशास्त्रिणः, चेन्नै.	
शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्.....	११
म.अ.अरुणावधानिनः, मत्तूरु	
शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्-	१४
वि.गणेशभट्टाः, बागेपल्ली	
अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः.....	१७
श्री सुब्रह्मण्यभट्टाः, बेङ्गळूरुः	
अनुभवस्वरूपम्.....	२१
म.सु.अश्वत्थनारयणावधानिनः, मत्तूरु	
सुषुप्तात्मविचारः	२५

श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः

सुषुप्तात्मविचारः	२९
डा॥ सी.ना.जोशीशास्त्रिणः, नांदेड्	
अध्यारोपापवादरीत्या कार्यकारणभावप्रतिपादनम्	३३
महामहोपाध्यायाः आर्. कृष्णमूर्तिशास्त्रिणः, चेन्नै	
कार्यकारणप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्	३९
श्रीअद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः	
वेदान्तेषु कार्यकारणप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणम् (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)	४१
श्रीशर्वानन्दस्वामिनः, प्रणवधाम, उत्तरकाशी	
अद्वैतवेदान्तस्य निर्विशेषब्रह्मात्मत्वसिद्धान्तः	४७
श्रीहरिब्रह्मेन्द्रानन्द स्वामिनः, आदिशङ्करब्रह्मविद्यापीठम्, उत्तरकाशी	
द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकः	५१
श्रीहित्त्विल्लिसूर्यनारायणनागेन्द्रभट्टाः बेङ्गळूरु	
मोक्षस्य स्वरूपं मुक्तलक्षणम्	५७
श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः	

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामिपादानां लेखनानि

01.अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्	६३
शुद्धशङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करतः ४. शाङ्करवेदान्तप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्	६३
02. दृष्टिद्वयम्	६९
वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः :- व्यावहारिकावस्थायां प्रमाणादिविभागसत्यत्वम्-	६९
शुद्धशङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करतः	७१
03. विद्याऽविद्यास्वरूपम्, अविद्यानिवृत्तिः	७२
विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा-२	७२
04. प्रातिभासिकवस्तुत्पत्तिविचारः	७६

विद्वद्गोष्ठीतः ९ पृ.	७६
05. मायास्वरूपम्	७८
विद्वद्गोष्ठीतः ११ पृ.	७८
06. शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्	८३
शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करतः २९ उपखण्डः	८३
प्रक्रिया प्रत्यभिज्ञातः २२७ खण्डसङ्ख्या	८४
विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा ७ खण्डः	८५
07. अनुभवस्वरूपम्	८९
विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः-अनुभवप्रधानदृष्ट्या उपदेशः १५खण्डः	८९
सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी २७ खण्ड	९०
08. अन्वयव्यतिरेकन्यायः तर्कश्च	९२
सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी-(४१खण्ड)	९२
नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः क्लेशापहारिणिव्याख्या समेता-उपोद्धाततः	९५
09. सुषुप्तात्मस्वरूपम्	९७
विवरणप्रस्थानपरीक्षा- वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः	१००
10. अवस्थात्रयविवेकः	१०३
अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियाया असाधारणधर्माः-(माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः पृ.१००)	१०३
11. कार्यकारणप्रक्रिया	१०८
सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी ५२-खण्डः	१०८
12. पञ्चकोशविवेकः	११२
तैत्तिरीयभाष्यार्थविमर्शिनी-उपोद्धाततः ४-खण्डः	११२
13. द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकप्रक्रिया	११४
वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः ३८-खण्डः	११४
14. श्रवणमननादिस्वरूपम्	११६
पारमहंस्यमीमांसा- अध्याय-४, पृ.५८	११६

विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा १४.श्रवणादिसतत्त्वविचारः.....	१२०
15. मोक्षस्वरूपम्-जीवन्मुक्तिः	१२६
विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः-अथ कृतकृत्यलक्षणम्	१२६
वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा-पृ. ५२२	१३०
सुगमा- पृ.११६	१३०

Invited papers in English.....1-70

Excerpts from Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji's Books

in English..... 77-161

Appendix: Bāshya Vākyas related to the topics

 भाष्यवाक्यानि विषयसंबद्धानि.....172-183

अध्यारोपापवाद-प्रक्रिया-स्वरूपम्

श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः

दूरवाणी : +91 08175 273 820

प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वविशेषमद्वितीयमवाङ्मनसगोचरं परमार्थतत्त्वं कथं नु नाम मुमुक्षूणां स्वात्मत्वेनानुभवमारोहेदिति सद्ब्रह्मात्मादिशब्दैर्निर्दिश्य तस्मिन् अस्तित्वं ज्ञेयत्वं चैतन्यसुखात्मकत्वं शास्त्राचार्योपदेशगम्यत्वं प्रपञ्चात्मना परिणामित्वं स्वसृष्टप्रपञ्चे जीवात्मनानुप्रवेशः इत्येवमादीन् मित्थाधर्मान् अध्यारोप्योपदिशन्ति वेदान्ता इत्यत्र न कापि संशीतिरस्ति विदुषाम्। तदेवमुपदेशार्थं प्रकल्पिता धर्माः परमार्थतत्त्वस्य वस्तुतोऽपि स्युरिति मा शङ्कीति प्रत्येकं तं तमारोपितं धर्मं विस्पष्टमपह्नुवते उपदेशान्ते वेदान्ताः। विशिष्य च ज्ञेयधर्मान् द्रव्यगुणत्वादीन् सर्वथा प्रतिषेधन्ति तस्मिन्नक्षराख्ये तत्त्वे इत्येदपि न प्रस्मर्तव्यम्। वेदान्ता अपि न प्रत्यक्षादिवदज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन प्रामाण्यमात्मनः प्रतिपद्यन्ते किं तर्हि प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारातीतत्वेन तत्सत्यत्वं समर्पयन्तोऽध्यारोपितधर्मनिवर्तकत्वमात्रेण प्रमाणमित्युपचर्यन्ते इत्यभिप्रायः। अत एव लौकिकाध्यारोपैः शास्त्राचार्यप्रकल्पितोपदेशार्थाध्यारोपैस्तदपवादैर्वा न कश्चिदतिशयः स्यात् गुणलक्षणो दोषलक्षणो वा ब्रह्मणि नित्यनिष्प्रपञ्चमेव हि ब्रह्म लौकिकैरबुधैः सप्रपञ्चत्वेन संसारित्वेन च विकल्प्यन्ते। यदनूद्य वेदान्तैराचार्यैश्च “प्रत्यस्तमिताशेषप्रपञ्चं एकाकारं ब्रह्मैवेदं सर्वं न त्वेव प्रपञ्चो नाम ब्रह्मव्यतिरेकेणास्ति, नापि जीवो नाम कश्चित्ततोऽन्योस्ति” इत्युपदिश्यते। न च विद्यमानः प्रपञ्चः श्रुतिभिराचार्यैर्वा स्वोपदेशेनापनीयते इति शक्यं कल्पयितुम्। न च शास्त्रशिष्यादिभेदः शिष्यगतमज्ञानं वा विद्यमानं सत् शास्त्राद्युपदेशेन विनिवर्त्यत इत्युरीक्रियते क्वचिदपि वेदान्तेषु। सर्वमेवेदं उपदेशार्थमुपायत्वेन प्रकल्प्यते; न तूपदेशकाले ततः प्राक् ऊर्ध्वं च जातुचिदस्ति इत्येष एव हि परमार्थः ॥

सैषाध्यारोपापवादैका प्रक्रिया सर्वोपनिषत्प्रसिद्धा, भगवत्पादैः तत्प्राक्तनैरपि वेदान्ताचार्यैः

सम्प्रदायविद्धिरुपदिष्टा । “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते” इति गीताभाष्योदाहृतवचनात् अवगम्यते । सैषा प्रक्रिया सर्ववेदान्तसमुपदिष्टा एकैव सती नानारूपाणि धत्ते । यतस्तत्र दरीदृश्यमाना कार्यकारणाद्यनेकप्रक्रियाः एतस्या एवावान्तरभेदा भवन्ति । भगवत्पादसम कालीनास्तत्प्राक्तनाश्चान्ये प्रस्थानान्तरावलम्बिन आचार्या एतस्याः प्रक्रियाः वेदान्तेषु परमं प्राधान्यं प्रत्यभिज्ञातुमसमर्थाः, विद्यमानमेव बन्धमज्ञानं वा साधनविशेषैर्विनिवर्त्यैव कृतकृत्यो भवेन्मुमुक्षुरिति अमन्यन्त । तेन तेऽनेकान् प्रक्रियाभेदान् कल्पयामासुः, तस्य च कारणमध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियानभिज्ञत्वमेव ॥

इदानीं तस्याः स्वरूपमुच्यते । प्रप्रथमतया सर्वाध्यारोपमूलम्, ‘आत्मनि अविद्यास्तीति’, यस्यां सत्यां इतरा भ्रान्तयः आत्मानं लभन्ते, तामविद्याशब्देन व्यपदिशन्ति वेदान्ताः, तद्वाधनेन ब्रह्मस्वरूपनिर्धारणं भवति । ततः प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वविशेषे सर्वात्मत्वेन नित्यप्राप्ते ब्रह्मणि क्वचित् आप्यत्वमध्यारोपितं, तेन तु ज्ञानातिरिक्तसाधनप्राप्यत्वशङ्का अपोद्यते । एवं क्वचित् ज्ञेयत्वमध्यारोप्य ब्रह्मातिरिक्ते वस्तुनि ज्ञेयत्वमपोद्यते । क्वचित् साक्षित्वमध्यारोप्य ज्ञातृत्वम् अपहन्यते । क्वचित् स्वरूपमेवापेक्ष्य ‘नेति नेति’ इति साक्षित्वमपि निराक्रियते । एवं क्वचिद्वाक्यगम्यत्वमङ्गीकृत्य प्रत्यक्षागम्यत्वं बोध्यते । क्वचित् स्वरूपापेक्षया वाङ्मनसयोरगोचरत्वं स्वीकृत्य वाक्यागम्यत्वं मनोगम्यत्वं च निराक्रियते । एवं जगत्कारणत्वं ब्रह्मण्यध्यारोप्य तस्य कार्यत्वमपहन्यते । ततः कारणत्वमप्यपहन्य स्वरूपमेवावेद्यते । पञ्चकोशात्मकत्वं क्रमेणाध्यारोप्य पूर्वपूर्वस्यात्मत्वं निराकृत्य पञ्चकोशातीतत्वमवगम्य सर्वद्वैतातीतत्वं विज्ञाप्यते । तथा दृक्चारोपेण दृश्यत्वापह्नुवः ततो द्वैतराहित्यमवबोध्य तस्यापि निराकरणं, अवस्थात्रयत्वमध्यारोप्य पूर्वपूर्वावस्थावत्त्वनिरासः, ततस्तुरीयत्वबोधनेन अवस्थावत्त्वमात्रनिरासः । किं बहुना ब्रह्मस्वरूपबोधनार्थं यद्यदारोप्यते तत्तदपहन्यते, स्वरूपे एव बुद्धिविश्रान्तिर्यथा स्यात् इति । यद्यद्यत् परमार्थतत्त्वबोधोपायत्वेन बोध्यते तस्य सर्वस्याप्यध्यारोपमात्रत्वात् पुनःपुनः स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मेति निह्नुते, निर्विशेषात्मस्वरूपं तु सर्वनिह्नुवात्परं स्वयमेव प्रकाशते इत्यभिप्रायः ।

इदन्त्विह बोध्यम्, अध्यारोपप्रक्रियाया जीवितमिदं यत् मिथ्याविकल्पनमपि ब्रह्मण्यध्यारोप्य तत्राध्यारोपितादन्यस्य प्रतिद्वन्द्विनः प्रतिषेधः, ततस्तस्याप्यध्यारोपितस्यापवादः इति । यावन्निरवशेषेण सर्वमप्याध्यारोपितमपोद्यते, तावदध्यारोपितापनये यत्नः कर्तव्यः । एवं सर्वविधाध्यारोपप्रतिषेधेनैव ब्रह्मस्वरूपं शक्यावगमनं नान्यप्रकारोऽस्ति तस्यावगमनायेति विस्पष्टमुद्धोषितं प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्येष्विति सर्वं शिवम् ।

परमार्थदृष्टि-व्यवहारदृष्टि-भेदविचारः

डा॥ वि. रामकृष्णभट्टाः, कालडि

दूरवाणी : +91 0484 2464 773

आनन्दघनमद्वन्द्वं निर्विकारं निरञ्जनम्।

भजेऽहं भगवत्पादं भजतामभयप्रदम्॥

अपारे संसारसागरेऽस्मिन् चित्र-विचित्रस्वभावकनरमृगपशुपक्षिसरीसृपाद्यनन्तजीवा मत्स्य इव संसरन्तीति को न जानाति स्वस्वकर्माधीनसुखदुःखादिकमनुभवन्ति च। आहारनिद्रादयो यद्यपि समानास्तथापि मनुष्यजन्मदुर्लभमिति स्मारयन्ति भगवत्पादाः “जन्तूनां नरजन्मदुर्लभमिति” असुलभजन्मलब्ध्वापि मनुष्योऽविवेकी, वस्तुयाथार्थ्यमजानन् दृश्यं यदिदं सत्यमिति विनिश्चित्य तदाप्तये धावन् धावन् मृत्युमुखं प्रविशति। लोको यस्य सत्यत्वं पश्यति, तस्य रहस्यं किमिति प्रकाशयन्ति उपनिषदः॥

“ब्रह्मसत्यं जगन्मिथ्येत्येवं रूपो विनिश्चयः” इति भगवत्पादास्तद्रहस्यं विवृण्वन्ति। अन्यत्र “ब्रह्मसत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः” इति। अर्थादद्वैतवेदान्तस्यायमेवैकान्तनिर्णयः। वेदान्तवाक्यानि ज्ञापयन्ति निरवयवं निर्गुणं निर्धर्मकं निष्कलङ्कं स्वप्रकाशस्वरूपं सच्चिदानन्दमेकमेव परमचैतन्यं ब्रह्म सत्यं पारमार्थिकं च। तद्विभ्रं सर्वं स्थावरजङ्गमात्मकं मनुष्याज्ञानकल्पितमशाश्वतमसत्यमिति। तदा आधुनिकाः पृच्छन्ति- असत्यान्नपानादेः क्षुधादिनिवृत्तिः कथम्? व्याघ्रोऽसत्यश्चेत् ततो भीतिः पलायनं, व्याघ्रोऽयमिति व्यवहारः कुतः? अयं मे पिता, इयं मे माता, मदीयः, तदीयः, कर्ता भोक्ताहमित्यादिलोकव्यवहारः कथं प्रवर्तते? इति। सत्यम् अज्ञजनमनसि प्रश्नाः। तत्र प्रश्नकण्टकटङ्कितमनस्कानां तेषां पीडापरिहाराय समुचितोत्तरभेषजमिदमस्ति- पारमार्थिकव्यावहारिकदृष्टिभेदात्तथा व्यवहारः प्रवर्तते इति।

आधुनिकेभ्यः केवलमुदाहरणं- चित्रपटे (सिनेमायां) प्रधाननायको मृतः तत्समीपस्थाः, तत्पत्नी, पुत्रबान्धवा रुदन्ति। वस्तुगत्या पतिपत्निभावादिकमस्ति वा? वस्तुगत्या मृतो वा सः। द्रष्टा जानाति किं तत्र सत्यमिति, नाटकीयव्यवहारे पतित्वमारोप्य, नायको न पतिः, तथापि पतिरिव मनसि निधाय रोदिति काचनाङ्गना (नायिका) भार्याभावेन व्यवहरति केवलम्। अवस्तुनि वस्त्वारोप्यैव नाटकीयव्यवहाराः सर्वे। न भर्ता नायकः, तथापि भर्तृत्वमारोपयति। इयं तु व्यवहारदृष्टिः। परमार्थदृष्ट्या तु नायको न भर्ता, नायिका न पत्नी, न मृतः। प्रकृतेऽपि परमार्थतो जगत्कल्पितमसत्यञ्च। तथाप्यज्ञानावस्थायां मदीयत्वकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिकं प्रकल्प्य सर्वोऽपि लोकव्यवहारः समुपपद्यते। वस्तुगत्या न रज्जुः सर्पः, न तत्र सर्पोऽस्ति, रज्ज्वज्ञानात् प्रतीयते तत्र सर्पः। एवं स्वाप्नपदार्थश्च। तथा जगन्नासीत्, न भविष्यति, न वर्तते च। तथापि जगदधिष्ठानपरब्रह्माज्ञानात् ब्रह्मणि भासते जगत्। तत्र नामरूपादिकं कल्पयन् नानाप्रकारेण व्यवहरति लोकः। व्यवहाराऽऽन्यथानुपपत्त्या व्यवहारावस्थायां जगत्सत्यमिति वक्तव्यं भवति, न परमार्थतः सत्यम्। अत एव भगवत्पादाः “अध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि।” (अ.भा.) “अतः समानः पश्वादिभिः पुरुषाणां प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः” एवं “प्राक् च तथाभूतात्मविज्ञानात्प्रवर्तमानं शास्त्रमविद्यावद्विषयत्वं नातिवर्तते। ‘ब्राह्मणो यजेत’ इत्यादीनि शास्त्राण्यात्मनि वर्णाश्रमवयोवस्थादि विशेषाध्यासमाश्रित्य प्रवर्तन्ते” इत्यादि (अ.भा.)।

तात्पर्यं तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या तु कोऽपि व्यवहारो नास्ति। सर्वे व्यवहाराश्च सन्ति व्यवहाराव स्थायामविद्यामभिलक्ष्य, व्यवहारदृष्टि इत्युच्यते। भगवत्पादास्तत्र तत्र सूत्रभाष्ये प्रतिपादयन्ति। दृश्यते च द्विविधं श्रुतिवचनम्- परमार्थब्रह्मस्वरूपावेदकम्, यथा ‘निष्कलं निष्क्रियम्’ ‘अजरोऽमरः’ ‘अस्थूलमनणु’ ‘सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तम्’ इत्यादि। जगत्कर्तृत्वेश्वरत्वसर्वज्ञत्वादि धर्मविशिष्टब्रह्मावेदकं द्वितीयम्। ‘यतो वा इमानि भूतानि’ ‘तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्’, ‘सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित्’ इत्यादि। तत्र पारमार्थिकदशायां व्यवहाराभावः। व्यवहारदशायां तु व्यवहारमुपपादयति द्वितीयश्रुतिवचनम्। अत्र भगवत्पादाः- “परमार्थावस्थायामीशित्रीशितव्यादिव्यवहाराभावः प्रदर्श्यते। व्यवहारावस्थायां तूक्तः श्रुतावपीश्वरादिव्यवहारः” ‘एष सर्वेश्वरः एव’ इत्यादि (सू.भा. २-१-१४)। कृत्स्नप्रसक्त्यधिकरणे - ‘निष्कलं निष्क्रियमित्यादि’ (श्वे.उ) वचनं तु निरवयवं ब्रह्मेति प्रतिपादयति। पूर्वस्मिन्धिकरणे चेतनमेकमेव ब्रह्म बाह्यसाधनमनपेक्ष्य स्वयं परिणममानं जगतः कारणमिति वर्णितम्। तत्र निरवयवं ब्रह्म स्वयं परिणमते, एकदेशपरिणामं

वा कृत्स्नपरिणामम् इति विकल्प्य उभयत्र दोषः प्रदर्श्यते। ‘श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वाद्’ इति सूत्रेण समाधानमुच्यते। इन्द्रियाद्यगोचरं ब्रह्मशब्दप्रमाणकं भवति। शब्दश्च अकृत्स्नपरिणामं निरवयवत्वं च ब्रह्मणः बोधयति। निमित्तभेदेन विचित्रशक्तिमन्मन्त्रादीनां विरुद्धानेकार्थं दृश्यते लौकिकोऽपि, पुनश्च ननु शब्देनापीति शङ्कामुद्भाव्य समाधत्ते वस्तुतोऽपरिणामि ब्रह्म। अविद्यासावयवत्वं कल्प्यते, कल्पितावयवत्वात् परिणमते ब्रह्म स्वयम्। तस्मात् अविद्याकल्पितनामरूपादिना ब्रह्म परिणामीत्यादिव्यवहाराः सर्वे उपपद्यन्ते’ इति भाष्ये प्रदर्शयन्ति- “अविद्याकल्पिते च व्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यत” इति। “पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते” इत्यपि। अर्थात् सुतरामत्र दृष्टिभेदः सुव्यक्तो भवति। एवम् आरम्भणाधिकरणे “तदनन्यत्वम् आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः” इति सूत्रभाष्ये- पूर्वं परमकारणादनन्यं जगदपि भोक्तृभोग्यलक्षणो विभागः समुद्रतरङ्गन्यायेनोपपादितः। आरम्भणशब्दस्तु “यथा सौम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वमित्यादिना एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं बोधितम्। मृत्तिकाया ज्ञाने सति घटादीनां विकाराणां ज्ञानं तु जातमेव घटादयो मृत्स्वरूपाः नामरूपादिकं तत्र वाचारंभणं विकारस्तु न यथार्थः, यथार्था तु मृत्तिका, तथा नामरूपात्मकं जगद्विकारभूतम् अनृतं ब्रह्म तु केवलं सत्यमिति दार्ष्टान्तिकेऽन्वयः। अत्र ननु- एकत्वैकान्ताभ्युपगमे नानात्वाभावात्प्रत्यक्षादीनि लौकिकानि प्रमाणानि व्याहन्येरन्नित्यादि पूर्वपक्षमुद्भाव्यात्रोच्यते इति समाधीयते- ब्रह्मात्मता विज्ञानात्पूर्वं सर्वव्यवहाराणां सत्यत्वमभ्युपगम्यते। प्रबोधात्पूर्वं स्वप्नव्यवहारो यथा। ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारादेव अविद्यानिवृत्तिः, यावत् पर्यन्तमविद्या वर्तते तावत् कर्ताऽहं भोक्ताहमित्यादिव्यवहारो विद्यत एव। अविद्यायां सत्याम् असत्यत्वबुद्धिर्नोत्पद्यते। एतत् सर्वं परमार्थब्रह्मस्वरूपम् अज्ञातवैव प्रवाहवद् गच्छति। अत एव भगवत्पादाः- यावद्धि न सत्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तिस्तावत्प्रमाणप्रमेयफललक्षणेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते। विकारानेव त्वहं ममेत्यविद्ययाऽऽत्मात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते। स्वभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा। तस्मात् प्राग् ब्रह्मात्मता प्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः” इति(२-१-१४)। “यथाकाशस्याविद्याध्यारोपितघटाद्युपाधिकृतरजोधूममलत्वादिदोषवत्त्वं तथात्मनोऽविद्याध्यारोपित बुध्याद्युपाधिकृतसुखदुःखादिदोषवत्त्वे बन्धमोक्षादयो व्यावहारिका न विरुद्ध्यन्ते। सर्ववादिभिरविद्याकृतव्यवहाराभ्युपगमात् परमार्थानभ्युपगमाश्चेति” (गौ.का.भा. ५) भगवत्पादाः। “सर्वोऽयं लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारोऽविद्या विषय इति” न विरोधो इति गौ.का.भाष्ये। “उपाधीनां चाविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितत्वात्, सत्यामेव च नैसर्गिक्यामविद्यां लोकवेदव्यवहारावतारा इति” भाष्ये (३-२-१५)

ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्ये सुव्यक्तमुपपादयन्ति भगवत्पादाः- परब्रह्म परमचैतन्यविज्ञानात् पूर्वावस्थायां ये व्यवहाराः सर्वे तेऽविद्याकल्पितोपाधिनिमित्ताः सन्ति। अस्यामेवावस्थायां सत्यत्वञ्च भजन्ते। परमार्थतो व्यवहारा न सन्त्येव। व्यवहारार्थं प्रमाणप्रमेयादीनामस्तित्वं च अभ्युपगच्छन्ति। यद्यपि तत्त्वज्ञा अवगमयन्त्येवोपनिषद्ग्रहस्यम्। तथापि दुर्घटैकविधायिनी अविद्या, तत्सौन्दर्यमोहितान्तःकरणा जनाः “जगन्मिथ्येति झटिति नावगच्छन्ति। नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः, अनादिकालात्प्रवहति। शनैः शनैः लक्ष्यस्थानं नेतव्या जनाः असत्यस्यापि व्यवहारस्य सत्यत्वमभ्युपेयमेव। नान्या गतिः। अहं तु लोकं वदाम्येवं- “श्रीरामचन्द्रः, तं दशरथो वदति मम पुत्रः, सीतादेवी तु मम पतिः। लवकुशौ आवयोः पिता। रावणः मम शत्रुः। प्रजा अस्माकं राजा। लक्ष्मणः मम भ्राता। वाल्मीकिमुनिः मम शिष्यः इति। तर्हि श्रीरामचन्द्रो वस्तुगत्या कस्य कः? तत्र तु स्वरूपतः श्रीरामचन्द्रो न कस्यापि, किन्तु रामचन्द्रपदबोध्य तादृशशरीराद्युपाधिं दृष्ट्वा शत्रुपतिपुत्रपितृभ्रातृराजादिव्यवहारो लौकिकप्रपञ्चे सत्यत्वं विन्दते, स्वरूपस्तु नास्त्येव व्यवहारः। कुतः सत्यत्वम्? लौकिके सव्यवहारोऽसत्यं चेत् रामायणस्यास्तित्वहानिर्भवेत्। एवं व्यवहारदृष्टिः। स्वरूपतः पारमार्थिकदृष्टिः इति दृष्टिभेदः सिद्ध्यति। शास्त्रप्रक्रियया भगवत्पादा अतिसरलसुगमभाषया दृष्टिभेदं प्रकाशयन्ति भाष्ये ॥

इत्थं च निर्गलितोऽयं निष्कर्षः-

“चोद्यं वा परिहारो वा क्रियतां द्वैतभाषया।
अद्वैतभाषया चोद्यं नास्ति नापि तदुत्तरम् ॥”

इति रीत्या परमार्थदृष्ट्या न कोऽपि व्यवहारः। व्यवहारदृष्ट्या सर्वव्यवहारः अविद्याधीनः। एवं दृष्टिभेदविचारोऽद्वैतवेदान्ते प्रकाशते ॥ इति ॥

अज्ञानमूलोऽयमनात्मबन्धो नैसर्गिकोऽनादिरनन्त ईरितः।
जन्माप्ययादिजरादिदुःखप्रवाहपातं जनयत्यमुष्य ॥
सर्वात्मकोऽहं सर्वोऽहं सर्वोऽहं सर्वातीतोऽहमद्वयः।
केवलाखण्डबोधोऽहमानन्दोऽहं निरन्तरः ॥

॥ शम् ॥



विद्याविद्ययोः स्वरूपम्, अविद्यानिवृत्तिप्रकारश्च

डा॥ मणिद्राविडशास्त्रिणः, चेन्नै.

दूरवाणी : +91 044 2466 2162

अथेदानीं श्रीमच्छंकरभगवत्पादानामुक्तीः परिशील्य विद्यादेः स्वरूपं यथामति निरूप्यते। यद्यपि ‘विद्या’ ‘अविद्या’ इति पदद्वयं तत्र तत्र स्थले विभिन्नेषु अर्थेषु प्रयुज्यमानमुपलभामहे, यथा- विद्याशब्दः ‘आत्मैकत्वविद्या’ इति ज्ञाने प्रयुज्यते, ‘विद्याभेदाभेदौ’ इत्यत्र उपासनापरतया विद्याशब्दप्रयोगः, तथा अविद्याशब्दश्च ‘तमेतमेवं....अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते’ ‘विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह। अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते’ ‘तामसो हि प्रत्ययः अविद्यात्रयस्योपलब्धेः’ इत्यादिस्थलेषु अध्यास-शास्त्रविहितकर्म-संशयाग्रहणादिपरतया प्रयुज्यते, तथापि विद्याविद्याशब्दयोः मुख्योऽर्थः कश्चिदेक एव, अन्यस्तु गौणोऽर्थः (अमुख्यः) इति भाष्यकाराभितं मन्यामहे। अत एव ईशावास्योपनिषद्भाष्ये -- ‘विद्याशब्देन मुख्या परमात्मविद्यैव कस्मान्न गृह्यते?’ इति मुख्येति विद्यायाः विशेषणं संगच्छते। अत्र हि उपासनां व्यावर्तयितुमेव मुख्येति विशेषणम्।

कोऽसौ विद्याशब्दस्य मुख्योऽर्थोऽभिप्रेतः इति विचारे क्रियमाणे वेदान्ततात्पर्यविषयीभूततत्त्वज्ञानमेव मुख्या विद्येति सिध्यति। यतो हि साक्षान्मोक्षसाधनं तत्त्वज्ञानमेव विद्याशब्दस्य मुख्योऽर्थः। तच्च अरोपितार्थव्यतिरेकेण आत्मस्वरूपज्ञानं वृत्तिरूपम् ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्यादिवेदान्तमहावाक्यजन्यम्। तथा च भाष्यम्- ‘तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः’ इति। इदमेव च तत्त्वज्ञानं मुमुक्षोः इच्छाविषयत्वेन सूत्रयामास भगवान् बादरायणाचार्यः- “अथाऽतो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा” इति। अत्र अथशब्देन नित्यानित्यविवेकादिसाधनसम्पत्त्यानन्तर्यं बोध्यते। अतः शब्देन च तस्य ब्रह्मजिज्ञासां प्रति हेतुत्वमुपपाद्यते। मुमुक्षोः ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा भवति इत्युच्यमाने फलेच्छायाः उपायेच्छां प्रति कारणत्वात् मुमुक्ष्वभिलषितमोक्षसाधनत्वं ब्रह्मज्ञाने

समभिव्याहारवशात् प्रतीयते, ‘यजेत स्वर्गकामः’ इत्यादौ यागे स्वर्गसाधनत्ववत्। एवं च मोक्षसाधनीभूतं ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वज्ञानं प्रथमसूत्रे सूत्रितम्।

इदानीम् अविद्याशब्दस्य मुख्यवृत्त्या विवक्षितोऽर्थः विचार्यते। तत्र पूर्वोक्तया विद्ययैव निवर्त्यः अविद्याशब्दस्य मुख्योऽर्थः। कोऽसौ इति जिज्ञासायाम्-अध्यासकारणभूतः कश्चिदर्थः इति ज्ञायते। कुतः? दृष्टान्ते तथा दर्शनात्। रज्ज्वादौ सर्पादिज्ञाने भ्रमात्मके जाते तन्निवृत्त्यर्थं रज्ज्वादिज्ञानमपेक्ष्यते। तदेव कुतोऽपेक्षणीयम्? यतः तत्रैव दण्डादिज्ञाने जातेऽपि पूर्वः सर्पभ्रमः निवर्तते। अतो रज्जुज्ञानस्य कुतोऽपेक्षा- इति प्रश्नः भवति। तत्रेदमुत्तरं वक्तव्यम्- सर्पदण्डादिभ्रमाणां सर्वेषामपि रज्ज्वज्ञानं कारणम्, तन्निवर्त्यर्थं तु रज्जुज्ञानमेवापेक्षणीयम्- इति। तथा च रज्जुज्ञानेन रज्ज्वज्ञानरूपे कारणे नष्टे सर्वोऽपि तज्जन्यः भ्रमः निवर्तते। रज्ज्वारोपितसर्पभ्रमनिवृत्त्यर्थं तत्कारणं निवर्तनीयम्, तन्निवर्तकं च रज्जुतत्त्वज्ञानम्। एवमेव आत्मनि अध्यस्तसकलभ्रमनिवृत्त्यर्थम् आत्मतत्त्वमपेक्षणीयम्। तथा चात्मतत्त्वज्ञानरूपविद्यया साक्षान्निवर्त्यम् अज्ञानम् अविद्याशब्दस्य मुख्योऽर्थः। तच्चाज्ञानम् आत्ममात्रविषयकम्, आत्मनि अनात्मारोपनिदानम् आत्मज्ञानैकापनोद्यम्। लोके रज्जौ सर्पभ्रमस्य भ्रमान्तरेण निवृत्तावपि रज्ज्वज्ञानस्य न तेन निवृत्तिः। रज्जौ उत्पद्यमानानां सर्वेषामपि भ्रमाणां रज्ज्वज्ञानं कारणं च भवति। अतः तत् रज्जुज्ञानैकापनोद्यम्। एवमेव आत्मज्ञानमपि आत्मतत्त्वज्ञानैकापनोद्यम्। अत एवोक्तं भाष्यकारैः -- “अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्या प्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ताः आरभ्यन्ते” इति अत्र अनर्थहेतुत्वेन प्रकृतः ‘अस्य’ इति संनिहितपरामर्शिसर्वनाम्नापरामृष्टः अध्यासो गृह्यते। तस्य च प्रकर्षेण हानं निवृत्तिः, मूलोच्छेदः। आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तिः तन्मूलोच्छेदे क्षमा। तदर्थः सर्वे वेदान्ताः अधीत्य विचार्यन्ते।

अतश्च इत्थमेव वक्तव्यम्, यतः, आत्मा हि स्वतः प्रकाशमानं वस्तु। न तत्प्रकाशार्थं प्रमाणव्यापारः इष्यते। अत एव आत्मा आरोपितैः अनात्मरूपैः अविविकृतया प्रकाशते एव। तदुक्तं भाष्ये- ‘न चायम् एकान्तेन अविषयः। अस्मत्प्रत्ययविषयत्वात्’ इति। ततश्च आत्मविषयकं वृत्तिरूपज्ञानं तु पूर्वमपि विद्यते एव। न तेन कस्यापि भ्रमस्य निवृत्तिर्दृश्यते। यदुच्येत- कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वभ्रमनिवृत्त्यर्थं ‘नाहं कर्ता नाहं भोक्ता’ इत्यादिरूपं ज्ञानमपेक्षते। तच्च नास्ति यस्य तस्य भ्रमानिवृत्तिरुपपद्यते इति। तन्न समीचीनम्। यतः ‘नाहम् कर्ता’ इति ज्ञानम् आत्मनि कर्तृत्वभ्रममेव निवर्तयेत् नान्यं भ्रमम्। एवं ‘नाहं भोक्ता’ इति ज्ञानमपि एकमेव भ्रमं निवर्तयितुं शक्नुयात्। सन्ति चात्मनि कोटिशः अध्यासाः। सर्वेषां तेषां निवृत्त्यर्थं न प्रत्येकं

विरोधिज्ञानं जन्मशतेनापि संपादयितुं शक्यम्। अत एव भाष्यकाराः अध्यासभाष्ये- सर्वस्य लौकिकवैदिकप्रमाणस्य अविद्यावद्विषयत्वं प्रतिपादयन्तः कथयन्ति- “ब्राह्मणो यजेत, इत्यादीनि शास्त्राणि आत्मनि वर्णाश्रमवयोऽवस्थादिविशेषाध्यसमाश्रित्य प्रवर्तन्ते। पुत्रभार्यादिषु विकलेषु सकलेषु वा अहमेव विकलः सकलो वेति बाह्यधर्मान् आत्मनि अध्यस्यति। तथा देहधर्मान्- स्थूलोऽहं कृशोऽहम्, गौरोऽहम्, तिष्ठामि, गच्छामि, लङ्घयामि चेति। तथेन्द्रियधर्मान्- मूकः, काणः, क्लीबः, बधिरः, अंधोऽहमिति। तथाऽन्तःकरणधर्मान्- कामसंकल्पविचिकित्साध्यवसायादीन्। एवमहंप्रत्ययिनम् अशेषस्वप्रचारसाक्षिणि प्रत्यगात्मनि अध्यस्य, तं च प्रत्यगात्मानं सर्वसाक्षिणं तद्विपर्ययेण अन्तःकरणादिषु अध्यस्यति।” इति। असंख्येया अध्याससंततिरिह भाष्यकारैः प्रदर्शिता। ततः परं च “अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये” इत्यनेन आत्मैकत्वविद्यामात्रेण सर्वाध्यासप्रहाणं वदन्तः मूलनिवृत्त्यैव सर्वाध्यासनिवृत्तिमभिप्रयन्तीति वाच्यम्। तदेव मूलम् अविद्याशब्देनास्माभिः विवक्ष्यते। तच्च प्रकाशमानेऽप्यात्मनि अन्यथावभासहेतुः भवति। आत्मतत्त्वज्ञानेन च तन्निवर्तते इति तत्कारणकसर्वाध्यासनिवृत्तिः सिध्यति।

अत एव- अध्यासकारणाविद्याभ्युपगमस्य सप्रयोजनत्वं वर्णितं भाष्यकारैः ‘तदधीनत्वादर्थवत्’ (ब्र.सू. १-४-३) सूत्रं व्याचक्षाणैः- “सा चावश्यमभ्युपगन्तव्या। अर्थवती हि सा। न हि तथा विना परमेश्वरस्य स्रष्टृत्वं सिध्यति। शक्तिरहितस्य तस्य प्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः। मुक्तानां च पुनरनुत्पत्तिः। कुतः? विद्यया तस्याः बीजशक्तेर्दाहात्। अविद्यात्मिका हि बीजशक्तिः, अव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुप्तिः। यस्यां स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः। तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम्- ‘एतस्मिन्नु खलु अक्षरे गार्गी आकाशः ओतश्च प्रोतश्च’ इति श्रुतेः। क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम्- ‘अक्षरात् परतः परः’ इति श्रुतेः। क्वचित् मायेति सूचितम्- ‘मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्’ इति मन्त्रवर्णात्।” इत्यादि। अन्यत्रापि- (बृ.उ. १-४-१०) “इदमविद्यायाः सतत्त्वमुक्तं भवति। सर्वात्मानं सन्तमसर्वात्मत्वेन ग्राहयति। आत्मनः अन्यद् वस्त्वन्तरम् अविद्यमानं प्रत्युपस्थापयति। आत्मानं असर्वमापादयति” इत्यादि। अत्र च आत्मस्वरूपमावृत्य अन्यथावभासस्य हेतुः अविद्या, अविद्यमानस्यानात्मनः प्रतिभासहेतुः। विद्यया च निवर्तते इति करतलामलकवत् स्पष्टं प्रतीयते। सत्यपि कारणभूतेऽज्ञाने भाष्यकारैः प्रथमं तत्कार्यमध्यासः एव प्रदर्शितः अध्यासभाष्ये। तत् अनर्थकरत्वस्य अध्यासे प्रत्यक्षसिद्धत्वात् तत्प्रदर्शनमात्रेण हेयताबुद्धिः यथा स्यादित्येवमर्थम्। अध्यासस्य हातव्यत्वे

सिद्धे हि तत्कारणस्य हेयत्वं सिध्येदिति ॥

इदानीमविद्यानिवृत्तिः विचार्यते- अविद्यायाः निवृत्तिः न घटादिनाशवत् नाशरूपाभ्युपगम्यते । तथा सति घटनाशेऽपि ‘पूर्वं घट आसीत्, इदानीं नास्ति’ इतिवत् अविद्यायाः अपि कालभेदेन सत्ताप्रतीतिः स्यात् । किन्तु- यथा रज्जौ सर्पभ्रमे रज्जुज्ञानेन शान्ते ‘न कदाचित् अत्र सर्पः’ इति कालविशेषसम्बन्धं विना प्रतीतिः तथा- ‘अविद्या मयि कदापि नास्ति’ इत्येवाङ्गीक्रियते । सोऽयं ‘बाधः’ इति शास्त्रे व्यवहियते । तदुक्तम्- “तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्योत्थसम्यग्धीजन्ममात्रतः । अविद्या सह कार्येण नासीदस्ति भविष्यति” इति । व्यवहारदृष्ट्या तु अविद्यायाः विनाशः उपचर्यते तत्र तत्र । न परमार्थतः । परमार्थदृष्ट्या तु- ‘न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः न बद्धो न च साधकः । न मुमुक्षुः न वै मुक्तः इत्येषा परमार्थता’ (गौ.का. ३२) इति ।

अतश्च साऽपि अविद्या अध्यस्तैवेति यावदविद्यां सकलव्यवहारनिर्वाहः । विद्योदये तु सति तस्याः तत्कार्यस्य च अत्यन्ताभाव एव । व्यवहारदृष्ट्यैव तत्र तत्र भाष्ये विद्यया अविद्यानिवृत्तेः प्रत्यक्षत्वादिवर्णनम्, स्वाप्नव्यवहारवत् इति संक्षेपः ॥



शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्

म.अ.अरुणावधानिनः, मत्तूरु

दूरवाणी : +91 08182 237 728

श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः

श्रीमद्भ्यः शङ्करभगवत्पादाचार्येभ्यो नमः ।

श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसद्गुरुभ्यो नमः

ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्ये शास्त्रयोनित्वाधिकरणे समन्वयाधिकरणे च विषयोऽयं विस्तरेण प्रपञ्चितः । भाष्यं-”शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्म अधिगम्यते इत्यभिप्रायः” (ब्र.सू. १.१.३) । इति । अस्य भाष्यवाक्यस्य तात्पर्यार्थः श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामिभिः एवमुक्तः । “अत्र पुनः तस्यैव ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रप्रमाणैकगम्यत्वं कण्ठरवेण उपन्यस्य जन्मादिसूत्रोक्तकारणे प्रमाणान्तर-विषयत्वाशङ्का व्युदस्यतीति विशेषः” । इति । भाष्यं- “ऋग्वेदादि शास्त्रं योनिः कारणं प्रमाणम्” (ब्र.सू.१.१.३) इत्यत्र प्रमाणम् इत्यस्य अवगतिपर्यन्तज्ञानजनने कारणम् इत्यर्थः” इति च । शास्त्रप्रामाण्यमित्यत्र शास्त्रमित्यस्य कोऽर्थः इति विचार्यते । शास्तीति शास्त्रमिति व्युत्पत्तिः । भगद्गीतासु शास्त्रमित्यस्य प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिधर्मो उच्येते (भ.गी.१५.२०) । लोके तु आचारा अपि शास्त्रमिति व्यवहियन्ते । अस्मात् शास्त्रयोनित्वाधिकरणात् अनन्तरपूर्वाधिकरणे जन्माधिकरणे भाष्यवाक्यमिदम्- “वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तर निर्वृता” (ब्र.सू.१.१.२) । इति वेदान्तवाक्यात् अन्येषां अनुमानादिप्रमाणानां प्रतिषेधात् अत्र शास्त्रमित्यस्य ऋग्वेदादिवाक्यानि इत्यर्थः । तथा च शास्त्रप्रामाण्यमित्यस्य वेदप्रामाण्यमिति अर्थस्सम्प्राप्तः ।

प्रमाणमित्यस्य प्रमाजनकं प्रमाणं, इन्द्रियाणि, अन्यत् लौकिकं ज्ञानसाधनं अपि इत्यर्थः । वेदप्रामाण्यमित्यत्र तु, वेदानां अवगतिपर्यन्तसत्यज्ञानजनने कारणत्वं तादृशज्ञानदाने स्वस्य

च सर्वज्ञत्वं इत्येतदर्थद्वयं भवितुं शक्यम्। पूर्वमीमांसायां स्थापितानि वेदप्रामाण्यकारणानि अपौरुषेयत्वादीनि केवलं कर्तृतन्त्रप्रधानभूतधर्मविषयाणि इत्यतः ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां न पर्याप्तानि भवन्ति। वस्तु तन्त्रत्वात् ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य। अयं विचारः समन्वयाधिकरणे विस्तरेण दर्शितः। सर्वज्ञात् परमात्मनः उच्छ्वासनिःश्वासरूपेण उत्पन्नत्वात् वेदस्य सर्वज्ञत्वं सिद्धम्। “अस्य महतो भूतस्य निश्वसितमेतत् यदृग्वेदः” (बृ.४.५.११) इति खलु श्रुतिः। अवगतिपर्यन्तसत्यज्ञानजनने कारणत्वन्तु प्रामाण्यकारणं सद्यः विचारणीयम्।

अत्रायमाक्षेपः- ननु “वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता” (ब्र.सू.१.१.२) इत्यस्मिन् भाष्यवाक्ये, “वेदवाक्यानि” अतः प्रमाणं इत्युच्यते। तस्मात् तत्र अन्यत् प्रामाण्यकारणं प्रतिषिद्धमित्युच्यते, “पूर्वमीमांसोक्तानि अपौरुषेयत्वादीनि प्रामाण्यकारणानि न पर्याप्तानि” इत्यपि उच्यते। किमनेन परस्परं विरुद्धप्रलापेन। अतः असमञ्जसोऽयं विचारः इति। अत्र समाधानम्। न किमपि वैरुध्यं वर्तते। “वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता” (ब्र.सू.१.१.२) इत्यत्र केवलं वेदवाक्यनिरपेक्षाणां अनुमानादिप्रामाण्यकारणानां प्रतिषेधः, न तु वेदवाक्यापेक्षाणां अनुमानादिप्रामाण्यकारणानामपि। अपि च भाष्यकारैः शङ्करभगवत्पादैरेव अन्येषामनुमानादीनां वेदप्रामाण्यकारणानां उपादानस्य उक्तत्वात्। भाष्यं- “न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां किं तु श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवं इह प्रमाणम्। अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य”। इति। (ब्र.सू.१.१.२)। अत्र वेदवाक्येभ्यः अन्येषां अनुभवादीनां च प्रामाण्यकारणानां उपादानस्य उक्तत्वात्। अस्मिन् भाष्यवाक्ये “यथासम्भवं” इत्यस्य पदस्य, येषु उपासनादिषु कर्तृतन्त्रेषु वेदवाक्यमात्रं प्रामाण्यं अपेक्षते प्रकारान्तरं न युज्यते तेषु वेदवाक्यमात्रं प्रमाणम्। ब्रह्मस्वरूपोपदेशिनीषु श्रुतिषु वेदवाक्यानि, तदपेक्षाणि अनुमानादीन्यपि प्रामाण्यकारणानि भवन्ति। वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात् इत्यर्थः। “अनुभवावसानत्वात्” इत्यनेन भाष्यपदेन इदमप्युक्तं भवति यत् ब्रह्मस्वरूपोपदेशिनीभिः श्रुतिभिः ब्रह्मज्ञानं अनुभवावसानं भवतीति उक्तम्। अतः अनुभवः प्राधान्येन, स्वातन्त्र्येण च प्रामाण्यकारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यते। अनुभवो नाम कः? लोके इन्द्रियानुभवः, विषयानुभवः, वेदानुभवः, क्रियानुभवः इत्याद्युच्यते। एषु लोकानुभवेषु अनित्यतादीनि अप्रामाण्यकारणानि सन्ति। अत्र तु एषु सर्वेषु लौकिकानुभवेषु सामान्येन स्थिता अपरिणता सत्या अवगतिरेव अनुभवः इत्युच्यते। तस्याः अवगतेः दर्शकज्ञानजनने कारणत्वमेव प्राधान्येन वेदप्रामाण्यस्य कारणं भवति। अस्य प्रमाणभूतं

भाष्यवाक्यं- “अवगतिपर्यन्तं ज्ञानं सन्वाच्यायाः, इच्छायाः कर्म” (ब्र.सू.१.१.१)। अनेन इदं निर्धारितं यत् जीवतः एव सत्यानुभवारूढज्ञानोपदेशित्वं वेदस्य प्रामाण्यकारणम् इति।

ननु अनुभवस्तु प्रत्यक्षः, प्रामाण्यकारणस्य पूर्वमीमांसोक्तस्य अप्रत्यक्षत्वस्य अनेन विरोधः संवृतः। न। अनुभवावसानत्वेपि नेन्द्रियग्राह्यरूपत्वं ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य। नापि मनोग्राह्यरूपत्वम्। अविषयत्वे पुनः निर्विषयं शास्त्रं संवृतं इत्याशङ्का। न। आत्मा च ब्रह्म इत्युक्तत्वात्, आत्मनि अध्यस्तोपाधिनिराकरणमात्रेण प्रामाण्यं प्रतिपद्यते शास्त्रम्। अविषयत्वात् आत्मनः। ब्रह्मणः आत्मत्वे परिच्छिन्नत्वविनाशित्वादिदोषप्रसक्तेः विनाशिवस्तूपदेशकस्य शास्त्रस्य अप्रामाण्यं स्यात्। न। अद्वितीयत्वात् अविनाशित्वाच्च आत्मनः। ब्रह्मैव आत्मा। अतः आत्मनो वस्त्वन्तरं न विद्यते। अतः अपरिच्छिन्नः आत्मा। तेनैव ब्रह्मोपदेशि शास्त्रं प्रामाण्यं लभते। अस्तु तर्हि ब्रह्मोपदेशिनः शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं, कर्मोपदेशिनः शास्त्रस्य तु अप्रामाण्यं स्यात् इति चेत्। न। अधिकारभेदेन उपदिष्टत्वात् उपपद्यते। अविद्यावतः कामिनां च कर्मोपदेशः। मुमुक्षूणां च ब्रह्मज्ञानोपदेशः। अधिकारभेदेन उपदिष्टमपि कर्म न कर्मास्तित्वप्रतिपादनाय उपदिष्टम्। किं तर्हि अविद्यावतो लोकस्य “कर्मणा फलं लभ्यते” इत्येतां बुद्धिमनुसृत्यैव कर्मोपदिष्टम्। तेषां कर्मणां समस्तस्य वेदस्य ब्रह्मज्ञानोपदेशे तात्पर्यं यथा तथा निर्धारितं बृहदारण्यके “तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति” (बृ.४.४.२२) इत्यत्र भाष्ये। तत्रैव कर्मणामपि ब्रह्मज्ञानोपकारकत्वं दर्शितम्। गीतासु च योगरूपेण अनुष्ठितानां कर्मणां ब्रह्मज्ञानोपकारकत्वं विस्तरेण प्रदर्शितम्। विषयस्यास्य प्रमाणभूतं भाष्यम्- “एवं काम्यवर्जितं नित्यं कर्मजातं सर्वं आत्मज्ञानोत्पत्तिद्वारेण मोक्षसाधनत्वं प्रतिपद्यते। एवं कर्मकाण्डेन अस्य एकवाक्यतावगतिः” (बृ.४.४.२२) इति। काम्यकर्मणामपि ज्ञानोत्पत्तिद्वारा मोक्षसाधनत्वं यथा तथा बृहद्वार्तिके सम्बन्धवार्तिकभागे सुरेश्वराचार्यैः निरूपितम्। तस्मात् अनुभवावसानरूपसत्यब्रह्मज्ञानोपदेशित्वात् (सत्यात्मज्ञानोपदेशित्वात्) तदेकमेव कृतार्थतारूपमोक्षसाधनत्वात् तत्र शास्त्रं प्रामाण्यं प्रतिपद्यते। कर्मकाण्डस्यापि ब्रह्मज्ञानोपकारकत्वेन उपदिष्टत्वात् ब्रह्मज्ञानोपकारकत्वद्वारा प्रामाण्यं प्रतिपद्यते। इदमेव भगवत्पादशङ्करैः अभिमतं शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्।

॥ इति शम् ॥



शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्-

वि.गणेशभट्टाः, बागोपल्ली

दूरवाणी : +91 9449619817

अवाङ्मनसगोचरस्य अप्रमेयस्य आत्मनः विषये वेदान्ताः, ब्रह्मसूत्राणि, गीताप्रस्थानं, इति प्रस्थानत्रयमपि प्रमाणमित्येव शिष्टैः गौडपादादिभिः अङ्गीकृतम् इति वेदान्तजिज्ञासुप्रपञ्चे निश्चप्रचं इति न वक्तव्यमस्ति। श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादानां विचारसरणीं अनुसृत्यैव, केन उपायेन वेदान्तशास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यत्वं सिध्यति? आचार्यपादाः, कथं शास्त्रप्रामाण्यं जिज्ञासुजनानां ज्ञाननिष्ठायोग्यतां प्रदास्यन्ति? इतीमान् विषयान् विचारयामः ॥

प्रमाणविषयः न केवलं शास्त्रविषयः किंतु, लोके सामान्यजनाः अपि- किमेतद् अस्मिन् विषये प्रमाणम् इत्येव व्यवहरन्ति। वैदिकशास्त्रार्थविषये प्रामाण्यस्थानम् अत्युन्नतमेवेति निश्चितम् ॥

पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रस्य केवलवागूपस्य उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरूपस्य मन्त्रभागस्य, श्रद्धामात्रेणैव प्रामाण्याय अलम्। कर्मकाण्डस्य अदृष्टफलस्वरूपत्वात्। मन्त्राणाम् अर्थज्ञानस्य अधिकतया अनावश्यकत्वात् एकमेव प्रामाण्यम्। परन्तु उत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रे, नैवं शास्त्रस्य प्रमाणत्वम् अङ्गीकुर्वन्ति विबुधाः। वेदान्तजनितात्मज्ञानस्य दृष्टफलत्वात्, अनुभवावसानत्वाच्च। लोकेऽपि पण्डिताः स्वाभिप्रेतं शास्त्रमपि प्रमाणमित्येव कथयन्ति। न्यायशास्त्रे जैमिनीयं। अष्टाध्यायीसूत्राणि वैयाकरणशास्त्रे। भाट्टप्राभाकराणां कुमारिलभट्टपादानां कारिकाः पूर्वमीमांसायां प्रमाणानि। परन्तु श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादाचार्याः केवलश्रद्धामात्रेण शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं नाङ्गीकुर्वन्ति। किन्तु अनुभवावसानत्वादेव वेदान्तवाक्यानां प्रामाण्यं स्थापयन्ति। सूत्रभाष्ये- “श्रुत्यादयो अनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवमिह प्रमाणम्” इति अनुभवस्य मुख्यतां सूचयन्ति। अन्यत्र- अनुभवावसानत्वात् ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य। अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम्। यदि शीतोऽग्निः अप्रकाशः वा इति अनुभवविरुद्धतया

श्रुतिशतमपि चेत् उक्तम्, अनुभवविरुद्धत्वात् नाङ्गीकुर्मः। तथैव वेदान्ता अपि ‘तत्त्वमसि’ ‘इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा’ इति स्पष्टतया उपदिशन्ति। गीतास्वपि ‘तस्मात् शास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ। ज्ञात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्तुमिहार्हसि॥’ इति भगवानेवोक्तवान्। पुनरपि ‘यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्तते कामकारतः। न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम्॥’ इति शास्त्रविधिं विसृज्य प्रवृत्तस्य स्वेच्छाचारिणः, न सुखं, न परां गतिरिति सखेदं सूचितवान्। एषा वेदान्तसम्प्रदायमर्यादा इति। केन उपायेन वेदान्ता अवाङ्मनसगोचरस्य, अप्रमेयस्य ज्ञानविषये प्रमाणा भवन्ति? विचारयामः- इमम् उपायमेव संप्रदायमिति आचार्याः मन्यन्ते। कोऽयं सम्प्रदाय इति पृष्ठे भाष्यकारैरेवोक्तम्- “संप्रदायविदां वचनम्- “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्याम् निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते” इति। अध्यारोपापवादेनैव शास्त्रस्य प्रमाणत्वं सिध्यति। वार्तिककारा अपि- “प्रमाता च प्रमाणं च प्रमेयः प्रमितिस्तथा। यत्सान्निध्यात् प्रसिध्यन्ति। तत्सिद्धौ किमपेक्षते ॥” इति, आत्मनः प्रमाणव्यवहारस्य सत्ता नितरां नास्तीत्येव भण्यते। यतो प्रमाणात् पूर्वसिद्धो ह्यात्मा। “भूतवस्तुविषयत्वात्ब्रह्मज्ञानस्येति” आचार्यैरेवोक्तम्। न आगन्तुकः आत्मा, अप्रमेयः चेत् शास्त्रप्रामाण्यस्य आवश्यकता किमस्तीति चिन्तितव्यमस्ति। केवलवाग्रूपवेदान्ताः, अवाच्यार्थम् आत्मानं कथं उपदिशन्ति? शङ्कामेतां परिहरन् भाष्यकाराः- “वाक्यार्थविचाराणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः। न अनुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता” (सू.भा. १-१-२) यद्यपि आत्मा भूतवस्त्वेव, तथापि ब्रह्मास्मीति निश्चयो शास्त्रार्थविचारं विना नैव जायते। आत्मानम् इदंतया न बोधयति वेदान्ताः, किन्तु अविषयतया बोधयन्ति। निराकृतसर्वव्यवहारवाक्यानि आत्मज्ञानविषये प्रमाणानीत्युपचर्यन्ते। अन्त्यं प्रमाणं शास्त्रमेव (इति) भगवत्पादमतम्। सूत्रेऽपि - जगदुत्पत्तिलयहेतुत्वं “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” सूत्रे अध्यारोपः; अत्र शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यत्वं इति “शास्त्रयोनित्वात्” इत्येतत् सूत्रं निरमायि। अपूर्वदेवतास्वर्गादिविषये यथा वेदवाक्यानां प्रामाण्यं विज्ञायते; एवमेव ब्रह्मात्मज्ञानविषयेऽपि वेदान्तवाक्यानि प्रमाणान्येव। श्री सुरेश्वरार्यैः - “अपूर्वदेवतास्वर्गपदार्थेष्वपि लोकतः। सिद्धेष्वतीन्द्रियोऽप्यर्थो वाक्यादेवावगम्यते ॥” इत्युक्तम्॥

केवलनिराकरणरूपवाक्यैरेव शास्त्रस्य न शास्त्रत्वम्। ‘नेतिनेतीति’ सर्वनिराकरणं कृत्वा न शास्त्रं तूष्णीमास्ते, किन्तु- “य एव निराकर्ता स एव भवसि त्वम्” इति सर्वव्यवहारनिरस्तमात्मानं दर्शयति- अयमेव पुरुषार्थः। वस्तुज्ञानानन्तरं तत् प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं न किञ्चिदपि कर्तव्यमस्तीति शास्त्रादेव ज्ञायते। अविद्याकल्पितसर्पज्ञानप्रतिषेधेनैव यथा रज्जुज्ञानं कर्तव्यान्तरं विना भवति, तथैव ब्रह्मात्मविज्ञानमपि कर्तव्यान्तरं नापेक्षते। सर्वमपि द्वैतं शुक्तिकारजतादिवत् विकल्पमात्रमिति

शास्त्रोपदेशः। आत्मानवबोधमात्रमेव द्वैतस्य स्थितिकारणं, ब्रह्मावबोधे प्रबोधे सति “अहम् एतत् क्षणपर्यन्तं, (ब्रह्माणमेव) (ब्रह्मैव) द्वैतमिति अविद्यातिमिरदृष्ट्या भ्रमितवान्” इति निश्चीयते। “द्वैतस्य च शुक्तिकारजतादिवत् सर्वस्यापि स्वतःसिद्धाऽद्वितीयात्मानवबोधमात्रोपादानत्वादव्यावृत्तिः। अतः सर्वानर्थहेतुरात्मानवबोध एव” इति नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धौ ॥

वार्तिककारैः- “शास्त्रप्रतिपादितप्रामाण्यं विषयं प्रत्यभिज्ञातम् ॥ आत्मा अन्वेष्टव्यः। विजिज्ञासितव्यः। मन्तव्यः। निदिध्यासितव्यः” इति शास्त्रमेव परमार्थतत्त्वं साधनपूर्वकं विविच्य उपन्यस्तम्। “तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि” जिज्ञासितम्। कथं पुनः शास्त्रम् निरस्तसर्वोपाधि ब्रह्मात्मानं बोधयतीति नाशङ्कितव्यम् - परिहारं भाष्यकारैवोऽक्तम्- “अविषये ब्रह्मणि शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्। न। अविद्याकल्पित भेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य। न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपादायिषति, किं तर्हि प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयदविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादि भेदम् अपनयति ॥”(सू.भा. १-१-४)

ब्रह्मात्मज्ञानानन्तरं ज्ञानिनः शरीरपातो भवतीति; अद्यतन कतिचन जिज्ञासवः मन्यन्ते, असाधुरेव सः, परन्तु प्राक् ब्रह्मविज्ञानात्, अब्रह्मदृष्टिः, असर्वदृष्टिः अविद्यातिमिरदृष्ट्या यन्निश्चितम्, तत्सर्वम् अब्रह्मदृष्टिं, असर्वदृष्टिं, अविद्याकृतं निवर्तयति शास्त्रम् ब्रह्मविद्योपदेशेन इति स्थितम्। “यत्र द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति, तदितर इतरं विजानाति।” इति, सर्वस्यापि द्वैतस्य “द्वैतमिव” इति ‘इव’ शब्देन भ्रान्तिभासितत्वं दर्शयति। न द्वैतविषये सत्यत्वबुद्धिं कुर्वीत इत्यभिप्रायः। अनन्तरम् “यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्” इति ब्रह्मविज्ञाने जिज्ञासून् संस्थाप्य, ब्रह्मज्ञानसमकाले एव “अत्र पिता अपिता भवति, माता अमाता” इत्युपक्रम्य, ज्ञानसाम्राज्ये जिज्ञासून् अभिषेचयदेव “अत्र वेदा अवेदा भवन्ति” इति स्वप्रामाण्यमपि अपह्नुते। एतद् अनुवदन् भगवानपि “त्रैगुण्य विषया वेदा निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन” इत्युक्तवान्। शास्त्रप्रामाण्य-जनितब्रह्मात्मविज्ञानेन, ज्ञानसमकाले एव सर्वात्मभावम् अनुभवति, तदनन्तरं किञ्चिदपि कार्यं न विद्यते, तावदेव शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यमिति सिध्यति- इति शास्त्रादेव विज्ञायते- अत एव अन्त्यप्रमाणं शास्त्रमिति स्थितम् ॥

श्री श्री सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसद्गुरुपादरजोस्पर्शनवेदान्तप्रवेशेन धन्यमात्मानं मन्येन मया “शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्” विषये किञ्चित् प्रस्थापितम्, हंसक्षीरन्यायेन विबुधा अत्रत्यविषयान् स्वीकृत्य बोधस्वरूपवाक्यानि सद्गुरोरेवेति, दोषस्थलानि ममेति मत्वा माम् अनुगृह्णन्तु सुधियः

अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः

श्री सुब्रह्मण्यभट्टाः, बेङ्गळूरु

दूरवाणी : +91 9480427775

अस्मिन् प्रपञ्चे खलु विद्यन्ते नानाविधाः प्राणिनः। अत्र सर्वे प्राणिनः नानाविध-
कष्टसुखादिकम् अनुभवन्ति। सर्वे प्राणिनः “सुखं मे भूयात् कष्टं मनागपि माभूत्” इति
इच्छन्ति इत्येतत् प्रसिद्धम्। अतः सुखेन जीवनयापनाय सर्वे प्रयत्नं कुर्वन्ति ॥

संसारस्य सर्वव्यवहारमूलं प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः। स च व्यवहारः पश्वादिष्वपि समानं
दृश्यते। तथा च सदृष्टान्तं प्रतिपादितं भाष्यकारैः “ पश्वादिभिश्च अविशेषात् ” इति। यथा हि
- “ पश्वादयः शब्दादिभिः श्रोत्रादीनां संबन्धे सति शब्दादि विज्ञाने प्रतिकूले जाते, ततो निवर्तन्ते,
अनुकूले च प्रवर्तन्ते - यथा दण्डोद्यतकरम् पुरुषम् अभिमुखम् उपलभ्य हरिततृणपूर्णपाणिम्
उपलभ्य तम् प्रति अभिमुखी भवन्ति ” इति। एवं पश्वादिष्वपि सुखस्य अपेक्षा वर्तन्ते। किं
वक्तव्यं बुद्धिजीविमानवविषये ॥

मनुष्यस्य प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः एव लौकिकालौकिकप्रवृत्तिं प्रति कारणं भवति इत्येतत्
प्रसिद्धम्। एतेन मनुष्यः सुखम् आप्तुम् इच्छति। एतादृशसुख एव दर्शनप्रपञ्चे “पुरुषार्थः” इति
शब्देन व्यवहियते। तत्र चत्वारः पुरुषार्थाः धर्मार्थकाममोक्षाख्याः लोके वेदेषु च प्रथितं वर्तते।
अत्रापि विचार्यमाणे “मोक्ष” एव परमपुरुषार्थः, नित्यश्च, अन्येषां त्रयाणां तस्य साधनत्वम्
अनित्यत्वम् अवगम्यते। “तद्यथा इह कर्मचितो लोकः क्षीयते एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यचितो लोकः
क्षीयते”(छां. ८-१-६) इत्यादयः प्रमाणत्वेन वर्तन्ते। एवमेव “न स पुनरावर्तते”(छां. ८-१५-
१) इत्यादयः श्रुतयः मोक्षस्य नित्यत्वम् उद्घोषयन्ति। एतादृश मोक्षः ब्रह्मज्ञानादेव भवति न
अन्यथा ॥

ब्रह्मभावरूपमोक्षस्य प्रतिपादनाय प्रमाणानाम् आवश्यकता वर्तते। अत्र किं प्रमाणम् इत्याकारकविवक्षायां भाष्यकारैः “न धर्मजिज्ञासायाम् इव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्। किंतु श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयश्च यथा सम्भवमिहप्रमाणम् अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वात् च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य ” इत्युक्तम्। अत्र संशयः, कः अयम् अनुभवः? किम् तस्य स्वरूपम्? अनुभवावसानम् नाम किम्? दर्शनान्तरप्रतिपादित अनुभवपदार्थस्य, अत्र प्रतिपादितस्य अनुभवपदार्थस्य भेदः विद्यते न वा? इत्या(दयो) अनेके प्रश्नाः समुत्पद्यन्ते। अनुभवस्वरूपं किञ्चित् विचारयामः ॥

लोके अनुभवशब्दस्य व्यवहारः सर्वत्र उपलभ्यते यथा - घटस्य अनुभवः, पटस्य अनुभवः, सुखस्य अनुभवः, दुःखस्य अनुभवः इति। अतः लौकिकव्यवहारेषु अनुभवो नाम ज्ञानमिति वक्तुं शक्यते। एतादृश ज्ञानं पुरस्कृत्य एव भाष्यकारैः, “तथा च लोके अनुभवः शुक्तिका हि रजतवत् अवभासते ” इत्युक्तम्। एवं भ्रमात्मकं संशयः, विपर्यासः इत्यादीनि ज्ञानानि अनुभवशब्दवाच्या भवन्ति। इत्थं च सामान्यज्ञानमेव अनुभवशब्देन लोके व्यवहियते ॥

अद्वैतप्रक्रियायां तु चैतन्यमेव, ज्ञानं, प्रमा इत्यादिना उच्यते। तथा च श्रुतिः- “यत् साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् ब्रह्म ” (बृ. ३-४-१) इति। सर्वस्य ज्ञानस्य चैतन्यत्वेऽपि वृत्तिश्च उपाधौ प्रतिबिम्बितं चैतन्यं ज्ञानम्, उपाधिरहितम् चैतन्यम् इति विभागः प्रतिपादितः। अतः ब्रह्माभिन्नं सर्वं ज्ञानम् अनुभवः, ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारः “अनुभवस्वरूपः” इति निश्चेतुं शक्यते। अत एव भाष्यकारैः “अनुभवावसानत्वात् ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य” इत्युक्तम्। अत्र श्रुतिविचारगुरूपदेशजनितं यत् ब्रह्मज्ञानम् अनुभवशब्देन उच्यते। ततः मनननिदिध्यासनान्ते यत् अभेदज्ञानम्, ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारः तदेव अनुभवस्य अवसानम्। अतः ब्रह्मैव अनुभवस्वरूपः इति सिध्यति। एतादृश अनुभवस्वरूपम् उपनिषत्सु, गीतासु, ब्रह्मसूत्रेषु प्रतिपादितम् ॥

तथा च ईशावास्ये “ अनेजदेकम् ” “स पर्यगात्” इत्यत्र ब्रह्मचैतन्यस्य व्यापकत्वम्, सर्वशरीरधर्मरहितत्वं निरूपितम् ॥

केनोपनिषदि- “श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम्” इत्यादिना, श्रोत्रादीन्द्रियाणानां श्रवणादिसामर्थ्यं यतः भवति, उपासना विषयभिन्नं च यत् तत् ब्रह्म इति, “अन्यदेव तद्विदितात्” इत्यत्र विदिताविदितात् अन्यत्, हेयोपादेयरहितं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादितम् ॥

अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः

कठोपनिषदि- “न जायते” इत्यत्र ब्रह्मचैतन्यस्य षड्भावविक्रियारहितवत्वम्, “हन्ता चेत्” इत्यत्र हननक्रियया उपलक्षितसर्वक्रियायाः कर्तृत्वम्, हननरूपकर्मोपलक्षित सर्वकर्मनिषेधपूर्वकं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादितम् ॥

प्रश्नोपनिषदि- षोडशकलानां कारणत्वेन, लयाधिष्ठानत्वेन च आत्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादितं उपलभ्यते ॥

मुण्डकोपनिषदि- “तदेतत् सत्यम्” इत्यादिना प्रपञ्चस्य कार्यस्य कारणत्वेन ब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वं निगद्यते ॥

माण्डूक्ये- ओंकारस्य तुरीयमात्रा स्वरूपेण ब्रह्मैव प्रतिपादितम् ॥

तैत्तिरीये- ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपलक्षणनिश्चयपूर्वकं, तटस्थलक्षणनिश्चयपूर्वकम्, अन्नमयादिपञ्चकोशविवेचनपुरस्सरं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादितम् ॥

ऐतरेये- “आत्मा वा ” इत्यादिना जगतः सृष्टिपूर्वकं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं उपपादितम् ॥

बृहदारण्यके- “अस्थूलमनणु” इत्यादिना सर्वविशेषरहितं ब्रह्म इति निश्चितम् ॥

छांदोग्ये- सदेव सोम्य इत्यादिना जगद्वृत्तकार्यस्य कारणत्वेन ब्रह्म उपपादितम् ॥

भगवद्गीतायाम् - “वेदाऽविनाशिनम्” इत्यादिना चैतन्यस्वरूपम् निश्चितम् ॥

ब्रह्मसूत्रे- “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” इत्यादिना ब्रह्मलक्षणकथनपूर्वकम् ब्रह्मस्वरूपं सुष्ठुनिरूपितम् ॥

एतादृशब्रह्मस्वरूपं पुरस्कृत्य एव भाष्यकारैः ‘अनुभवावसानम्’, ‘अनुभवात्मकः’ इत्यादिशब्दाः प्रयुक्ताः। तथा च- गीताभाष्ये, (भ.गी १८-५५) भाष्यावसरे “ननु विरुद्धम् इदमुक्तम् ‘ज्ञानस्य या परा निष्ठा, तथा मामभिजानाति’ इत्याकारक संशयस्य उत्तरावसरे, “यत् आत्मानुभवनिश्चयावसानत्वं तस्य निष्ठाशब्दाभिलापात्” इत्यत्र “अनुभवनिश्चयवासानशब्देन” चैतन्यस्वरूपमेव प्रतिपादितम्। अपि च (भ.गी-४-२२) श्लोकस्य भाष्यावसरे “स्वानुभवेन तु शास्त्रप्रमाणादिजनितेन अकर्ता एव ” इति ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारः इत्यस्मिन् अर्थे “स्वानुभवः” शब्दः भाष्यकारैः प्रयुक्तः। अपि च भ.गी. ३-४० श्लोकस्य भाष्यावसरे, ज्ञानविज्ञानशब्दयोः अर्थभेदं वदद्भिः भाष्यकारैः, “विज्ञानं विशेषतः तदनुभवः ” इति एष एव पक्षः समर्थितः। तथा

च ब्र.सू.भा ३-३-३२ सूत्रे “तदवसाने उदयास्तमयवर्जितं कैवल्यम् अनुभवति” “ब्रह्मनिष्ठः आरब्धभोगक्षये कैवल्यम् अनुभवन्ति ” “अनुभवरूढं तु ज्ञानफलम्” एष एव अर्थः भाष्यकारैः समर्थितः। एवं च ब्र.सू.भा. ४-१-२ इत्यत्रापि “एकः अहम् इत्येष आत्मानुभवः ” “न च एवम् आत्मानम् अनुभवतः किञ्चित् कर्तव्यम् अवशिष्यते” “यस्य तु न एष अनुभवः द्रागिव जायते तं प्रति अनुभवार्थ एव आवृत्यभ्युपगमः” इत्यादिभिः भाष्यकृद्भिः ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कार एव अनुभव शब्देन व्यवहृतः इति अवगम्यते ॥

तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारः जीवब्रह्मणोः अभेदज्ञानेन संभवति। अभेदज्ञानं तु अभेदबोधकश्रुतिवाक्यात् संजायते। अभेदबोधनाय एव सर्वाः उपनिषदः तात्पर्येण प्रवृत्ताः इत्येतत् प्रथितं वर्तते ॥



अनुभवस्वरूपम्

म.सु.अश्वत्थनारयणावधानिनः, मत्तूरु

दूरवाणी : +91 08182 237 728

“ज्ञानेन हि प्रमाणेन अवगन्तुम् इष्टं ब्रह्म”

कीदृशं ज्ञानम् अनुभवरूपं प्रमाणत्वं भजते? कीदृशी अवगतिः अनुभवात्मिका फलभूता? इति।

अत्राभिधीयते- अत्र प्रमाणभूतं तु ज्ञानं वेदान्तवाक्यजन्यं उपलब्ध्याभासप्रत्ययरूपम्। तद्यथा तैत्तिरीयके आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्- स यश्चायं पुरुषे यश्चासावादित्ये स एकः इति वाक्यार्थानुसंधानजन्यं बौद्धप्रत्ययरूपं ज्ञानं प्रमाणं सत् ‘आनन्दस्वरूपनिरुपाधिकब्रह्मैवाहं’ इति ब्रह्मात्मनि अवस्थानलक्षणवति पर्यन्तं भवतीति तत्रावगतौ प्रमाणमित्युच्यते।

यथा वा छांदोग्ये- ‘ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि इति वाक्यार्थानु-संधानजन्यं बौद्धप्रत्ययरूपं ज्ञानं प्रमाणं सत् ‘अहमस्मि सर्वस्यात्मभूतं परमार्थनित्यं सद् ब्रह्म’ इत्येवं लक्षणावगतिपर्यन्तं भवतीति तत्र प्रमाणम्। एवं सर्वत्रापि वेदान्तवाक्येषु जिज्ञासा पर्यवसाने तत्तद्वेदान्तवाक्यजन्यबौद्धप्रत्ययरूपेण ज्ञानेन जिज्ञासुः ब्रह्मात्मानं अवगच्छतीति तादृशज्ञानस्य तत्र तत्र करणत्वात् तत् प्रमाणज्ञानशब्दवाच्यं भवति। फलभूतं तु ज्ञानं तादृशज्ञानान्ते लक्ष्यमाणा अवगतिः ॥

‘श्रुत्यनुग्रहीत एव अत्र तर्को अनुभवाङ्गत्वेन आश्रीयते’ इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य कोऽर्थः इति विचार्यते।

सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी- २ (पृ. ४७)

“यथा जगज्जन्मादिवाक्यान्यपि श्रुत्यनुग्रहीततर्कात्मकानीह अनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयन्त इति।

सत्सु हि 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' (तै. २-१), 'सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छां. ६-२-१) इत्यादिषु श्रुतिवाक्येषु ब्रह्मस्वरूपावगमार्थेषु, तदधिगमार्थम् एवञ्जातीयकास्तर्काः श्रुत्यनुग्रहीता अनुभवाङ्गत्वेनोपप्रदर्शयमाना अपि आगमविधयैव विनियुक्ता भवन्ति। वक्ष्यति हि भाष्यकारोऽग्रे 'श्रुत्यनुग्रहीत एव अत्र तर्को अनुभवाङ्गत्वेन आश्रीयते- स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरिततेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, संप्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना संपत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वम्; प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात्, कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः- इत्येवञ्जातीयकः' (सू.भा. २-१-६) इति। तत्रागमरूपैरेतादृशवाक्यैर्निष्पाद्यमानोऽनुभवो विज्ञानापरपर्यायः 'सत्यं ज्ञानम्', 'सदेव सौम्य', 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिवाक्यैरुत्पिपादयिषितानुभवस्य 'प्रमाणम्' इति भाष्यते। वाक्यजन्यावगतिश्च फलरूपा 'अनुभवावसानत्वात्' इत्यत्रत्येन अनुभवशब्देन परामृश्यते। 'अनुभवादयश्च' इत्यादिशब्देन अवान्तरवाक्यजन्यज्ञानोपबृंहकः श्रौततर्कः, तदनुसारिणी लौकिकयुक्तिः, तदविरोधिनी च इत्येते अपि प्रमाणत्वेनोपलक्ष्यन्ते। ब्रह्मात्मानुभवरूपाम् अवगतिं प्रति परम्परया करणत्वेन, उपकरणत्वेन चानीयमानत्वात्।”

अनुभवः नाम अनुसृत्य भवतीति यत्, स अनुभवः। स च पञ्चधा।

अ] प्रयत्नमनुसृत्य भवति यः सः प्रयत्नजन्योऽनुभवः-वाहनचालनादिकः।

आ] प्रमाणमनुसृत्य भवति यः सः प्रमाणजन्योऽनुभवः- शर्करा मधुरा।

इ] वेदनाम् अनुसृत्य भवति यः सः वेदनाजन्योऽनुभवः-बुभुक्षितोऽहं, अहं दुःखी।

ई] योगसाधनं तपआदिकं अनुसृत्य भवति यः सः योगजन्यानुभवः- योगिप्रत्यक्षः

उ] पूर्वसिद्धोऽनुभवः अवस्थादृग्गुणः, साक्ष्यनुभवः।

एतेषु यः प्रयत्नजन्योऽनुभवः यद्यपि व्यवहारेषु यस्याश्रितस्य महते धनलाभाय महते बहुमानाय भवति तथापि भाष्यवाक्यार्थवगतौ निरर्थकः विघ्नकरश्च भवति।

यस्तु द्वितीयतृतीयौ प्रमाणजन्योऽनुभवः वेदनाजन्यो अनुभवः। यद्यपि तौ भाष्येषु दृष्टान्तेषु उपयुज्येते तेन दृष्टान्तेन वाक्यार्थस्पष्टीकरणमात्रं प्रयोजनं स्यात् तथापि अपूर्वज्ञानजनने असमर्थो लोकप्रसिद्धबोधकत्वात् तयोः साक्षात् सम्यग्दर्शने वेदान्तवाक्यार्थविचारणे च निरर्थकौ एव। यश्च तुरीयः योगजन्यः दिव्यानुभवः भव्यानुभवो वा सः वैयक्तिकत्वात्, कादाचित्कत्वाच्च वेदान्तवाक्यार्थावगतौ निरर्थकः, दुर्मार्गकारी च भवेत्।

यस्तु अवस्थासाक्षिरूपः पूर्वसिद्धोऽनुभवः सर्वलोकसाधारणोऽपि व्यवहारेषु अनुपयुक्तोऽपि,

वेदान्तवाक्यार्थावगतौ प्रमाणं भवन् सम्यग्दर्शने- ब्रह्मात्मावगतौ साधनं स्यात्। तेन अनुभवेन उपपन्नस्तर्कोऽपि अवान्तरवाक्यार्थावगतौ प्रमाणं भवति। “स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरिरतेतर- व्यभिचारात् निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वं” इत्यादि। सर्वासु कार्यकारणादि प्रक्रियासु उपदिश्यमानः अयमेव अनुभवः अध्यासांशान् अपवदन् परमवाक्येन महावाक्येन ब्रह्मावगतिं च बोधयति। युष्मदस्मद्प्रत्ययगोचरयोः इत्यारभ्य सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः इत्यन्तः यो भाष्यभागः अध्यासभाष्यरूपः स समस्तः केवलं अनुभवप्रमाणमात्रमाश्रित्य प्रदर्शितः। अत एव ‘नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः- इत्यादिना अनुभवमात्रं प्रमाणं दर्शयति। सर्वत्र भाष्येषु यानि हेतुभूतानि वाक्यानि दृश्यन्ते पञ्चमीविभक्त्यन्तानि तानि सर्वाणि अनुभवस्वरूपमेव दर्शयन्ति-

इमं प्राश्निकमुद्दिश्य तर्कज्वरभृशातुराः।

त्वाच्छिरस्कवचोजालैर्मोहयन्तीतरेतरम् ॥ (नै.सि. २-५९)

अनुभवस्वरूपविवेचनसंदर्भे कल्पना, ममता, सौन्दर्य, श्रद्धादीनां पदार्थविवेकः तुलना-त्मकदृष्ट्या कर्तव्यः। मनुष्यः कदाचित् स्वकल्पना अपि स्वानुभवशब्देन व्यवहरति। यथा- चलद्याने दृष्टे सति, तद्गता चलनक्रियापि चक्षुर्ग्राह्या- इति कल्पनामात्रमपि अनुभव इति मन्यते लोकः - नायम् अनुभवः। यथा च- शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धाः पृथगिन्द्रियग्राह्या, विशेषणानि तानि सर्वाणि एकस्मिन् पदार्थे संहतानि इति यत् कल्पनामात्रमपि, अनुभव इत्येव मन्यते लोकः, नायम् अनुभवः।

एवं ममतारूपो व्यवहारः मम पिता, मम माता, भ्राता, भगिनी- इत्यादिषु आत्मीयेषु -पितृत्वादीनि- अनुभवरूपाण्येवेति मन्यते लोकः- नायम् अनुभवः। तथैव- इदं सुन्दरं, इदं समीचीनं, इदं अनुकूलम्, प्रतिकूलम्- इत्यादिषु व्यवहारेषु वस्तुनिष्ठमेव सौन्दर्यं वस्तुनिष्ठान्येव आनुकूल्यप्रातिकूल्यसमत्वादीनीति मन्यते लोकः असति अनुभवरूपत्वेऽपि।

तथैव श्रद्धायुक्ते कर्मणि फले जाते- अस्य कर्मणः फलं मया अनुभवेन दृष्टं इति मन्यते। नायं अनुभवः। अत्र सर्वत्र, कल्पनाः, ममता, सौन्दर्यश्रद्धादयः प्रतिपुरुषं भिद्यन्ते। प्रतिकालं च देशं च भिद्यन्ते। अतः असार्वत्रिकः, न सर्वजनसाधारणः, न सार्वकालिकः यस्तु अनुभवः, यथा अग्निरुष्णः, प्रकाशात्मकः सूर्यः इत्यादयः स सर्वजनसाधारणः सार्वकालिकः, सर्वप्रश्नयोग्यः सकलजनविचारणार्हः -एकरूपः- सर्वप्रमाणाधारभूतः स एव अनुभवपदार्थः।

अन्ते च इदं संप्रधार्यं यत् ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां अनुभवः प्रमाणं इत्यनेन वाक्येन प्रमाणत्वम् अनुभवे अध्यारोष्यते, प्रत्यक्षादीनि अत्र न प्रमाणानि संभवन्ति इत्यपवादाय। अन्यच्च धर्मजिज्ञासायां इव केवलं शास्त्रवाक्यबलात्, श्रद्धामात्रबलात् ब्रह्मात्मैक्यत्वं न अभ्युपगन्तव्यं किं तु वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात् ज्ञानस्य, ब्रह्मणः भूतवस्तुत्वात् स्वयंसिद्धत्वात् सर्वप्रमाणानपेक्षत्वं च बोध्यते।

ब्रह्म अनुभवात्मकं, परिनिष्ठितवस्तरूपं चेति पदद्वयेन यत् न केवलवाक्यबलात् वा, श्रद्धाबलात् वा वयं ब्रह्मास्तित्वं प्रतिजानीमहे। किंतु सर्वस्य आत्मभूतत्वात् ब्रह्मणः स्वानुभवेन याथात्म्यं ज्ञातुं शक्यते इति ॥



सुषुप्तात्मविचारः

श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः

दूरवाणी : +91 08175 273 820

अत्यन्तमहत्त्वपूर्णोऽयं विचारः वेदान्तेषु । यतोऽत्र वादिनो बहवो विसङ्गिरन्ते । परमेतत्स्वरूपा-
वधारणानुगुण्येनैवानितरसाधारणाः बहवो विचाराः आत्मस्वरूपसम्बद्धा सुपरिनिश्चिता भवन्ति ।
आत्मनोऽविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तत्वमद्वितीयत्वं नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावत्वमसङ्गत्वमविपरि-
लुप्तचैतन्यात्मकत्वमित्यादयो धर्माः निश्चिता भवन्ति । अतः सर्वप्राधान्येनायं विचारः करणीयः ।

तत्रेमे प्रश्नाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति, सुषुप्तिकाले कीदृशोऽयमात्मा भवति? प्रपञ्चः किं
भवति? आत्मना साकं किमन्यत् तदा वर्तते? श्रुत्या वा सार्वजनीनप्रसिद्धीयमवस्था
किमर्थमानीता? भाष्यकारैर्गौडपादादेश्चास्मिन्विषये किमुक्तमित्यादयः प्रश्नाः प्रादुर्ष्यन्ति । तत्र
श्रुतिभाष्यानुभवयुक्त्यनुसारेण विचारयामः । प्रथमं श्रुतिः- “तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दा अपहतपाप्मा
अभयं रूपम् प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद अकामं रूपं शोकान्तरम्”
(बृ. ४-३-२१), “न तु तद्वितीयमस्ति” (४-३-२३), “सलिल एको द्रष्टाऽद्वैतो भवति एष
ब्रह्मलोकः एषोऽस्य परम आनन्दः” (४-३-३२), “यत्र सुप्तो न कंचन कामं कामयते
.... तत्सुषुप्तम् ” (मां. ५), “सुषुप्तस्थाने एकीभूतः प्रज्ञानघन एव आनन्दमयो प्राज्ञः”
(मां. ५), “सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति” (छां. ६-८-१) इत्यादिस्थलेषु स्पष्टतया जीवस्य
स्वरूपं सुषुप्तिकाले ब्रह्मस्वरूपमेवेति गम्यते । भाष्येऽपि- “सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीवः
एकतां गच्छति ” (सू.भा. १-४-१८), “अपि च न कदाचित् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सत् सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति,
स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्” (सू.भा. ३-२-७), “यथा सुषुप्तादुत्थितः सत्त्वमात्रमवगच्छति सुषुप्ते
‘सन्मात्रमेव केवलं वस्त्विति इत्यभिप्रायः’ ” (छां ६-२-१), “तत्र सति सम्पन्नस्तावत्
तदेकत्वान्न जानातीति युक्तम्” (सू.भा. ३-२-७) इत्येवमादीनि भाष्यवाक्यानि सुषुप्तेऽयं जीवः

ब्रह्मस्वरूपमेव सम्पन्नो भवतीति दर्शयन्ति। अनुभवस्वरूपपर्यालोचनेनापि इदमवगम्यते यत् सुषुप्तौ न कश्चन विशेषोऽनुभूयते। परं आत्मनश्चैतन्यं तत्रापि विद्यत एव, तदेवास्माकं स्वरूपं यतः सर्वोऽपि द्वितीयं वस्त्वन्तरमेव नास्तीत्यनुभवति, न तु अनुभवितुस्स्वरूपमेव मम नास्तीति मन्यते। यदि अनुभवितुस्स्वरूपमेव नाभविष्यत्, तदा किञ्चिदपि नासीदित्यपि वक्तुं नाशक्यत्। यस्मान्नासीत्किञ्चिदपि इत्यपि वक्तुं स्वयं स्यात् तदानीम् इत्यतः स आसीदेवेति गम्यते। लोकेऽपि यं कमपि सुप्तोत्थितं पुरुषं पृष्टे स वदति अहं सुखेनास्वाप्सं न किञ्चित् तदानीं ज्ञातमित्येव खलु सर्वो पुरुषो ब्रवीति। अतः स्वस्य सत्त्वं समर्थयति अन्यत् सर्वं निषेधति। अत्र केचिदाहुः भावाविद्यावादिनः यत्- ‘न जानामि’ इत्यनुभवो न मिथ्याज्ञानविषयः, मिथ्याज्ञानस्य ज्ञानत्वाधिकरणत्वात्, नापि ज्ञानाभावविषयः ज्ञानरूपे आत्मनि तदभावस्यासम्भवात् न वा संशयविषयः अभावविरुद्धज्ञाने तदज्ञाने च तादृशाभावज्ञानायोगात्, यद्विषये कदापि ज्ञानं न भविष्यति तत्रापि न जानामीत्यनुभवाच्च। पारिशेष्यात् तस्यानुभवस्य भावाज्ञानमेव विषयो भविष्यतीति। तदेतत्सर्वमनुभवविरुद्धं भाष्ययुक्तिविरुद्धं च। यतः निश्चितज्ञानसापेक्षस्य ज्ञानाभावादित्रिकस्य तादृशानुभवविषयत्वे बाधकाभावात्। ज्ञानाभावसंशयमिथ्याज्ञानं मुक्त्वा न किञ्चिदज्ञानपदार्थं पश्यामः। न च ‘न जानामि’ इति निर्भासस्य संशयमिथ्याज्ञानगोचरत्वानुपपत्तिः। सम्यग्ज्ञानं हि अत्र ज्ञानशब्दार्थः तस्मान्न जानामीति ज्ञानाभाववत् तदन्यत् तद्विरुद्धं वा ज्ञानं यथासम्भवं गोचरयेत्तत्रेति किमपि बाधकं न पश्यामः।

ननु सुषुप्तौ स्यादित्युक्ते, तत्रापि सुतरामसिद्धिः। न हि जातुचिदनुभूता भावाविद्या तस्यामवस्थायां शक्यानुभवा वा। ननु व्यञ्जकाभावादेवायमनुभवः नाभावहेतुरिति चेत्? तदपि न, यतः न हि विद्यते किञ्चिद्विनिगमकं किमविद्याभावादेवोत व्यञ्जकाभावात् तस्या अननुभवे। न चास्ति व्यञ्जकस्य कस्यचिदवकाशः सुषुप्तौ, यस्मिन् सति निश्चिनुयाम कतरदत्र युक्तमिति। न च व्यञ्जकमन्यदपेक्ष्यैव सर्वत्र वस्तूपलब्धिरिति नियमोऽस्ति। यतः मनसः उपलभ्यमानत्वात्। व्यञ्जकाभावे नोपलभ्यते चेत् मनसोपलब्धिर्न स्यात्। नहि तत्रापि ग्राह्यग्राहकव्यतिरिक्तं किञ्चिद् व्यञ्जकं शक्यशङ्कम्। मनसः स्वच्छद्रव्यत्वात् नास्ति व्यञ्जकान्तरापेक्षेत्युच्येत, अविद्यायास्तु तमोरूपत्वात्तदपेक्षा अस्ति इति। तदपि न समीचीनं- यतः तमोद्रव्यस्य सुतरामालोकसङ्गमासहिष्णुत्वात् व्यञ्जकसत्त्वेऽपि असिध्यापत्तेः। न हि दीपहस्तस्सन् तमो पश्यति कश्चित्। न च स्वयंज्योतीरूपस्य व्यवधानान्तररहितं स्वात्माश्रयं भावाज्ञानमनुभवितुं व्यञ्जकान्तरकल्पनं पेशलं स्यात्। व्यञ्जकस्यापि व्यञ्जनसामर्थ्यं आत्मन

एव खलु? तथाप्यङ्गीक्रियते चेद्भावाविद्यासुषुप्तौ तदापि नेष्टसिद्धिः। यतः सर्वस्य जन्तो स्सुषुप्तेस्स्वाभाविकत्वात् तस्यामपि विशेषानुभवे सति सुषुप्तित्वभङ्ग एव स्यादित्यतः तादृशाविद्या सुषुप्तौ नास्त्येवेति ध्येयम्। साक्षिवेद्यता स्वीकारेप्यविद्यायाः नोक्त दोषान्मुक्तिरस्ति, यतस्तादृशानुभवे सति, सुषुप्तित्वभङ्गो दुर्वारण एव स्यात्। नहि कश्चन तत्रैवाविद्यामन्वभूवमिति परामृशति जागरे, साक्ष्यनुभूतत्वे वा सर्वसंप्रतिरस्ति। सुषुप्तौ विशेषानुभवश्च नाभ्युपगम्यते वा। तस्मादनुभवाभावे नास्तीत्येवावगन्तव्यं भावाज्ञानम्।

ननु “सुखमहमस्वाप्सं न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्” इति जागरिते परामर्शसत्त्वादनुमीयत एव भावाज्ञानं सुषुप्ते इति चेत्, न, जाग्रत्स्वापतुलनरूपमनोव्यापारत्वात्सुप्तोत्थितपरामर्शव्यवहारस्य बुद्धिविकल्पमात्रमेतद्भावाविद्यानुमानम्। यथा जागरितेऽयमहमस्मि, इमे जना मत्तोऽन्य इति विशेषानुभवोऽस्ति स नास्ति सुषुप्ते इत्येव तत् परामर्शवाक्यस्यार्थः। स्मर्यमाणस्यान्यथानुपपत्तेः प्रतीयते एव भावाज्ञानमिति चेत्, न। न किञ्चिदवेदिषमिति सर्वाभावस्मरणात् इति अन्यथाप्युपपत्तेस्तादृशानुमानस्याभासत्वोपपत्तेः। अनुभवितुः स्वरूपे सिद्धे सति अनुभाव्यो नासीदित्येवार्थः परामर्शवाक्यस्य।

ननु कानिचिद् भाष्यवाक्यानि भावाविद्याप्रतिपादकानीव दृश्यन्ते उपनिषत्सु? यथा- ईशावास्ये-(१) “शुद्धं निर्मलं अविद्यामलरहितमिति कारणशरीरप्रतिषेधः” (ई-८) इत्यत्र। न। शरीरं नाम यद्विनाशि तत् इत्यर्थः। शीर्यत इति व्युत्पत्तिदर्शनात्। आत्मज्ञानेन विनाश्यत्वात्, शरीरादिमन्तो वयमित्यस्य प्रत्ययस्य तस्यैवाज्ञानस्य हेतुत्वात् अविद्यां कारणशरीरमित्युक्तमिति ज्ञेयम्। इदं चान्यत् यत्- न कुत्राप्यन्यत्र प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्ये ‘कारणशरीर’मिति पदमुपलभ्यते, इति ज्ञेयम्। (२) द्वितीयं “प्रकृतिः कारणमविद्याव्याकृताख्या” (ई १२) इति। अत्रापि अव्याकृतस्याविद्याकल्पितत्वादविद्येत्युक्तमिति ज्ञेयम्। तथा हि भाष्यम्- “अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन प्रतिपद्यते” (सू.भा २-१-२७) इति। (३) तृतीयं “अविद्याकृतकलानिमित्तो हि मृत्युः तदपगमे अकलत्वादेवामृतो भवति” (प्र.भा. ६-५)। अत्रापि अविद्याकल्पितकलानिमित्तो हि मृत्युरिति अध्यासलक्षणाविद्यापक्षेऽपि सम्भवति नात्र भावाविद्या कल्पनीया। समनन्तरपूर्वब्राह्मणभाष्येऽपि “एताः कलाः प्राणिनामविद्यादिदोषबीजापेक्षया सृष्टा इव सर्वपदार्थाः” (प्र.६-४) इति अविद्याभूमावेव सर्वो सृष्ट्यादिव्यवहारः इत्युक्तम्। (४) चतुर्थं, “परमार्थब्रह्मस्वरूपाभावलक्षणया अविद्यया” (तै.भा. २-८)। अत्रापि “अभावदर्शनमात्रेण” भावाविद्योक्तम् इति न भवति। यतः अग्रे भाष्यकाराः विवेकाविवेकौ रूपादिवत् प्रत्यक्षौ

उपलभ्येते अविद्या च स्वानुभवेन रूप्यते मूढोऽहमिति विवृण्वन्ति । पञ्चमं तु- इममेव ईशावास्यमन्त्रं भगवत्पादाः स्वीयोपदेशसाहस्र्यां स्थूललिङ्गशरीरप्रतिषेधनपरत्वेन व्याख्यातवन्तः (उप. १५-१०) । अतः तेषामप्यभिप्राये “कारणशरीर”मित्यत्र मूलाविद्येति नास्ति । अतः सर्वत्र प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्ये भावाविद्यावादिभिरुक्ताविद्या न कुत्राप्युक्ता, वादिभिरादर्शितप्रकारेण वा वर्णिता । ननु भाष्ये एवान्यत्र “ ‘सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादौ’ मिथ्याज्ञानस्य अनपोदितत्वात्” (सू.भा. २-२-९) “बुद्धिसंबन्धः शक्यात्मना विद्यमान एव सुषुप्तिप्रलययोः आविर्भवति”(सू.भा. २-३-३०) “अपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते” (सू.भा. २-२-९) “तस्मात् तत्प्रकृतिकत्वेऽपि सुषुप्तिप्रलयवत् बीजभावावशेषैवैषा सत्सम्पत्तिः” (सू.भा. ४-२-८) इत्यत्र उक्तमिव भातीति चेत्, न । सर्वत्र तैः प्रतिपादिता भावाविद्योक्तेति न शक्यमवगन्तुम् । यतः तादृशाविद्यायाः न कुत्रापि भाष्यकारेणोक्तत्वात्, यावदात्मज्ञानं तावदज्ञानस्य संशयमिथ्याज्ञानस्य वावश्यंभावात् पुनः एतेभ्यस्त्रिभ्यो अज्ञानादिभ्यः व्यतिरिक्तायाः भावरूपाविद्याया न कस्याप्यनुभवे सत्त्वादयुक्तेयं कल्पना । यत्र भाष्ये सुषुप्तौ क्वचिदग्रहणमुक्तं, तत्र सर्वत्र अग्रहणं नाम ज्ञानाभाव इत्येवार्थः न भावाविद्या यतः ज्ञानमन्तरेण तादृशस्याज्ञानस्य अग्रहणरूपस्य निवृत्यसम्भवात् केवलमज्ञानं व्यवहारदृष्ट्याङ्गीकृतम् । न हि सुषुप्ते ज्ञानप्राप्त्यवकाशोऽस्ति, द्वितीयाभावात् । अपि च सुषुप्तौ ज्ञानाभावे एकत्वमेव कारणं न तु अज्ञाननिमित्तम् (बृ. ४-३-२१) परन्त्व त्नाप्यविद्यासद्भावादेवाज्ञानमिति केचन व्याख्यातारः, तत्तु भाष्यबहिर्भूतमिति स्पष्टमेव । अतः सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादौ अज्ञानम् अनपोदितमित्युक्तं भाष्ये, न त्वज्ञानमस्तीत्युक्तम् । यत्र तु भाष्ये सुषुप्तिस्वरूपस्यैव वर्णनं क्रियते तत्रेदृशं वाक्यं भवति “न च देहाद्यात्मप्रत्ययभ्रान्तिसन्तानविच्छेदेषु सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादिषु कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वाद्यनर्थः उपलभ्यते ” (गी.भा. १८-१६) “एतस्मिन् काले अविद्याकामकर्मनिबन्धनानि कार्यकरणानि शान्तानि भवन्ति । तेषु शान्तेषु शिवं शान्तं भवति” (प्र.भा. ४-७) “प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते यत्राविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति” (बृ.भा. ४-३-२१) “अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपं यत्सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षतः” (बृ.भा. ४-३-२२) इत्यत्र सर्वत्र स्पष्टमुद्धोषितं भाष्यकारेण यत् अविद्याकामकर्मादिकं न भवति सुषुप्ताविति । अविद्याभावे कथम् जाग्रति जनाः? इत्युक्ते जाग्रतीत्येतदविद्या, न तु अविद्यया जागरणम् । “मायामात्रं ह्येतद्यत्परमात्मनोऽवस्थात्रयात्मनावभासनं रज्वा इव सर्पादिभावेन” (सू.भा २-१-९) इति उक्तत्वात्, अवस्थावत्त्वमेवाविद्या, न तु अविद्ययावस्थावत्त्वम् इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥



सुषुप्तात्मविचारः

डा ॥ सी.ना.जोशीशास्त्रिणः, नांदेड्

दूरवाणी : +91 2462 252 396

श्रुतयः, उपनिषदः, ब्रह्मसूत्राणि वेदान्तग्रन्थश्च आत्मस्वरूपनिर्धारणाय प्रयतन्ते। यद्यपि वेदान्तवाक्यैः मायाविद्यादितत्त्वानाम्, जीवस्य तिसृणाम् अवस्थानाम् अन्येषां च विषयाणां तर्कतः श्रुतिप्रामाण्येन च परामर्शः कृतः, तथापि स परामर्शः ब्रह्मविज्ञानपर एव। “आत्मा वारे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यः मन्तव्यः निदिध्यासितव्यश्च ” इति उपदेशे ‘ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति’ इति वेदान्तस्य तात्पर्यम्। सा वेदान्तस्य मर्यादा ॥

सुषुप्तात्मविचारे जीवस्य अवस्थात्रयनिरूपणद्वारा ब्रह्मण एव स्वरूपं निगदितम्। ‘अन्यार्थं तु जैमिनिः प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यामपि चैवमेके’ इति सूत्रे बालाक्यजातशत्रुसंवादे भाष्यकारैः निगदितं यत् सुषुप्तिकाले जीवः परब्रह्मणा एकतां गच्छति। अस्य वाक्यस्य अयमाशयः यत् कौषीतकिब्राह्मणे “यो वै बालाके एतेषां पुरुषाणां कर्ता, यस्य वैतत् कर्म स वेदितव्यः” इति श्रुतिमधिकृत्य विचारः प्रवृत्तः। स यथा- अत्र वेदितव्यत्वेन उपदिष्टः जीवः, उत मुख्यः प्राणः, अथवा परमात्मा इति ?

न च सूत्रद्वये ‘जगद्वाचित्वात्’ ‘जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेत् तद्व्याख्यातम्’ इत्यत्र इदं वाक्यं परमात्मपरमेव इति सिद्धान्तयित्वा ‘अन्यार्थं तु जैमिनिः प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यामपि चैवमेके’ इति सूत्रे इदं वाक्यं जीवपरमस्तीति जैमिनिमतं निर्दिष्टम्। कुत इदं जैमिनिमतं प्रवृत्तमिति चेत् तर्हि प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यां जीवस्यैव परामर्शः इति अवबोधो भवति ॥

प्रश्नस्तावदयम् अस्ति श्रुतौ “क्वैष एतद् बालाके पुरुषोऽशयिष्ट, क्व (तदा) एतदभूत्, कुत एतदागतम्” इति। एतस्मिन् प्रश्ने जीवस्य अधिकरणविषयादि पृष्टम्। तत्र प्रतिवचनमपि

यत् “यदा सुप्तः स्वप्नं न कञ्चन पश्यति, अथास्मिन् प्राण एकधा भवति, एतस्मादात्मनः प्राणाः यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते, प्राणेभ्यो देवाः, देवेभ्यो लोकाः” इति। अत्र श्रुतिवाक्यद्वयेन जीवस्य सुषुप्तौ ब्रह्मणा तद्रूपता उक्ता ॥

अत्र “यदा सुप्तः स्वप्नं न कञ्चन पश्यति” इति श्रुतौ प्राणशब्देन ब्रह्म एव निर्दिष्टम्। अनेन च जीवस्य अधिकरणं ब्रह्म इति सिध्यति। एवं च एतानि वाक्यानि सुषुप्तिकाले जीवः परेण ब्रह्मणा एकतां गच्छति इति निर्दिशन्ति ॥

एवं च ‘एतस्मादात्मनः’ इति श्रुत्या सर्वकारणत्वनिर्देशात् ‘आत्मा’ इति शब्देन ब्रह्मणः एव ग्रहणं भवति। तस्मात् सुषुप्त्यवस्थायां जीवब्रह्मणोः अभेद एव प्रतिपादितः। अयमेव विचारः आचार्यैः “तस्माद् यत्रास्य जीवस्य निःसम्बोधतास्वच्छतारूपः स्वापः उपाधिजनितविशेषविज्ञानरहितं स्वरूपम्। यतस्तद् भ्रंशरूपमागमनम्। सोऽत्र परमात्मा वेदितव्यतया श्रावितः इति गम्यते ” इत्येतैः व्याक्यैः प्रतिपादितः। तथा च यद्यपि प्रश्नवचनाभ्यां जीवस्यैव परामर्शः इति जैमिनिमतम्, तथापि सुषुप्तौ जीवस्य परेण ब्रह्मणा एकरूपत्वात् अत्र परब्रह्मण एव विचार इति भाष्यकाराणामाशयः ॥

तथैव द्वितीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमपादे नवमे सूत्रे ‘न तु दृष्टान्तभावात्’ इत्यत्र पूर्वपक्षिणः शंका आसीत् यत् ‘समस्तस्य विभागस्य अविभागप्राप्तेः पुनर्विभागे न उत्पत्तौ नियमकारणं नोपपद्यते’ इति। तत्र आचार्यैः सुषुप्तात्मविचारः दृष्टान्तद्वारा कृतः। तस्य अयमाशयः- यथा सुषुप्त्यवस्थायां अथवा समाधौ जीवब्रह्मणोः अविभाग एवं भवति, यतो हि तत्र मिथ्याज्ञानमेव नास्ति; तथापि प्रबोधे पुनः विभागः भवत्येव। तथैव कार्यकारणयोः विभागः भविष्यति। अत्र दृष्टान्तद्वारा सुषुप्त्यवस्थायां गतस्य जीवस्य ब्रह्मरूपतामेव अभिप्रयन्ति भाष्यकाराः ॥

ईक्षित्यधिकरणे च “मनः प्रचारोपाधिविशेषसंबन्धात्, इन्द्रियार्थान् गृह्णन् तद्विशेषो जीवो जागर्ति। तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनः शब्दवाच्यो भवति। स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायाम् उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन एवेति स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति इति उच्यते।” इत्येतत् भाष्यकाराणां वचनम्। अत्र जाग्रत्-स्वप्न-अवस्था द्वयेऽपि उपाधिविशिष्टः जीवः विश्वतैजससंज्ञको भवति। अत्र स्वात्मा इति प्रश्नं जगत्कारणमेव गृहीतव्यमिति स्पष्टतया आदौ एव भाष्यकारैः “यः प्रवृत्तः सच्छब्दवाच्यः तम् अपीतो भवति, अपिगतो भवति इत्यर्थः” इत्यनेन वाक्येन निरणायि ॥

तथा च अत्रैव अग्रे आचार्याः “न चेतनः आत्मा अचेतनं प्रधानं स्वरूपत्वेन प्रतिपद्येत” इति तर्कतः अपि सिद्धान्तयन्ति। अत्रैव च अन्या बृहदारण्यकान्तर्गता श्रुतिः अपि चेतने एव जीवस्य (लयम्) दर्शयति। तथा च जीवस्य लयः चेतने एव भवतीति कृत्वैव जगतः कारणम् अचेतनं न भवति इति अत्र तर्कः भवेत्। यद्यपि प्रस्तुतम् अधिकरणं जगत्कारणं किम् इति विषये प्रवृत्तम्, तथापि सुषुप्तात्मविचारं (विशयं) स निर्णयः कर्तुं न शक्यते। अत एव तस्यापि अत्र विचारः कृतः इति सूत्रकाराणाम् एव च भाष्यकाराणामाकृतम् ॥

तृतीयाध्याये द्वितीये पादे सप्तमे सूत्रे अयमेव च विचारः विशेषतः कृतः। तत्र सुषुप्तौ जीवस्य स्थानं किम्? एकमेव स्थानं वा, भिन्नानि वा स्थानानि इत्येतद्विषये विचार्य ‘ब्रह्मैव सुषुप्तिस्थानम्’ इति निर्दिष्टम् ॥

अत्र इदम् आचार्याणां वचनम्- “अपि च न कदाचित् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति स्वरूपस्य अनपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते” इति। जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सह कदाचिदपि तादात्म्यं न भवति इति न। किन्तु तस्य तादात्म्यं सुषुप्तावस्थायां भवत्येव। एष एव उपर्युक्तस्य वाक्यस्य आशयः ॥

अत्र ‘स्थानं ब्रह्म’ इति अधिकरणत्वेन यद्यपि ब्रह्मणः निर्देशः, तथापि तत्र न आधाराधेयभावयोः विवक्षा। किन्तु तादात्म्यमेव विवक्षितम्। ‘स्थानम्’ इति तु औपचारिकः प्रयोगः। इत्येतदपि द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

बृहदारण्यके श्रुतौ अपि आचार्याणामिदं वचनम्- “इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षो विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यं स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति।” अत्र मोक्ष एव प्रत्यक्षतया सुषुप्तावस्थायां भवति इति उक्तम्। तथा च यथा मोक्षे जीवब्रह्मणोः ऐक्यं भवति तथैव अत्र सुषुप्त्यवस्थायाम् ऐक्यं भवति। तत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति। स्वरूपापत्तेः एव “बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद” इति श्रुतिः ॥

सुषुप्ते असंगता अपि अस्ति। सैव बृहदारण्यकश्रुत्या श्येनपक्षिदृष्टान्तेन उक्ता। यथा- “श्येनः परिश्रान्तः नीडम् एव पुनः आश्रितो भवति। यथैवायं जीवः स्वप्नजागरितयोः उपाधिविशिष्टः खिन्नः सुषुप्तौ उपाधिविनिर्मुक्तो भवति। तथैव च न कञ्चन कामं कामयते। न किमपि इच्छति।

अनेन तत्र सुषुप्तौ जीवस्य अन्यविषयकः कामः नास्तीति दर्शितम्। तत्र हि अन्यस्य अभावात् सङ्ग एव नास्ति। कामस्य कारणं सङ्गो भवति। सङ्गाभावात् कामाभावोऽपि दृश्यते” इति ॥

“अविद्यया भयं मन्यते” इत्यत्र कार्यप्रतिषेधद्वारा कारणप्रतिषेधः कृतः। अत्र भयं कार्यं कारणं च अविद्या। अत्र अभयं भवति इति भयस्य निषेधः कृतः। कुतः भयं न भवति? तत्रोत्तरं यथा- भयस्य कारणं अविद्या। सा तत्र नास्ति। अतो न भयापत्तिः इत्याशयोऽत्र ज्ञेयः। एतदेव अग्रे ‘अभयं वै जनकं प्राप्तोऽसि’ इति श्रुतिवाक्येन उपपत्तितः दर्शितम् ॥

तथैव च पुनः ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्ये तृतीयाध्याये द्वितीयपादे सप्तमे सूत्रे “ब्रह्मैव तु एकम् अनपायि सुषुप्तिस्थानम्” इति आचार्याणां वचनम्। अस्य वचनस्य अयमाशयः - तत्र नाड्यादीनां समुच्चयः नापेक्षते। यतो हि तेषां विज्ञानेन किमपि फलं नास्ति। श्रुतौ तथा नोक्तम्। ब्रह्मणः विज्ञानस्य तु फलं विद्यते। ब्रह्मणः जीवस्य च ऐक्यम्, एवं च स्वप्नजागरितस्थानात् जीवस्य मुक्तिः। तदेतत् अत्र फलम्। नाड्यादीनां विज्ञानस्य ईदृशं किमपि फलं नास्ति। तद्विज्ञानस्य यद्यपि फलं न श्रूयते, तथापि तस्य अङ्गफलं स्यात् इत्यपि आशंका न कार्या। तद्विज्ञानं फलवतः कस्यचित् अङ्गमस्तीति श्रुतौ नोक्तम्। तस्मादत्र सुषुप्तिस्थानं ब्रह्मैवेति स्पष्टम् ॥

तात्पर्यं तु, सुषुप्तौ अविद्यादिकं किमपि नास्ति। जीवः ब्रह्मणा एकतां गच्छति। एष आचार्याणां भाष्यस्य आशयः ॥



अध्यारोपापवादरीत्या कार्यकारणभावप्रतिपादनम्

महामहोपाध्यायाः आर्. कृष्णमूर्तिशास्त्रिणः, चेन्नै

दूरवाणी : +91 44 2498 4698

उपोद्धातः- सर्वे वेदान्ताः आत्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तये प्रवृताः। दर्शनेषु दर्शनीयतमं दर्शनं वेदान्तदर्शनम् इति प्रवाद अत एवोपपन्नः। पूर्ण-भूम-अद्वितीय-ब्रह्म-शब्दाः निष्प्रपञ्चम् एकं तत्त्वमेव सूचयन्ति। अभिलषितेषु पुरुषार्थेषु निर्भयता एव सर्वोत्तमम् अभिलषितं वर्तते। अत एव बृहदारण्यके उपसंहृतं- “अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसि”-इति। प्रायः सर्वाः उपनिषदः उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्याम् अभ्यासेन च इदम् एकत्वं द्रढयन्ति। ‘लोको भिन्नरुचिः’- इति न्यायेन भेदप्रपञ्चे एव स्वरसतः जन्तूनां रुचिः परिज्ञानं च समस्ति। एवम् अतिरूढे मूढे दृढप्रत्यये जाग्रति सति भूमज्ञानम् अथवा सुखज्ञानं कथम् उदेष्यति? अस्यां दशायां मातापितृसहस्रेभ्योऽपि हितैषिणी श्रुतिः नानाप्रकारेण अस्मान् विविधैः न्यायैः आत्मैकत्वं बोधयति। ब्रह्मणो जगत्सर्गः, तेषु अनुप्रवेशः- इत्यादिः एकरूपेण उपनिषत्सु वरीवर्ति। अत एव ऐतरेयोपनिषद्भाष्ये द्वितीयाध्यायोपोद्धाते एवमुक्तं- “अत्रात्मावबोधमात्रस्य विवक्षितत्वात् सर्वोऽयमर्थवादः इत्यदोषः। मयाविवद्धा, महामायावी देवः सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिः सर्वमेतच्चकार। सुखावबोधनप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं लोकवदाख्यायिकादिप्रपञ्चः इति युक्ततरः पक्षः। न हि मृदादिपरिज्ञानात्किञ्चित्फलमिष्यते। ऐकात्म्यस्वरूपपरिज्ञानादमृतत्वं फलं सर्वोपनिषद्प्रसिद्धम्” ॥ (ऐ.भा.२-१)

अत्रैकम् उदाहरणम् एवं वक्तुं शक्यं यत् “नैष्कर्म्यं वास्तविकं कर्मणां योगबुद्धानुष्ठानिनैव सेत्स्यति, न तु कर्मणां परित्यागेन” इति उक्तं हि “न कर्मणामनारम्भात् नैष्कर्म्यं पुरुषोऽनुते। न च सन्यसनादेव सिद्धिं समधिगच्छति ॥” (गी. ३-४)

१. विविधसृष्टिवाक्यानि-

तैत्तिरीयोपनिषदि ब्रह्मणो लक्षणम् एवमुक्तम्- “सत्यं ज्ञानमन्ततं ब्रह्म” इति। तत्र परिच्छेदत्रयरहितम् अनन्तशब्दार्थं वस्तु- इति श्रुत्वा शङ्का जायते- सर्वजगत्कारणं ब्रह्म कार्यवस्तुभ्यो भिन्नमेव खलु स्यात्; ततश्च कार्यवस्तुभ्यः परिच्छेदः कथं वार्यते? इति। अत्रैवं शङ्कासमाधाने भाष्योक्ते --

शङ्काः- कथं पुनः सर्वानन्यत्वं ब्रह्मणः इत्युच्यते?

सर्ववस्तुकारणत्वात्॥ सर्वेषां हि वस्तूनां कालाकाशादीनां कारणं ब्रह्म कार्यापेक्षया वस्तुतोऽन्तवत्त्वम् इति चेत्;

समाधानम्:- न, अनृतत्वात् कार्यवस्तुनः। न हि कारणव्यतिरेकेण कार्यं नाम वस्तुतोऽस्ति। यतः कारणबुद्धिर्निवर्तते। वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यं, एवं सदेव सत्यम् इति श्रुत्यन्तरात्। अतो निरतिशयमात्मनः आनन्त्यं देशतः तथाऽकार्यत्वात् कालतः, तद्भिन्नवस्त्वन्तराभावाच्च वस्तुतः॥ -इति (तै.भा. २-१)

२. **मुण्डोकोपनिषदि** “एवं पुरुषात्सर्वमिदं सम्प्रसूतम्। अतो वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयमनृतं, पुरुष इत्येव सत्यम् अतः पुरुष एवेदं सर्वं न विश्वं नाम पुरुषादन्यत्किञ्चिदस्ति” (मुं. २-१-१०)

३. **छान्दोग्ये-** एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं कथं भवेदित्युपपादनसन्दर्भे मृद्धटोदाहरणं दत्तम्। तत्र च भाष्यम् एवं प्रवर्तते- “कथं मृत्पिण्डे कारणे विज्ञाते कार्यमन्यत् विज्ञातं स्यात्? नैष दोषः, कारणेनानन्यत्वात् कार्यस्य। यन्मन्यसे अन्यस्मिन्विज्ञाते अन्यत् न ज्ञायते इति; सत्यमेवं स्यात्, यदि अन्यत्कारणात् कार्यम्। ननु कथं तर्हि लोके ‘इदं कारणम्’ ‘अयमस्य विकारः’ इति? शृणु वाचारम्भणं वागरम्भरणं वागालम्भनमित्येतत्। कोऽसौ? विकारः; नामधेयं नामैव नामधेयं, स्वार्थे ध्येयप्रत्ययः।” (छां. ६-१-४)

४. **ऐतरेये-** आत्मशब्देनैव परमात्मानमुपक्रम्य ‘स ईक्षत’ इत्यादिवाक्यैः कारणत्वं तस्य प्रतिज्ञायते। तत्र कारणं ब्रह्म, कार्यं जगत् इत्यादिभेदव्यवहारः कथम् उपपद्यते इति शङ्कायाम् इदमेवमुक्तम्- “अथवा यथा विज्ञानवान्मायावी निरुपादानः आत्मानमेव आत्मान्तरत्वेन, आकाशेन गच्छन्तमिव निर्मिमीते तथा सर्वज्ञो देवः सर्वशक्तिः महामायः आत्मानमेवात्मान्तरत्वेन जगद्रूपेण निर्मिमीते इति युक्ततरम्। एवं च सति कार्यकारण-उभयासद्वादादिपक्षाश्च न प्रसज्यन्ते अनिराकृताश्च भवन्ति” (ऐ. १-२)

५. **प्रश्नोपनिषदि** च - षष्ठप्रश्नसन्दर्भे षोडशकलपुरुषनिरूपणप्रस्तावे एवं प्रतिपादितम्- “इहैवान्तश्शरीरे हृदयपुण्डरीकाकारमध्ये हे सोम्य स पुरुषः न देशान्तरे विज्ञेयः, याश्च एता उच्यमानाः षोडशकलाः प्राणान्ताः प्रभवन्ति उत्पद्यन्ते इति । षोडशकलाभिरुपाधिभूताभिः सकल इव निष्कलपुरुषो लक्ष्यते अविद्यया इति तदुपाधिकलाध्यारोपापनयनेन विद्यया स पुरुषः केवलो दर्शयितव्यः इति कलानां तत्प्रभवत्वमुच्यते प्राणादीनाम् । अत्यन्तनिर्विशेषे तत्त्वे न शक्योऽध्यारोपमन्तरेण प्रतिपाद्यप्रतिपादनादिव्यवहारः कर्तुम् इति कलानां प्रभवस्थित्यप्यया आरोप्यन्ते अविद्याविषयाः” (प्र. ६-१)

अत्र च ब्रह्मसूत्रं स्मर्तव्यम् “अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्” (३-२-१४) इति । अन्यच्च- “प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः ” (३-२-२२)- इत्येवम् अरोप्यनिषेधनप्रकारं विना उपदेशप्रकारोऽन्यो नास्ति इति स्पष्टमुक्तम् ।

६. **सूत्रभाष्ये**- तत्र तत्र ब्रह्मकारणत्वं जगतः प्रतिष्ठापयन्तः सूत्रकाराः तदनन्यत्वाधिकरणे प्रपञ्चस्य कालत्रयनिषेधप्रतियोगित्वं न्यरूपयन् । तत्र च भाष्ये एवमुक्तम्- “तत्र कल्पितरूपप्रतिषेधनेन ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपावेदनम् इति निर्णयते । तदास्पदं हि **इदं समस्तं कार्यं** नेति नेति इति प्रतिषिद्धम् । युक्तं च कार्यस्य वाचारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः असत्त्वमिति नेति नेतीति प्रतिषेधनम्, न तु ब्रह्मणः सर्वकल्पनाशून्यत्वात् ।” -इति ।

अत्रेतः परं प्रक्षालनपङ्कन्यायायातः स्यादिति शङ्काम् उत्थाय एवं परिहारः कृतः- “यतो नेदं शास्त्रं प्रतिपाद्यत्वेन ब्रह्मणो रूपत्रयं निर्दिशति, लोकप्रसिद्धं तु इदं रूपद्वयं ब्रह्मणि कल्पितं परामृशति प्रतिषेध्यत्वाय शुद्धब्रह्मस्वरूपप्रतिपादनाय च- इति निरवद्यम्”- (ब्र.सू.३-२-२२)

७. **बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्योपोद्धाते** च एवमुपसंहृतम्- “सोऽयं व्याकृताव्याकृतरूपसंसारः अविद्याविषयः क्रियाकारकफलात्मकतया आत्मरूपत्वेन अध्यारोपितोऽविद्ययैव मूर्तामूर्ततद्वासनात्मकः..... अतोऽस्मात् क्रियाकारकफलभेदस्वरूपात् एतावदिदम् इति साध्यसाधनरूपाद्विरक्तस्य कामादिदोषकर्मबीजभूताविद्यानिवृत्तये रज्ज्वामिव सर्पविज्ञानापनयनाय ब्रह्मविद्यारभते ” बृ.अव.

अत्र च व्याख्याने अयं भागः एवमवतारितः - व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकसंसारस्य प्रामाणिकत्वेन सत्यत्वमाशङ्क्य अविद्याकृतत्वेन तन्मिथ्यात्वमुक्तं स्मारयति- सोऽयमिति ॥

८. जन्माद्यधिकरणे च तत अनुमानरूपत्वनिरसनप्रस्तावे एवमुक्तम्-

“न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवमिह प्रमाणं; अनुभवावसानत्वात्, भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य” -(ब्र.सू. १-१-२)

अत्र भामत्यां एवमुक्तं- “व्यतिरेकसाक्षात्कारस्य नीरूपो विषयविषयिभावः”-इति। तत्र च कल्पतरुः-“प्रपञ्चाभावोपलक्षितस्वरूपं, तद्विषयसाक्षात्कारस्य ब्रह्मणा सह विकल्परूपो विषयविषयिरूपः संबन्धः अस्ति न तु तत्त्वतः”

९. “सत्त्वाच्चावरस्य” (२-१-१६) सूत्रभाष्यव्याख्यापरंपरायां- परिमलकारैः एवमुक्तम्- (पृ.४६६) “अस्मन्मते भेदतत्प्रतीत्योः मायामयत्वेन लोकमर्यादयाप्राप्तकारणानपेक्षणात्, न ऐन्द्रजालिकप्रदर्शितानेकप्रासादनगरादीनि तदपेक्षाणि। अस्माकं तु अध्यारोपापवादेन ब्रह्मात्मैक्यपरणां स्वार्थतात्पर्याभावात् मायिका प्रपञ्चसृष्टिः (मिथ्या)तथावाऽस्तु”- इति।

१०. “प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः” (३.२.२२) इति सूत्रे भष्ये एवमुक्तं- “तस्मात् ब्रह्मणो रूपप्रपञ्चं प्रतिषेधति परिशिनष्टि ब्रह्म इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम्” (पृ.७२०) “युक्तं च कार्यस्य वाचारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः असत्त्वमिति नेति नेतीति प्रतिवचनम्, न तु ब्रह्मणः सर्वकल्पनाशून्यत्वात्।”(पृ. ७२१)

“न चेषमाशङ्का कर्तव्या- कथं हि शास्त्रं स्वयमेव ब्रह्मणः रूपद्वयं दर्शयित्वा स्वयमेव पुनः प्रतिषेधति - प्रक्षालनाद्धि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम् इति? यतो नेदं शास्त्रं प्रतिपाद्यत्वेन ब्रह्मणो रूपद्वयं निर्दिशति, लोकप्रसिद्धं त्विदं रूपद्वयं ब्रह्मणि कल्पितं परामृशति प्रतिषेध्यत्वाय शुद्धब्रह्मस्वरूपप्रतिपादनाय च इति निरवद्यम् ॥ ”

“नहि प्रपञ्चप्रतिषेधरूपादादेशनात् अन्यत् परम् आदेशनं ब्रह्मणोऽस्ति - इति”

११. बृहदारण्यकोपनिशद्भाष्ये (२-१-१९) “अथ यदा सुषुप्तो भवति”, इति कण्डिकायाः व्याख्यां समाप्य “क्वैष तदाऽभूत्” इत्यस्य प्रश्नस्य प्रतिवचनमुक्तम्, ‘कुत एतदागात्’ इत्यस्य प्रश्नस्य अपाकरणार्थः आरम्भः... इत्युक्त्वा, प्रश्नद्वयस्य पौनरुक्त्यरूपामाशङ्कां परिहर्तुम् एवमुपक्रान्तम्- “नैष दोषः, प्रश्नाभ्यामात्मनि क्रियाकारकफलात्मताऽपोहाय विवक्षितत्वात्”- ततः परं विद्याविषयब्रह्मणः निर्णयाय, ‘ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणि’ इति प्रक्रान्तं, ज्ञपयिष्यामि इति च इत्युक्त्वा एवं सुदृढम् उद्धोषितम्- “तस्य च याथाम्यं क्रियाकारकफलभेदशून्यम् अत्यन्तशुद्धमद्वैतम्-

इत्येतत् विवक्षितम्”(पृ. २४७).

तत्सन्दर्भे उक्तं -(पृ. २४८) “आत्मव्यतिरेकेण वस्त्वन्तराभावात् न अस्ति प्राणादि आत्मव्यतिरिक्तं वस्त्वन्तरं न , प्राणादेः तत् एव निष्पत्तेः, तत् कथमिति, उच्यते- यथोर्णनाभिः”

अनेन प्रकरणेन इदं ज्ञायते यत् कारणत्वं ब्रह्मणि एकत्वबोधनाय, अत्र च विस्तरशः विचारं कृत्वा एवं स्थिरीकृत्योच्यते- “किंचातो? शृणु, अतो यद्भवति; यथाभूता मूर्तामूर्तादिपदार्थधर्माः लोके प्रसिद्धाः, तद्दृष्टान्तोपादानेन तदविरोध्येव वस्त्वन्तरं ज्ञापयितुं प्रकृतं शास्त्रं न लौकिकवस्तुविरोधज्ञापनाय लौकिकमेव दृष्टान्तमुपादत्ते” (पृ. २५८)

“तस्मात् उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यामयमर्थो निश्चीयते-परमात्मैकत्वप्रत्ययद्रढिम्ने उत्पत्तिस्थिति- प्रलयप्रतिपादकानि वाक्यानीति, अन्यथा वाक्यभेदप्रसङ्गाच्च।” इति। (पृ. २५९)

“तस्मात् एकरूपैकत्वप्रत्ययदाढ्यायैव सर्ववेदान्तेषु उत्पत्तिस्थितिप्रलयकल्पना न तत्प्रत्ययकरणाय”(पृ.२६१)

एवमेव तत्र तत्र भाष्यपर्यालोचनेन निश्चितमिदम् अस्माभिरवगन्तव्यम्, यत्- “कार्यकारणभावस्यब्रह्मजगतोः,वस्तुतःअध्यारोपापवादन्यायमनुसृत्यएकत्वप्रत्ययदाढ्यार्थत्वमेव” इति परन्तु अधिकारिणां वेदान्तजिज्ञासूनाम् “आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्तमदृष्टयः” इति रीत्या त्रैविध्यात् येषां मध्यमादीनां झटित्येव पूर्वोक्ततत्त्वस्य हृदयंगमत्वं -मनसि अनाकुलतया स्वीकारः न भवति तेषामपि क्रमशः तत्त्वबोधो जायताम् इति मनीषया,भोक्तृपत्यधिकरणन् यायेन प्रतिपत्तिक्रममनुसृत्य स्वप्नात्मकत्वे जाग्रत्प्रपञ्चस्य अध्यारोपविशेषात्प्राप्तं शृङ्गवत्वम् अनादिवासनासंदृब्धम् अनुजानन्त एव सूत्रभाष्यकाराः, उभयलिङ्गाधिकरणे- (३-२-११) नाभावाधिकरणे (२-२-२९) च बोधयति। तथाहि तत्रस्थानि कानिचन वाक्यानि पश्यामः ---

“किं पुनर्वैधर्म्यं; बाधाबाधाविति ब्रूमः”(पृ.५५५) ()

“बाधते हि स्वप्नोपलब्धं वस्तु प्रतिबुद्धस्य मिथ्या मयोपलब्धो महाजनसमागमः इति ...

नैवं जागरितोपलब्धं वस्तु स्तम्भादिकं कस्याञ्चिदवस्थायां बाध्यते” (पृ. ५५५)

“अपि च स्मृतिरेषा यत्स्वप्नदर्शनम्, उपलब्धिस्तु जागरितदर्शनम्..”(पृ.५५५)

“इतराणि तु आकारवद्ब्रह्मविषयाणि वाक्यानि न तत्प्रधानानि, उपासनाविधिप्रधानानि हि तानि। तेष्वसति विरोधे यथाश्रुतमाश्रयितव्यम्। सति तु विरोधे तत्प्रधानानि अतत्प्रधानेभ्यो बलीयांसि भवन्तीति एष विनिगमनायां हेतुः।” (पृ.२०९)

“एवं ब्रह्मापि पृथिव्यादिसंबन्धात्तदाकारतामिव प्रतिपद्यते, तदालम्बनो ब्रह्मणः आकारविशेषोपदेशः उपासनार्थो न विरुध्यते। एवमवैयर्थ्यम् आकारबद्धविषयाणामपि वाक्यानां भविष्यति”।

“नहि वेदवाक्यानां कस्यचिदर्थवत्त्वं कस्यचिदनर्थवत्त्वम् इति युक्तं प्रतिपत्तुं, प्रमाणत्वाविशेषात्” (पृ.७०९)

“नैसर्गिक्याम् अविद्यायां सत्यामेव लोकवेदव्यवहारावतारः इति तत्र तत्रावोचाम”-- इति। (पृ.७०९)

एवं च प्रतिपत्तिदशायां बालकस्य चलनाभ्यासोत्पत्तिदशायां त्रिचक्रिकाशकटावलम्बनेन चलनशक्तिमुत्पाद्य तदनन्तरं स्वचरणावस्थानं यथा शिक्ष्यते एवमत्रापि सोपानक्रमकल्पनया भाष्ये प्रवृत्तिः दरीदृश्यते। अत एव संध्याधिकरणे (३.२.१)

“न च वियदादिसर्गस्यापि आत्यन्तिकं सत्यत्वमस्ति। प्रतिपादितं हि तदनन्यत्व-मारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः (२.१.१४) इत्यत्र समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम्। प्राक्तु ब्रह्मात्वदर्शनात् वियदादिप्रपञ्चः व्यवस्थितरूपः भवति। सन्ध्याश्रयस्तु प्रपञ्चः प्रतिदिने बाध्यते इत्यतो वैशेषिकं संध्यस्य मायामात्रत्वमुदितम्” (पृ. ६९३)

सर्वमिदम् एतल्लेखप्रतिपादितम् अतिसंक्षिप्तेन चिरन्तनोक्तिकथनोद्धरणेन समन्वया-धिकरणभाष्यान्ते-

“देहात्मप्रत्ययो यद्वत् प्रमाणत्वेन कल्पितः।

लौकिकं तद्वदेवेदं प्रमाणं तु आ आत्मनिश्चयात्॥(पृ.१५५)- इति”



कार्यकारणप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्

श्रीअद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः

दूरवाणी : +91 8175 273 820

सर्वा अपि प्रक्रिया ब्रह्मात्मस्वरूपप्रतिपादनाय एव प्रवृत्ता इति सुप्रसिद्धमिदं वेदान्ताभियुक्तानाम्। तत्र कार्यकारणप्रक्रियापि तत् कथं प्रतिपादयतीति भवति विचारणा। कार्यं नाम उत्पन्नं वस्तु, क्रियत इति कार्यमिति व्युत्पत्तेः, कारणं नाम उत्पादकं वस्तु करोतीति कारणमिति व्युत्पत्तिसम्भवात्। तत्र कार्यं वस्तु, आकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चम्। कारणं तु ब्रह्मैव। तत्र “तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः” इति सूत्रेण कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वं प्रत्येतव्यम्। यद्यप्यापाततः भिन्नभिन्नासूपनिषत्सु क्वचित् तेजआदिका, क्वचित् आकाशादिका, क्वचित् अक्रमेणेति विभिन्नरूपेणैव सृष्टिः प्रतिपादितेति भाति तथाप्येतत् सर्वं भगवान् सूत्रकार एव “न वियदश्रुतेः” इत्यत आरभ्य कार्यविगानं सर्वं पर्यहार्षीत्। दिङ्मात्रतयात्र पुनः प्रदर्श्यते तत्र मुण्डकोपनिषदमेवाधिकृत्य सर्वेषां सृष्टिवाक्यानामेकवाक्यतावगन्तव्या। यतस्तत्र साकल्येनोक्तत्वात्। सृष्टिविषयपर्यालोचनेन जगदुत्पिपादयिषया प्राणिकर्मवशात् ब्रह्म सृष्ट्युन्मुखं भवति। बीजमिवाङ्कुरमुत्पिपादयिषतदित्यर्थः। ततः अव्याकृतमन्नमविद्याकल्पितनारूपबीजशक्तिरूपमजायत, व्याचिकीर्षितावस्थां समापद्यतेत्यर्थः। ततोऽव्याकृतात् ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तिप्रधानः हिरण्यगर्भः स एव सूत्रात्मेत्युच्यते, स अजायत। ततः मन इति सङ्कल्पविकल्पाद्यात्मकं समष्ट्यन्तःकरणतत्त्वं उत्पन्नम्। ततः सर्वाणीन्द्रियाणीति ध्येयम्, “मनस्सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च”(२-१-३) इत्युत्तरत्र पाठात्। मनस्समानयोगक्षेमत्वाच्च करणानाम्। अत्राभौतिकानां सर्वेषां करणानां सृष्टिं शिष्ट्वा ततः भौतिकस्य सृष्टिं शास्तीति ज्ञेयम्। अनन्तरं सत्यं, सत्यं नाम मूर्तामूर्तात्मकं सूक्ष्मं भूतपञ्चकम्। तस्मात् भूतपञ्चकात् अण्डक्रमेण सप्तलोकाः, अत्रैव विराट्सृष्टिरप्युक्तेति वेदितव्या। तदर्थं पञ्चीकृतस्थूलभूतसृष्टिश्चोक्तेति ज्ञेयम्। विराजः देवाः ऋषयो मनुष्याः पशुपक्षिमृगास्तरुलतागुल्मादयो जाता इति वेदितव्यम्। ततः कर्माणि तत्फलानि चोत्पन्नानि इति सृष्टिक्रमः।

अत्रेदं अवधेयं, सुवर्णाज्जातानां स्वस्तिरुचकादीनां मृदो जातानां च घटशरावोदञ्चनादीनामनन्यत्वं दृष्टं तद्वदत्रापि दार्ष्टान्तिके वियत्पवनयोरनलानिलयोर्वा, अप्तेजसोर्वारिधरणयोर्वा न दृश्यते अनन्यत्वं । परमत्रापि भवितव्यं प्रतिज्ञासंसिध्यर्थम् । ब्रह्मजगतोर्वा न शक्यते प्रत्यक्षादिनावगन्तुमनन्यत्वं तत्कथं संगच्छते कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायः ब्रह्मात्मकत्वं वा सर्वस्य? नैष दोषः । यद्यपि जगदन्तर्वर्तिनां जीवानां स्वीयप्रमातृदृष्ट्यावनिजलतेजसां स्वकारणभूताप्तेजोनिलेभ्योऽनन्यत्वं, तथापि ‘सूक्ष्मताव्यापिते ज्ञेये गन्धादेरुत्तरोत्तरम्’ इति (उप.सा. ९-२) भगवत्पादैरादर्शितानुमानप्रमाणेन शक्यत एवावगन्तुं तथा चैतन्याव्यतिरेकेणानुपलम्भात् सर्वस्य द्वैतजातस्य प्रपञ्चस्य, चैतन्यात्मकत्वाच्च ब्रह्मणः ब्रह्माभिन्नत्वं प्रपञ्चस्य, पञ्चभूतानां च परस्परानन्यत्वं शक्यत एवावगन्तुमिति ध्येयम् । ‘मायामात्रं ह्येतद्यदवस्थात्रयात्मना परमार्थात्मनोऽवभासनम्’ (सू.भा. २-१-९) इत्युक्तेः ।

अन्यच्चेदं यत् जगदन्तर्वर्तिनां घटपटादीनां सर्वेषामुत्पत्तिः कालदेशाधारत्वेन भवति, परं यदा समस्तस्य कालदेशादिसहितस्य प्रपञ्चस्यैवोत्पत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते, तदा कथं सा देशकालाधारत्वेनोत्पत्तिरिति विवक्ष्यते? । अत एव नियतपूर्ववर्ति कारणमिति लक्षणं जगदन्तर्वर्तिनां पदार्थानां संगच्छते, नतु समस्तस्य कालदेशकार्यकारणानामरूपलक्षणस्य प्रपञ्चस्य । अत एवात्र कार्यं नाम कल्पनारूपं कारणं नाम कल्पनाधारभूतमिति ध्येयम् । तद्यथा कल्पितस्य सर्पस्य कार्यत्वं रज्जोश्च कारणत्वमितिवत् ध्येयम् । तद्वत् कल्पितस्य प्रपञ्चस्य कार्यत्वं कल्पनाधारस्य ब्रह्मणः कारणत्वमुक्तमित्यवगन्तव्यम् । यदा प्रपञ्चस्य कल्पितत्वं भवति तदा तस्य कार्यत्वमप्यपगच्छति । कार्यत्वाभावे कारणत्वस्याप्यभाव इति ब्रह्म कार्यकारणोभयरूपविधुरमिति सिद्धं भवति । तदा केवले शास्त्रप्रकाशिते ब्रह्मण्येवोपशाम्यति मनः । एतदर्थमेव हि कल्पिता कार्यकारणप्रक्रिया । अन्यथोभयसत्यत्वे द्वैतप्रसङ्गात् सिद्धान्तहानिरनिर्माक्षप्रसङ्गश्च प्रसज्यते । तादृशोभयरूपविनिर्मुक्तं केवलं रूपं सुषुप्तौ सर्वैरप्यनुभूयत इति सर्वेषां नः प्रत्यक्षमेतत् । अध्यारोपदृष्ट्या ब्रह्मणि कारणत्वं जगतश्च कार्यत्वमुक्तमिति न प्रस्मर्तव्यम् । जगतः कार्यत्वाभावे ब्रह्मणः कारणत्वस्याप्यभावः अतः एतादृशचिन्तनरीत्यावगन्तव्यं सर्वात्मभूतं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतमित्युक्त्वा विरम्यते ।



वेदान्तेषु कार्यकारणप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणम् (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)

श्रीशर्वानन्दस्वामिनः, प्रणवधाम, उत्तरकाशी

दूरवाणी : +91 9458134070

कार्यं नाम कर्तुं इष्टम्- क्रियते इति कार्यं -फलम्- इति अनर्थान्तरम्। कारणं नाम-येन विना यन्न भवति/ न सिध्यति (अर्थात् कार्यं न भवति) तत् तस्य कारणम्। यद्यपि भिन्नभिन्नदर्शनेषु कार्यकारणयोः सिद्धान्ते तथा परिभाषायाः भिन्नत्वेऽपि, वेदान्तेषु एतावन्मात्रेणैव बोधेन अभीष्टं तत्त्वं निरूपयितुं शक्यते।

कार्यात्मकमिदं दृश्यमानं जगद् यस्मिन्नधिष्ठाने, अधिष्ठानस्वरूपाज्ञाननिमित्तो भ्रान्त्या प्रतीयते, तदेव अध्यासं आधारं कृत्वा श्रुत्यनुसारेण तद् भ्रान्तिनिवृत्त्यर्थं अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण परम् तत्त्वं बोधयन्ति सम्प्रदायविदः आचार्याः।

तदुक्तं भाष्यकृता “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चम् प्रपञ्चते इति तथा हि सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम्।” प्रक्रिया नाम- प्रकर्षेण क्रियासाधनम्। अध्यारोपो नाम- वस्तुन्यवस्तु-आरोपो(व्यवहारः) यथा शुक्तिकाशकलादौ रजतादेः, अत्र वस्तु चिदात्मा तत्रावस्तुनः प्रपञ्चस्यारोपः, तथा हि-अतीन्द्रियं निर्विशेषं वस्तु प्रतिपादयितुं श्रुत्या प्रथमतः सृष्टिमाध्यमेन कार्यं जगत् कस्माच्चित् कारणाज्जातम् इति दर्शयति। तदेव अध्यारोपः। अपवादो नाम दोषप्रस्थापनम्- तथा सति आरोपितस्याधिष्ठानमात्रं पर्यवसानम्, अर्थात् अधिष्ठाने भ्रान्त्या प्रतीतस्याधिष्ठानव्यतिरेकेण अभावनिश्चयः, एवमेतदुक्तं भवति- (१) दृश्यमानं जगत्प्रपञ्चं कार्यात्मकं किमपि कारणं विना न भवितुमर्हति, न द्रष्टुं शक्यते। (२) अतः येन विना यन्न सिध्यति / भवति वा तदस्ति एव, इन्द्रियागम्यमपि सद्- एतद् निश्चीयते, एतद् एव दर्शितं सूत्रकृता “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” इति

सूत्रेण, तथा मूर्तामूर्तब्राह्मणे बृहदारण्यकोपनिषदि (३) तदनन्तरं निषेधश्रुतिभिः - अथात आदेशेनेति नेति इति नेत्यन्यत् परमस्ति” , अथवा वाचारम्भणश्रुत्या- “वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्” कार्यस्य विकारमात्रत्वात्, केवलं प्रतीयते, कारणमेव सत्यम्। अर्थात् अधिष्ठानमेव सत्यम्, कार्यं तु नास्ति एव। (४) अतः यदा कार्यं नास्ति इति निर्णयते तदा कारणताऽपि नास्ति, परन्तु किमपि अविकारि निर्विशेषं वस्तु/ धातु अस्ति एव यद् भ्रान्त्या जगद्रूपेण प्रतीयते, अर्थात् यदा पारमार्थिकदृष्ट्या कार्यं प्रपञ्चं नास्ति इति निश्चीयते तदा कारणताऽपि नास्ति, अपि तु अस्ति तदधिष्ठानं निर्विशेषं- यत् जगद्रूपेण एतावन्तं कालं दृश्यते मया इति बोद्धुं शक्यते। इयं एव अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रिया।

अत्र एतत् चिन्त्यं- कथं श्रुतिप्रतिपादितं जगत् ‘मिथ्या’ अथवा ‘नास्ति एव’ इति निश्चीयते? यतः अस्य जगतः कारणरूपेण यत् दर्शितं श्रुत्या तस्मिन् निर्विशेषे, अपरिच्छिन्ने, निरवयवे अविकारिणि अधिष्ठाने कारणतारूपी योग्यता नास्ति एव, तदुक्तं कारिकारैः “द्रव्यं द्रव्यस्य हेतुः स्यात् अन्यदन्यस्य चैव हि। द्रव्यत्वमन्यभावो वा धर्माणां नोपपद्यते” (गौ.का ४-५३); निष्कलं निष्क्रियं (श्वे. ६-११) श्रुतेः अतः विवर्त एव एकमात्र उपायो येन जगत् प्रतीयते। कोऽयं विवर्तो नाम? पूर्वावस्थाऽनपाये अवस्थान्तरापत्तिः /यथार्थपूर्वरूपापरित्यागेना सत्यनानाकारप्रतिभासः। यथा रज्जुसर्पः।

अतः ब्रह्मसूत्रे यदा प्रथमसूत्रेण विवेकवैराग्यवद्भिः षट्सम्पत्ति(समान्न)मुमुक्षुभिः ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा कर्तव्या इति निश्चीयते, तदा प्रश्नं उत्थाप्य- किं तद् ब्रह्म इति? अर्थात् किं लक्षणं ब्रह्म? यस्मात् “लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां वस्तुसिद्धिः”, अतः किं लक्षणं तद् ब्रह्म इति जिज्ञासायां, द्वितीय सूत्रेण सूत्रकारेण उत्तरं दीयते, श्रुतिवाक्यमाश्रित्य - “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” (अध्यारोपप्रक्रियाम् आश्रित्य), अत्र भाष्यकृता सूत्रार्थं कृतं “अस्य जगतो नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियतदेशकालक्रियाश्रयस्य मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभङ्गः यतः सर्वज्ञात् सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद् भवति तद् ब्रह्म।” (१-१-२)। उपर्युक्तचतुर्णां जगद्विशेषणानां विचारेण श्रुतिवाक्यसहितेन-“सोऽकामायत”, “स ईक्षत” इत्यादिना एतद् निश्चीयते किमपि चेतनतत्त्वं विना एतादृशः जगतः कारणम् असम्भवम्। एतेन श्रुत्या प्रधानादिकारणवादा निराकृताः। यद्यपि अनिर्वचनीये तत्त्वे कस्यापि शब्दस्य प्रयोगोऽयुक्तः, तथापि भिन्नभिन्नदार्शनिकानां मतं निराकरणार्थं श्रुतिमाश्रित्य शब्दप्रयुज्यते वेदवादिभिः, तथा हि उक्तं कारिकाकारैः - अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नाप्यजः। परतन्त्राभिनिष्पत्त्या संवृत्या जायते तु सः ॥(गौ.का- ४-७४)

जन्मादि सूत्रेण यतः कारणात् भवति तद् ब्रह्म- निमित्तम् उपादानमपि ब्रह्मैवेति निश्चीयते, कस्मात् सृष्टेः प्रागेकत्वावधारणात्, बृहिवृद्धौ धातोः निरतिशयव्याप्तिः, अर्थात् परिच्छिन्न- राहित्यस्य स्मरणाच्च। उपादाननिमित्तकारणयोः भिन्नत्वे परिच्छिन्नत्वापादात्।

अधुना कार्यं किम्? कार्यं आकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत्, कारणं परं ब्रह्म। तस्मात् कारणात् पारमार्थिकम् अनन्यत्वं, कस्मात्? व्यतिरेकेण अभावात्। कुतः कार्यस्याभावोऽवगम्यते? आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः (२-१-१४)। आरम्भणशब्दस्तावत्- एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाय दृष्टान्तापेक्षायामुच्यते- “यथा सौम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृण्मयं विज्ञातं स्यात् वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्” (छां. ६-१-१) एतस्मात् कारणात् पृथक् असत्त्वं कार्यस्य साध्यते, नैक्यम्। वाचारम्भणं नाममात्रं विकारो न कारणात् पृथगस्तीति ‘एव’कारार्थः।

एतेन एतदुक्तं भवति- एकेन मृत्पिण्डेन परमार्थतो मृदात्मना विज्ञातेन सर्वं मृन्मयं घटशरावादिकं मृदात्मकत्वाविशेषाद् विज्ञातं भवेत्। एष ब्रह्मणः दृष्टान्तः आम्नातः। दार्ष्टान्तिकेऽपि “एतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं, तत्सत्यम्” इति च परमकारणस्यैवैकस्य सत्यत्वावधारणात्। नामरूपस्यानृतत्वाभिधानाच्च। “अपागादग्नेरग्नित्वं त्रीणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम्”।

ननु छांदोग्योपनिषदि त्रिषु एव मृदादिदृष्टान्तेषु परिणामो दृश्यते, तथा च यथा मृद्धटादिरूपेण परिणमते, सुवर्णो वा आभूषणरूपेण(परिणमते); एवं ब्रह्मापि जगद्रूपेण परिणमते, तेन च एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानप्रतिज्ञापि यथार्थो भवति। अतः परिणामवद् ब्रह्म शास्त्राभिमतमिति गम्यते, ततश्च श्रुतिप्रतिपादितस्य जगतः परिणामवादेन सृष्टिः कथं मिथ्या भवेत्? अत्राभिधीयते- न चेयं परिणामश्रुतिः परिणामप्रतिपादनार्था, कस्मात्? तत् प्रतिपत्तौ फलानवगमात् सर्वव्यवहारहीनब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनार्था त्वेषा, तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलावगमात्।

“स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा” इति उपक्रम्याह “अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसि” इति। निष्प्रपञ्चब्रह्मात्मधीशेषत्वेन सृष्टिरनूद्यते, न सृष्टिः प्रतिपाद्यते। तस्मादस्माद् अधिष्ठानस्वरूपं अपरित्यज्य दोषवशाद् रूपान्तरकथनरूपे विवर्तवादे न कश्चित् दोषप्रसङ्गो अस्ति। (२-१-२७) किञ्च “स वा एष महानज आत्माऽजरोऽमृतोऽभयो ब्रह्म”, “स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा”; “अस्थूलमनणु” इत्याद्याभ्यः सर्वविक्रियाप्रतिषेधश्रुतिभ्यो ब्रह्मणः कूटस्थत्वावगमात्। न हि एकस्य ब्रह्मणः परिणामधर्मत्वं तद्द्रहितत्वं च शक्यं प्रतिपत्तुम्। (२-१-१४) एतेन कृत्स्नप्रस

क्तिनिरवयत्वशब्दकोपोऽपि शङ्का निराकृता। (का.भा ३-२७) यस्मात् सतः विद्यमानस्य वस्तुनः वस्तुतः उत्पत्तिः न सम्भवति, तथापि सतो विद्यमानात् कारणात् मायानिर्मितस्य हस्त्यादिकार्यस्येव, जगतो जन्म युज्यते, नासतः कारणात्, सतो विद्यमानस्य वस्तुनः रज्वादेः सर्पादिवत् मायया जन्म युज्यते; किन्तु असतो वस्तुनो माययापि जन्म नैव युज्यते, किमु तत्त्वतः। तथापि यथा क्षीरादीन्येव द्रव्याणि दध्यादिभावेन अवतिष्ठमानानि कार्यरूपाणि लभन्ते। ततो न कारणात् अन्यत्कार्यं कदापि निश्चेतुं शक्यम्। तथा मूलकारणमेव आ अन्त्यात् कार्यात् तेन तेन कार्याकारेण नटवत् सर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते (२-१-१८) कथं प्रतिपद्यते? मायावेशवशात् - हेतुफलयो कार्यकारणभावे अभिनिविष्टं चित्तं सर्वत्र हेतुफलसम्बद्धतया एव जगद् द्रष्टुमिच्छति। परन्तु केनापि उपायेन जगतः वस्तुतः जन्मासम्भवे सति परिशेषाद् सदेकमेव वस्तु अविद्यया उत्पत्तिविनाशादिधर्मैः नटवत् अनेकधा विकल्पते। (गी.भा. १८-४८)

अविद्या अथवा समष्टिरूपेण माया एव वस्तु तर्हि! यदावेशवशाद् जगतः सृष्टिस्थितिलयादि आत्मलाभः क्रियते। नैवं, सा च माया न विद्यते। माया इति अविद्यमानस्याख्या इत्यभिप्रायः। कथं मायोपमं सृष्ट्यादि? यथा मायामयात् मायविना दर्शितात् अभ्रादिबीजात् मायामयोऽङ्कुरो जायते क्रमेण फलमपि दृश्यते, तथैव दृश्यमानं इदं जगद् यदा नित्यं न च (उच्छेद/विनाशी)। कथं? यतः भोक्तृभोग्यलक्षणं विभागं जगद्रूपं न परमार्थतोऽस्ति, वाचारम्भणं मात्रत्वात् न हि वस्तुवृत्तेन विकारो नाम कश्चिदस्ति, नामधेयमात्रं ह्येतदनृतम् अधिष्ठानमेव सत्यम्। (सू.भा २-१-१४)

इतश्च यस्मात् कारणस्य भावे एव तत्कार्यमुपलभ्यते, नाभावे। तद्यथा सत्यां मृदि घटः उपलभ्यते, सत्सु च तन्तुषु पटः एवं कारणता रूपी धर्मासम्भवेऽपि यस्य अज्ञानतः जगत् प्रतीयते तदस्ति एव यत् कार्यरूपेण प्रतीयते। एतां दृष्टिं अवष्टभ्यैव कारणादनन्यत्वं कार्यस्य। (सू.भा २-१-१५)

ननु यदि कार्यं कारणात् अभिन्नं, तर्हि कारणात्मकम् इदं जगत् सावयवम् अचेतनम् (असुखं) च दृश्यते, कारणमपि तस्य तादृशेनैव भवितव्यं, कार्यकारणयोः सारूप्यदर्शनात्, ब्रह्म च नैवं लक्षणम् अवगम्यते “निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनम्” इति श्रुतेः, अतः ब्रह्मणोऽन्यद् उपादानकारणम् अशुद्ध्यादिगुणकम् अभ्युपगन्तव्यम्। अत्राभिधीयते- प्रकृतिश्चोपादानकारणं च ब्रह्मैवाभ्युपगन्तव्यं निमित्तकारणं च, कस्मात्? प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्, एवमभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानकारणे सति प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ श्रौतौ न उपरुध्येते। प्रतिज्ञा तावत् “उत

वेदान्तेषु कार्यकारणप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणम् (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)

तमादेशमप्राक्षो येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतम् अविज्ञातं विज्ञातं (भवति)” दृष्टान्तः - “यथा सौम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयम् विज्ञातं स्यात्” इत्यादि, अर्थात् एकेनैवोपादनकारणेन विज्ञातेन तत् विकारजातं सर्वविज्ञानं सम्भवति- उपादानकारणाव्यतिरेकात् कार्यस्य। तथा अन्यत्रापि (सू.भा.१-४-२३) “कस्मिन्नु भगवो विज्ञाते सर्वम् इदं विज्ञातं भवति” इति प्रतिज्ञा; यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयः सम्भवन्ति इति दृष्टान्तः “आत्मनि खल्वरे दृष्टे श्रुते मते विज्ञाते इदं सर्वं विदितं” इति प्रतिज्ञा; “स यथा दुन्दुर्भेहन्यमानस्य...” इत्यादि दृष्टान्तः यथा लोके मृत्सुवर्णादिकमुपादानकारणं कुलालसुवर्णकारादयः निमित्तकारणं, नैवं ब्रह्मणः उपादानकारणस्य सतोऽन्याऽधिष्ठात्रापेक्षाऽस्ति, कस्मात्? प्रागुत्पत्तेः एकमेवाद्वितीयमित्यवधारणात्। तस्मादधिष्ठात्र-न्तराभावात् ब्रह्मणः कर्तृत्वमुपादानान्तराभावात् च प्रकृतित्वम्।

एवं तर्हि ब्रह्मणोऽभिन्नत्वात् जगतः सत्यत्वमेवावेद्यते त्वया। न, अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादि सर्वं व्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते, पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते।

एवं सर्वेषु वेदान्तेषु प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्- अर्थात् उत्पत्तिस्थितिलयहेतुदृष्टान्तैः विकारविकारित्वादि एकप्रत्ययहेतून् प्रतिपाद्य अनन्तरमबाह्यमयमात्मा ब्रह्म इति प्रतिपाद्यन्ते। किञ्च उपक्रमोपसंहारादिलिङ्गैश्च परमात्मैकत्वप्रत्ययद्रढिम्नैव सर्ववेदान्तेषु, उत्पत्तिस्थितिलयादि कल्पना, न तत् प्रत्ययकरणाय इति अयमर्थोपि निश्चीयते (बृ.भा. २-१-२०)।

तथा च छान्दोग्ये सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्- इति उपक्रम्य- एतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत् सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि इत्यादि उपसंहारात्।

बृहदारण्यकोपनिषदि- ब्रह्म ते ब्रवाणीति उपक्रम्य, तदेतत् ब्रह्मापूर्वमनपरमनन्तरमबाह्य-मयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूरित्यनुशासनम् इति उपसंहारात्।

तैत्तिरीयोपनिषदि- ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् इति उपक्रम्य आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति उपसंहारात्। तदुक्तं कारिकाकारैः “मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा। उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथंचन॥”

किञ्च यथा शक्तिकायां रजतदर्शनं बुद्धिसापेक्षं किन्तु शक्तिकाज्ञानं न बुद्धिसापेक्षं। एवं

दृश्यमानं जगदपि बुद्धिसापेक्षं दृश्यं। यत् बुद्धिसापेक्षं तत् मिथ्या भवितुमर्हति। परमार्थवस्तु तु बुद्धिनिरपेक्षं- अतः सत्यमेव। यस्मात् श्रुतिनिरूपितं परतत्त्वं निर्विकारं निराकारं निर्गुणं निष्क्रियं पूर्णव्यापकं निरवयवं तस्मात् परमार्थतस्तु न कस्यचित् केनचिदपि प्रकारेण कार्यकारणभाव उपपद्यते। कथं? नास्ति असद्धेतुकम् असत् शशविषाणादिहेतुः कारणं यस्य असतः एव खपुष्पादेः, तदसद्धेतुकम् असन्न विद्यते सदपि वस्तु असद्धेतुकं नास्ति। तथा सच्च विद्यमानं घटादिवस्त्वन्तरकार्यं नास्ति, सद्कार्यम् असत् कुतः एव सम्भवति? न चान्यः कार्यकारणभावः सम्भवति शक्यो वा कल्पयितुम्। अतो विवेकिनाम् असिद्ध एव कार्यकारणभावः कस्यचित् इत्यभिप्रायः “नासतो विद्यते भावो नाभावो विद्यते सतः” इति स्मृतेश्च सदेकत्वावधारणात्। तथापि आत्मनः निर्विशेषता बोधयितुं प्रवृत्ता श्रुतिः क्वचित् पञ्चकोशान् आत्मनि आरोप्य “ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा” इति ऐक्यं प्रतिपाद्य जीवम् अभयपदे स्वरूपे प्रतिष्ठापयति; क्वचित् अवस्थात्रयमारोप्य तुर्यस्वरूपेण “प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवम् अद्वैतम्” जीवस्वरूपं निश्चीयते। समष्टिरूपेण ईश्वरादि स्थावरान्तं जगदध्यारोप्य- “तत्त्वमसि” उपदेशेन जीवस्वरूपं बोधयति। एवम् अध्यारोपापवादरूपप्रक्रियां आधारं कृत्वा, श्रुतिवाक्यरूपोपकरणैः निर्मितः सम्प्रदायविदाचार्यैः प्रदर्शितयुक्तिरूपप्रहारैश्च सुरक्षितः अद्वैतवेदान्तसिद्धान्तरूपो महादुर्गः सर्वेषां कल्याणाय भवतु।

विवदत्स्वेव निक्षिप्य विरोधोद्भवकारणम्।

तैः संरक्षितसद्बुद्धिः सुखं निर्वाति वेदवित् ॥

शान्तं शिवम् अद्वैतम् ॥



अद्वैतवेदान्तस्य निर्विशेषब्रह्मात्मत्वसिद्धान्तः

श्रीहरिब्रह्मेन्द्रानन्द स्वामिनः, आदिशङ्करब्रह्मविद्यापीठम्, उत्तरकाशी

दूरवाणी : +91 9458134070

ॐ

॥शङ्करदेशिक मे शरणम्॥

यद्यपि वेदान्तविचक्षणानां शङ्करभाष्यमनीषिणां वेदान्तमुख्यसिद्धान्तसन्दर्भे न जातु किमपि परोक्षमिव तथापि प्रसङ्गविचारावताराय वदिष्येऽत्र किञ्चिदावश्यकम्। अद्वैतवेदान्ते प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वोपाधिविशेषस्य नेतिनेतीत्यादिवाक्यसंवेद्यस्य निरञ्जनस्यानुभवैकगोचरस्य ब्रह्मात्मन एव प्रतिपिपादयिषा नान्यस्य कस्यचिदपि कथञ्चनापि। “उपेयस्तु स एवाऽत्मा यश्चतुर्थे अथात आदेशो नेति नेतीति निर्दिष्टः” (बृ.भा. ४-५-१५); “तदेतत् प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वोपाधिविशेषं नेति नेतीति सर्वविशेषापोहसंवेद्यं ”(ऐ.भा. २-३-३); “अनुभवारूढं च विद्याफलम्” (बृ.भा. ३-४-१५) इत्येतैर्वाक्यशतैः तत्र तत्रोक्तमेतद् भगवता भाष्यकारेण। अत एव च तैत्तिरीयके सत्यज्ञानानन्तलक्षिते ब्रह्मणि निर्विशेषे शास्त्रीयोऽशास्त्रीयो वा साक्षाच्छब्दगोचरो व्यवहारो न मनागपि संभवतीति सत्यादिब्रह्मविशेषणानि “विशेषणत्वेऽपि सत्यादीनां लक्षणार्थप्राधान्यात्”। (तै. भा. २-१-१) “तस्मादेव च न ज्ञानशब्दवाच्यमपि तद् ब्रह्म। तथाऽपि भासकत्वेन बुद्धिधर्मविशेषेण ज्ञानशब्देन तल्लक्ष्यते न तूच्यते” (तै.भा. २-१-१) इति निश्चयेन लक्षणार्थत्वेन व्याख्यातानि।

सूत्रमपि “अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधान्यात्” (ब्र.सू. ३-२-१४) इत्यादि द्रष्टव्यम्।

तथा पूज्याभिपूज्यैः संप्रदायाचार्यैरपि “न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः” इत्यारभ्य तदर्थद्रढिम्ने “अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नाप्यजः” (मा.का. ४-९५) इत्यजशब्दस्यापि परमार्थतो वाच्यत्वमात्मनः कण्ठरवेण निराकृतं चेद् अहो का कथाऽन्यस्य कस्यचित्!

किन्तु अस्य सर्वप्रतिषेधस्य शून्यत्वाऽऽशङ्का स्यात्, तदपि दृढं दूरीकृतं भाष्यकृताऽन्यत्र “ब्रह्मावसानोऽयं प्रतिषेधो नाभावावसानः” (ब्र.सू. ३-२-२२) इति ब्रुवता। तथा च विद्याफलकथनावसरे “ब्रह्मवित् सर्वोऽपाधिः सर्वात्मा सर्वो भवति” इति प्रक्रम्य निरुपाधिर्निरूपाख्योऽनन्तरोऽबाह्य... इत्येवं विशेषणो भवति” (बृ.भा. २-५-१५) इत्यादिवाक्ये ब्रह्मावबोधस्य स्पष्टीकृतम् ॥

प्रतिपादनप्रक्रिया त्वेषा

तदेतन्निरुपाधि निरुपाख्यं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं कथं नाम मन्दबुद्धीनां जिज्ञासूनां मुमुक्षूणां बुद्धिपथमवतरेदिति सृष्टिस्थितिकार्यकारणादिप्रक्रिया, तथा तदेतद् ब्रह्म कथं वा साक्षित्वेन स्वात्मत्वेनानुभवेयुरिति पञ्चकोशावस्थात्रयादिप्रक्रिया चाद्वैतवेदान्तप्रस्थानेषु श्रुतिसंप्रदाय तात्पर्यज्ञैरूपायत्वेनोपाधीयते। तथा हि “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते” (गी.भा. १३.१३) इति संप्रदायविदां वचनम्।

तस्मात् प्रतिपादनप्रयोजनमिदमेकं विहाय श्रुत्याध्यारोपणप्रदर्शनार्थं कल्पितानाम् ईश्वरमायाऽविद्याजीवबहुभवनसर्गप्रवेशनादीनां द्रष्टृदृश्यचेतनाचेतनप्रपञ्चानामर्थानां न स्वतोऽर्थवत्त्वं तद्विज्ञानफलं वा किञ्चिदन्यदिष्यते वेदान्ते। यद्येषां सृष्ट्यादीनामात्मन उदरमन्तरं स्वतन्त्रसत्ता वा परमार्थतः कथमपि कल्प्येत प्रसज्येत तदा ब्रह्मणः सजातीयविजातीयस्वगतभेदशून्यत्वनिर्विशेषत्वहानिरद्वैतव्याकोपश्च। अतः शास्त्रव्यवहारेऽङ्गीकृतानां सृष्ट्यादिसर्वविधवाक्यानां प्रतिपादनप्रक्रियाऽन्तर्भूतत्वेनैव तात्पर्यग्रहणं न्याय्यम्। सैव प्रक्रिया “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां” इत्येवमुद्धृष्टा दृश्यते।

तथैव च स्मर्यते कारिकासु-

मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्तिभेदः कथंचन ॥ (मां.का. ३-१५)

भाष्यवचनान्यपि, “नहि प्रपञ्चप्रतिशेधरूपादादेशनादन्यत्परमादेशनं ब्रह्मणोऽस्ति” (ब्र.भा. ३-२-२२) (प्रतिषेधश्चारोपणं विना ज्ञानेन ज्ञेयधर्मिणि न शक्यते कल्पयितुं, ज्ञानस्याऽकारकत्वादिति सारः) “मृदादिदृष्टान्तैर्हि.... प्रतिपादयच्छास्त्रं नोत्पत्त्यादिपरं भवितुमर्हति।” (ब्र.भा. ४-३-१४) “सुखबोधनप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं नहि सृष्ट्याख्यायिकादिपरिज्ञानात्किञ्चित्फलमिष्यते।” (ऐ.भा. २-१) “तस्मादेकत्वप्रत्ययदाढ्याय सुवर्णमणिलोहाग्नि

विस्फुलिङ्गदृष्टान्ता नोत्पत्त्यादिभेदप्रतिपादनपराः” (ब्र.भा. २-१-२०) “भेददर्शनापवादाच्च सृष्ट्यादिवाक्यानामात्मैकत्वदर्शनार्थपरत्वोपपत्तिः” (बृ.भा. १-४-७) “न ह्ययं सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चः प्रतिपिपादयिषितः न तत्प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित्पुरुषार्थो दृश्यते शूयते वा” (ब्र.भा. १-४-१४) “तत्र कल्पितरूपप्रत्याख्येन ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपाऽवेदनमिति निर्णयते...।” (ब्र.भा. ३-२-२२) “गृहीते त्वात्मैकत्वे बन्धमोक्षादिसर्वव्यवहारपरिसमाप्तिरेव स्यात्” (ब्र.भा. १-२-६) इत्यादीनि शतश उदाहार्याणि ॥

पञ्चकोशानिरूपणम्-

“सर्वव्यवहाराणामेव प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताविज्ञानात् सत्यत्वोपपत्तेः।” (ब्र.भा. २-१-१४)

यथैवाध्यारोपक्रमेण कार्यकारणाभेदं दर्शयितुं सर्गस्थितिवर्णनेन कार्यकारण-प्रक्रियोपन्यासः तथैव कोशपदवाच्येभ्योऽन्नमयादिभ्यः शरीरादिभ्यः तादात्म्यमात्मनो व्यवच्छिद्य नेतिनेतीति संवेद्यसाक्षिस्वरूपे परब्रह्मणि शाखाचन्द्रनिदर्शनवच्चित्तसमाध्यवतारोपायत्वेन तत्तत्कोशाध्यारोपः तदनन्तरं चोपसंक्रमतिना तदपवादः प्रदर्शितः तैत्तिरीयके। “अन्नमयादिभ्यः आनन्दमयान्तेभ्य आत्मभ्योऽभ्यन्तरतमं ब्रह्मविद्यया प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन दिदर्शयिषु शास्त्रमविद्याकृत-पञ्चकोशापनयनेन...।” (तै.भा. २-२)

“एवं च ब्रह्म परमेव यत्प्रकृतं.... यस्य च प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं पञ्चान्नमयादयः कोशा उपन्यस्ताः।” (तै.भा. २.५) “यथोक्तलक्षणात्मप्रतिपत्त्यर्थमेव.... संक्रमणादि परिकल्प्यन्ते....।” (तै.२-८) “तद्विज्ञापयिष्यैवान्नमयादय-आनन्दमयपर्यन्ताः पञ्चकोशाः कल्प्यन्ते” (ब्र.भा. १-१-९) “न चैते प्रियशिरस्त्वादयो ब्रह्मधर्माः अपि च परस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि चित्तावतारोपायत्वेनैवेते परिकल्प्यन्ते, न द्रष्टव्यत्वेन” (ब्र.भा. ३-३-१२) इत्यादिभाष्यवाक्यानि ग्राह्यान्वयत्र।

तथा चास्मिन्प्रसङ्गे संक्रमणादिसमानादानन्दमयात्मनोऽपि कार्यात्मत्वं “ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठेति” ब्रह्मण एव वेद्यत्वेन विधानमिति आनन्दमयाधिकरणोक्तमपि स्मर्तव्यम्।

अथ जिज्ञासूनां सुबोधाय पञ्चकोशप्रकरणं भाष्यवाक्यावलम्बेन किञ्चिदिव संगृह्य प्रदर्शयते--

“ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्” इति प्रतिज्ञाय “सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म ” इति लक्षणं कृत्वा, अनन्तरं च कुत्र किल तद्ब्रह्म वेदितव्यमिति निर्धारयितुं “यो वेद निहितं गुहायां” इति गुहास्थानकथनेन तस्यैवात्मत्वं सूचितम्। पुनः गुहानिहितस्य तस्यात्मन एव सृष्टिकर्मणि कर्तृत्वकारणत्वादिनिर्वाहाय सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वकर्तृत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वादिकारणधर्मं च दर्शयति “तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन

आकाशः संभूतः” इत्यादिना। तत्र आकाशादिपुरुषाकारान्तं कार्यजातमात्मशब्दवाच्यस्य ब्रह्मणो निर्दिश्य ब्रह्मात्मनोरैक्यज्ञापनपुरःसरं पुरुषाकारस्य ब्रह्मणश्च कार्यकारणताऽपि प्रकाशिता। पश्चाच्च अनामयादिष्व्वात्मत्वेनान्तर्हितं ब्रह्म तदधिष्ठानयाथात्म्यप्रतिपत्त्या कथं जानीयादित्याशयेन अविद्याकृतस्यान्नमयादिविशेषात्मन आत्मत्वेनाध्यारोपितस्यानात्मनोऽपोहार्थं तत्तत् कोशोपस्थापनमनन्तरकोशोपदर्शनेन पूर्वकोशापोहनं च विस्तरेण प्रवर्तितम् (तै.भा.२-८) तदेतद् “अन्नमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति” (तै.उ. २-८) इत्यादौ उपसंक्रमणशब्देनोच्यते।

अत्रेदं बोध्यम्- अविद्याकृततादात्म्यसंबन्धेनान्नमयात्मानमेव आत्मत्वेनाभिमन्यमानोऽज्ञ एतदुपसंक्रमणविज्ञानेन सर्वपिण्डस्यापि अन्नपरिणामत्वेनात्रात्मकतां विजानाति यदा तदाऽन्नमयात्मानो देहमात्रपरिच्छिन्नतां हित्वा विषयजातं सर्वं समष्टिपिण्डात्मानोऽन्नमयाद् व्यतिरिक्तं न पश्यति। तदेव “अस्माँल्लोकात्प्रेत्य” (तै.उ. २-८) लोकात् प्रेत्य- प्रत्यावृत्य निरपेक्षो भू त्वाऽन्नमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामतीत्युच्यते। एतद्विज्ञानकालेऽन्नमयात्मनः समष्टिरूपमेवानुभवन् देहात्माभिमानमूढत्वं जहातीत्यर्थः। एवमेव ततोऽभ्यन्तरं प्राणमयं सर्वान्नमयस्यात्मस्थं, ततो मनोमयम्- इत्येतेष्वपि व्यष्टिभावमपोह्य समष्टिभावमेव प्रतिपद्यते। अन्ते तु आनन्दमयान्तःस्थस्यैव सर्वान्तरस्य आकाशाद्यन्नमयान्तं कार्यं सृष्ट्वाऽनुप्रविष्टस्य हृदयगुहाभिसंबन्धादन्नमयादिषु अनात्मस्वात्मविभ्रमः संक्रमणेनाऽत्मविवेकविज्ञानोत्पत्त्या विनश्यति। (तै.भा.) अत एव संक्रमणशब्देनात्र न जलूकादिवत्संक्रमणमिष्यते, नापि प्राप्तिः संक्रमणम्, अपि तु विज्ञानमात्रम्। तथाहि अन्नमयाद्यानन्दमयान्तात्मव्यतिरिक्तज्ञानमात्रेण अविद्याविभ्रमनाशे संक्रमणशब्द उपचर्यते। (तै.भा.२-)

अथ किमिति “सर्वं वै तेऽन्नमाप्नुवन्ति” इत्यादि तत्र तत्र फलश्रवणमिति चेत्? तदन् नब्रह्मोपासनमात्रस्यैतदवान्तरफलश्रवणम्। तदुपासनान्तरं प्रेतस्य ‘अन्नजोऽन्नात्माऽन्नप्रलयोऽहमिति’ समस्तान्नात्मप्राप्तिरित्येवम्। अथवा, उपक्रमोपसंहारयोर्ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वप्रतिपादनेनैवोपक्षयान्मध् ये ग्रन्थस्यान्यतात्पर्ये गृह्यमाणे च वाक्यभेदाद् “अङ्गेषु स्तुतिः परार्थत्वादिति” न्यायेन (जै.सू. ४-३-१७) अन्नमयादिप्रतिपत्तेः फलश्रवणमर्थवाद एव तत्तद्बुद्धिस्थिरीकारस्य पूर्वपूर्वबुद्धिविलापने नात्मप्रतिपत्तिशेषत्वादिति गृहाण।

इत्थं पञ्चकोशविवरणं हि अन्नमयादिष्वविद्याकृततादात्म्यं ब्रह्मात्मानुभवं साक्षात्कर्तुं नितरामयुक्तं मन्यते करुणामयी श्रुतिर्भगवती ॥इति शम् ॥

द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकः

श्रीहित्वाळिसूर्यनारायणनागेन्द्रभट्टाः बेङ्गळूरु

दूरवाणी : +91 9341737499

श्रीगुरुः शरणम्

सर्वेषु दर्शनेषु दृश्यमानस्य जगतो, द्रष्टृर्जीवस्य, स्रष्टृश्च परमेश्वरस्य विषये चर्चा विद्यते। केचित् कस्यचित् सद्भावं साधयन्ति, कस्यचिच्चाभावम्। आस्तिकदर्शनेष्वपि त्रयाणामेषां विषये समानो विचारो नास्ति। साङ्ख्या मीमांसकाश्च निरीश्वरा इति प्रसिद्धिः। वेदान्तिनो जगतो मिथ्यात्वं जीवस्य च परमेश्वरत्वं स्थापयन्ति। तथा च तन्मते द्रष्टा दृश्यञ्चेति द्वयमेव स्वीकृतमिति वक्तव्यम्। तदुक्तमभियुक्तैः -

श्लोकार्धेन प्रवक्ष्यामि यदुक्तं ग्रन्थकोटिभिः।

ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः।।

श्रुतिसिद्धमिदं तत्त्वं गौडपादकारिकासु सुस्पष्टं निरूप्यते। आचार्यगौडपादा हि श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादानां परमगुरवो माण्डूक्योपनिषदो व्याख्यानं प्रथमे प्रकरणे कृत्वा वैतथ्यप्रकरणे अद्वैतप्रकरणे अलातशान्तिप्रकरणे च सर्वं विवक्षितमर्थं प्रतिपादयन्ति। आचार्यश्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादाः कारिकाः स्वव्याख्यानेन योजयन्ति। तत्र मूल एव क्वचित् पुस्तके नान्तःप्रज्ञमित्यादिवाक्येऽदृष्टपदस्थानेऽदृश्यपदमस्ति। अत्र तदवगन्तुं दृश्यं किमिति प्रथमतो ज्ञातव्यम्। दृश्यज्ञानं यद्यपि सर्वेषामस्ति, तथापि वाक्यार्थमवगन्तुं प्रकृते तदर्थज्ञानमनिवार्यम्। प्रेक्षणकर्मणो दृशेः प्रकृते न प्रेक्षण- मात्रमर्थः, किन्तु रसनादिकमपि। तथा सति दृश्यं ज्ञेयसामान्यमित्यर्थः पर्यवस्यति। द्रष्टा च न प्रेक्षक एव, किन्तु ज्ञाता। जाग्रदादौ यद्दृश्यं यश्च द्रष्टा तदुभयज्ञानेन सर्वस्यापि श्रेयः सिध्यति। तदुक्तं गौडपादैः -

त्रिषु धामसु यद् भोज्यं भोक्ता यश्च प्रकीर्तितः।

वेदैतदुभयं यस्तु स भुञ्जानो न लिप्यते।। इति।

अत्र शाङ्करभाष्यम् - त्रिषु धामसु जाग्रदादिषु स्थूलप्रविविक्तानन्दाख्यं भोज्यमेकं त्रिधा भूतम्। यश्च विश्व- तैजसप्राज्ञाख्यो भोक्तैकः सोऽहमित्येकत्वेन प्रतिसन्धानाद् द्रष्टृत्वाविशेषाच्च प्रकीर्तितः। यो वेदैतदुभयं भोज्यभोक्तृतया अनेकधा भिन्नं स भुञ्जानो न लिप्यते। भोज्यस्य सर्वस्यैकस्य भोक्तुर्भोज्यत्वात्। न हि यस्य यो विषयः स तेन हीयते वर्धते वा। न ह्यग्निः स्वविषयं दग्ध्वा काष्ठादि तद्वत्। - इत्यस्ति।

अत्र जागरितादि सर्वं दृश्यम्, द्रष्टाऽऽत्मेति स्पष्टम्। उत्तरत्रापि तुर्यं तत् सर्वदृक् सदा, मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः इत्यादावपि दृश्यं मिथ्या, द्रष्टृ सत्यमिति ज्ञायते।

अध्यासभाष्ये युष्मदस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोरित्यादिनामित्येति भवितुं युक्तमित्यन्तमध्यासमाक्षिप्य, तथापीत्यादिना समाहितम्। तत्रेदमस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोरिति वक्तव्ये युष्मद- स्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोरिति कथनमित्यन्तभेदोपलक्षणार्थं इत्युक्तं वाचस्पतिमिश्रैः। तथा चेदमिति प्रतीयमानं वस्तु विषयः, अहमिति प्रतीयमानो विषयीति ज्ञायते। अत्र द्रष्टृदृश्ययोरेवोल्लेखो विद्यते। तत्र तयोः तमःप्रकाशवद् विरुद्धस्वभावत्वमुक्तम्। दृश्यं तमःस्थानीयम्, द्रष्टा च प्रकाशस्थानीयः। चित्स्वभावस्य द्रष्टुः जडस्वभावेभ्यो बुद्धीन्द्रियादिभ्यो विरुद्धत्वम्। तथा च विषयिणि द्रष्टरि विषयतद्धर्माणामध्यासः, विषये दृश्ये विषयितद्धर्माणाञ्चाध्यासो नास्तीति मीमांसकादेराक्षेपः।

अयमाक्षेपः सङ्गच्छेत, यद्यहंप्रत्यय आत्मतत्त्वं प्रकाशेतेत्यादिनाऽध्यासस्य सर्वलोकसिद्धत्वं सिद्धान्ते भामत्यादौ दर्शितम्।

सर्वस्यापि शास्त्रस्य दर्शनस्य वा द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकः प्राधान्येनाप्राधान्येन वा प्रयोजनमिति वक्तुं शक्यम्। अत एव द्रष्टृदृश्यादिविषये तत्र तत्र शास्त्रेषु कथ्यते। यथा पातञ्जलयोगदर्शने- तदा द्रष्टुः स्वरूपेऽवस्थानमिति सूत्र एव द्रष्टृशब्दो विद्यते। तदवस्थे चेतसि विषयाभावाद् बुद्धिबोधात्मा पुरुषः स्वरूपेऽवतिष्ठत इति सूत्रार्थः।

पाणिनीये - साक्षाद् द्रष्टरि संज्ञायाम् इति सूत्रं तद्धितप्रकरणे दृश्यते। भट्टोजिदीक्षितैः - साक्षाद् द्रष्टा साक्षीति तत्रैव व्युत्पत्तिः प्रादर्शि। वेदान्तशास्त्रं तु प्रायेण द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकपरम्।

श्रीशाङ्करभगवत्पादैः सूत्रभाष्ये द्रष्ट्रादिशब्दो बहुत्र प्रयुक्तः। यथा -

द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकः

(१) यद्यप्यदृष्टत्वादिव्यपदेशः प्रधानस्य सम्भवति, तथापि न द्रष्टृत्वादिव्यपदेशः सम्भवति, प्रधानस्याचेतनत्वेन तैरभ्युपगमात्। अदृष्टो द्रष्टाऽश्रुतः श्रोताऽमतो मन्ताऽविज्ञातो विज्ञाता (बृह.३.७.२३) इति हि वाक्यशेष इह भवति। आत्मत्वमपि न प्रधानस्योपपद्यते।(१.२.१९)

(२) यद्यपि द्रष्टृत्वादयो धर्मास्तस्य सम्भवन्ति, तथापि घटाकाशवदुपाधिपरिच्छिन्नत्वाच्च कात्स्न्येन पृथिव्यादिष्वन्तरवस्थातुं नियन्तुं च शक्नोति। अपि चोभयेपि हि शाखिनः काण्वा माध्यन्दिनाश्चान्तर्यामिणो भेदेनैनं शारीरं पृथिव्यादिवदधिष्ठानत्वेन नियम्यत्वेन चाधीयते - यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन् (बृ.३.७.२२) इति काण्वाः। य आत्मनि तिष्ठन् इति माध्यन्दिनाः। (१.२.२०)

(३) अपि च पूर्वत्रादृष्टत्वाद्यभिलापसम्भवेऽपि द्रष्टृत्वाद्यभिलापासम्भवान्न प्रधानमभ्युपगतम्। इह त्वदृश्यत्वादयो धर्माः प्रधाने सम्भवन्ति।(१.२.२१)

(४) तत्रादृष्टत्वादिव्यपदेशः प्रधानस्यापि सम्भवति। द्रष्टृत्वादिव्यपदेशस्तु न सम्भवति, अचेतनत्वात्। तथा नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति श्रोतृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति मन्तृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञातृ इत्यात्मभेदप्रतिषेधान्न शारीरस्याप्युपाधिमतोऽक्षरशब्दवाच्यत्वम्। (१.३.१२)

(५) योऽक्षिणि प्रसिद्धो द्रष्टा द्रष्टृत्वेन विभाव्यते, सोऽमृताभयलक्षणाद् ब्रह्मणोऽन्यश्चेत् स्यात् ततोऽमृताभयब्रह्मसामानाधिकरण्यं न स्यात्। (१.३.१९)

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः(बृ.२.४.५) इति। य आत्मापहतपाप्मा सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः(छां. ८.७.१) आत्मेत्येवोपासीत(बृ.१.४.७) आत्मानमेव लोकमुपासीत (बृ.१.४.१५) ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति(मुं. ३.२.९) इत्यादिविधानेषु सत्सु कोऽसावात्मा किं तद् ब्रह्म इत्याकाङ्क्षायां तत्स्वरूपसमर्पणेन सर्वे वेदान्ता उपयुक्ताः - नित्यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वगतो नित्यतृप्तो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावो विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म इत्येवमादयः।(१.१.४)

किमर्थानि तर्हि आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यः इत्यादीनि विधिच्छायानि वचनानि, स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तिविषयविमुखीकरणार्थानीति ब्रूमः। यो हि बहिर्मुखः प्रवर्तते पुरुषः इष्टं मे भूयादनिष्टं मा भूदिति, न च तत्रात्यन्तिकं पुरुषार्थं लभते, तत्रात्यन्तिकपुरुषार्थवाञ्छिनं स्वाभाविककार्यकरणसंघातप्रवृत्तिगोचराद् विमुखीकृत्य प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्तयन्ति आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः इत्यादीनि। तस्यात्मान्वेषणाय प्रवृत्तस्याहेयमनुपादेयं चात्मतत्त्वमुपदिश्यते। इदं

सर्वं यदयमात्मा (बृ.२.४.६) यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत् केन कं विजानीयात् विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात् (बृ.४.५.१५) अयमात्मा ब्रह्म(बृ.२.५.१९) इत्यादिभिः । (१.४.४)

ननु - नास्ति तावद् ज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकारणवानीश्वरादन्यः संसारी, नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति विज्ञाता (बृ.३.७.२३) इति श्रुतेः। तत्र किमिदमुच्यते संसारिणः शरीराद्यपेक्षा ज्ञानोत्पत्तिर्नेश्वरस्येति। अत्रोच्यते - सत्यं नेश्वरादन्यः संसारी। तथापि देहादिसंघातोपाधिसंबन्ध इष्यत एव, घटकरकगिरिगुहाद्युपाधिसंबन्ध इव व्योमनः। तत्कृतश्च शब्दप्रत्ययव्यवहारो लोकस्य दृष्टो घटच्छिद्रं करकादिच्छिद्रमित्यादिराकाशाव्यतिरेकेऽपि। तत्कृता चाकाशे घटाकाशादि-भेदमिथ्याबुद्धिर्दृष्टा। तथेहापि देहादिसंघातोपाधिसंबन्धाविवेककृतेश्वरसंसारिभेदमिथ्याबुद्धिः। दृश्यते चात्मन एव सतो देहादिसंघातेऽनात्मन्यात्मत्वाभिनिवेशो मिथ्याबुद्धिमात्रेण पूर्वेण। सति चैवं संसारित्वे देहाद्यपेक्षमीक्षितृत्वमुपपन्नं संसारिणः। (१.१.५)

प्रतिषिध्यत एव तु परमार्थतः सर्वज्ञात्परमेश्वरादन्यो द्रष्टा श्रोता वा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा (बृ.३.७.२३) इत्यादिना। परमेश्वरस्त्वविद्याकल्पिताच्छारीरात् कर्तुर्भोक्तुर्विज्ञानात्माख्यादन्यः। यथा मायाविनश्चर्मखड्गधरात्सूत्रेणाकाशमधिरोहतः स एव मायावी परमार्थरूपो भूमिष्ठोऽन्यः। यथा वा घटाकाशादुपाधिपरिच्छिन्नादनुपाधिपरिच्छिन्न आकाशोऽन्यः। ईदृशं च विज्ञानात्मपरमात्म-भेदमाश्रित्य नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः भेदव्यपदेशाच्च इत्युक्तम्।।(१.१.१७)

श्रुतिस्तु - नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति श्रोता (बृ.३.७.२३) इत्येवंजातीयका पर-मात्मनोऽन्यमात्मानं वारयति। तथा स्मृतिरपि - क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्वक्षेत्रेषु भारत(गी.१३.२) इत्येवंजातीयकेति।

अत्रोच्यते - सत्यमेवैतत्। पर एवात्मा देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्ध्युपाधिभिः परिच्छिद्यमानो बालैः शारीर इत्युपचर्यते। यथा घटकरकाद्युपाधिवशादपरिच्छिन्नमपि नभः परिच्छिन्नवदवभासते, तद्वत्। तदपेक्षया च कर्मकर्तृत्वादिभेदव्यवहारो न विरुध्यते प्राक् तत्त्वमसि इत्यात्मैकत्वोपदेशग्रहणात्। गृहीते त्वात्मैकत्वे बन्धमोक्षादिसर्वव्यवहारपरिसमाप्तिरेव स्यात्।। (१.२.६)

एवमणीयस्त्वादिगुणगणोपेत ईश्वरस्तत्र हृदयपुण्डरीके निचाय्यो द्रष्टव्य उपदिश्यते। यथा शालग्रामे हरिः। तत्रास्य बुद्धिविज्ञानं ग्राहकम्। सर्वगतोऽपीश्वरस्तत्रोपास्यमानः प्रसीदति। व्योमवच्चैतद् द्रष्टव्यम्। यथा सर्वगतमपि सद्ध्योम सूचीपाशाद्यपेक्षयार्भकौकोऽणीयश्च

व्यपदिश्यते, एवं ब्रह्मापि। (१.२.७)

अनन्तरे च मन्त्रे तावेव द्रष्टृद्रष्टव्यभावेन विशिनष्टि —

समाने वृक्षे पुरुषो निमग्नोऽनीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः।

जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमस्य महिमानमिति वीतशोकः ॥ (मुं.३.१.२) इति। (१.२.१२)

तदेतत्सत्त्वं येन स्वप्नं पश्यति, अथ योऽयं शारीर उपद्रष्टा स क्षेत्रज्ञस्तावेतौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञौ इति। नाप्यस्याधि करणस्य पूर्वपक्षं भजते। नह्यत्र शारीरः क्षेत्रज्ञः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिना संसारधर्मणोपेतो विवक्ष्यते। कथं तर्हि? सर्वसंसारधर्मातीतो ब्रह्मस्वभावश्चैतन्यमात्रस्वरूपः, अनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीतीत्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिपश्यति ज्ञः इति वचनात्। तत्त्वमसि, क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि(गी.१३.२) इत्यादि- श्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यश्च। तावता च विद्योपसंहारदर्शनमेवमेवावकल्पते, तावेतौ सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञौ न ह वा एवंविदि किंचन रज आध्वंसते इत्यादि।(१.२.१२)

यदि प्रधानमात्मत्वद्रष्टृत्वाद्यसम्भवान्तर्याम्यभ्युपगम्यते, शारीरस्तर्ह्यन्तर्यामी भवतु। शारीरो हि चेतनत्वाद् द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता विज्ञाता च भवति, आत्मा च प्रत्यक्त्वात्। अमृतश्च, धर्माधर्मफलोपभोगोपपत्तेः। अदृष्टत्वादयश्च धर्माः शारीरे प्रसिद्धाः। दर्शनादिक्रियायाः कर्तारि प्रवृत्तिविरोधात्। न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येः(बृ.३.४.२) इत्यादि- श्रुतिभ्यश्च। तस्य च कार्यकरण-सङ्घातमन्तर्यमयितुं शीलं भोक्तृत्वात्। (१.२.१९)

कथं पुनरेकस्मिन्देहे द्वौ द्रष्टारावुपपद्येते, यश्चायमीश्वरोऽन्तर्यामी यश्चायमितरः शारीरः। का पुनरिहानुपपत्तिः। नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा इत्यादिश्रुतिवचनं विरुध्येत। अत्र हि प्रकृताद् अन्तर्यामिणोऽन्यं द्रष्टारं श्रोतारं मन्तारं विज्ञातारं चात्मानं प्रतिषेधति।(१.२.१९)

अपि च पूर्वत्रादृष्टत्वाद्यभिलाषसम्भवेऽपि द्रष्टृत्वाद्यभिलाषासम्भवान्न प्रधानमभ्युपगतम्। इह त्वदृश्यत्वादयो धर्माः प्रधाने सम्भवन्ति। नचात्र विरुध्यमानो धर्मः कश्चिद् अभिलष्यते। (१.२.२१)

यदन्यद् ब्रह्मणोऽक्षरशब्दवाच्यमिहाशङ्क्यते, तद्भावादिदम्बरान्तविधारणमक्षरं व्यावर्तयति श्रुतिः - “तद्वा एतदक्षरं गार्ग्यदृष्टं द्रष्टृश्रुतं श्रोत्रमतं मन्त्रविज्ञातं विज्ञातृ” (बृ.३.८.११) इति। तत्रादृष्टत्वादिव्यपदेशः प्रधानस्यापि सम्भवति। द्रष्टृत्वादिव्यपदेशस्तु न सम्भवति,

अचेतनत्वात्। तथा नान्यदतोऽस्ति द्रष्टृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति श्रोतृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति मन्तृ नान्यदतोऽस्ति विज्ञातृ इत्यात्मभेदप्रतिषेधान्न शारीरस्याप्युपाधिमतोऽक्षरशब्दवाच्यत्वम्। अचक्षुष्कमश्रोत्रमवाग-
मनः(बृ.३.८.८) इति चोपाधिमत्ताप्रतिषेधात्। न हि निरुपाधिकः शारीरो नाम भवति। तस्मात्
परमेव ब्रह्माक्षरमिति निश्चयः।। (१.३.१२)

एवं सर्वशास्त्रेष्वपि द्रष्टुरुल्लेखो यद्यपि दृश्यते, तथापि तत्र सर्वत्र मतभेदो विद्यते। न हि सर्वे दार्शनिका आत्मतत्त्वं सदृशं मन्यन्ते। तदिदं दर्शितं दक्षिणामूर्तिस्तोत्रे -

देहं प्राणमपीन्द्रियाण्यपि चलां बुद्धिं च शून्यं विदुः ।

स्त्रीबालान्धजडोपमास्त्वहमिति भ्रान्ता भृशं वादिनः॥

तत्र दृश्यत्वं नाम वृत्तिव्याप्यत्वं, फलव्याप्यत्वं, वृत्तिव्याप्यत्वे सति फलव्याप्यत्वं, कदाचित्
कथञ्चित् चिद्विषयत्वं, स्वव्यवहारे स्वातिरिक्तसंविदन्तरापेक्षा नियतम् इति वा वदन्ति।

श्रीमच्छङ्करभगवत्पादैः प्रणीतेषु प्रकरणग्रन्थेषु दृग्दृश्यविवेकोऽप्यन्यतमः। तत्र
द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेक एव ध्यानादिना सप्रयोजनो विवृतः -

विवेको नाम विवेचनम्। यदा विवेचनं करणीयम्, तदा द्वयमपेक्षितम्। प्रकृते दृग् दृश्यञ्चेति
द्वयमस्ति। इदं विवेक्तुं संस्कारसंस्कृतः पुरुष एव प्रभवति। प्राकृतः पुरुषः दृश्यं सर्वं सत्यं
चिन्तयति। यत्नेन न दृश्यते, तत् नास्तीत्येव मन्यते। किन्तु शास्त्रेण प्रत्यक्षादिभिरनवगतमपि
किञ्चिद् उच्यते। प्राकृतः शास्त्रं न विश्वसिति। प्राज्ञस्तु प्राप्तसाक्षात्कारः किमपि कर्तव्यं न
पश्यति। अतो विवेचनमिदं तेन करणीयम्, यो न प्राकृतः, नापि प्राज्ञः। एतादृशोऽपि त्रेधा
भवितुमर्हति - मुमुक्षुः धार्मिकः जिज्ञासुश्चेति। तत्र जिज्ञासुरेव विवेचनाधिकारी।

सम्प्रति विवेचनस्य का वा आवश्यकतेति प्रश्नो जायते। यदा वस्तुद्वयं संसृष्टं, तदा
विवेचनमेपेक्ष्यते। तण्डुलः पाषाणखण्डैः सह सम्मिश्रश्चेत् पृथक्करणं बुभुक्षूणामनिवार्यम्।
तण्डुल इव पाषाणोऽपि श्वेतश्चेत् पृथक्करणं न सुकरम्। अथवा वस्तुनोः यथार्थज्ञानं नास्ति
चेदपि विवेक्तुं न शक्यते। यथा कश्चिद् शुक्तिरजतयोर्भेदमेव न जानाति स शुक्तिमेव रजतं
मन्येत। द्वितीयः सूर्य इव कदाचित् कल्पित एव स्यात् द्वितीयः। तथा सति विवेचनं अत्यन्तं
कठिनम्। प्रकृते द्रष्टारं विना नान्यत् किञ्चिद् वस्तुतो विद्यते। यथा स्वप्ने स्वात्मानं विस्मृत्य
वस्तुजातं पश्यन् मुह्यति, तथा। तत्र दृश्यं सर्वं कल्पितमेव। द्रष्टरि ज्ञाते दृश्यं न शिष्यते।

मोक्षस्य स्वरूपं मुक्तलक्षणम्

श्री अद्वयानन्देन्द्रसरस्वती स्वामिनः, होळेरसीपुरः

दूरवाणी : +91 08175 273 820

मोक्षः मुक्तिः परं श्रेयः इत्येवमादीनां शब्दानां शब्दभेद एव नार्थभेदः इति सुप्रसिद्धः शाङ्करवेदान्ताधीतिनाम् । तथापि लौकिकव्यवहारे क्वचित् शिष्टव्यवहारे च सन्यासिमृतिविषयेऽपि मुक्तिशब्दप्रयोगोऽस्ति यथा “तन्मठाधीशाः मुक्तिंगता, एतन्मठाधीशाः मुक्तिंगता” इति तदा तदा वार्तापत्रिकायां वयमवलोकयामः । परं भगवत्पादैः कस्मिन्प्रकरणे कोऽर्थः परिगृहीतः इति इदमिदानीं विचारयामः ।

प्रथमं तावत् मुक्तिर्नाम का? इति पृच्छायां बन्धननिवृत्तिरेव मुक्तिशब्दस्यार्थः इति भाष्यादवगम्यते । बन्धनं नाम किमिति पृष्टेऽविद्याकामकर्माणि एव बन्धनानि तानि (मृत्योरूपाणि) मृत्युशब्दवाच्यानि इति गम्यते । तथा हि भाष्यं “मृत्योरूपाणि मृत्युः कर्माविद्यादिः । न तस्यान्यद्रूपं स्वतः (विद्यते) कार्यकरणान्येव अस्य रूपाणि । अतस्तानि मृत्योरूपाणि.... ” इति । मुक्तेः मोक्षस्य वा विरुद्धं पदं बन्धनं तदविद्यादिरिति यथोक्ताद्भाष्यादवगम्यते । सा चाविद्याऽत्मविषया सती आत्मस्वरूपपरिज्ञानादेवापगच्छति । सैव विद्या, सा च यथावस्थितात्मस्वरूपविषया । तस्यां सत्यामवश्यमज्ञानं निरवशेषं बाधत एव । तथा हि “ज्ञानं चोत्पद्यमानं तद्विपरीतमज्ञानमवश्यं बाधते इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम्” इति हि खलु (गी. २-२१) भाष्यम् । “विद्यायां सत्यां प्रणाशमुपगच्छत्यविद्या” (२-६९) इति ह्यन्यत्र । “मोक्षकारणविपर्ययेण बन्धकारणमविद्या इत्येतदपि उक्तमेव भवति” (बृ. ४-४-७) इत्येवमादीनि अनेकानि भाष्यवचनानि सन्ति इति स्पष्टम् । स्वतो जीवस्य न संसारधर्मोऽस्ति । उपाधिनिमित्तमेव तु तस्य संसारित्वं (तत्) अविद्याध्यारोपितम् (बृ.४-३-१९) । अतः बन्धनरूपेणाविद्याकामकर्माणां जीवः संसरतीति सिद्धं भवति । तस्याश्च प्रधानकारणभूताया अविद्यायाः अपाय एव मुक्तिः परप्राप्तिर्वा

नार्थान्तरम्(मु. १-१-५) इति विज्ञेयम्। अतः यावदनात्मविषयान्कामान् अविद्यालक्षणान् न विमुञ्चति तावदयं जीवः मृत्युग्रस्त एव, तद्वद्ध एवेत्युक्तं भवति। अतो मृत्युवियोगे (सति) विद्वान् जीवन्नेवामृतो भवति। अस्मिन्नेव शरीरे वर्तमानः ब्रह्म समश्नुते ब्रह्मभावं मोक्षं प्रतिपद्यते। न पुनर्मोक्षगमनाय देशान्तरगमनाद्यपेक्षते (बृ. ४-४-७) इति उक्तम्। इयमेव हि प्रधाना मुक्तिर्नाम भाष्यकाराभिप्रायेणाभिप्रेता, न देशान्तरलोकान्तरमरणादिकमपेक्षते।

सर्वत्रैव हि प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्ये मुक्तेरविद्याव्यतिरेकेण नान्योऽन्तरायः प्रतिपादितोऽस्ति। तस्याश्चाविद्याया विद्याव्यतिरेकेणा नान्यया निवृत्तिरस्ति। अतोऽविद्याया अपाय एव परं श्रेयः (मुक्तिरिति) भाष्योक्तं सुस्थितं भवति। अतोऽन्येन साधनेन ये मुक्तिप्राप्तिं प्रतिपादयन्ति, तेषां मते मुक्तिरनित्या कृतका चेत्युक्तं भवति। साधनसाध्यं सर्वमनित्यमिति प्रसिद्धम् अत एव पूज्या भाष्यकाराः “यस्य तु मते मोक्षः उत्पाद्यः आप्यस्संस्कार्यो विकार्यो वेति” विकल्पान् प्रदर्श्य तन्मते अनित्यत्वाद्यनेकान् दोषान्प्रदर्शयन्ति। अतः मोक्षो नाम स्वस्वरूपावस्थानमेव। स्वरूपानवस्थानकारणं देहाद्यनात्मसु आत्मत्वबुद्धिरूपाविद्या, इत्यसकृदुक्तं भगवता भाष्यकारेण स्वीये भाष्ये। अतः अविद्यानिवृत्तिद्वारेण प्राप्यमाणाया मुक्तेरेवानेकानि मोक्षः, परंश्रेयः, कैवल्यं, स्वात्मन्यवस्थानं, ब्रह्मात्मभावः, परःपुरुषार्थः, ब्राह्मीस्थितिः, अशरीत्वं इत्येवमादीनि नामानि सन्ति।

भाष्ये क्वचित्- कर्मवादिमते स्वर्गोऽपि मोक्षशब्दव्यपदेश्यत्वेन निर्दिष्टं दृश्यते यथा “निरतिशयप्रीतेः स्वर्गशब्दवाच्यायाः कर्मनिमित्तत्वात्कर्मभ्य एव मोक्षः” (तै.शी.अव.भा) इत्यत्र। तत्रैव समुच्चयवादिमते “प्रध्वंसाभाववत् नित्योऽपि मोक्षः आरभ्यते” कर्मरभ्यत्वं च मोक्षस्योक्तम्। तथैव कार्यब्रह्मलोकवर्तिनामपि उपासकानां मुक्तशब्दव्यपदेशो दृश्यते “जगदुपत्यादिव्यापारं वर्जयिवा अन्यदणिमाद्यात्मकम् ऐश्वर्यं मुक्तानां भवितुमर्हति” इति (सू.भा. ४-४-१७) इति। एतत् सर्वं पूर्वपक्षमतत्वेन प्रासङ्गिकत्वेन चोक्तमिति ज्ञेयम्। मुख्यो मोक्षस्तु यथोक्तमेव।

एतवता विचारेण किंफलितमित्युक्ते- शास्त्राचार्योपदेशजनितविज्ञानेनाविद्यादिसंसारधर्मनिवृत्तौ अद्वैतात्मन्यवस्थानमेव मोक्षः इति उच्यते। सोऽपि अध्यारोपदृष्ट्यैवोच्यते, तथ्यतो बन्धमोक्षयोरभावात् “न निरोधो न चोत्पत्ति न बद्धो न वै मुक्तः इत्येषा परमार्थता” (गौ.का. २-३२) इत्युक्तत्वात्। अत एवास्य मोक्षस्य ज्ञानकार्यत्वमपि औपचारिकमिति

ज्ञेयम्। दशमज्ञानेन दशमप्राप्तिरिव ब्रह्मप्राप्तिश्चौपचारिकमेव एतादृशज्ञानिनो बाधितानुवृत्त्या मिथ्याज्ञानानुवृत्तेः सत्त्वेऽपि तज्ज्ञानस्य न काचित् क्षतिः। यथैव तस्य कर्मणो लोकसंग्रहार्थत्वेऽपि तस्य कर्मबन्धाभावः तद्वत् तत्कृतोपदेशेन मुमुक्षुजनानुग्रहेऽपि न तस्मिन् तस्य वास्तविकं कर्तृत्वमस्ति ॥

मुक्तिद्वयम्येयं मुक्तिः विद्याधिगम्या सा ज्ञानसमकाललब्धात्मभावत्वात् सद्योमुक्तिरित्युच्यतेऽभियुक्तैः। सैव च जीवन्मुक्तिशब्दव्यपदेश्या। व्यवहारदृष्ट्या जीवतैव लभ्यत्वात् यावज्जीवमनुवर्तनाच्च। शरीरपातानन्तरं तु या ब्रह्मरूपेणैवावस्थितिः सा विदेहमुक्तिः, ब्रह्मनिर्वाणं, क्षेमः अपुनरावृत्तिरित्येतैः शब्दैरुपचर्यते। शरीरान्तरादानहेतोः कर्मशेषस्याभावात्। मुख्यो मुक्तिस्तु सद्योमुक्तिरेव। “ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति”(बृ. ४-४-६) “अनुष्ठाय (ज्ञात्वा) न शोचति”(कठ.२-२-१) इत्यादिश्रुतिप्रामाण्यादवगम्यते। अन्यापि एका मुक्तिर्विद्यते सा क्रममुक्तिशब्दनिर्देश्या- “कार्यब्रह्मलोकप्रलयप्रत्युपस्थाने सति तत्रैवोत्पन्नसम्यग्दर्शनाः सन्तः तदध्यक्षेण हिरण्यगर्भेण सहातः परं परिशुद्धं विष्णोः परमं पदं प्रतिपद्यन्ते। इत्थं क्रममुक्तिः अनावृत्त्यादिश्रुत्यभिधानेभ्योऽभ्युपगन्त्वा। न हि अञ्जसैव गतिपूर्विका परप्राप्तिः सम्भवतीत्युपपादितम् (सू.भा. ४-३-१०)” इत्यत्र। मुख्यो मोक्षः अशरीरत्वलक्षणः, सोऽपि धर्मकार्यमस्तु इत्युक्ते तत् नोपपद्यते इति “अशरीरत्वमेव धर्मकार्यमिति चेत्। न। तस्य स्वाभाविकत्वात्” (कठ. १-२-२१) इत्यत्र स्पष्टमुक्तम् अशरीरत्वलक्षणस्य मोक्षस्य स्वाभाविकत्वमिति।

एतदुक्तं भवति- अविद्यया कार्यकरणसंघातं अहमेवेति तादात्म्येन यावदनुभवति तावद् बद्धः इत्युच्यते। यस्तु विद्यया तामविद्यामत्यन्ताय विनाश्य स्वात्मन्येवाजरेऽमरेऽभयेऽवतिष्ठते स महात्मा शरीरेन्द्रियादिवर्जितोऽविद्याकामकर्मभिर्मुक्तत्वात् जीवन्मुक्तः इति परिभाष्यते वेदान्तेषु। “अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते” (कठ. २-३-१४) इति श्रुतेः। स एव ज्ञानी, सः यद्यपि अस्मदादिवत् देहेन्द्रियसंघाताभिमानवानिवाभाति तथापि स्वेन पारमार्थिकेन ज्ञानेन नित्यमसंस्पृष्ट एव भवति। तथा हि भाष्यम्- पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि “त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासं नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काले” इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति। एवमेव च मोक्षः उपपद्यते। (सू.भा. ४-१-१३) इत्युक्तम्। अत एव करणादिव्यापरयितृत्वमपि मिथ्यैव ज्ञानिदृष्ट्या। न हि असङ्गस्यात्मनः तत्साक्ष्यभूतेन शरीरेण कश्चित् सम्बन्धः कयाचित् युक्त्या दर्शयितुं शक्यते। न चानुभवदृष्ट्या समस्ति शरीरादिकम्, सर्वस्य परमार्थसद्रूपानुभवेनैव व्याप्तत्वात् नानुभवातिरेकेणान्यत्

किञ्चिदस्ति। तस्य शरीरादिसङ्घातस्य प्रतिभासस्तु व्यावहारिकः स्वाप्नशरीरादिप्रतिभासवत् इति अन्यथाप्युपपद्यते। तस्यैव गीतासु स्थितप्रज्ञः, युक्तः, भक्तः, गुणातीतः इत्येवमादिनामान्तरेण व्यपदेशो दृश्यते। स च सर्वविधाविद्याकामकर्मबन्धनैर्मुक्तः सर्वभूतात्मभूतब्रह्मण्येव स्थितः सुखदुःखादिद्वन्द्वातीतः इति गम्यते। एतदेव वेदान्तविज्ञानफलं हृदयग्रन्थिभेदः, अविद्याग्रन्थिभेदः इति च परिभाष्यते श्रुतिषु। एकान्तेन द्वैतबाधे कथं व्यवहारः? इति पृष्टे तस्येदं उत्तरं यत्, स्वानुभवदृष्ट्या (विद्वद्दृष्ट्या) नैव व्यवहारो तस्य विद्यते यद्यपि लौकिकव्यवहारदृष्ट्या सशरीरत्वं सेन्द्रियत्वमङ्गीकरोत्येव, तथापि द्वैतदर्शनहेतोर्मिथ्याज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाधितत्वात्, तद् बाधितानुवृत्तैव व्यवहारानुवृत्तेः न तेन जीवन्मुक्तेर्बाधो भवति। “बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कञ्चित्कालमनुवर्तत एव” (सू.भा. ४-१-१५) इति हि भाष्यम्। अत्र बाधितानुवृत्तं मिथ्याज्ञानं नाम न वास्तविकाविद्यालेशः येन तत्कृतो बन्धशेषोऽप्यनुवृत्तः इति शङ्क्येत। तस्मात् जीवन्मुक्तोऽज्ञानी व्यवहारे द्वैतं पश्यन्नपि न पश्यति, कर्माणि कुर्वन्नपि न करोति इत्येव सिद्धान्तः। तदुक्तं गीताभाष्ये- “विद्वांस्तु पुनर्विद्यया अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां शक्नोत्येवाशेषतः कर्माणि परित्यक्तुम्। अविद्याध्यारोपितस्य शेषानुपपत्तेः। न हि तैमिरिकदृष्ट्याध्यारोपितस्य द्विचन्द्रादेः तिमिरापगमे शेषोऽवतिष्ठते। एवं च सति इदं वचनमुपपन्नम् ‘सर्वकर्माणि मनसा’ ”(गी.५-२३) इत्याद्युक्तत्वात् (गी.भा. १८-४८) ज्ञानिनि अविद्यालेशसम्भवः नोपपद्यत इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥



श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीस्वामिपादानां
लेखनानि

०१. अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्

शुद्धशङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करतः ४. शङ्करवेदान्तप्रक्रियास्वरूपम्

प्रक्रियासारः : अथेदानीं सत्संप्रदायाभिमतवेदान्तप्रक्रियास्वरूपं निर्धारणीयम्। तत्र नित्यशुद्धे एवाद्वितीयात्मनि प्रमातृत्वादिलक्षणं द्वैतमविद्ययैवाध्यारोपितं देहेन्द्रियादिष्वहंममाभिमानलक्षणया इत्यतः तदपयनेन वस्तुतत्त्वजिज्ञापयिषया वेदान्ताः प्रवृत्ताः; स्वतःसिद्धात्मनि तु ते केवलमतद्धर्मनिवर्तकत्वात् प्रमाणमित्युपचर्यन्ते- इत्युक्तम्। तत्र कया प्रक्रियया ते आत्मन्यध्यारोपितान् अतद्धर्मान् निवर्तयन्तीति? अत्रोदाहृतं गीताभाष्ये-

(१) तथा हि संप्रदायविदां वचनम् ‘अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते’ इति ॥

अत्रायं प्रक्रियासारः - (1) शुद्धब्रह्मात्मवस्तुनः निर्विशेषत्वस्वाभाव्यं बोधयितुं स्थूलबुद्धिभिरध्यारोप्यमाणानां सर्वेषां विशेषाणां प्रतिषेध्यत्वेनैव निर्देशः क्रियते ‘अस्थूलमन एवहस्वमदीर्घमलोहितमस्नेहमच्छायमतमोऽवाय्वनाकाशमसंगमरसमगंधमचक्षुष्कमश्रोत्रमवागमनोऽतेजस्कमप्राणममुखममात्रमनन्तरमबाह्यं न तदश्नाति किञ्चन न तदश्नाति कश्चन’ (बृ 3-8-8) इत्यादिभिः श्रुतिभिः। एवं सर्वधर्मप्रतिषेधात् शून्यमेव तत् स्यादित्याशङ्का मा भूदिति तस्यासत्त्वबुद्धिनिरासार्थम् उपाधिकृतं मिथ्याविशेषमपि तद्धर्मवत् परिकल्प्य समुपदेशः। तदनु जिज्ञासुप्रतिबोधनार्थमेवं परिकल्पितस्य वस्तुधर्मत्वमेवेति शङ्कानिरासार्थम् उपदेशपरिसमाप्तौ तस्याप्यपवादः - इति ॥

निष्प्रपञ्चे प्रपञ्चकल्पनमुपदेशार्थमेव, न तु प्रपञ्चो वस्तुसन् - तत्र यदज्ञैर्विकल्प्यते विशेषः स्वे आत्मनि, यदपि श्रुतिभिः परिकल्प्यते उपदेशार्थम्, तदेतदुभयमपि उपायमात्रत्वेन वेदान्तिभिः परामृश्यते, न तु वस्तुसदिति कृत्वा। इत्थं च जिज्ञासूनां जिज्ञासुत्वम्, तेषामज्ञानम्,

शास्त्राचार्योपदेशजनितज्ञानेन तन्नाशः, ततश्च सप्रपञ्चत्वनिवृत्तौ आत्मनो निष्प्रपञ्चत्वेनावस्थानम् - इत्येतत् सर्वमपि अपरमार्थमेव सत् उपदेशोपायत्वेन सिद्धवत् परिकल्प्यते। तदेतत् स्पष्टमभिहितं संप्रदायविद्भिः श्रीगौडपादाचार्यैः -

अन्यथा गृहणतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥ गौ.का. 1-15.

अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥ गौ.का. 1-16.

प्रपञ्चो यदि विद्येत निवर्तेत न संशयः।

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः ॥ गौ.का. 1-17.

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित्।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते गौ.का. 1-18.

इति। अत्र (1) स्वप्नजागरिते सिद्धवत्कृत्य तत्रान्यथाग्रहणलक्षणस्वप्नत्वम् अध्यारोपितम्, जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिलक्षणावस्थात्रयं सिद्धवत्कृत्य तिसृष्वपि परमार्थाज्ञानलक्षणनिद्रात्वमध्यारोपितम्। तत्र च जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरन्यथाग्रहणलक्षणो विपर्यासविशेषः। अग्रहणलक्षणा निद्रा यद्यपि तत्रापि विद्यत एव, तथापि केवलनिद्राध्यारोपः सुषुप्तावेवेति स एवासाधारणो विपर्यासस्तत्र - इति द्वेषा राशीकरणमवस्थानाम्। एवं चाग्रहणलक्षणो विपर्यासः, अन्यथाग्रहणलक्षणो विपर्यासश्च यदा तत्त्वज्ञानेन बाध्येते तदा 'तुरीयोऽहम्' इति निश्चयो भवतीति प्रथमश्लोकार्थः ॥

तदेवं तत्त्वाज्ञानतत्त्वान्यथाज्ञानलक्षणौ विपर्यासौ उपदेशार्थं प्रकल्पितौ प्रथमश्लोकेन। अथ द्वितीयेन तावपवदति -अनादिमाययेति। श्लोकाभिप्रायस्तु - (2) अग्रहणलक्षणनिद्रा वा अन्यथाग्रहणलक्षणस्वप्नोवा नास्त्येवात्मनि वस्तुतः। तदुभयमपि स्वप्नवद् विकल्पितमेव। अनादिमाययैव निद्रास्वप्नौ यथोदितौ कल्पितौ तत्र। यथा सुप्तःप्राकृतजनः स्वप्ने आत्मन्यविद्यमानमेव विशेषं कल्पयति माययैव, एवं मृषैवायं जीवः स्वात्मनि अग्रहणान्यथाग्रहणे कल्पयति अनादिमायास्वापवशात्। यदा तु शास्त्राचार्योपदेशात् परमार्थतत्त्वं जानन्, एतस्मान्मायास्वप्नात् प्रतिबुध्यते, तदा 'नासीदस्ति भविष्यति वा, अग्रहणलक्षणा निद्रा अन्यथाग्रहणलक्षणः स्वप्नो वा मय्यजे नित्यनिरवस्थे अद्वैतात्मनि' इति तुरीयत्वं विनिश्चिनोतीति ॥

अत्र 'यदा प्रबुध्यते तदा अजमनिद्रम् अस्वप्नम् अद्वैतं बुध्यते' इत्यक्षरार्थं गृहीत्वा

अजत्वादयो ये आत्मनो धर्माः, ते बोधादूर्ध्वं बुध्यन्ते - इति न भ्रमितव्यम्। जन्मनिद्रादयो नात्मधर्मा इति ज्ञापने हि तात्पर्यं वाक्यस्य, न तु मायास्वापादयः प्राग् वस्तुसन्तः प्रबोधेन निवर्त्यन्ते - इत्यत्रापि। वक्ष्यते हि -

(अ) जन्म मायोपमं तेषां सा च माया न विद्यते ॥ का.4-58.

इति। तस्मात्, माया वा, मायास्वापो वा, निवर्त्यजन्मनिद्रास्वप्नादयो वा, निवर्तकप्रबोधो वा नैव विद्यन्ते परमार्थदृष्ट्या, सर्वोऽप्येष उपदेशार्थ एव वादः - इति बोध्यम्। अत एवाजत्वादयोऽपि निषेध्यापेक्षयैव समुपदिश्यन्त इति बोध्यम्। यदपि वक्ष्यते -

(आ) अजः कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नाप्यजः ॥ का. 4-74. इति ॥

तृतीयश्लोकाभिप्रायस्त्वयम् - (3) नैवं मन्तव्यम् अन्यथाग्रहणकाले सप्रपञ्चः सन् जीवस्तत्त्वज्ञानादूर्ध्वं निष्प्रपञ्चो भविता - इति। कुतः ? वस्तुतः प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वेन सर्वदाप्यभावात्, प्रपञ्चोपशमत्वमेवास्य स्वभावः - इति ॥

अथ तुरीयश्लोकाभिप्रायः - (4) नैवेत्थमपि प्रत्येतव्यम् अन्यः शिष्यः स्वान्येन शास्त्रेणाचार्येण च प्रतिबोधितः, स्वस्य निष्प्रपञ्चत्वं बुध्यत इति। यत्कारणम्, उपायमात्रमिदमुपदेशार्थं कल्पितं वेदान्तेषु शास्त्रं, शास्ता, शिष्यः, अज्ञानम्, प्रतिबोधश्चेति। ज्ञाते तु परमार्थतत्त्वे नैवास्ति शिष्यादिविकल्पोऽपि परमार्थत इति निश्चीयत इति ॥

वेदान्तेष्वभ्युपगतोऽध्यारोपो न तत्रामाण्यविहन्ता-यथोक्तरीत्या आत्मन्यनात्माध्यारोपो द्विविधो भवति, नैसर्गिकाविद्याकृतः शास्त्रकृतश्चेति। तत्राविद्याकृतो लौकिकव्यवहारो मिथ्याभूतोऽपि सत्यत्वाभिनिवेशपूर्वक इति संसारानर्थहेतुः, शास्त्रकृतस्तु तत्त्वोपदेशार्थमनूद्यमानः संव्यवहारमात्रालंबनो जिज्ञासुजनबुद्धिवैशद्यार्थं भवतीति विवेकः। यथाहुः श्रीगौडपादाचार्याः -

(1) संवृत्या जायते सर्वं शाश्वतं नास्ति तेन वै।

सद्भावेन ह्यजं सर्वमुच्छेदस्तेन नास्ति वै ॥ 4-57

इति। अत्र संवृतिर्नाम संवरणम्, अविद्याविषयो लौकिको व्यवहारः। व्यवहारदृष्ट्या सर्वमिदं जायत एव, तेन अविद्याविषये व्यवहारे शाश्वतं नाम न किञ्चिदस्ति सद्भावेन तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या वीक्ष्यमाणं सर्वमप्यजात्मतत्त्वमेव, तेन न कस्याप्युच्छेदः - इत्यर्थः ॥

(2) योऽस्ति कल्पितसंवृत्या परमार्थेन नास्त्यसौ ।

परतन्त्राभिसंवृत्या स्यान्नास्ति परमार्थतः ॥ 4-73.

अत्र कल्पितसंवृतिर्नाम । परमार्थप्रतिपत्त्युपायत्वेन शास्त्रेणाचार्येण वा अभ्युपगम्यमानो व्यवहारः । यथा सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः (मुं) इत्यादिस्थले अभ्युपगम्यमानः, बाह्यादिविशेषरहिते बाह्याभ्यन्तरत्वादिमत्त्वव्यवहारः । परतन्त्राभिसंवृतिस्तु सांख्यकाणादाद्यभिमतप्रमाणप्रमेयसत्कार्यवादपरमाणुकारणवादादिव्यवहारः ॥ तदेतदुभयमपि संव्यवहारमात्रालंबनमिति तत्त्वबोधाभ्युपायमात्रम् - इति बोध्यम् ॥

तदेवं लौकिकव्यवहारो वैदिकव्यवहारश्चेत्युभावपि यद्यप्यविद्याभूमावेव, तथापि अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियायाम् वेदान्तेषूररीक्रियमाणोऽध्यारोपो न शास्त्रप्रामाण्यविहन्ता उपदेशार्थमेव केवलमनूद्यमानत्वात् - इति गौडपादैः सुस्पष्टं दर्शितमेव शाङ्करभाष्येष्वनुस्रियत इति न विस्मर्तव्यम् ॥

अध्यारोपापवादेनैव बोधने हेतुः - स्वतःसिद्धस्यात्मनो विषयत्वाभावाद् दुर्बोधत्वमालक्ष्य विविधाध्यारोपं कुर्वन्ती श्रुतिः, अध्यारोपितोपायस्य मिथ्यात्वादग्राह्यत्वमेव ज्ञापयत्यपवादेन - इतीदमपि प्रक्रियारहस्यं संप्रदायविद्भिर्गौडपादैरुद्धोषितम् -

स एष नेतिनेतीति व्याख्यातं निहनुते यतः ।

सर्वमग्राह्यभावेन हेतुनाजं प्रकाशते ॥ गौ.का. 3-26.

यद्यदुपायत्वेन व्याख्यातं तत् सर्वम् अग्राह्यमिति हेतोरेव श्रुतिः 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' (बृ.3-9-26, 4-2-4, 4-4-22, 4-5-15) इति पदे पदे निहनुते । अजमद्वयमात्मतत्त्वं तु ततः स्वयमेव प्रकाशत इति कारिकार्थः ॥

ब्रह्मणः परप्रतिषेधैकगम्यता प्रस्थानत्रयसंमता - निर्विशेषत्वादविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्म अध्यारोपितपरप्रतिषेधैकगम्यमिति बादरायणीयसूत्रेऽप्युक्तम्, उपनिषत्सु बोधितम्, गीतास्मृत्युपदिष्टं च इति भाष्यकारेण प्रस्थानत्रयसंगानं प्रदर्शितम् ॥

(1)दर्शयति चाथो अपि स्मर्यते ॥ वे.सू. 3-2-17.

(2)अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत् ॥ वे.सू. 3-2-18.

इत्यत्र भाष्योदाहृतानि ‘अथात आदेशो नेति नेति’ ‘अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि’ ‘यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते’। अप्राप्य मनसा सह’ ‘उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा’ ‘न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते’ ‘सर्वभूतगुणैर्युक्तं मैवं मां ज्ञातुमर्हसि’ ‘उपाधिना क्रियते भेदरूपः’ ‘एकधा बहुधा चैव दृश्यते जलचन्द्रवत्’ - इतीमानि वाक्यानि परिशीलनीयानि ॥

अध्यारोप्योपदेशः सर्वत्रापि तदन्यप्रतिषेधार्थः :- अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियाप्रकारास्त्वनन्ताः। तत्र कतिचिदेवावान्तरप्रक्रियाविशेषास्तत्समाख्यया प्रसिद्धाः। तासु काश्चिदुत्तरस्मिन् लेखने समालोचयिष्यामः। ते तु प्रदर्शनार्था एवेति विज्ञापनार्थं तावत् काश्चिदन्यप्यध्यारोपप्रकारान् अन्तर्णीतान्यनिषेधार्थान् अत्रोदाहरिष्यामः। (1) प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वविशेषेऽपि सर्वगतसर्वात्मत्वेन नित्यप्राप्तेऽपि ब्रह्मणि आप्यत्वम् श्रुतिषु क्वचिदध्यारोप्यते, ‘ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्’ (तै. 2-1) इत्यादिषु। तदिदं ज्ञानातिरिक्तसाधनप्राप्यत्वनिराकरणायैव ‘आप्नोति स्वाराज्यम्’ (तै. 1-6) इत्यादिस्थले इव गतिपूर्वकप्राप्यत्वं त्विह न विवक्षितमिति ज्ञापनाय च। एवं क्वचिज्ज्ञेयत्वमध्यारोप्यते ‘एतज्ज्ञेयं नित्यमेवात्मसंस्थम्’ (श्वे. 1-12), ‘नारायणं महाज्ञेयम्’ (तै.ना. 13-29), ‘येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम्’ (छां. 6-1-3) इत्यादिस्थलेषु। तत्तु ज्ञानेनात्यन्तमज्ञाननाशः, ज्ञातव्यान्तराभावश्च इति ज्ञापनार्थम्। क्वचित्तु ज्ञातृत्वाध्यारोपेण ज्ञेयत्वं निरस्यते ‘विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्’ (बृ. 2-4-14) इत्यादिस्थलेषु यथा। क्वचित्पुनः साक्षित्वमध्यारोप्यते ज्ञातृत्वस्याप्यपहनवाय, ‘साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च’ (श्वे 6-11) इत्यत्र यद्वत्। अन्यत्र स्वरूपमेव निर्दिश्यते ‘नेति नेति’ (बृ. 2-3-6) इति साक्षित्वादेः सर्वस्यापि विशेषधर्मस्य निषेधार्थम्। एवं क्वचिद् वेदान्तवाक्यगम्यत्वमध्यारोप्यते प्रत्यक्षाद्यगम्यत्वबोधनाय, यथा ‘वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः’ (मुं 3-2-6) इत्यादिस्थलेषु। क्वचित्तु मनोगम्यत्वमुच्यते इन्द्रियागोचरत्वं ज्ञापयितुम्, ‘मनसैवानुद्रष्टव्यं नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन’ (बृ. 4-4-19) इत्यादिवाक्येषु यथा। क्वचित्तु मनोवागगोचरत्वमेवोच्यते तद्व्यतिरिक्तानुभवमात्रगम्यत्वबोधनार्थम् ‘यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते। अप्राप्य मनसा सह। आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्। न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति’(तै. 2-9) इत्यादिस्थलेषु यथा। एवमन्यत्राप्यूह्यं सुधीभिः ॥

तत्रैकैकेनाध्यारोपेण एकैकस्यैव विकल्पस्य निरासो विवक्ष्यत इत्यपि न नियमः। तद्यथा - आत्मनि ज्ञेयत्वाध्यारोपेण न केवलं तदन्यस्याज्ञेयत्वम्, किं तु तज्ज्ञानेन सर्वज्ञत्वम्, अज्ञानस्यात्यन्तिकनाशश्च - इत्यपि गम्यते। आत्माज्ञानमेव द्वैतप्रतिभासहेतुः, आत्मज्ञाने सति पुनर्न ज्ञातृज्ञानज्ञेयविभागः - इत्याद्यपि ततो गम्यत एव। तदेवम् आत्मातिरिक्तमपि ज्ञेयमस्तीति

विकल्पः, आत्मज्ञानेन तन्मात्रमेव ज्ञातं स्यादिति विकल्पः, तज्ज्ञाने सत्यपि पुनरप्यज्ञानं कदाचिद् प्रादुर्भूयादिति विकल्पः, द्वैतं विद्यमानमेव प्रतिभासत इति विकल्पः, ज्ञातेऽप्यात्मनि ज्ञातृत्वमवशिष्यत एवेति विकल्पश्चेत्येवमाद्यनेकविकल्पनिवारणम् आत्मनि ज्ञेयत्वाध्यारोपाद् विवक्षितं भवति ॥

दिङ्मात्रमिह दर्शितं यथा कस्य कस्याध्यारोपेण किं किमपोद्यत इति सूक्ष्मबुद्धिभिरेवमेवोद्यम् अन्यत्राप्यध्यारोपस्थलेषु। इदं तु न प्रस्मर्तव्यं यत् निर्धर्मके परमार्थतत्त्वे यत्र यत्र यद्यदारोपपूर्वकमुपदिश्यते तत्र तत्र केवलं तत्तदन्यप्रतिषेध एव प्राधान्येन विवक्ष्यते, न तु वस्तुनस्तत्तद्धर्मत्वमपि, अन्यत्र तस्याप्यारोपितस्य कंठरवेण निषेधात् इति ॥



०२. दृष्टिद्वयम्

वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः :- व्यावहारिकावस्थायां प्रमाणादिविभागसत्यत्वम्-

४८. यद्यपि यथोक्तनीत्या ब्रह्मात्मातिरिक्तं वस्तुसन्नास्त्येव वेदान्ते 'ब्रह्मैवेदं विश्वमिदं वरिष्ठम्' (मुं. २-२-१२), 'यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमा' (छां. ७-२४-१), 'आत्मैवेदं सर्वम्' (छां. ७-२५-२), 'इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा' (बृ. २-४-६), 'ऐतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि' (छां. ६-८-७), 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (बृ. ४-४-१९) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः। तथापि प्रागेतस्मात् तत्त्वविज्ञानादिष्यत एव सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च प्रमाणादिव्यवहारो यथादृष्टः। तेन न दृष्टापलापः शक्यापादनो वेदान्तनये यथा महावैनाशिकपक्षे। अमुष्यां च व्यावहारिकावस्थायां लोकदृष्टिः, शास्त्रदृष्टिश्चेति दृष्टिद्वयमवलम्ब्य प्रमाणादिविभाग आस्थीयते। तत्र स्वाभाविकी रागद्वेषादियुक्ता लौकिकी दृष्टिः, यया स्वाभाविकज्ञानानुसारेण क्रियमाणं कर्मानर्थाय भवति। यदा त्विन्द्रियनिग्रहं कृत्वा शास्त्रानुसारेणैव प्रवर्तते, तदा अवलम्ब्यमाना शास्त्रदृष्टिर्भवतीति कर्मणि लौकिकशास्त्रदृष्टिविवेकः। एवं ज्ञानविषयेऽपि विवेक्तव्यम्। यया नैसर्गिकबुद्ध्या, केवलप्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणबलाद् वा शरीरेन्द्रियसंघात एवाहंममाभिमानं करोति सा लौकिकी दृष्टिः। यया पुनः शास्त्रमनुसरन्देहेन्द्रियाद्यसंपृक्ते कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वरहिते शुद्धात्मन्येवात्ममतिं करोति सा शास्त्रदृष्टिरिति। शास्त्रदृष्टिः, आर्षदर्शनम्, पारमार्थिकदृष्टिश्चेति पर्यायाः। लौकिकदृष्टिः, स्वाभाविकदृष्टिः। व्यावहारिकदृष्टिः- इति च। शास्त्रदृष्टिश्चेयं परमार्थतत्त्वदर्शनलक्षणां सती तत्त्वदर्शिन आचार्यस्यापि भवतीति 'आचार्यदृष्टिः' इत्यपि व्यपदेशमर्हति। अत एव शास्त्राचार्योपदेशमनुसृत्य यदनुभवारोपणं तत् 'अनुदर्शनम्' इति व्यवहियते क्वचित्। अत एव 'तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीराः' (का. २-२-१२) इति श्रुतिवाक्यं भाष्यकारो व्याचष्टे 'तमेतमीश्वरं ये निवृत्तबाह्यवृत्तयोऽनुपश्यन्ति आचार्यागमोपदेशमनु साक्षादनुभवन्ति' इति। तत्र स्वाभाविकीं लौकिकदृष्टिं व्युदस्य शास्त्रदृष्ट्या

श्रेयोमार्गेऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसफले प्रस्थातव्यमिति वेदेन बोध्यते, अविद्याभूमौ (२६, २७)। अत एव चात्मज्ञानात् प्रत्यक्षादीनां शास्त्रोपदेशस्य च न तत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवृत्तिरित्युक्तं। तत् स्मर्तव्यम् ॥

(१) नह्ययं सर्वप्रमाणप्रसिद्धो लोकव्यवहारोऽन्यत्तत्त्वमनधिगम्य शक्यतेऽपहनोतुम्।
अपवादाभावे उत्सर्गप्रसिद्धेः ॥ सू.भा. २-२-३१, भा.भा.६४.

(२) यः शास्त्रविधिमुत्सृज्य वर्तते कामकारतः।
न स सिद्धिमवाप्नोति न सुखं न परां गतिम् ॥
तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते कार्याकार्यव्यवस्थितौ।
ज्ञात्वा शास्त्रविधानोक्तं कर्म कर्तुमिहार्हसि ॥

गी. १६-२३, २४.

(३) या हि पुरुषस्य प्रकृतिः सा रागद्वेषपुरःसरैव स्वकार्ये पुरुषं प्रवर्तयति। तदा स्वधर्मपरित्यागः परधर्मानुष्ठानं च भवति। यदा पुनः, रागद्वेषौ तत्प्रतिपक्षेण नियमयति, तदा शास्त्रदृष्टिरेव पुरुषो भवति न प्रकृतिवशः ॥ गी. भा.३-३४, भा.भा.२१०.

(४) ‘उपसंहारदर्शान्नेति चेन्न क्षीरवद्धि’ (वे.सू. २-१-२४) इत्यत्र तु बाह्यनिमित्तनिरपेक्षमपि स्वाश्रयं कार्यं भवतीत्येतल्लोकदृष्ट्या निदर्शितम्। शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तु पुनः सर्वत्रैवेश्वरापेक्षत्वम् आपद्यमानं न पराणुद्यते ॥ सू.भा.२-२-३, भा.भा.११.

(५) शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् ॥ वे.सू. १-१-३०.

भाष्यम्-इन्द्रो नाम देवतात्मा स्वमात्मानं परमात्मत्वेन ‘अहमेव ब्रह्म’ इत्यार्षेण दर्शनेन यथाशास्त्रं पश्यन्नुपदिशति स्म ‘मामेव विजानीहि’ इति ॥ सू.भा.१-१-३०.

(६) ननु ‘हत्वापि न हन्ति’ इति विप्रतिषिद्धमुच्यते यद्यपि स्तुतिः। नैष दोषः। लौकिकपारमार्थिकदृष्ट्यपेक्षया तदुपपत्तेः, देहाद्यात्मबुद्ध्या हन्ताहम् इति लौकिकीं दृष्टिमाश्रित्य ‘हत्वापि’ इत्याह। यथादर्शितां पारमार्थिकीं दृष्टिमाश्रित्य ‘न हन्ति न निबध्यते’ इति ॥ गी.भा. १८-१७.

(७) नन्वैकत्वैकान्ताभ्युपगमे नानात्वाभावात् प्रत्यक्षादीनि लौकिकानि प्रमाणानि व्याहन्येरन्। स्थाण्वादिष्विव पुरुषादिज्ञानानि। तथा विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रमपि भेदापेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याहन्येत। मोक्षशास्त्रस्यापि शिष्यशासित्रादिभेदापेक्षत्वात् तदभावे व्याघातः स्यात्।...अत्रोच्यते। नैष दोषः। सर्वव्यवहाराणामेव प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताविज्ञानात् सत्यत्वोपपत्तेः, स्वप्नव्यवहारस्येव प्राक् प्रबोधात्। यावद्धि न सत्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तिः, तावत् प्रमाणप्रमेयफलक्षणेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते। विकारानेव तु ‘अहं मम’

इत्यविद्यया अत्मात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते स्वाभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा । तस्मात् प्राग् ब्रह्मात्मताप्रतिबोधादुपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः । यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान् भावान् पश्यतो निश्चितमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राक् प्रबोधात्, न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति । तद्वत् ॥ सू.भा.२-१-१४, भा.भा.४३६.

शुद्धशङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्कतः

52. दृष्टिद्वयाङ्गीकारेण सर्वदोषपरिहारः - तदेवमत्र प्रस्थाने, अविद्याकल्पितव्यवहारदृष्ट्यैव प्रपञ्चसद्भावः, जीवानां प्रमातृत्वकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वलक्षणः संसारः, उपास्योपासकादिभेदः, शास्त्राचार्यवाक्यप्रामाण्यम्, ज्ञानसाधनानुष्ठानम्, ज्ञानेनाज्ञाननिवृत्तिः, बंधमोक्षौ च - इत्येवमादयः सर्वे व्यवहारा अभ्युपगम्यते । परमार्थदृष्ट्या तु नैवास्ति किञ्चित् निर्विशेषब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तम् - इत्यभ्युपगमात्, अभ्युपगमस्य चास्य श्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवसंगानेनोपपादनाच्च न कश्चिदस्ति वेदान्तार्थोऽसाधितः, न कश्चिद्दोषोऽस्त्यपरिहृतः । अत एवात्र श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणानां यथासंभवं प्रामाण्यम् उररीकृत्य मीमांसान्यायाधारेण वाक्यार्थनिर्णयः, विनेयान् प्रति तत्तदधिकारानुगुणं शास्त्रतर्कादानेन श्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवसंगानप्रदर्शकवादकथासरण्या उपदेशः, पराभिमतप्रस्थानन्तराणाम् असारत्वप्रख्यापनेन मुमुक्षूणां ततो विमुखीकरणाय यथायोगं जल्पवितंडादिकथा अप्याश्रित्य प्रयतनं च - इत्येतत् सर्वमवकल्पते, प्रस्थानान्तरेषु तु नैवम् - इति सुमहद् वैलक्षण्यम् ।



०३. विद्याऽविद्यास्वरूपम्, अविद्यानिवृत्तिः

विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा-२

अविद्या

यद्यपि स्वरूपेण वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदवर्जितमेव ब्रह्म नित्यशः, तथापि तस्मिन् अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वलक्षणं वेदितृत्वं तदितरत्वेन विभाविते च इदंप्रत्ययगोचरत्वलक्षणं वेद्यत्वं च प्रकल्प्य व्यवहरति 'अहमिदं वेद्मि' इति; तथा आत्मनि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च प्रकल्प्य व्यवहरति लोकः 'अहमिदं करोमि; तेन सुखं दुःखं वा अनुभवामि' इति। तत्र इदंप्रत्ययगम्यम् अनात्मरूपं वेद्यम्- अहंप्रत्ययगम्यस्य वेदितुः; युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरोऽपि भवति; बुद्ध्यादीनामेकैकमप्यनात्मानं संबोधेन विषयीकृत्य 'त्वम्' इत्यपि व्यपदेशुं शक्यते यतः। तत्र अहङ्कारम् अनृतरूपमेव सत्यस्वरूपे आत्मन्यध्यस्य, तं च सत्यात्मानम् अनृतेऽहङ्कारे अध्यस्यति लोकः, सत्यानृतसत्त्वविवेकाभावात्। तयोश्च सत्यानृतयोः, आत्मनः प्रत्यक्त्वं बोद्धृत्वं चाहङ्कारे, अहङ्कारस्य विक्रियावत्त्वं बोध्यत्वं चाऽऽत्मनि सर्वविक्रियासाक्षिणि अध्यस्य 'अहं वेदिता, कर्ता, भोक्ता च' इति मृषैवाभिमन्यते। तदेवम् अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे व्यावहारिके विषयिणी युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरणामपि देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धीनां विषयभूतानाम्, तद्विपर्ययेण तेषु नित्यविषयिण आत्मनश्च तादात्म्यं ताद्धर्म्यं चाध्यस्य 'अहं स्थूलः, कृशः, गौरः, कृष्णः, मूकः, वाग्मी; तिष्ठामि, गच्छामि; अन्धः, चक्षुष्मान्' इति, 'सङ्कल्पयामि, इच्छामि, द्वेष्मि, संशये, अध्यवस्यामि' इति चैवं व्यवहरति, इतरेतरतत्त्वाविवेकेनैव ॥

तमेतम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतरतादात्म्यताद्धर्म्याध्यासम् 'अविद्या' इति मन्यन्ते तत्त्वदर्शिनः; तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्याम् आहुः ॥४॥

तदेवम् आत्मानात्मनोरन्योन्यात्मकताऽऽकलनलक्षणं अन्योन्यधर्मवत्ताऽऽकलनलक्षणं च मिथ्याज्ञानम् अविद्यायाः स्वरूपम्; तस्य निमित्तं चाऽऽत्मानात्मनोरितरेतरविवेकाभावः; कार्यं तु अनृतरूपस्यानात्मनः प्रत्युपस्थापनम्, ततश्च प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः, कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वव्यवहारश्च - इति स्थितम् ॥

स चायं व्यवहारः, लौकिको वैदिको वा वस्तुतत्त्वविवेकाभावनिबन्धनमिथ्याबुद्धिमात्रहेतुत्वात्, उत्पन्नात्मानात्मसतत्त्वविवेकज्ञानस्य मिथ्याबुद्धिलक्षणाविद्यानिवृत्तौ निवर्तते; अविद्यायाश्च विद्याविरोधित्वात् वस्तुतत्त्वविवेकलक्षणविद्योत्पत्तिमात्रान्निवृत्तिः ॥

एवं च सति, अविद्यया मिथ्याविकल्परूपया यत्र यदूपत्वाध्यासः, यद्धर्मवत्त्वध्यासो वा, तत्कृतेन गुणेन वा दोषेण वा- अणुमात्रेणापि -विकल्पास्पदभूतं तद् वस्तु न परमार्थतः संबध्यते। तथा च आत्मचैतन्याध्यासकृतेन प्रत्यक्त्वज्ञातृत्वलक्षणेन गुणेन अहङ्कारो न कदापि किञ्चिदपि संबध्यते; तथा अहङ्कर्तृभोक्तृत्वाध्यासकृतेन विक्रियावत्त्वसुखदुःखभोगादिरूपेण दोषेण वा नात्मा तत्साक्षी ईषदपि संबध्यते। एवम् अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचर आत्मा स्वस्मिन्नध्यारोपित देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिभिः विषयभूतैरनात्मभिस्तद्धर्मैर्वा नाणुमात्रमपि संबध्यते क्वचिदपि परमार्थतः। एवं देहेन्द्रियादयोऽपि स्वस्मिन्नध्यारोपितचैतन्यरूपेण, आत्मत्वरूपेण वा धर्मेण न परमार्थत एव चित्स्वरूपा आत्मस्वरूपा वा स्युः। अपि च सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया वीक्ष्यमाणे ज्ञातृत्वं कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च नैवात्मनः, नाप्यनात्मनः संभवति। अविक्रियत्वादात्मनः, अचेतनत्वात्, अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितानृतस्वभावत्वाच्चानात्मनः। यथोक्तं भाष्यकारेण-

“तथा च श्रुतिः ‘यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्तत्रान्योऽन्यत्पश्येत्’ इत्यादिना स्वप्नदृष्टहस्त्यादिव्यवहारवदविद्याविषय एव कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहारं दर्शयति। ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्’ (बृ. ४-५-१५) इत्यादिना च विवेकिनः कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहाराभावं दर्शयति ॥” (सू.भू. १-२-१२) इति ॥

सेयम् अविद्यापि अविद्यादृष्ट्यैव लौकिकैः स्वात्मन्यध्यस्तेति न तथा स्थितया वस्तुतः एवाविद्यावत्त्वं तेषाम्, न च तथा विद्यया निवर्तितया वस्तुत एव निवृत्ताविद्यत्वं तेषाम्। अत एवोक्तं भाष्यकारैः-

“एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः ॥” (अध्या.भा)

इति। युक्तं चैतत्। न ह्यध्यस्तस्य वस्तुत एवोत्पत्तिर्नाशो वा उपपद्यते। तैमिरिकदृष्टस्य द्वितीयचन्द्रस्य नाऽऽत्मलाभो नाशो वा अस्ति यद्वत्। तस्मात् साधूक्तमिदं यद् वेदान्तशास्त्रम् अविद्याकल्पितवेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयदेव ब्रह्मणि प्रमाणमित्युपचर्यत इति ॥

विद्वद्गोष्ठी-८

सम्यग्ज्ञानमात्रात् परमपुरुषार्थसिद्धिरिति वेदान्तमर्यादा इत्यत्राविप्रतिपत्तिः सर्वेषां शाङ्कराद्वैतिनाम्। तथा च वेदान्ताः ‘ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्’ (तै.) ‘स यो ह वै तत् परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति’ (मुं. ३-२-९) इत्याद्याः। न च ज्ञानमात्राद् प्रहीयेत विद्यमानोऽप्यर्थः। अत एवाहुर्भगवत्पादाः ‘अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय, आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते’ इति। अत्र यद्यनर्थहेतुत्वम् अविद्याया उपादानकारणविधया, तर्हि कारणनाशादेव स्यादनर्थहानिः, न तु विद्योदयमात्रात्। उपदिशन्ति तु वेदान्ता ब्रह्मदर्शनमात्रात् सर्वानर्थप्रहाणिम् ‘भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्चिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः। क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे’ (मुं.) इत्याद्याः। न च ते जगत्कारणभूतप्रकृतिशब्दवाच्यमूलाविद्याप्रणाशनं पुरुषार्थहेतुत्वेनोपदिशन्ति, ब्रह्मज्ञानकारणत्वेन वा। यदि नामोपदिशेयुः क्वचित्, तथापि तेषामर्थान्तरं कल्प्यं। साक्षाज्जगन्मूलप्रणाशनस्य पुरुषमात्रेणाशक्यकरणत्वात्। न हि वचनशतमपि अशक्यविषयमुपदेशं कुर्वत् प्रामाण्यमुपेयादिति ॥

अध्यासलक्षणाविद्यायाः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रयोजकत्वात् तस्या हानार्थं विद्यामुपदिशन्ति वेदान्ताः- इति प्रतिज्ञानादेव भाष्यकाराणाम् अध्यासकारणान्वेषणं न तेषां हृदि स्थितमित्यनुमातुम् शक्यते। न ह्यनर्थहेतुरविद्येति विज्ञाते, पुनस्तद्धेतुगवेषणमर्थवद् भवेत्। न च तत्कारणनाशात् तस्या विनिवृत्तिः स्यादिति तद्गवेषणार्थवत्त्वम्। नहि कारणनाशद्वारा कार्यनाशने क्वचिदपि विद्या व्यापृता दृष्टा, येन अत्रापि तथा स्यादिति शङ्कनीयं भवेत्। उदाहृतं च भगवत्पादीयं वाक्यं अविद्यामात्रप्रहाणाय विद्योपदेशने सर्ववेदान्तप्रवृत्तिं ज्ञापयत्। कण्ठरवेणाप्याहुस्ते-

‘एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः, कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः।’

इति। न च नैसर्गिकस्याध्यासस्य हेतुः शक्यान्वेषणः। यत्कारणम्, योऽयं दृश्यते शूयतेऽपि वा द्वैतप्रपञ्चो हेतुफलात्मकः, नायं परमात्मनोऽन्यः, न च जीवो नाम क्रियाकारकफलात्मकोऽन्योऽस्ति परमात्मातिरिक्तः- इत्युद्धोषयन्ति श्रुतयः ‘ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं

पुरस्तात्...’(मुं. २-२-११), नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा (बृ.३-७-२३)- इत्याद्याः। तदेवम् अयमब्रह्मप्रत्ययो देशकालनिमित्तक्रियाकारकफलाद्यात्मकप्रपञ्चदर्शकः, अविद्यामात्रं रज्ज्वामिव सर्पप्रत्ययः इति स्थिते, को नाम विवेकी पृच्छेत् ‘अविद्यायाः किं कारणम्?’ इति न हि प्रपञ्चं स्वक्षेत्रम् अतीत्यापि कार्यकारणभावप्रत्ययः परस्तादप्यध्यसात् प्रधावितुं जङ्घालो भवेदिति। तस्मात् खे शकुनीनां पदान्वेषणमेवेदम् अध्यासस्य निमित्तोपादानादिगवेषणमिति स्थितम्। ‘इतरेतराविवेकेन’ (अध्या.भा.), ‘क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः’ (गी.भा. १३-२६) -इत्यादिस्थलेषु अध्यासस्य विवेकाभावनिमित्तकत्वोक्तिस्तु नाभावस्य कारणताविवक्षया -न खल्वभावः कस्यचिदपि निमित्तं कार्यकारणप्रपञ्चेऽपि, मूर्च्छादिष्वपि कार्योत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात्; किमु वक्तव्यम् अध्यासस्य निमित्तनैमित्तिकादिसर्वव्यवहारमूलस्य तत्र निमित्तमिति। तस्मात्, नायं अध्यासस्य नैमित्तिकत्वं प्रतिपादयितुं यत्नः- किं तर्हि, अविद्यायाः विद्याख्यविवेकप्रकाशोदयमात् रविनाश्यस्वलक्षणत्वज्ञापनायेति संतोष्यम् ॥



०४. प्रातिभासिकवस्तुत्पत्तिविचारः

विद्वद्गोष्ठीतः ९ पृ.

सर्ववेदान्तानां प्रवृत्तिः सम्यज्ञानप्रतिपत्त्या मिथ्याप्रत्ययलक्षणनैसर्गिकाविद्यानिवर्तना यैव, नतु कार्यकारणादिपरिशीलनाय- इति स्थिते, विद्याविद्यावैलक्षण्यं प्रद्योतयितुं यदुदाहरणं वेदान्ताभियुक्तैः शुक्तिरजतरज्जुसर्पादेः, न तत् तथ्यतो रजतादीनां तत्र तत्रोत्पत्तिविनाशादिप्रतिपादनार्थम्, किं तर्हि, अविवेकमात्रादन्यथा प्रतिभासमानस्य विवेकमात्रेण स्वरूपनिर्धारणं भवेदिति निदर्शनार्थम् इत्यर्थात् सिध्यति। उक्तं कण्ठरवेण भाष्ये-

- (१) क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोः विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः इतरेतरतद्धर्माध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञस्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः, रज्जुशुक्तिकादीनां तद्विवेकज्ञानाभावात् अध्यारोपितसर्परजतादिसंयोगवत्। गी.भा. १३-२६
- (२) निरस्तसर्वोपाधिविशेषं ज्ञेयं ब्रह्मस्वरूपेण यः पश्यति, 'क्षेत्रं च मायानिर्मितहस्तिस्वप्नदृष्टवस्तुगन्धर्वनगरादिवत् असदेव सदिव अवभासते' इति एवं निश्चितविज्ञानः यः, तस्य यथोक्तसम्यग्दर्शनविरोधात् अपगच्छति मिथ्याज्ञानम्॥ गी.भा. १३-२६

अत्र गीताभाष्यवाक्ये विवेकज्ञानलक्षणविद्याविनाश्यं मिथ्याज्ञानम् अध्यासशब्दवाच्यम्- इति दार्ष्टान्तिकार्थनिदर्शनार्थं शुक्तिरजतरज्जुसर्पमायाहस्तिस्वप्नदृष्टवस्तुगन्धर्वनगरदृष्टान्ता आनीताः ; न कुत्रापि वस्तुवृत्तेन रजतादिप्रतीतिविषयाणां केनापि रूपेणोत्पत्तिरप्युक्ता विवक्षिता वा- इति स्पष्टम्। यद्यपि भ्रान्तिकाले रजतादीनि तत्र तत्र स्थितान्येव वस्तूनीति मन्यते लोकः, तथापि सर्वत्रापि तत्र मिथ्याभिनिवेश एवापराध्यति; न तु तथाविधं वस्तु विद्यते- इति हि प्रतिपादनरीतिः। एवं छांदोग्येऽपि द्विचन्द्रादिभेदप्रत्यय एव चन्द्राद्येकत्वप्रत्ययेन उपमृदितव्यत्वेन शिष्टः, नतु द्वितीयचन्द्राद्युत्पत्तिरप्यभीष्टमिति; आकाशे च तलमलबुद्ध्युत्पत्तिरेव निषिद्धः न तु

तलमलिनत्वोत्पत्तिरपीति च स्पष्टम् ॥

उपदिष्टश्च तत्र तत्र प्रातिभासमानानामिव विभाव्यमानानाम् अभावो निस्सन्दिग्धतया-

(३) एकाधिकरणत्वं घटादिविशेष्याभावे न युक्तम् इति चेत्, न। 'इदमुदकम्' इति मरीच्यादौ अन्यतराभावेऽपि सामानाधिकरण्यदर्शनात् ॥ गी.भा. २-१६.

(४) ब्रह्मार्पणम्। येन करणेन ब्रह्मवित् हविः अग्नौ अर्पयति, तत् ब्रह्मैव इति पश्यति। तस्य आत्मव्यतिरेकेण अभावं पश्यति, यथा शुक्तिकायां रजताभावं पश्यति। तदुच्यते ब्रह्मैव अर्पणमिति, यथा यद् रजतं तत् शुक्तिकैवेति ॥ गी.भा. ४-२४.

[इह प्रातिभासिकस्य स्वकल्पनास्पदरूपेणैव सत्त्वम्, प्रतीतरूपेण त्वभाव एवेत्युपदिष्टम् ॥]

अत एव हेतोः, शुक्तिरजतदीनां ख्यातिः किंकारणं कथं भवतीति विचारप्रयासोऽपि मुधैवेति मन्मतिः। फल्गुप्रयोजनत्वात्। अध्यासलक्षणमेव हि प्रकृतं सूत्रोपोद्धातभाष्ये, न तु ख्यात्यन्तराणां परीक्षणम्। मतन्तरोपन्यासस्तु स्वाभिमतलक्षणस्य सर्ववादिसंप्रतिपन्नत्वप्रदर्शनार्थ इति भगवत्पादैरेव स्फुटितम्-

(५) 'सर्वथापि तु अन्यस्यान्यधर्मावभासतां न व्यभिचरति'

इत्युपसंहर्द्रिः। तस्मात्, एकस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि चेतनाचेतनात्मकप्रपञ्चाध्यासः- एकमेव ब्रह्म द्वैतप्रपञ्चवदवभासते अविवेकिनाम्- शुक्तिकादिरिव रजतादिवत्, एकश्चन्द्र इव च सद्वितीयवत्- इत्येतावत् प्रयोजनमभिप्रेतम् अध्यासलक्षणदृष्टान्तयोः प्रणयनेनेत्यस्मदभिप्रायः ॥



०५. मायास्वरूपम्

विद्वद्गोष्ठीतः ११ पृ.

यत्पुनरव्यक्ताव्याकृतादिशब्दवाच्यं व्याकृतनामरूपजगद्बीजम्, तस्य मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धरूपेणैवानुमानम् इत्यत्र भाष्यवाक्यं (सू.भा. २-१-९) प्रमाणितं (विज्ञप्तौ)। तस्य च देहादिसंघातरूपेणपरिणतस्य शरिरस्य क्षेत्रलक्षणस्य क्षेत्रज्ञेन मृषासंबन्ध एव अविद्याशब्दवाच्यः- इत्यत्रापि भाष्यवचनमस्ति-

१) देहस्यारम्भकाणि भूतानि पञ्च विषयाश्च प्रकृतिसंभवाः विकाराः पूर्वोक्ताः इह 'कार्य'ग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते। गुणाश्च प्रकृतिसंभवाः सुखदुःखमोहात्मकाः करणाश्रयत्वात् 'करण'ग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते। तेषां कार्यकरणानां कर्तृत्वम् उत्पादकत्वं यत् तत् कार्यकरणकर्तृत्वं तस्मिन् कार्यकरणकर्तृत्वे हेतुः कारणम् आरम्भकत्वेन प्रकृतिः उच्यते। एवं कार्यकरणकर्तृत्वेन संसारस्य कारणं प्रकृतिः। गी.भा. १३-२०.

२) यदा पुनः कार्यकरणसुखदुःखस्वरूपेण हेतुफलात्मना परिणतया प्रकृत्या भोग्यया पुरुषस्य तद्विपरीतस्य भोक्तृत्वे न अविद्यारूपः संयोगः स्यात्, तदा संसारः स्यात् इति ॥ गी.भा. १३-२०.

अत्र प्रकृतेः कार्यकरणसंघातोपादानकरणत्वेन संसारहेतुत्वमुक्तम्। तथा च संघातरूपेण परिणतया पुरुषस्य असङ्गस्यापि सत्, 'अविद्यारूपः'- अध्यासरूपः, यः षड्विंशतितमश्लोकभाष्ये प्रपञ्चयिष्यते सः - संयोगः संसारानर्थस्य हेतुरित्युक्तम्। एतेन, भाष्योपात्तपरिभाषया न प्रकृतिरविद्या, किं तु प्रकृतिपुरुषाध्यास एवाविद्या- इति स्फुटं भवति ॥

३) यदि वस्तुभूता गुणाः, यदि वा अविद्याकल्पिताः, तद्धर्मः कर्म, तदात्मनि अविद्याधारोपितमेव ॥ गी.भा. १८-४८.

४) तस्मात् गुणा इव नित्यपरतन्त्राः क्षेत्रज्ञं प्रति अविद्यात्मकत्वात् क्षेत्रज्ञं निबध्नन्तीव । तम् आस्पदीकृत्य आत्मानं प्रतिलभन्ते इति निबध्नन्ति इति उच्यते । ते च प्रकृतिसंभवाः भगवन्मायासंभवाः निबध्नन्तीव ॥ गी.भा. १४-५.

अत्र प्रथमोदाहरणेन सांख्याभिमतान् प्रकृतिगुणान् अङ्गीकृत्यैव प्रक्रियाप्रणयनात् सर्वत्रैव तत्प्रक्रियायां संप्रतिपत्तिः इति मा भूत् कस्यचिदपि मतिः- इति ‘परमतमप्रतिषिद्धम् अनुमतं भवति’ इति न्यायानुसारेण गुणानामङ्गीकारेऽपि तेषां वस्तुसत्त्वं नाङ्गीक्रियत इति स्फुटयितुम् उक्तम् ‘यदि वा अविद्याकल्पिताः’ इति । न हि साङ्ख्याः प्रकृतेरविद्याकल्पितत्वम् अनुमन्यन्ते इति । एवं च अविद्याकल्पितया प्रकृत्या पुरुषस्य भोक्तृत्वेन यदध्यासलक्षणः संबन्धः स एव संसारहेतुः- इत्युक्तं भवति ॥

द्वितीयस्मिंस्तु वाक्ये एतदुक्तम् यद् गुणाः अविद्याकल्पितत्वात् अविद्यामात्रशरीराः, अत एव स्वास्पदीभूतं पुरुषमाश्रित्यैव स्वात्मानं लभन्ते सर्पादय इव रज्ज्वादि- इति गुणा इव परतन्त्रा, तैश्च वस्तुवृत्तेन क्षेत्रज्ञोऽणुमात्रेणापि न संबध्यते इत्यतस्तं ‘निबध्नन्तीव’ इत्यभाणि ॥

तदेतदव्यक्तादिशब्दवाच्यं मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबन्धानुमितं जगद्बीजं सुषुप्तिमरणप्रलयेषु सिद्धवत्कृत्यैव पुनरुत्थानपुनर्जन्मपुनःसृष्टस्य उपपाद्यन्ते श्रुत्यन्तरेषु । एतदुपजीव्यैव च मायिककार्यकारणप्रक्रिया आश्रीयते । न तु वस्तुवृत्तेन तास्ववस्थासु आत्मन्यविद्याकामकर्मसम्बन्धो वा कारणत्वं वा समस्ति । अत एव हि बीजरहितेनैव स्वरूपेण निर्दिदिक्षायां सर्वविशेषापहनवेनैव ‘नेति नेति’ इत्यादिरूपेणोपदिष्यत आत्मा । आवाङ्मनसगोचरत्वात् । अत्रेमानि वाक्यान्यनुसंधेयानि-

५) निर्बीजतयैव चेत् सति प्रलीनानां संपन्नानां सुषुप्तिप्रलययोः पुनरुत्थानानुपपत्तिः स्यात् । मुक्तानां च पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः । बीजाभावाविशेषात् । ज्ञानदाह्यबीजाभावे च ज्ञानानर्थक्यप्रसङ्गः । गौ.का.भा. १-२

६) तस्मात् सबीजत्वाभ्युपगमेनैव सतः प्राणत्वव्यपदेशः सर्व श्रुतिषु च कारणत्वव्यपदेशः । अत एव “अक्षरात् परतः परः” “सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः” (मुं.२-१-२) “यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते” (तै. २-९) “नेति नेति” (बृ. २-३-६) इत्यादिना सबीजवत्त्वापनयनेन व्यपदेशः ॥ गौ.का.भा. १-२.

७) तामबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादिसंबन्धरहितां पारमार्थिकीं

पृथग्वक्ष्यति ॥

[‘तस्यैव प्राज्ञस्य’ इत्युक्तेः प्राज्ञे सबिजत्वमविद्याकल्पितमेवेति स्फुटितम्।]

८) अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपं यत् सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षतः ॥ बृ.भा.

४-३-२२.

तदेवं सुषुप्तिप्रलयाद्यवस्थासु या बीजावस्था जगतः, मिथ्याज्ञानानुमेया, सैवाव्यक्तप्रकृत्या दिशब्दशब्दिता कार्यकरणसंघातलक्षणेन क्षेत्ररूपेण परिणता माया, अविद्या तु प्रकृतिस्थत्वाख्या क्षेत्रप्रत्युपस्थापकोऽध्यासः, ततादात्म्यभावनालक्षणश्च- इति स्फुटम् ॥

अयमत्र संग्रहः। रज्जुसर्पयोरिव सत्यानृतयोरात्मानात्मनोरन्योन्यं मृषासंयोगलक्षणोऽध्यासः एव शाङ्करप्रक्रियायाम् अविद्या। तत्प्रयुक्त एव च सर्वो जीवस्य लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः। सा चाविद्या स्वयम् अव्यक्तैव सती जीवानाम् अज्ञत्वं विषयतृष्णापहतबुद्धित्वं कामित्वं कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च प्रत्याययति; सैव च तेषाम् अनेकजन्मानुष्ठितपुण्याहितसंस्कारेण विवेकवैराग्यशमदमादिसंपत्तिशास्त्राचार्योपदेशलब्धविद्यापरिपाकतो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्ते स्वात्मनि ब्रह्मणि स्थितिं च दर्शयति। अतः सैव ‘महतः परमव्यक्तम्’ इति श्रुत्युदिताव्यक्तशब्दार्हा मुख्यवृत्त्या। यथोक्तं भगवद्भिर्भाष्यकारैः-

यदा तु जीवो महान्, तदाप्यव्यक्ताधीनत्वाज्जीवभावस्य महतः परमव्यक्तम् इत्युक्तम्।

अविद्या हि अव्यक्तम्। अविद्यावत्त्वेनैव जीवस्य सर्वः संव्यवहारः संततो वर्तते ॥ सू.भा.

१-४-३.

इति। यत् पुनरव्याकृतनामरूपाबीजात्मकं जगद्बीजावस्थालक्षणम्, तदप्यव्यक्तम्। व्यवहारे व्यक्तस्य व्याकृतनामरूपात्मकजगदपेक्षया अव्यक्तत्वात्। प्रतीतेन स्वेन रूपेण च आत्मनः स्वरूपेण तदन्यत्वेन वा अशक्यनिरूपणत्वाच्च। तदपेक्षयापि परमात्मनः सूक्ष्मतरत्वं सर्वप्रत्यगात्मत्वं च निर्दिदिक्षुभिर्हि श्रुतिभिः स्मृतिभिश्च तद् बीजमव्यक्ताक्षरादिशब्दैर्व्यपदिश्यते। तथा च भाष्यम्-

२) अक्षरम् अव्याकृतं नामरूपबीजशक्तिरूपं भूतसूक्ष्मम् ईश्वराश्रयं तस्यैवोपाधिभूतम्, सर्वस्माद् विकारात् परो योऽविकारः, तस्मात्परतः परः ॥ सू.भा. १-२-२२.

३) अ) पूर्वोक्ताद् भूतग्रामबीजभूतात्, अविद्यालक्षणात्, अन्यो विलक्षणो भावः ॥ गी.भा.

८-२०.

आ) तमेवाक्षरसंज्ञकम् अव्यक्तं भावमाहुः परमां प्रकृष्टां गतिम् ॥ गी.भा. ८-२१.

तत्तु अक्षरादिशब्दितम् जगद्धीजम् 'अविद्यात्मिका', 'अविद्यालक्षणा', 'अविद्याकृता' इत्यादिविशेषणैः, मृषाप्रतीतिद्योतकमायाशब्देन च तत्र तत्र विशिषन्त्याचार्याः -

४) अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वान्यत्वाम्याम् अनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते ॥

सू.भा. २-१-२७.

५) अविद्यात्मिका हि बीजशक्तिरव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुप्तिः ॥

सु.भा. १-४-३.

६) अव्यक्ता हि सा माया। तत्त्वान्यत्वनिरूपणस्याशक्यत्वात् ॥ सू.भा. १-४-३.

७) न व्यक्तमव्यक्तम्, अव्याकृतम्, ईश्वरशक्तिः, 'मम माया दुरत्यया' इत्युक्तम् ॥ गी.भा. १३-५.

८) प्रकृतिरीश्वरस्य विकारकारणशक्तिः, त्रिगुणात्मिका माया ॥ गी.भा. १३-१९.

यत्रापि 'अविद्याध्यारोपित'(सू.भा. २-१-९), 'अविद्याकल्पित' (सू. २-१-४), 'अविद्याध्यस्त' (गौ.का.भा. २-३२)- इत्यादिप्रयोगा दृश्यन्ते भाष्ये, तत्रापि 'मिथ्याप्रत्ययदर्शित' इत्येषार्थोऽवसेयः। करिकलभेत्यादिप्रयोगवत् तत्राध्यस्तादिशब्दानां ग्रहणविषयभूतविशेष्यमात्रवा चित्वसम्भवात्। न तु तावतैवाविद्या अध्यासव्यतिरिक्तापि काचित् कल्पनीया। भाष्यप्रस्थाने तादृशाविद्याया अनभ्युपगमादिति स्पष्टम् ॥

प्रसङ्गादिदमपीह चिन्त्यम्। अव्यक्ताक्षरप्रकृत्यादिशब्दितां नामरूपबीजशक्तिं मायाशब्देनैव व्यवहरन्ति भाष्यकाराः, न क्वचिदप्यविद्याशब्देन। एवम् अध्यासं नियमेनाविद्येत्येवाभिदधते, न तु मायेति। तत्र कस्तेषामाशयः? किं बीजशक्तिरप्यविद्याशब्दमर्हति, न वा? तथा यथोक्तविद्यापि मायाशब्दव्यपदेशार्हा, न वा? -इति। अत्र ममैवं भाति। य एवाविद्यादृष्ट्या प्रतीयते पदार्थः तमेवाभूतार्थं मायिकमिति व्यपदिशति लोकः। तस्मात् यद्यदभूतं वस्तु, अविचारितसिद्धम्, तत्सर्वं मायाशब्दार्हम्, अविद्याशब्दस्तु सम्यग्ज्ञानविनिवर्त्याज्ञानवाचकत्वेनैव प्रसिद्धो लोके, न पुनर्ज्ञेयपदार्थवाचकत्वेन। तस्मात् अध्यास एवाविद्याशब्दमर्हति, तत्कल्पितप्रातीतिकार्थस्तु मायाशब्दमित्येव युक्तम्। तथापि यद्यदविद्यया प्रतीयते, तत्तदप्यविद्याकल्पितमिति द्योतनविवक्षया लक्षणया अविद्याशब्देन यदि लक्ष्यते, तदा न कोऽपि दोषः। एवम् यदा अविद्याया

ज्ञानविशेषत्वमुपसर्जनीकृत्य तस्या वृत्तिरूपेणावभासमानतैव प्राधान्येन विवक्ष्यते, तदा सापि मायाशब्देन व्यपदेश्यं शक्यैव। उक्तं हि तैत्तिरीयभाष्ये-

९) तस्मात् नामरूपपक्षस्यैव विद्याविद्ये। नामरूपे च नात्मधर्मो। ‘नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद् ब्रह्म’ इति श्रुत्यन्तरात्। ते च नामरूपे सवितर्यहोरात्रे इव कल्पिते न परमार्थतो विद्यमाने॥ तै.भा. २-८.

इति। अत्र विद्याविद्ययोर्वृत्तिज्ञानस्वरूपत्वमुपगम्य कल्पितनामरूपत्वोक्त्या मायाशब्दार्हत्वं सूचितमिति स्पष्टम्। अत्र सारासारनिर्णये तु भाष्यार्थनिर्णयोकोविदा एव प्रमाणम्॥

एतावता विचारेण इदमेकं सुनिष्पन्नं यदध्यारोपदृष्टिमवष्टभ्य शास्त्रकारैरुपदेशार्थमेवेदं सर्वं प्रकल्पितं विद्याविद्याविभागः, अविद्यामायाविभागश्चेत्यादि परमार्थतत्त्वविजिज्ञापयिषया तदुपायत्वेन। विज्ञाते तु तत्त्वे अविद्या तत्कल्पिता माया वा नासीन्नास्ति न भविष्यतीति विज्ञायत इति। अत एव ह्यभियुक्तोक्तिः-

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता॥ गौ.का.२-३२

इति॥



०६. शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्

शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करतः २९ उपखण्डः

शास्त्रप्रामाण्यप्रक्रिया - 'एवं तं त्वौपनिषदं पृच्छामि' (बृ. 3-9-26), 'सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति' (का. 1-2-15) इति च श्रुतेः, आत्मन उपनिषन्मात्रवेद्यत्वोक्तिः प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणांतरागम्यत्वद्योतनायैव, न तु शब्दज्ञाप्यत्वमङ्गीकृत्य यथाह भगवान् भाष्यकारः -

(1) वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः, नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता ॥ सू.भा. 1-1-2.

(2) रूपाद्यभावाद् हि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः। लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम्। आगममात्रसमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत् ॥ सू.भा. 2-1-6.

आगममात्रसमधिगम्यत्वमेव त्वभिप्रेत्य सूत्रितं भगवता बादरायणेन 'शास्त्रयोनित्वात्' (वे.सू. 1-1-3) इति, भाषितं च भाष्यकारेण 'शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्माधिगम्यत - इत्यभिप्रायः' इति। न तु तावता प्रमाणप्रमेय-व्यवहारः पारमार्थिक - इति, शास्त्रं च प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणवदेव प्रमाणादनधिगतं ब्रह्म ज्ञापयतीति वा भ्रमितव्यम् 'यद्वाचानभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युद्यते' (के. 1-5) इत्यादिश्रुतेः। प्रमाणानां शास्त्राणां च, अविद्यापुरस्सरमेव प्रवृत्तेश्च। यदाह भाष्यकारः -

(1) शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् अतद्धर्माध्यारोपण-मात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रामाण्यमात्मनः प्रतिपद्यते, न त्वज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन ॥ गी.भा. 2-18.

[अतद्धर्मनिवर्तकत्वमात्रेण इति भिन्नक्रमो मात्रशब्दः]

(2) प्रमातृत्वं हि आत्मनो निवर्तयति अन्त्यं प्रमाणम्, निवर्तयदेव च अप्रमाणीभवति स्वप्नकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे ॥ गी.भा. 2-69.

[अविद्याकृतप्रमातारमाश्रित्यैव प्रमाणव्यवहारप्रवृत्तेः, श्रुतेरपि प्रमाणत्वमविद्यादृष्ट्यैवोपचर्यते - इति भावः ॥]

(3) तमेतमविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहाराः लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः। सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि ॥ अध्यासभाष्यम्, सू.भा.

[‘सर्वे’ इत्यविशेषवचनात् मुमुक्षुमुक्तव्यवहारा अपि अविद्यादृष्ट्यैवेत्युक्तं भवति। ‘मोक्षपराणि’ इत्यनेन आत्मविषयकमपि शास्त्रं सांवृतिकप्रमाणव्यवहारमाश्रित्यैव प्रवृत्तमित्युक्तं भवति ॥]

तदेवं वेदान्तिनां प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः, शास्त्रादिव्यवहारश्च तत्त्वोपदेशार्थम् अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियामाश्रित्यैवेति सिद्धम् ॥

प्रक्रिया प्रत्यभिज्ञातः २२७ खण्डसङ्ख्या

‘प्रकाशकं प्रमाणम्’ इति प्रमेयविषये यद्यपि लोकदृष्ट्या सम्यगेव, ब्रह्म तु वेदितुरात्मैव स्वयंप्रकाशम् इति न तत्र प्रमाणव्यापारावसरः। शास्त्रं तु प्रमात्रादिभेदभ्रान्तिनिषेधकृत्। यथोक्तं बृहदारण्यकभाष्ये-

(अ) ननु विरुद्धमिदमुच्यते अप्रमेयम्, ज्ञायत इति च।...नैष दोषः। अन्यवस्तुवत् अनागमप्रमाणप्रमेयत्वप्रतिषेधार्थत्वात् ॥

(आ) प्रमातृप्रमाणादिव्यापारप्रतिषेधेनैव आगामोऽपि विज्ञापयति न त्वभिधानाभिधेयलक्षणवाक्यधर्माङ्गीकरणेन।..... प्रतिपादयित्रात्मभूतं हि तत्। प्रतिपादयितुः प्रतिपादनस्य प्रतिपाद्य- विषयत्वात्। भेदे हि सति तद्भवति ॥४-४-२०, पा. १२८

यदापि निवर्तकमेव, प्रमाणम्, तदापि न मूर्तद्रव्यापनयनतुल्या निवृत्तिः किं त्वविद्याप्रत्ययस्य बाधनमेवेत्युक्तम्। रज्जुसर्पादिवत् द्वैतस्याध्यस्तत्वात्, तद्बाध एव कर्तव्यो न तु वास्तवं किञ्चिन्निवर्तनमपीति वेदान्तसिद्धान्तः। तथा हि माण्डूक्यभाष्यम्-

(इ) कथं पुनःस्वरूपे व्यापाराभावे शास्त्रस्य द्वैतविज्ञाननिवर्तकत्वम् ? नैष दोषः। रज्ज्वासर्पादिवदात्मनि द्वैतस्याविद्याध्यस्तत्वात्।... यतोऽविद्याध्यारोपितसुखित्वादिविशेषप्रतिबन्धादेवात्मनः स्वरूपेणानवस्थानम्, स्वरूपावस्थानं च श्रेयः-इति सुखित्वादिनिवर्तकं

शास्त्रम् आत्मन्यसुखित्वादिप्रत्ययकरणेन नेति नेत्यस्थूलादिवाक्यैः। अत्मस्वरूपवत् असुखित्वाद्यपि सुखित्वादिभेदेषु नानुवृत्तोऽस्ति धर्मः ॥ गौ.का. भा. २-३२, पा. २०५

यदप्युच्यते निवर्तकत्वपक्षेऽपि अज्ञाननिवर्तकत्वमिति, तत्राध्यास एवाज्ञानं चेत्, ओमिति ब्रूमः। अध्यासस्य भ्रान्तिप्रत्ययत्वज्ञापनमेव हि तन्निवृत्तिरिति। अथ प्राप्तस्यैव कस्यचित् निवृत्तिरज्ञाननिवृत्तिरिष्यते, न तत्र ज्ञानव्यापारः। मोक्षोऽनित्यश्च भवेत् प्राप्तापनयनपक्षे। यत्तूदाहरणं 'सिद्धं तु निवर्तकत्वात्' इति तस्याप्यध्यासबाधने तात्पर्यम्, भाष्यकारैरेव तथोक्तत्वात्।

विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा ७ खण्डः

तदेवम्, कूटस्थचैतन्यैकस्वरूपस्यैव सत आत्मनः प्रत्याक्षादि प्रमाणाश्रितत्वम्, प्रमाणव्यापारयितृत्वलक्षणं च प्रमातृत्वं, प्रमेय विषये अज्ञत्वं, प्रमाणैः प्रमेयं परिच्छिद्य तत् तत्त्वावगतिरूपफलभाक्त्वं चेति प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः सर्वोऽपि अविद्या पुरस्सर एवेत्युपपद्यते। अत एव प्रमातृनानात्वं विभागश्चेत्येतत् सर्वमपि व्यावहारिकमेव न परमार्थसत् इत्यपि सिद्धं भवति, अविद्याकृतप्रमातृत्वालम्बनत्वात् सर्वस्याप्यस्य व्यवहारस्य। स्वप्नोऽपि परमार्थात्मन्येकस्मिन्नेव प्रमातृनानात्वम्, प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणव्यवहारश्च प्राक् प्रबोधात् अनुवर्तते, स्वस्मिन् सत्यत्वबुद्धिं चावहति। न च तावता तस्य परमार्थसत्त्वम् आयातीति। तदाह भाष्यकारः-

“यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान् भावान् पश्यतो निश्चितमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राक् प्रबोधात्, न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति, तद्वत्॥” सू.भा. २-१-१४ इति ॥

एवं वेदप्रामाण्यव्यवहारोऽपि यावदविद्याव्यवहारानुवृत्तिस्तावदेव, तस्याप्यविद्याप्रत्युपस्था पितप्रमात्राश्रितत्वात्। विद्यायां तु जातायां नैव शास्त्रम्, न शास्ता, न च शिष्यः- इत्यतो वेदप्रामाण्यव्यवहारस्यापि प्राक् प्रबोधादेवानुवृत्तिरिति युक्तम्। तथा हि भाष्यम्-

प्रत्यक्षाद्यभावे श्रुतेरप्यभावप्रसङ्ग इति चेत्। न। इष्टत्वात्। ‘अत्र पिताऽपिता भवति’ इत्युपक्रम्य, ‘वेदा अवेदाः’ इति वचनात्, इष्यत एव अस्माभिः श्रुतेरप्यभावः प्रबोधे॥ सू.भा. ४-१-३. इति ॥

आत्मविषयकाविद्यानिबन्धनत्वादेव प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारस्य, अविद्या अनुभवमात्रसिद्धा,

न तस्यां प्रमाणानां प्रवृत्तिरिति सिध्यति। प्रमाणैविषयीकर्तुं योग्योऽपि विषये तावत्, तद्विषया अविद्या प्रमाणप्रवृत्तेः प्रागेव सिद्धा, न पुनः प्रमाणैः सिषाधयिषति तां कश्चिदिति सर्वविदितम्। किं पुनर्वक्तव्यम् अविषयभूतब्रह्मात्मविषयाम् अविद्याम् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितानि प्रमाणानि वा न केचिद् विषयीकर्तुं प्रभवेयुरिति। न ह्यविषये ब्रह्मात्मनि कस्यचिदपि प्रमाणस्य प्रवृत्तिः शक्या चिन्तयितुमपि। प्रमातैव तावत् न प्रमाणानां विषयः। यथोक्तं गीताभाष्ये-

सिद्धे हि आत्मनि प्रमातरि प्रमित्सोः प्रमाणान्वेषणा भवति। न हि पूर्वं 'इत्थमहम्' इति आत्मानं प्रमाय पश्चात् प्रमेयपरिच्छेदाय प्रवर्तते ॥ गी.भा. २-१८.

इति। न च प्रमाणानामपि प्रमाणविषयता। न हि स्वयं प्रमेयज्ञापकं सत् प्रमाणं स्वज्ञापने प्रमाणान्तरं समपेक्षते इति युक्तं स्याद् वचः; न हि दीपस्य स्वप्रकाशने दीपान्तरापेक्षा इति एवं च सिद्धमिदं प्रमातृप्रमाणप्रमेयविभागाध्यासस्यास्पदभूतः परमार्थात्मा सर्वथा न कस्यचिदपि प्रमाणस्य विषय इति। तदेवं प्रमाणानां प्रमातुश्च प्रमाणप्रकाश्यत्वकाङ्क्षाभावात्, परमात्मनश्च सर्वसाक्षिणोऽविषयत्वात्, स्वयंप्रकाशकूटस्थचैतन्यस्वरूपत्वेन नित्यसिद्धत्वात्, प्रमातृप्रमाणादिविकल्पास्पदत्वाच्च न प्रमाणविषयता; अविद्यायाश्च प्रमाणप्रमेयादिविकल्पप्रत्युपस्थापकत्वात्, विचारासहिष्णुस्वभावत्वाच्च न प्रमाणविषयता इति स्थितम् ॥

८. ब्रह्मात्मनः शब्दप्रमाणकत्वम्

अथ कथं 'सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति' (का. १-२-१५), 'उपदेक्ष्यन्ति ते ज्ञानं ज्ञानिनस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः' (गी.भा. ४-३४)- श्रुतिस्मृतिवचनानि? कथं वा गीताभाष्यवचनम् 'शास्त्राचार्योपदेशशमदमादिसंस्कृतं मन आत्मदर्शने करणम्' (गी.भा. २-२१) इति? न हि शास्त्रम्, आचार्योक्तिर्वाशब्दत्वाविशेषे स्वसामर्थ्यमतिक्रम्याप्याऽऽत्मतत्त्वं प्रकाशयितुमलं भवेत्। अत्रोच्यते- 'न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति। किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति।' इति। तदनुसन्धेयम्। निर्विशेषे सर्वशब्दप्रत्ययप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तवर्जिऽप्यात्मतत्त्वे देहेन्द्रियाद्यनृतमिथ्योपाधिसंबन्धकृतं प्रमातृत्वम् अध्यारोप्यैवोपदिशति शास्त्रम् 'तत्त्वमसि' इति। तत्र 'त्वम्' इति संसारिप्रमातृरूपम् अनूद्य तदपनयनेन 'तत्' असंसारि ब्रह्मासि इति बोधयद् हि शास्त्रम् आत्मनः प्रमातृत्वमेवापवदति। सोऽयम् अध्यारोपापवादाख्यो न्यायः सर्वेषु वेदान्तेषु परमार्थात्मतत्त्वोपदेशार्थं समाद्रियते ॥

यस्मादेवम् अध्यारोपदृष्ट्या प्रमातृत्वं मिथ्यारूपमात्मधर्मवत् परिकल्प्य तदपवादेन

सर्वव्यवहारातीतं परमार्थं ब्रह्म समर्पयति, अत एवेदम् ‘अन्त्यं प्रमाणम्’ इति परिभाष्यते। न हि तत्त्वबोधानन्तरमपि प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारोऽवशिष्यत इति कृत्वा। तदुक्तं भाष्ये-

“अपि च, अन्त्यमिदं प्रमाणम् आत्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकम्, नातः परं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति, सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वादवगतेः। सति हि अन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणेऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात् ; न त्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽर्थोऽस्ति य आकाङ्क्ष्येत ॥” सू.भा. २-१-१४.

इति। तथा अन्यत्रापि-

“तस्मात् अहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्येतदवसाना एव सर्वे विधयः सर्वाणि चेताराणि प्रमाणानि। न हि अहेयानुपादेयाद्वैतात्मावगतौ सत्याम्, निर्विषयाणि अप्रमातृकाणि च प्रमाणानि भवितुमर्हन्तीति।” सू.भा. १-१-४. इति ॥

अत एवात्र शब्दो न केवलशब्दत्वेन प्रमाणं यथा धर्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किं तर्हि अनुभवानुसारेण तत्त्वं विज्ञापयत्, अनुभवानुसारितर्केण चात्मतत्त्वं विवेचयच्च ‘प्रमाणम्’ इत्युपचर्यते। तदेतदुक्तं भाष्ये-

“न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायम्। किन्तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवमिह प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य।” सू.भा. १-१-२.- इति ॥

अस्य भाष्यस्यायमभिप्रायः- यद्यदनुभवाधारेण तत्त्वं ज्ञाप्यते स स अनुभवः प्रमाणमत्र। यस्मिंस्तुअन्त्येऽनुभवे अवगत्यपराभिधाने अद्वैतब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वसमर्पके परिसमाप्यते जिज्ञासा, स प्रमाणफलम् इति परिभाषा। अत्र मीमांसायां यत्र कर्मप्रतिपादनं वा उपासनाप्रतिपादनं वा अदृष्टफलकं प्रक्रम्यते, तत्र श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणम्; यत्र दृष्टानुसारेण प्रमेयतत्त्वाधिगमोपायः प्रतिपाद्यते, तत्र प्रत्यक्षादयोऽपि प्रमाणम्; यत्र पुनः केवलं साक्षादपरोक्षम् आत्मवस्त्वेव प्रतिपाद्यते, तत्र प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणानामप्यनुग्राहकम् अनुभवमात्रं प्रमाणम् इति ‘यथासंभवम्’ इति विशेषादानमिति। तथा हि भाष्यम्-

“कर्तव्ये हि विषये नानुभवापेक्षास्तीति श्रुत्यादीनामेव प्रामाण्यं स्यात्, पुरुषाधीनात्मलाभत्वाच्च कर्तव्यस्य।” सू.भा. १-१-२.

“प्रत्यक्षफलत्वाच्च ज्ञानस्य फलविरहाऽऽशङ्कानुपपत्तिः; कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादौ अवनुभवानारूढे स्यादाशङ्का। भवेद्वा न वा इति; अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम्, ‘यत्

साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म(बृ.३-४-१) इति श्रुतेः, 'तत्त्वमसि' इति सिद्धवदुपदेशात्॥” सू.भा.
३-३-३२

“प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यप्रवृत्तिपूर्वकौ संभवासंभवौ अवधार्येते, न पुनः संभवासंभवपूर्वके प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यप्रवृत्ती। यद्धि प्रत्यक्षादीनामन्यतमेनापि प्रमाणेनोपलभ्यते तत्संभवति। यत् न केनचिदपि प्रमाणेनोपलभ्यते, तन्न संभवति। इह तु यथास्वं सर्वैरपि प्रमाणैर्बाह्योऽर्थ उपलभ्यमानः कथं व्यतिरेकाव्यतिरेकादिविकल्पैर्न संभवतीत्युच्येत? उपलब्धेरेव।”
[अत्र बाह्याऽर्थे प्रत्यक्षादीनामेव प्रामाण्यम्, न केवलतर्कस्य इत्युक्तम्॥]



०७. अनुभवस्वरूपम्

विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः-अनुभवप्रधानदृष्ट्या उपदेशः १५खण्डः

अनुभवैकगम्यं ब्रह्म

१५. अपगतो भगवत्प्रसादात् अविद्यागतः संशयः। जिज्ञासवः पुनः केन साध्येन तद् ब्रह्म विजानीयुः स्वात्मत्वेन? - इत्येतत्तु भगवान् मे ज्ञापयितुमर्हति ॥

एतदपि खलु सोम्य, उक्तमेव मया। वेदान्तैयथा यथा तत्स्वरूपमुपदिश्यते तथा तथा स्वानुभवमेव साधनीकृत्य विज्ञातुमर्हसि। न हि स्वयंसिद्धमात्मवस्तु बाह्यप्रमेयपदार्थ इव प्रमाणेन परिच्छेदं भवेत्, अतोऽनुभवेनेनैव ब्रह्म स्वात्मत्वेन विजिज्ञासस्व ॥

एवं तर्हि भगवन्, ब्रह्मण्यपि प्रमाणप्रमेयविभागोऽस्तीत्येवापन्नम्, यावता अनुभवस्तत्र प्रमाणम्, तेन च ब्रह्म प्रमीयत इति। कथमेतद् विजानीयाम् अद्वितीयं ब्रह्म ममाऽऽत्मा, अनुभवेन ज्ञातव्यं चेति? नन्वेतदपि विप्रतिषिद्धम् ॥

न विप्रतिषिद्धम्। अप्रमेयं तत्, स्वात्मभूतमेव - इति विज्ञाने प्रमाणप्रमेयविभागानवतारात्। श्रुत्युपदिष्टविधया अतद्धर्मवारणेनैव एकरूपं तत् - इति ज्ञाने हि न विरोधः। न च जिज्ञासायाः फलाभावः, अनुभवैकदेशेन तत्तदध्यारोपितांशापोहेनान्ततः परमानुभवरूपफलावसानत्वाद् विचारस्य। तथा चोक्तं संप्रदायविद्भिः 'न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किं तु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवम् इह प्रमाणम्। अनुभवावसानत्वात्, भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य '(सू.भा. १-१-४*)इति। एवं च न प्रमाणप्रमेयविभागो भवत्यत्र; प्रमाणभूतानुभवैकदेशानामपि फलभूतानुभवस्येव ब्रह्मात्माव्यतिरेकात्, अनुभवस्वरूपत्वाच्च ब्रह्मात्मनः। तदप्युक्तम् अभियुक्तैः 'अकल्पकमजं ज्ञानं ज्ञेयाभिन्नं प्रचक्षते। ब्रह्मज्ञेयमजं

नित्यमजेनाजं विबुध्यते' (गौ.का. ३-३३) इति ॥

ननु भगवन्, अनुभवोऽपि प्रतिव्यक्ति भिन्नभिन्नो भवति। शीतोष्णाद्यनुभववत् तत्र कस्य वाऽनुभवः सर्वसंप्रतिपन्नः स्यात्? अपि च सर्वसिद्धान्तानामपि स्वस्वानुभवापेक्षया उपपन्नत्वमेवङ्गीक्रियते वादिभिः। न खलु सर्वशून्यवाद्यपि तर्केण स्वसिद्धान्तमनुभवसिद्धत्वेन न साधयतीति ॥

न मया शीतोष्णाद्यनुभववद् वेदनारूपोऽनुभवोऽभिप्रेतः। किं तर्हि साक्षादात्मानुभव एव। न हि कश्चित् संशेते स्वात्मनि, आत्मा वा न वा - इति। सार्वत्रिकश्चायमनुभवो न कैश्चिदपि तार्किकैरपहनोतुं शक्यते। अनुभवमात्रशरणा हि वादाः सर्वप्रमाणविदां तार्किकाणां च। अनुभवपर्यवसायीन्येव हि प्रमाणानि प्रमाणत्वेन परिगण्यन्ते। न च शून्यवाद्यपि कञ्चित् तर्कमेतादृशानुभवापर्यवसायिनं तर्कत्वेनोपस्थापयितुं क्षमते। प्रतिवादितार्किकैरपि खलु अनुभवानुसारि तर्क एव अनुभवपर्यवसायी सत्तर्कत्वेनाभ्युपगम्यत इति। यथोक्तं तर्कतत्त्वविद्भिः सुरेश्वराचार्यैः - ' इमं प्राश्निकमुद्दिश्य तर्कज्वरभृशातुराः। त्वाच्छिरस्कवचोजालैर्मोहयन्तीतरतरम्। ' (नै. सि. २-५९) इति। तस्मात्, सर्ववेदान्तगम्यम् अनुभवस्वरूपमात्मानं सार्वत्रिकानुभववेद्यं न व्यभिचरितवैयक्तिकानुभवैस्तुल्यितुमर्हसि ॥

सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी २७ खण्ड

अनुभवादयश्च यथासम्भवं प्रमाणम्-इत्यस्यार्थः-

तत्र 'अनुभवावसानत्वात्' इति फलभूतानुभवप्रदर्शनं परमार्थतत्त्वावगतौ एकान्तेन जिज्ञासापरिसमाप्तिः- इति द्योतनार्थमिति स्पष्टमेव; 'स यो ह वै तत् परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' (मुं. ३-२-९), 'आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्' (तै. ३-६), 'सत्त्वशुद्धौ ध्रुवा स्मृतिः' (छां. ७-२६-२०) इत्यादिषु कृतकृत्यताप्रकाशनार्थम् उपात्ताः विद्याः विज्ञान-ध्रुवस्मृत्यादिशब्दाः एतमेवानुभवं परामृशन्ति। स चानुभवः (१) अवान्तरवाक्यजन्यज्ञानान्यनुभवशब्दवाच्यानि, (२) अनुभवसंनिकृष्टास्तर्कान् श्रुत्यनुगृहीतान्, (३) तदुपजीवकांश्च लौकिकान् प्रमाणशब्दशब्दितान् अवश्यमपेक्षते स्वोत्पत्तौ दृष्टफलकानुभवपर्यवसानत्वाज्जिज्ञासाया इति स्फुटमेव। अत एव हि शिष्यप्रश्नाचार्यप्रतिवचनलक्षणसंवादरूपया आख्यायिकया जिज्ञास्यं वस्तु स्मर्यते 'कथं नु भगवः

स आदेशो भवति' (छां. ६-१-३), 'भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयत्विति तथा सोम्येति होवाच' (छां. ६-८-७) इत्यादिभिर्वचनैः। अत्र प्रमाणभूतानुभवशब्दवाच्यः कः पदार्थः इति विचिन्त्यम्। न तावत् प्रत्यक्षानुभवः, नापि सुखदुःखहृदयशूलादिवेदनालक्षणोऽनुभवो मानसः। प्रत्यक्षानुभवो हि बाह्यप्रमेयमात्रविषयः, इन्द्रियसंनिर्घर्षजन्यश्च क्वाचित्कः ; सुखदुःखानुभवस्तु वैयक्तिकः, तत्तदाध्यात्मिकवेदनाविशेषः, क्वाचित्कश्च। अयं पुनः सर्वबाह्याध्यात्मिकवेद्यविषयकः प्रकाशः आत्मस्थः। कृत्स्नानात्मसंनिधौ, तदभावे च सुषुप्तादिषु सदैवैकरूपेण वर्तमानः सर्वदेशकाल-स्थितपुरुषमात्रसाधारणः। तदेवं सर्वान्तरानुभवतदनुसारितर्कप्रमाणसहकृता ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा श्रुत्याद्या-धेयविज्ञानोत्पत्तिबन्धकसंशयादिनिवृत्तिद्वारेण, अधिकारिणाम् अवगत्यपराभिधानानुभवाभिव्यक्तौ पर्यवस्यतीत्येष राद्धान्तो वेदान्तार्थविज्ञानविषयकः ॥



०८. अन्वयव्यतिरेकन्यायः तर्कश्च

सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी-(४१खण्ड)

अथ किमिदं मीमांसाशास्त्रम्, कश्चासौ तदविरोधितर्को नाम? इतीदं विविच्यते। तत्र मीमांसाशब्दस्त्वावत् कस्यचनानुष्ठेयस्य, यथावस्थितवस्तुनो वा, सतत्त्वस्य निर्धारणे प्रवृत्तस्य विचारस्य वाचकत्वेन वेदान्तेषु व्यवहियते। तद्यथा- ‘अथातो व्रतमीमांसा’ (बृ. १-५-२१) इत्यत्र उपासनकर्मविचारणा मीमांसाशब्दव्यपदिष्टा प्राणव्रतोपदेशार्था सार्थवादमारभ्यते। यथा च- ‘सैषानन्दस्य मीमांसा भवति’ (तै. २-८) इत्यत्र निरुपाधिकानन्दस्वरूपाध्यवसानार्थं विचारणा प्रतायते मीमांसाशब्दव्यपदिष्टैव। तद्वदिहापि वेदान्तगतानि वाक्यानि किंपराणीति विचार्य ब्रह्मस्वरूपम्, शारीरात्मनस्तदव्यतिरिक्तता, ब्रह्मोपासनप्रकारश्चेत्यादीनां सतत्त्वं निर्णेष्यत इतीयं विचारणा ‘वेदान्तमीमांसा’, ‘शारीरकमीमांसा’ इति च व्यपदिश्यते। तादृशमीमांसाप्रकारप्रदर्शना र्थत्वात् शास्त्रमपि मीमांसेत्युपचर्यत इति मन्तव्यम्। यद्यपि शास्त्रशब्दोऽयम् ऋग्वेदादिभिर्विभक्तस्य वेदस्यैव वक्ता मुख्यया वृत्त्या, शास्ति-अनुष्ठेयं विधत्ते इति, परमार्थतत्त्वं अनुशास्तीति वा कृत्वा; तथापि तादृशशास्त्रवाक्यार्थनिर्धारणार्थत्वात् सूत्रात्मकग्रन्थमपि शास्त्रमित्युपचरन्ति। अस्य च मीमांसाशास्त्रस्य वेदान्तवाक्यानि मीमांसतया विषयः, तात्पर्यनिर्णयप्रकारं बुभुत्सुरधिकारी यथोक्तसाधनसम्पन्नः, तन्निर्णयाच्च प्राप्यं निःश्रेयसं प्रयोजनं इत्यतः सानुबन्धं शास्त्रमित्यभिप्रायेण ‘वेदान्तमीमांसा’, ‘तदविरोधितर्कोपकरण’, ‘निःश्रेयसप्रयोजना’ इति विशेषणात्रयादानमिति ज्ञेयम् ॥

(४२.) मीमांसोपकरणभूतस्तर्कः- अथ तर्कं प्रति चिन्ता। उक्तमेतद् ब्रह्मावगतेः पुरुषार्थतोपपादनप्रस्तावे (खं २४, पा. ५७), यथा महावक्येन ब्रह्मावगतौ जनयितव्यायाम्, तदवान्तरवाक्यानि, आत्मन्यध्यारोपिततत्तदनात्मांशापोहेनोपकुर्वन्तीति। तद्यथा तैत्तिरीयके

‘ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्’ इति प्रतिज्ञाय, ‘यो वेद निहितं गुहायाम्’ इत्युक्तरीत्या ब्रह्मण आत्मत्वं विनिर्दिश्य, तदवगत्युत्पादनार्थम् ‘अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमयः’ (तै.२-२), ‘अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमयः’(तै. २-३), इत्यादिना ‘अन्योऽन्तर आत्माऽऽनन्दमयः’ (तै. २-५) इत्यन्तेन वाक्यजातेनार्थतोऽनुसंधीयमानेन देहप्राणमनआद्यात्मताबुद्धिः क्रमक्रमेणापोह्यमाना ‘स यश्चायं पुरुषे’ (तै. ३-१०) इति वाक्यश्रवणेन अप्रतिबद्धब्रह्मात्मावगतिप्राप्तौ द्वारीभवतीति यथोक्तावा न्तरवाक्यार्थानुसंधानजः पञ्चकोशविवेकः ‘श्रुत्यनुगृहीततर्कः’ इत्युच्यते। एवमेव मुण्डकादिषु तत्र तत्र शूयमाणानि सृष्टिवाक्यानि जगतो ब्रह्मात्मकत्वप्रदर्शनद्वारा ब्रह्मात्मावगत्यनुकूलं तर्कमनुगृह्णन्ति। एवम् अवस्थात्रयपरीक्षणवाक्यान्पि बृहदारण्यकादिषु ‘एष ब्रह्मलोकः सम्राडेनं प्रापितोऽसीति’ (बृ. ४-४-२३) इत्यादिपरिसमाप्तिवाक्यजन्यावगत्यङ्गत्वेन तदनुकूलतर्कमनुगृह्णन्तीति बोध्यम् ॥

सोऽयं श्रुत्यनुगृहीतस्तर्कोऽपि श्रुत्यन्तर्भावेन श्रुतिरेवेति स्थिते, नागमविधया तत्त्वमुपदिशति, तर्कविधया तु - इति कृत्वा तर्कशब्देन व्यवहियत इति बोध्यम्। अथ सर्वस्यास्य वेदान्तवाक्यकलापस्य कुत्र परमतात्पर्यमिति निर्धारयितव्ये, उपक्रमोपसंहारभ्यासा पूर्वताफलार्थवादोपपत्तिलक्षणतात्पर्यलिङ्गानां समवधानेन वाक्यार्थानुगमपर्यालोचनरूपा या ‘मीमांसा’, जिज्ञासुभ्यः शिष्यते, सापि तर्क एव। वाक्यार्थाम्यूरूपमानसव्यापारत्वात्। ये चात्रोपकारिणः पुर्वतन्त्रसिद्धा न्यायाः सगुणविद्याविषयाः, याश्च श्रुतार्थापत्तिदृष्टार्थापत्तिलक्षणा उपपत्तयोऽत्रोपन्यस्यन्ते वाक्यार्थनिर्णयाय तेऽपि मीमांसारूपतर्कान्तर्गता एव द्रष्टव्याः ॥

अथ ये यथोक्तश्रुत्यनुगृहीततर्कमीमांसालक्षणतर्कोभयविलक्षणा लौकिकास्तर्का वेदान्ततर्कोपष्टम्भकाः, ये च प्रमाणानुग्राहकाः केवलाश्च तर्काः परमतनिराकरणार्थमुपयोक्ष्यमाणाः, ते सर्वेऽत्र तदविरोधितर्का उच्यन्ते। अत्र च तच्छब्देन वेदान्तवाक्यान्पि परामुश्यन्ते, न तु वेदान्तवाक्यमीमांसा। ‘वेदान्तवाक्यानि हि सूत्रैरुदाहृत्य विचार्यन्ते ... अनुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवन्न निवार्यते’ इत्युत्तरसूत्रभाष्यानुरोधात्। तत्र श्रुत्यनुगृहीततर्कोपष्टम्भकस्य लौकिकतर्कस्योदाहरणं यथा- मृदादिविकाराणां घटादीनामिव ब्रह्मकार्याणां तेजोऽबन्नानां वाचारम्भणत्वोपपादनरूपश्रुत्यनुगृहीततर्कानुसारेण सर्वस्यापि जगतः स्वकारणानन्यत्वं वाचारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यो हेतुभ्यः प्रसाध्य, तस्यास्य मीमांसालक्षणस्य तर्कस्योपकरणत्वेन ‘भावे चोपलब्धेः’ (२-१-१५) इति कारणभावे एव कार्यस्योपलब्धेश्चैवम् इति लौकिकतर्क उपस्थाप्यते। परमतनिराकरणाय लौकिकतर्कस्योपादानं यथा-

‘नाभाव उपलब्धेः’ (२-२-२८) इति प्रत्यक्षोपलब्धस्य बाह्यवस्तुनोऽभावत्वमनुपपन्नमिति विज्ञानवादनिराकरणावसरे प्रमाणानुसारी लौकिकतर्क आनीयते। अथ केवलतर्कादानं यथा- ‘समवायाभ्युपगमाच्च साम्यादनवस्थितेः’ (२-२-१३) इति परमाणुकारणवादनिराकरणार्थम्, कारणभूताणुभ्यामत्यन्तभिन्नस्य द्व्यणुकस्य समवायलक्षणेन संबन्धेन ताभ्यं संबन्धमभ्युपगच्छतः, समवायस्यापि समवायिभ्योऽत्यन्तभिन्नत्वात्, अन्येन समवायलक्षणेन सम्बन्धेन तैः संबन्धोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यः स्यात्; ततश्च अन्यान्यसंबन्धकल्पेनानवस्थादोषः प्रादुःष्यात्- इति केवलतर्क उपकरणत्वेनादीयत इति। त एतादृशास्तर्काः, मीमांसाशरीरान्तर्गततर्काणामुपकारिणो भवन्ति पाकाध्यक्षस्येव सहकारिणः परिचारका इति ‘उपकरणानि’ इत्युच्यन्ते। तदेतत् सर्वमभिप्रेत्याह- ‘वेदान्तवाक्यमीमांसा तदविरोधितर्कोपकरणं प्रस्तुयत इति’ इति सर्वं निराकुलम् ॥

जगज्जन्मादिकारणवादिनीनां श्रुतीनामर्थग्रहणदाढ्याय हि तर्कसाहाय्यमूरीकृतं भाष्ये। तत्र जगज्जन्मादिवाक्यानां किं श्रुतिवाक्यत्वादेव ब्रह्मणि प्रामाण्यं स्वीक्रियते, किं वा कार्यलिङ्गकानुमानविधया, अहोस्वित् स्वबोधार्थं प्रमितिजनकतया- इति विवेक्तव्यम्। तत्र न तावत् केवलं वाक्यत्वेन। ‘तद् विजिज्ञासस्व’ इत्याद्युपक्रमसामर्थ्याद् विज्ञानार्थताया एवावगमात्। विज्ञानं हि नामानुभवः। अत एव न कार्यलिङ्गकानुमानविधया। तथा हि ‘अस्ति किमपि जगज्जन्मादिलिङ्गकं ब्रह्माख्यं वस्तु’ इति मतिः स्यात्, न पुनरिदं तत् इति विज्ञानम्। इह पुनः ‘अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्म’, ‘तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्म’, ‘आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्। आनन्दाद्ध्येव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते... ॥’ इत्यादिवाक्यसन्दर्भपर्यालोचनया विशिष्टविज्ञानाधायकत्वमेवोद्दिष्टमिति गम्यते। उपपादितं च प्राग् यथा लक्षणसूत्रस्यास्य तदनुगतजन्मादिवाक्यानां च न केवलं ब्रह्मास्तित्वसद्भावनामात्रपरत्वम्। निराकृतश्चानुभवशब्दस्य ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारार्थस्वीकार-वादो भाष्यबहिर्भूतत्वोपपादनेन तादृशवादस्य। तस्मान्नेदं तर्कानुभवशब्दयोः सम्यग्व्याख्यानमिति स्थितम् ॥

कथं तर्हि ‘अनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवमिह प्रमाणम्’ इति वाक्यं व्याख्येयमिति? तदुच्यते- उक्तमधस्तात् यथा जगज्जन्मादिवाक्यान्पि श्रुत्यनुगृहीततर्कात्मकानीह अनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयन्त इति। सत्सु हि ‘सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म’ (तै. २-१), ‘सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वादीतीयम्’ (छां. ६-२-१) इत्यादिषु श्रुतिवाक्येषु ब्रह्मस्वरूपावगमार्थेषु, तदधिगमार्थम् एवज्जातीयकास्तर्काः श्रुत्यनुगृहीता अनुभवाङ्गत्वेनोपप्रदर्शयमाना अपि आगमविधयैव विनियुक्ता भवन्ति। वक्ष्यति

हि भाष्यकारोऽपि ‘श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेन आश्रीयते- स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयो-
रितरेतरव्यभिचारादात्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, संप्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना संपत्ते-
र्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मत्वम्; प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्म प्रभवत्वात्, कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः-
इत्येवंजातीयकः’ (सू.भा.२-१-६) इति। तत्रागमरूपैरेतादृशवाक्यैर्निष्पाद्यमानोऽनुभवो
विज्ञानापरपर्यायः ‘सत्यं ज्ञानम्’, ‘सदेव सोम्य’, ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्यादिवाक्यैरुत्पिपादयिषितानु-
भवस्य ‘प्रमाणम्’ इति भाष्यते। वाक्यजन्यावगतिश्च फलरूपा ‘अनुभवावसानत्वात्’ इत्यत्रत्येन
अनुभवशब्देन परामृश्यते। ‘अनुभवादयश्च’ इत्यादिशब्देन अवान्तरवाक्यजन्यज्ञानोपबृंहकः
श्रौततर्कः, तदनुसारिणी लौकिकयुक्तिः, तदविरोधिनी च इत्येते अपि प्रमाणत्वेनोपलक्ष्यन्ते।
ब्रह्मात्मानुभवरूपाम् अवगतिं प्रति परम्परया करणत्वेन, उपकरणत्वेन चानीयमानत्वात् ॥

नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः क्लेशापहारिणिव्याख्या समेता-उपोद्धाततः

वाक्यार्थाप्रतिपत्तौ त्वं पदार्थानभिज्ञत्वं हेतुः (नै.सि. २-१)। यस्य त्वंपदार्थविवेकः
स्वप्रयत्नेनैव, अथवा दैववशात् जातः, न तस्य भूयो भूयो वाक्यार्थस्मारणमावश्यकम् (नै.
सि. २-३, ३-६४)। यस्य पुनर्न त्वं पदार्थविवेकः, स अन्वयव्यतिरेकपुरःसरं स्मारणीयः (नै.
सि. २-९, ३-६४)। अन्वयव्यतिरेकश्च द्वेषा, बुद्ध्युपाधिकृतं ज्ञातृत्वोपाधिमात्मानं परिगृह्य
द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकः (नै.सि. २-५८), अविद्यापरिकल्पितसाक्षित्वमाश्रित्य साक्षिसाक्ष्यविभागश्चेति
(नै.सि. ३-५४)। तत्राद्येनाहंमत्वादेः, द्वितीयेन तु कर्तृत्वादेशचानात्मत्वेन परित्यागो भवति
(२-५८) ॥

आत्मा अहंप्रत्ययगम्यः - इति मीमांसकपक्षः एवं निरसनीयः - (१) अहङ्कारो
हि ज्ञातुर्विषयः (२-२४), (२) तस्यान्तःकरणधर्मत्वं प्रत्यक्षेणैवानुभूयते (२-२५)। (३)
आत्मा निर्विभागः, निरंशः, अविषयश्च (२-२६); अहङ्कारस्तु आगमापायी (२-२२)
प्रमाणैवगम्यः (२-३७); सुषुप्ते तस्य स्वरूपव्यभिचारोऽपि भवति (२-३२)। एवं तावत्,
द्रष्टृदृश्यान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां गम्यते। अथ साक्षिसाक्ष्यान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम् अन्वयव्यतिरेको यथा -
सुषुप्तौ अन्तःकरणविकाराभावे सति ‘इदम्’ इति बुद्ध्युपाधिकृतं विषयाज्ञातृत्वं नोपलभ्यते, नापि विषये
‘मम’ इति बुद्ध्युत्थोपकारित्वापकारित्वे वा तत्र दृश्येते (३-६२)। आत्मा अशेषबुद्धिप्रचाराणां
साक्षी। बुद्धिः खलु तत्तद्विषयाकारेण परिणम्य पर्यायेण विषयान् जानाति। साक्षी पुनः

स्वरूपचैतन्येन जात्यमणिः स्वप्रकाशेनेव सर्वान् संनिहितान् ज्ञात्रादीन् युगपदवभासयति (२-६४...८९)। बुद्धेर्देहाद्युपाध्यपेक्षया प्रत्यक्त्वं प्रत्योत्पत्तिहेतुतो ज्ञातृत्वं चावभासेते, आत्मनस्तु प्रत्यक्त्वं ज्ञातृत्वं च स्वभाव एव (३-१८,१९); बुद्धेरिव ते नैव जातुचित् परस्परं व्यभिचरतः। न वा तयोर्धर्मधर्मिभावः (३-१२,१३,१४)। कूटस्थानुभवात्मत्वात् आत्मनो नैव विक्रिया जातुचित्। बुद्धिधर्माध्यासादेव तु तस्मिन् प्रमातृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च (२-६१... ६३)। देहव्यतिरिक्ते बाह्ये वस्तुनि इदंबुद्ध्यानात्मत्वं स्वतःसिद्धम्। ज्ञातुरप्यात्मता स्वत एव सिद्धा; मध्ये स्थितानां तु देहादिबुद्ध्यन्तानां तारतम्येन अहंबुद्धिविषयत्वं (३-७२) इदम्बुद्धिविषयत्वं च दृश्यत इत्यतो मोमुह्यते जनः (४-४,५,६)। एष च मोहः पुरस्तादभिहितद्विविधान्वयव्यतिरेकन्यायाभ्यामपसरति (४-७)। तथा च सर्वमिदं बुद्ध्यादिदेहान्तमनात्मैवेति निश्चयो भवति ॥

सोऽयमात्मानात्मविभागोऽपि अविद्याकार्यमेव (४-१४); आत्मा स्वतःसिद्धः अनात्मा तु अविचारितसिद्धः (२-९७), आत्मा कुटस्थबोधरूपः अनात्मा तु मिथ्याध्यास एव; तयोश्चाविद्यानिमित्तः संबन्धः (३-१)। अस्याश्च अविद्यायाः वेदान्तवाक्यजन्यज्ञानादेव निवृत्तिः (२-१०१,१०२,१०३; ३-६)। केवलम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकन्यायानुसरणात्राविद्यानिवृत्तिः स्यात्; देहादिविलक्षणोऽहम् इति- इत्येव स्वभावरूपं ज्ञानं तेनोपजायते। लिङ्गजन्येन ज्ञानेन आत्मास्तित्वमात्रं निश्चीयते (३-५७) नायमात्मा, भेदरहितश्चायम्- इत्येतावदेव तु विज्ञायते (२-९४, ३-६) ‘अद्वितीयात्माऽहम्’ इति तु ज्ञानं वेदान्तवाक्यादेव (३-३३)। अन्वयव्यतिरेकपूर्वकं वाक्यमेव अवाक्यार्थरूपं आत्मानं प्रतिपादयति (३-३९,४०,६३)। अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां सर्वाननात्मनो निरस्य ‘कोऽस्मीति’ इति वीक्षापन्नस्य ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति श्रुतिर्ब्रह्मणीति (३-५३)। अत्र दशमवाक्यं दृष्टान्तः (३-६४,६५,६८,७०; ४-३४,३५) ॥

वाक्यार्थज्ञाने तत्त्वंपदयोर् सामानाधिकरण्यम्, पदार्थयोर्विशेष्यविशेषणभावः, पदार्थयोः प्रत्यगात्मनश्च लक्ष्यलक्षणभावश्च क्रमेण बोध्यः। लक्ष्यलक्षणभावप्रतिपत्तौ त्वंपदार्थस्य सद्द्वयत्वम्, तत्पदार्थस्य च पारोक्ष्यमपनीयते, अद्वितीयप्रत्यगात्मैव अवाक्यार्थो विज्ञातो भवति (३-७६,७७,७८)। ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति वाक्ये त्वंपदम् ‘अहं ब्रह्मास्मि’ इति वाक्ये अहंपदं च अहंव्याजेन प्रत्यगात्मानमेवाद्द्वयं बुबोधयिषति। अहंवृत्तिं मुक्त्वा न कयाप्यन्यया वृत्त्या आत्मा लक्षयितुं शक्यः, तदा हि परमात्मा अनात्मैवेति मतिर्भवेत्, श्रुतिश्चाप्रामाण्यं इयात् (३-९८,)



०८. सुषुप्तात्मस्वरूपम्

विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा १६ खण्डः, ८५-उपखण्डः

जागरिताद्यवस्थानां परिशीलनं प्रत्यवस्थम्, स्वरूपापेक्षया अवस्थान्तरापेक्षया चेति द्वेधा भवति। तद्यथा स्वप्नसुषुप्तापेक्षयैव जागरितस्य जागरितत्वम् ; स्वरूपेण तु स्वात्मन्यध्यस्तकार्यकरणसङ्घातावस्थात्वम्। एवं स्वप्नस्य स्वप्नत्वं सुषुप्तापेक्षयैव, स्वरूपेण तु स्वात्मन्यध्यस्तवासनाप्रपञ्चावस्थात्वम्। एवं सुषुप्तेरपि स्वप्नापेक्षया अदर्शनवृत्तिनिद्रावस्थात्वम्, जागरितापेक्षया च विश्रान्तकरणव्यापारावस्थात्वं; स्वरूपेण तु स्वप्नकामविरहितनिद्रावस्थात्वम्, ब्रह्मसंपत्त्यवस्थावत्त्वं वा। अत एव श्रुतिः सुषुप्तिस्वरूपकथनायाऽऽह- ‘यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति तत् सुषुप्तम्’ (मां.५) इति, ‘यत्रैतत्पुरुषः स्वपिति नाम सता सोम्य तदा संपन्नो भवति’ (छां. ६-८-१) इति च। एवं समाध्याद्यवस्था अपि विज्ञेयाः। अत एव दर्शनवृत्तिस्वरूपमपेक्ष्य भाष्यकार आह- ‘न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि’ (सू. ३-२-११) इति सूत्रार्थव्याख्यानमारभमाणः-

(१) “येन ब्रह्मणा सुषुप्त्यादिषु जीव उपाध्युपशमात्संपद्यते, तस्येदानीं स्वरूपं श्रुतिवशेन निर्धार्यते ॥” सू.भा. ३-२-११.

इति। एवं जागरितापेक्षया तु सुषुप्तिम्, स्थित्यपेक्षया च प्रलयावस्थां परिशीलयन्नाह-

(२) “यथा लोके पुंस्त्वादीनि बीजात्मना विद्यमानान्येव बाल्यादिष्वनुपलभ्यमानानि अविद्यमानवदभिप्रेयमाणानि यौवनादिष्वविर्भवन्ति; न अविद्यामानान्युत्पद्यन्ते, षण्डादीनामपि तदुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् एवम् अयमपि बुद्धिसंबन्धः शक्त्यात्मना विद्यमान एव सुषुप्तप्रलययोः पुनः प्रबोधप्रसवयोराविर्भवति; एवं हि एतद्युज्यते; न हि आकस्मिकी कस्यचिदुत्पत्तिः संभवति। अतिप्रसङ्गात्।” सू.भा. २-३-३१.

इति। न चैवं बुध्याद्युपाधिसम्बन्धोऽवशिष्यते वा न वा सुषुप्तादौ - इत्यत्र विनिगमनाविरहः ;

व्यवहारदृष्ट्या अस्तीत्यनुमीयते, परमार्थतस्तु नास्ति- इति स्वरूपपररूपापेक्षया व्यवस्थासंभवात् ।
तदप्याह भाष्यकृत् स्वयमेव-

(३) “अपि च मिथ्याज्ञानपुरःसरोऽयमात्मनो बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धः । न च मिथ्याज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानादन्यत्र निवृत्तिरस्ति- इत्यतो यावद् ब्रह्मात्मताऽनवबोधः, तावदयं बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धो न शाम्यति ।” सू.भा. २-३-३०.

(४) “यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादावपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्याम् अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात् पूर्ववत् पुनः प्रबोधे विभागो भवति, एवमिहापि भविष्यति । श्रुतिश्चात्र भवति ‘इमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सति संपद्य न विदुः सति संपद्यामह इति, त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदा भवन्ति’ इति ।” सू.भा. २-१-९.

[सुषुप्तौ प्रलये च स्वाभाविकी सत्संपत्तिः, प्रबोधे स्थितौ च पुनर्व्याघ्रादिभावो जीवानां मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः- इत्युक्तमत्र ॥]

(५) “यथा हि अविभागेऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात् मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहृतः स्थितौ दृश्यते, एवम् अपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते ॥” सू.भा. २-१-९.

[अत्र परमात्मा सदा द्वैतविभागरहित एव सन्, स्थितौ अध्यस्तविभागस्यास्पदभूतो यथा तथा प्रलयेपि अध्यस्तविभागशक्तिर्व्यवहारदृष्ट्यैव- इत्युक्तम् । अध्यासस्तु सुषुप्तौ प्रलये वा न कदापि संभवतीति तदा सत्संपत्तिः स्वाभाविक्येव इति च ॥]

(६) “ ‘तेजः परस्यां देवतायाम्’ (छां. ६-८-६) इत्यत्र प्रकरणसामर्थ्यात् तत् यथाप्रकृतं तेजः साध्यक्षं सप्राणं सकरणग्रामं भूतान्तरसहितं प्रयतः पुंसः परस्यां देवतायां संपद्यत- इत्येतदुक्तं भवति । कीदृशी पुनरियं संपत्तिः स्यादिति चिन्त्यते । तत्र आत्यन्तिक एव तावत् स्वरूपप्रविलय इति प्राप्तम् । तत्प्रकृतित्वोपपत्तेः । सर्वस्य हि जनिमतो वस्तुजातस्य प्रकृतिः परा देवता- इति प्रतिष्ठापितम् । तस्मात्, आत्यन्तिकी इयमविभागापत्तिरिति । एवं प्राप्ते, ब्रूमः । तत् तेजआदि भूतसूक्ष्मं श्रोत्रादिकरणाश्रयभूतम् आ अपीतेः संसारमोक्षात् सम्यग्ज्ञाननिमित्तात् अवतिष्ठते ‘योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः । स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम्’ (का. २-२-७) इत्यादिसंसारव्यपदेशात् । अन्यथा हि सर्वः प्रायणसमय एव उपाधिप्रत्यस्तमयात् अत्यन्तं ब्रह्म संपद्येत । तत्र विधिशास्त्रम् अनर्थकं स्यात्, विद्याशास्त्रं च । मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तं च बन्धो न सम्यग्ज्ञानादृते विस्रंसितुमर्हति । तस्मात् तत्प्रकृतित्वेऽपि सुषुप्तिप्रलयवत् बीजभावावशेषैव एषा

सत्संपत्तिरिति ॥” सू.भा. ४-२-८.

इति ॥

अत्रापरविद्याऽपरसंज्ञासूपासनासु विद्वान् साक्षात्कृतेश्वरः, प्रायणकाले परस्याम् देवतायां संपद्यते इति वक्तुमारब्धमिदं प्रकरणम्, ‘देवो भूत्वा देवानप्येति’ (ब्रु. ४-१-२) इति श्रुतिमाश्रित्य । अत एव हि समनन्तरपूर्वभाष्ये लिखितम्-

(७) “अविद्वान् देहबीजभूतानि भूतसूक्ष्माण्याश्रित्य कर्मप्रयुक्तो देहग्रहणमनुभवितुं संसरति, विद्वान्स्तु ज्ञानप्रकाशितं मोक्षनाडीद्वारमाश्रयते ॥” सू.भा. ४-२-७.

इत्यादि । तस्मात् बीजभावावशेषत्वं सत्सम्पत्तेरिहोक्तं न परब्रह्मविदः । वक्ष्यते च गत्युत्क्रान्त्योरभावो ब्रह्मविदः ‘प्रतिषेधादिति चेन्न शारीरात्’ (सू.भा. ४-२-१२) इत्यत आरभ्य । इदमेव च वैलक्षण्यमाश्रित्य बीजावशेषसत्संपत्तिनिर्बीजसत्संपत्त्योः तारतम्यं भाष्यकारेणोक्तम् अन्यत्र-

(८) “अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितद्वैतसंपृक्त आत्मा स्वप्नजागरितावस्थयोः कर्ता दुःखी भवति । सः तच्छ्रमापनुत्तये स्वमात्मानं परं ब्रह्म प्रविश्य विमुक्तकार्यकरणसंघातः, अकर्ता सुखी भवति संप्रसादावस्थायाम् । तथा मुक्त्यवस्थायामपि अविद्याध्वान्तं विद्याप्रदीपेन विधूय, आत्मैव केवलो निर्वृतः सुखी भवति ।” सू.भा. २-३-४०. इति ॥

तदेवम्, सुषुप्ति-मूर्छा-समाधि-प्रलय-मरणाद्यवस्थासु सत्संपत्तिः स्वाभाविक्यपि सती, यावद्विद्योदयं मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तोपाधिसंपर्कं प्रहातुं न प्रभवतीति वेदान्तमर्याद । अपि चासु सत्संपत्तिः शूयमाणा सावधानं प्रत्यभिज्ञाता स्फुटतरं ब्रह्मात्मैकत्वविज्ञानं लम्भयतीत्येतावता पुनःपुनरुपदिश्यते वेदान्तेषु, न पुनरदर्शनवृत्तिसुषुप्ताद्यवस्थास्वेव सत्संपत्तिर्भवतीति कृत्वा । यथाह भाष्यकृत्-

“अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्य अनपायित्वात् । स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते” सू.भा. ३-२-७.

एवं समाध्यादिष्वपि व्युत्थानाद्यवस्थासु विभाव्यमानपररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य पररूपोपशमात् स्वरूपापत्तिरुच्यत इत्यतिदेष्टव्यम् ॥

विवरणप्रस्थानपरीक्षा- वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः

सुषुप्तौ अविद्यासद्भावे न किञ्चित् प्रमाणमस्ति। अविद्याया अध्यासरूपाया विशेषज्ञानलक्षणत्वात्। विशेषज्ञानस्य सुषुप्तावभावात्, तदभावे नित्यविज्ञानस्वरूपात्मविभक्त-द्वितीयवस्त्वभावस्यैव हेतुत्वेन श्रुत्यैव बोध्यमानत्वात्, 'यद् वै तन्न विजानाति विजानन् वै तन्न विजानति न हि विज्ञातुर्विज्ञातेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यतेऽविनाशित्वान्न तु तद् द्वितीयमस्ति ततोऽन्यद् विभक्तं यत् विजानीयात्' (बृ.४-५-३०) इति। अत एव हि भाष्यकृतोक्तम्-

(अ) तत्र सति संपन्नस्तावदेकत्वान्न विजानातीति युक्तम्। 'तत् केन कं विजानीयात्' इति श्रुतेः ॥सू.भा. ३-२-७. इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षो विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यम्, स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति ॥ बृ.भा. ४-३-२१,

इति च। सुषुप्तौ स्वरूपेऽप्ययः उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावादिति प्रतिपादनस्थले मनइन्द्रियलक्षणोपाधिद्वयस्यैव नियमेनोक्तेश्चैतदेवमिति निश्चीयते-

(ई) स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायाम् उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इवेति 'स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति' इत्युच्यते ॥ सू.भा. १-१-९, पा. ३२-३३

(उ) श्रान्तः शरणं प्रेप्सुरुभयरूपादपि शरीराभिमानात् समुत्थाय सुषुप्तावस्थायां परं ज्योतिराकाशशब्दितं परं ब्रह्मोपसंपद्य विशेषविज्ञानवत्त्वं च परित्यज्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते ॥ सू.भा. १-३-२०, पा. ११६

(ऊ) बुद्ध्याद्यपाधिस्थानविशेषयोगाद्बुद्धतस्य विशेषविज्ञानस्योपाध्युपशमे य उपशमः स परमात्मना संबन्ध इत्युपाध्यपेक्षयैव उपचर्यते न परिमितत्वापेक्षया ॥सू.भा. ३-२-३४, पा. ३७१

(अत्र सर्वोपाध्युपशम एवोच्यते न त्वविद्यालक्षणोपाध्यवशेष इतीदमवधेयम् ॥)

स्वप्नदृष्टान्तादानेन तूनीयते यथा स्वप्नप्रपञ्चः सुप्तपुरुषदृष्ट्यैव समस्ति, एवं सुप्तपुरुषदृष्ट्या किमपि नास्ति सुषुप्तौ इति। एतावांश्चेदभिप्रायः, तर्हि समीचीन एव सः। अज्ञाने सर्वोपादाने सर्वं विलीनं भवतीति चेत्, न समीचीनः। श्रुतिभाष्ययुक्त्यनुभवविरोधात्। श्रुतिस्तावत्-

(अ) 'यदा सुप्तः स्वप्नं न कञ्चन पश्यत्यथास्मिन् प्राण एवैकधा भवति तदैवं वाक् सर्वैर्नामभिः सहाप्येति..' (कै ४-१९) 'एतस्मादात्मनः प्राणा यथायतनं विप्रतिष्ठन्ते

प्राणेभ्यो देवा देवेभ्यो लोकाः' कौ.४-२०

इत्यात्मन्येव प्रभवप्रलयौ प्राह, नाज्ञाने। आत्मस्वरूपप्रतिबुधयिषया चैतदेवं श्रूयते। तेन विरुध्येत यदि सुषुप्तेऽज्ञाने प्रलयोऽङ्गीक्रियेत। न ह्यज्ञानयुक्ते आत्मनि विवक्षिते गार्ग्याजातशत्रुसंवादप्रकरणं विशुद्धपरमात्मज्ञानविषयकमित्यवकल्पेत। सर्वं चेदं प्रकरणं परमात्मविषयकमिति गम्यते। वाक्यान्वयात्। 'यो वै बालाक एतेषां पुरुषाणां कर्ता यस्य वैतत्कर्म' इति प्रतिज्ञावाक्यात्, विस्फुलिङ्गदृष्टान्तेन यथोक्तात्मन एव सृष्टेस्तस्मिन्नेव चाप्ययस्य श्रवणात्, 'एवमेवैव प्राज्ञ आत्मेदं शरीरमनुप्रविष्टः' इति सृष्टावनुप्रवेशवचनात्, 'यावद्ध इन्द्र एतमात्मानं न विजज्ञौ तावदेनमसुरा अभिबभूवुः स यदा विजज्ञावथ हत्वासुरान् विजित्य सर्वेषां भूतानां श्रेष्ठ्यं स्वाराज्यमाधिपत्यं पर्येति' इति च (कौ.४-२०) फलसंकीर्तनेन संस्तुतत्वाच्चात्मज्ञानस्येति ॥

(आ) सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति। परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा ॥सू.भा. १-४-१८

इति भाष्यम्। तेन विरुध्यतेऽयमज्ञानेऽहङ्कारादिप्रलयाभ्युपगमः। न हि जीवत्वविनिर्मुक्तायामवस्थायाम् अविद्याऽभ्युपगमो युक्त इति ॥

युक्तिरपि- यदि सुषुप्तौ अज्ञानं स्यात्, तर्हि अज्ञानादेव जगज्जातम् इति निश्चीयते जनैरुत्थितैः। न त्वेतदस्ति, 'सुषुप्ते न किञ्चिच्चेतितं मया यथेदानीम्' इत्येव तु सौषुप्तपरामर्शो लोकस्येति ॥

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयो-स्तूपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते। अतश्च सुप्तावस्थायां कदाचित् संपद्यते कदाचिन्न संपद्यते इत्ययुक्तम् ॥सू.भा. ३-२-७

इति भाष्यं सुषुप्ते नियमेन स्वरूपभूतपरमात्मसंपत्तिमाह। तेन च विरुध्यतेऽहङ्कारादेरज्ञाने विलय इति वचनम् ॥

अनुभवोऽपि सौषुप्तो विरुध्यतेऽनेनाभ्युपगमेन। न हि सुषुप्ते किञ्चिदप्यनुभूयते लोकैः। आत्मानुभवस्तु निर्विकल्पोऽस्ति तत्र 'न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्' इत्यनुभूतविषयनिराकरणावधित्वात् परामर्शो आत्मानुभवस्य। यथाहूर्वातिककाराः-

न चेदनुभवव्याप्तिः सुषुप्तस्याभ्युपेयते ।

नावेदिषं सुषुप्तेऽहमिति धीः किंबलाद् भवेत् ॥

बृ.वा. ३-४-१०३

तथा अज्ञानाभावमित्याहुस्त एवात्रावस्थायाम्-

तत्तु द्वितीयं नेहास्ति तमोऽनर्थस्य कारणम् ।

द्रष्टादिरूपसंभेदाद् यत्पश्येज्जागरे यथा ॥बृ.वा. ३-४-१४१९

इति ॥



१०. अवस्थात्रयविवेकः

अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियाया असाधारणधर्माः-(माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः पृ.१००)

अवस्थापरीक्षा नाम तदवच्छिन्नस्याऽऽत्मनः स्वरूपनिरूपणमेव--

तत्रावस्थात्रयपरीक्षाप्रक्रियायाः श्रुतिप्रदर्शिताया असाधारण धर्मास्तावदवधारणीयास्तत्त्वजिज्ञासुभिः। यद्यप्यवस्थात्रयं नाम जाग्रत्स्वासुषुप्तय इति सर्वलोकविदितमिति न किञ्चिदस्तीव तत्र परीक्षणीयम्। तथापि वेदान्तेषु नावस्थात्रयस्य विषयभूतस्य तादर्थ्येनैव परीक्षा प्रतायते येन तन्निरूपणं व्यर्थप्रयासत्वेन शङ्कनीयं स्यात्; किं तर्हि अनूद्य लोकसिद्धमवस्थात्रयं तदनुभवितुः परमार्थस्वरूपं निर्धारयितुमेव। अवस्थात्रयवत्त्वं हि मिथ्यारूपं परमार्थत एवाऽऽत्मनो धर्म इति विकल्पयति लोकः। तदेतद्विकल्पन-मध्यारोपदृष्ट्या तावदभ्युपगम्याऽऽत्मनः स्वरूपमविद्यागृहीतात्स्वरूपाद्विलक्षणं तत्साक्षिरूपं विज्ञाप्याद्वैतात्मानं समधिगमयति भगवती श्रुतिः। अधिगते तु तस्मिन्स्वरूपेऽवस्थावत्त्वमप्यपनयति। तथा च दर्शनम् सोऽयमात्मा चतुष्पात् (मं. २) इत्युपक्रम्य नान्तःप्रज्ञं न बहिःप्रज्ञम् स....स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः (मं. ७) इत्यन्तम्॥

तिसृष्वेवावस्थास्वन्तर्भावोऽन्यासामवस्थानाम्-

यद्यपि जाग्रदाद्यवस्थात्रिकव्यतिरिक्ता अप्यवस्था समनुभूयन्ते लोकैः, तूष्णीमवस्थामदमूर्छनिद्राविहार (sornambulism) मौढ्य (idiocy) स्थित्युन्माद (insanity) परवश्यता (mesmeric or hypnotic state) मरणाद्यवस्थानां लोकसिद्धत्वात्। समाधिमुक्त्यवस्थयोश्च शास्त्रप्रसिद्धेः। तथापि लौकिकैः शक्यानुभवायाः सर्वस्या अप्यवस्थाया दर्शनवृत्त्यदर्शनवृत्त्यन्यतरत्वावश्यंभावात्, दर्शनवृत्तिरूपायाः सत्यत्वेन विभाव्यमानाया जागरितसमानयोगक्षेमत्वात्, मिथ्यात्वेन विभाव्यमानायास्तु स्वप्नसमानयोगक्षेमत्वात्, अदर्शन-

वृत्तिरूपायाः सुषुप्तिसमानयोगक्षेमत्वाच्च जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्ताख्यावस्थात्रयमेव सम्यङ्निरूपित-
मलं तत्त्वनिर्णयायेति न कश्चन न्यूनताशङ्कातङ्कोऽत्र समस्ति। अवस्थाश्चैताः स्वस्यैव
निरूपिता जिज्ञासोरलं तत्त्वपरिसमाप्त्यै। स्वस्मादन्यत्वेनोपलभ्यमानानां हि सर्वेषां पुरुषाणां
स्वजाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरन्यतरस्यामेवावस्थायामुपलम्भात् तेऽपि स्वानुभवपरीक्षणेनैव परीक्षिता
भवन्तीति न ज्ञेयैकदेशस्यापरीक्षितत्वमापतेत्। तथा ह्याह भगवान् भाष्यकारोऽलातशान्तिव्याख्याने
ज्ञेयमेतान्येव त्रीणि। एतद्व्यतिरेकेण ज्ञेयानुपपत्तेः (४-८८) इति।

अवस्थायाः प्रपञ्चव्यापकत्वम्--

अन्यच्चेदमस्ति मनसि करणीयमत्र प्रक्रियाया असाधारणरूपत्वेन यज्जागरिताद्यवस्थानां
न प्रपञ्चान्तर्भूतत्वं ग्राह्यं किं तु तत्तदवस्थान्तर्गतत्वमेव तत्र तत्र समुपलभ्यमानस्य
ग्राह्यग्राहकप्रपञ्चस्य कृत्स्नस्यापीति। यद्यपि प्रमातृदृष्टिमवष्टभ्य जाग्रत्प्रपञ्चान्तर्गतमेवाऽऽत्मानं
स्वस्वदेहपरिच्छिन्नं चाभिमन्यते सर्वोऽपि जनः, तथापि शास्त्रदृष्ट्या समस्तजाग्रत्प्रपञ्चोपाधिक-
तत्साक्षित्वेनाभिलक्ष्यमाणपरमार्थात्मापेक्षया सोऽपि प्रमाता जाग्रत्प्रपञ्चान्तर्गत-स्वानुमेयसकलेत
रप्रमातृगणसहितस्तत्प्रपञ्चान्तर्गत एव, स च प्रपञ्चो जागरितावस्थाव्याप्त एव। तदतिरेकेणा
न्यत्राननुभूयमानत्वादिति ध्येयम्। अत एव हि श्रुतिर्जागरितस्थानमात्मानं सकलप्रपञ्चोपहितं
विज्ञापयति सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः स्थूलभुग्वैश्वानरः प्रथमः पादः (मं. ३) इति, तस्याऽयं
जागरितस्थान आत्मा सर्वप्रपञ्चोपाधिकः प्रथमः पाद इति तदर्थः ॥

अवस्थानां परस्परवैलक्षण्यमस्ति, न तु परस्परसंबद्धत्वं परस्परभिन्नत्वं वा-

अयमपरो विशेषोऽस्याः प्रक्रियाया अविस्मरणीयो यज्जाग्रदाद्यवस्थानां परस्परविलक्षणत्वेन
प्रतीयमानानां न कश्चनसंबन्धः शक्यावधारण इति। यतः सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया विमृश्यमाने त्रित्वमेव
तावदवस्थानां न घटते, यावता तासामन्यतमावस्थाने तदितरयोरपि सहस्थितिर्नाभ्यूहितुमपि
शक्या। न हि कश्चिद्युगपज्जागर्ति स्वप्नं पश्यति सुषुप्तमनुभवतीति च शक्यकल्पनमेतदिति।
न चैकस्मिन् देशेऽवर्तमानानामेकस्मिन् काले आनुपूर्वीमभजमानानां वा भावानां संख्येयत्ता
भागिनी। स्वप्नजागरितान्तर्गतभेदानां तत्तदवस्थोचितान्यादृशान्यादृशकालदेशभाक्त्वमेव प्रतीयत
इति तु सर्वानुभवसिद्धमेतत्। न च तत्तत्स्थानाविनाभूतत्वेन निश्चीयमानप्रपञ्चमात्रे विभाव्यमाना
कालदेश-बुद्धिरुभयोरपि तयोः साधारणभूतकालदेशान्तरसद्भावे प्रमाणं भवेत्। सुषुप्तावस्थायास्तु
नान्तर्न बहिर्वा कालदेशौ संस्त इत्यतो जाग्रदाद्यवस्थानां त्रित्वबुद्धिर्भ्रान्तिरेवेति सिद्धम्। अत एव

तासां मिथोभिन्नत्वं सुतरां दुःसम्पादम्। न हि कालदेशपरिच्छेदं विना दृश्यानां भिन्नत्वं अभिन्नत्वं वा भवेत्। अत एव च तासां कोऽपि संबन्धो न शक्यकल्पनः। भिन्नानामेव हि भावानां संबन्धः कश्चन कल्पनीयो भवति न तु परस्परमुखानभिज्ञानां मायास्वप्नगन्धर्वनगरस्थानानामिवेति ॥

अनुभवस्य प्रामुख्यम्--

अपि चायमपरो विशेषोऽस्यां प्रक्रियायां यदनुभवस्यैव प्राधान्यमास्थीयतेऽत्र न तु प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणानामिति। अवस्था एव हि तावन्न प्रत्यक्षादिगम्याः, प्रागेव चात्मा स्वयंसिद्धः। न हि तत्रेन्द्रियालोचनस्य पुरुषमतिप्रभवस्य तर्कस्य वाऽवकाशोऽस्ति। तदविषयत्वात्। शास्त्राचार्योपदेशरूपागमस्तु अतद्धर्मनिरासकत्वमात्रेणानुभवसिद्धमात्मानमावेदयतीति तत्र प्रमाणत्वेनोपचर्यत इत्यन्यदेतत्। उपपत्तिरप्यत्र प्रक्रियायामानीयमाना श्रुत्यनुगृहीता तदविरोधितर्करूपा वेति साप्यनुभवायतैवेति न पृथक्प्रमाणत्वेन परिगण्यते। अनुभवशब्देन चात्र न पातञ्जलादितन्त्रान्तरीययोगजसमाधिजन्यस्तपोमन्त्रादिसिद्धिजन्यो वा प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणजन्यानुभवो वा वैयक्तिकवेदनादिरूपानुभवो वा व्यपदिश्यते। किं तु सर्वजनसाधारणः स्वाभाविक एव, यः खल्विन्द्रियान्तःकरणव्यापारानपेक्षो जाग्रदादिसर्वावस्थानां साक्षाद्विज्ञापकः सर्वैरपि वादिभिरनपलपनीय इति ॥

अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियासिद्धः सिद्धान्तः--

यथोक्तासाधारणधर्मयुक्तावस्थात्रयप्रक्रियानुसंधानेन संस्कृतान्तःकरणानां सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवोऽद्वैत आत्मैवैकः परमार्थ इति सम्यङ्मतिर्जायते। यद्यपि अवस्थात्रयानुभववानहम्, शरीरेन्द्रियविषयवेदनावान् दुःखमनुभवामि जागरितस्वप्नयोर्भूयो भूयः सुषुप्तिप्रतिपत्त्या विश्रम्य विश्रम्येति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः। तथापि जाग्रत्प्रमातृदृष्ट्यैव सः, न त्ववस्थात्रयसाधारणसार्वत्रिकानुभवसंमत इत्युपेक्ष्यः। न हि जाग्रत्प्रमाता स्वप्नसुषुप्तयोरपि स्वासाधारणवेषेण प्रमाणैस्तद्गतप्रमेयविशेषान् प्रमिणोति येन तस्यानुभवं तद्विषयेऽपि प्रमाणीकुर्महे। अत एव च योऽपि सुखमहमस्वाप्समिति स्वप्नमद्राक्षमिति वा जागरिते स्मरणाभासः प्रमातुः, तदपि विकल्पमात्रमिति निश्चेतव्यम्। स्वप्नेऽन्यादृशस्यैव प्रमातुर्व्यापारस्य सुषुप्तौ सर्वप्रमात्रभावस्य च तेनैव प्रमात्रा परामर्शादित्यवधेयम्। यः पुनरात्मा सर्वावस्थासाधारणः, तस्य सर्वत्र ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषात्, जागरिताद्युपाधीनां तत्कृतबहिःप्रज्ञत्वान्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिविशेषरूपाणां च परस्परव्यभिचाराच्च नित्यनिरवस्थ एव स आत्माऽद्वितीय इत्यवगम्यते। स एवैकः सर्वेषां न आत्मेति सर्वे वयमादित एवाजाह्वयात्मस्वरूपा एव नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावा इति च सिद्धम्।

तदिदमाह श्रुतिः “एकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः”(मं.७) इति ॥

विद्वद्गोष्ठी- Vedantins Meet. १५ पृ.

तदेवं वास्तविकेन वृत्तेन नास्त्येवावस्थात्रयसंबन्ध आत्मन इति स्थिते, अविद्यादृष्ट्या अध्यस्तदेहादियोगात् तत्संबन्धम् अभ्युपगम्य वेदान्तिनोऽपि लोकसिद्धमनुवदन्ति- जागरिते द्वैतज्ञानमस्ति, स्वप्ने च तद्वासनाकृतो ज्ञानाभासोऽस्ति; सुषुप्ते पुनः किञ्चिदपि जीवो न जानातीति। स च ज्ञानाभावः किंनिबन्धनः? - इति विचारं प्रस्तुत्य तत्र श्रुत्युपदिष्टमुत्तरं द्वेषा विभज्य वदन्ति- अविद्याकल्पितबुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धत एव जीवस्य जीवत्वम्। स च संबन्धः सम्यग्ज्ञानोदयात् ऋते न शाम्यतीति सुषुप्तेऽपि यद्यपि शक्त्यात्मना विद्यत एव, तथापि तत्र तस्यानभिव्यक्तत्वात् न विशेषविज्ञानहेतुत्वं प्रतिपद्यते। यदा तु अविद्याकामकर्मवशात् प्रबुध्यते, तदा स संबन्धः पुनराविर्भवतीति ‘इदमित्थम्’, ‘अयमहमस्मि’- इति विजानातीति विशेषः। इदं तावदेकमुत्तरम् अध्यारोपदृष्ट्या ॥

अथ द्वितीयम् अपवाददृष्टिम् अवष्टभ्योच्यते। नैव परमार्थतो जीवस्य नित्यमुक्तस्वभावात् परमात्मनोऽन्यत्वमस्ति। यदापि जागरिते कार्यकरणवानिव विभाव्यते, तदापि तत्संबन्धं सर्वथा अत्येतीति सुप्रसिद्धम्। स्वप्ने तु यद् द्वैतदर्शनम्, तन्मिथ्यादर्शनमेव, तद्वासनाप्रायबुद्धिवृत्त्युद्भावितत्वात्। सुषुप्तौ पुनः परमात्मना एकीभावं गच्छति जीव इत्यतो द्वितीयाभावादेव हेतोर्न किञ्चिज्जानाति। तस्मात्, वस्तुतो नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभाव एव सन् अविद्याकल्पितोपाधि-धर्माध्यासवशेनैव संसारबन्धनमनुभवतीवेति विज्ञेयम्। अयमेव च न्यायोऽतिदिश्यते जन्मजीवन-मरणावस्थाविचारे, सृष्टिस्थितिप्रलयविचारे चेति सर्वं सुस्थम्। अध्यारोपदृष्ट्या यद्यदुररीक्रियते बुद्धिसंबन्धादि जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः, जीवितावस्थास्थितिकालयोश्च, यदापि तस्य संबन्धस्य बीजात्मना अवस्थानम् अनुमीयते सुषुप्तौ मरणप्रलयोश्च- तदेतत् सर्वं मिथ्याज्ञाननिबन्धमेवेत्यपहनूयते अपवाददृष्ट्या इत्यविरोधो द्रष्टव्यः ॥

माण्डूक्योपनिषदि तत्कारिकाभाष्ययोश्च पुनः- जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः सर्वसमताप्रतिपादनेन, अवस्थात्रयस्य व्यभिचरत्स्वरूपदर्शनेन च तदपहनूय, अद्वैतात्मचैतन्यस्यैवाव्यभिचरत्स्वरूप-त्वात् परमार्थत्वमिति श्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवसंगानेनोपपादितम्। तदप्यध्यारोपापवादन्यायमनुसृत्यैवेत्य नवद्यम् ॥

10. अवस्थात्रयविवेकः

ये पुनर्वास्तवेनैव वृत्तेन सुषुप्तादिषु काञ्चिदविद्याशक्तिम् अभ्युपयन्ति, तेषां सर्वथापि तदनिवृत्तिर्दुर्वारणा भवति । न हि सुषुप्त्यादिषु समस्ति किञ्चित् साधनं ज्ञानोपदेशे तच्छ्रवणादौ वा ; न च जागरितलभ्येन केनचिदुपायेन कथञ्चिदपि तन्निवृत्तिः शक्यसंपादना इति ॥

अत्र कानिचिदेव वाक्यानि प्रमाणार्थमुपन्यस्यन्ते । भाष्येषु तादृशानि परःशतं सुवीक्षणानि वाचकानामिति-

१) यावदेव चायं बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धः, तावज्जीवस्य जीवत्वं संसारित्वं च; परमार्थतस्तु न जीवो नाम बुद्ध्युपाधिसंबन्धपरिकल्पितस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेणास्ति; न हि नित्यमुक्तस्वरूपात् सर्वज्ञात् ईश्वरात् अन्यश्चेतनो धातुर्द्वितीयो वेदान्तार्थनिरूपणायाम् उपलभ्यते ॥ सू.भा. २-३-६०.

२) यदा असौ स्वप्नो भवति स्वापवृत्तिं प्रतिपद्यते धीः, तदा सोऽपि स्वप्नवृत्तिं प्रतिपद्यते । यदा धीर्जिजागरिषति तदा असावपि ॥ बृ.भा. ४-३-७.

३) स्वप्नो भूत्वा स्वप्नवृत्तिमवभासयन् धियः स्वापवृत्त्याकारो भूत्वा इमं लोकं जागरितव्यवहारलक्षणं कार्यकरणसङ्घातात्मकं लौकिकशास्त्रीयव्यवहारास्पदम् अतिक्रामति, अतीत्य क्रामति विविक्तेन स्वेन आत्मज्योतिषा स्वप्नात्मिकां धीवृत्तिम् अवभायन् अवतिष्ठते यस्मात् तस्मात् स्वयञ्ज्योतिःस्वभाव एवासौ । विशुद्धः स कर्तृक्रियाकारकफलशून्यः परमार्थतः, धीसादृश्येनेव तु उभयलोकसंचारादिसंव्यवहार-भ्रान्तिहेतुः । बृ.भा. ४-३-७.

४) कथं पुनः अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादीनाम् आत्मनि गम्यमानानां रज्ज्वादौ सर्पादिवत् प्रतिषेधात् असत्त्वं गम्यते इति ? उच्यते । ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वम्, रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पधारादिविकल्पितभेदवत्; सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वम् । सुषुप्ते व्यभिचरति इति चेत् । न । सुषुप्तस्य अनुभूयमानत्वात् । मां भा. ७.



११. कार्यकारणप्रक्रिया

सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी ५२-खण्डः

सिद्धान्ते ब्रह्मण एव जगत्कारणत्वोपपत्तिः- ननु, अध्यासलक्षणाविद्यावादिनोऽपि जगतो मायाकारणकत्वं दुरपहनवम्। ‘मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात्’ (श्वे. ४-१०), ‘अव्यक्ताद् व्यक्तयः सर्वा प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे। रात्र्यागमे प्रलीयन्ते तत्रैवाव्यक्तसंज्ञके ॥’ (गी. ८-१८), ‘एतद्योनीनि भूतानि सर्वाणीत्युपधारय ॥’ (गी. ७-६) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभ्यः। आह च गीताभाष्यकारः ‘प्रकृतिद्वयद्वारेणाहं सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरो जगतः कारणम्’ (गी.भा. ७-६) इति। अतः कथमिदं व्याख्यानप्रस्थानप्रत्याख्यानं शोभत इति?

न। उक्तोत्तरत्वात्। अविद्याकल्पितैव प्रकृतिः, अव्याकृतनामरूपलक्षणा मायाशब्दव्यपदेश्या; ते च नामरूपे सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इव कल्पिते तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्याम् अनिर्वचनीये आश्रित्यैव ईश्वरस्य कारणत्वव्यवहारो मायिनः, न तु परमार्थतो विद्यया अपास्तसर्वोपाधिस्वरूपस्य कारणत्वं कार्यत्वं वा- इत्युक्तोत्तरमिदं चोद्यम्। ब्रह्मात्मभावप्रतिपादनपरा हि सर्वा सृष्टिश्रुतिः, न परमार्थविषया। यथोक्तमभियुक्तैः ‘मृल्लोहविस्फुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्या चोदितान्यथा। उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ॥’ (गौ.का. ३-१५) इति। तस्मात्, मायिकरूपविशेषेणैव ब्रह्म जगज्जन्मादिकारणमिति व्यपदिश्यते, न तु स्वेन पारमार्थिकेन रूपेण। ‘अपूर्वमनपरम्’ (बृ. २-५-१९) इति श्रुतेः। तदाह भाष्यकारः ‘अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते।’ (सू.भा. २-१-२७) इति। वस्तुतः कार्यकारणभावरहितमेव ब्रह्म अध्यारोपदृष्ट्या कारणत्वेनानूद्य, उपदेशान्ते कारणत्वमपोद्य ब्रह्मतत्त्वं प्रतिबोधयितुं प्रवृत्ता वेदान्तः - इत्येतद् वार्तिककारैरपि सुस्पष्टमुक्तम्

‘अकारणं सदज्ञानात् कारणत्वं यथैत्यजम् । सर्वकारकतामेवं क्रियातत्फलतामपि ॥ साध्यसाधनतां तस्मात् अज्ञानैकव्यपाश्रयाम् । उच्चैरनूद्य तत्तत्त्वं वेदान्ताः प्रत्यपीपदन् ॥ अकारणमकार्यं च कार्यकारणतामगात् । मोहादेव ततः शास्त्रं तदुच्छित्तौ प्रवर्तते ॥’ (बृ.वा. १-२, १२८, १२९, १३०) इति । न चैवं जिज्ञास्यत्वेन प्रतिज्ञातस्य शुद्धब्रह्मणो नेदं लक्षणं स्यादित्यनिष्टप्रसक्तिः । जिज्ञास्यत्वव्यवहारस्यापि अध्यारोपदृष्ट्यैवाङ्गीकारात् । परिशुद्धे हि ब्रह्मणि तत्त्वतो विज्ञाते न जिज्ञास्यत्वं न वा जगज्जन्मादिकारणत्वम् । सर्वव्यवहारानामपि तदन्तत्वात् । तदेवं स्थिते ब्रह्मणो मायिकेन रूपभेदेन कारणत्वे, मायायाश्च ब्रह्मत्वेन तदन्यत्वेन वा अनिर्वचनीयत्वे, यन्मायायाः कारणत्वमुक्तम् क्वचित् श्रुतौ स्मृतौ वा, तदविद्याकल्पितरूपभेदवतो ब्रह्मण एवोक्तं भवति । तदेवं श्रुतौ, सूत्रे, तद्भाष्ये च यज्जगज्जन्मादिकथनं तत् सृष्ट्यादिकालत्रयेऽपि जगतो ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणार्थं इति सिद्धम् । अतो मूलाविद्यासंज्ञितमायायाः स्वातन्त्र्येण जगत्कारणत्वमातस्थुषां व्याख्यानप्रस्थानस्य, ब्रह्मणो मायया जगज्जन्मादिकारणत्वं स्वीकुर्वतः श्रौतप्रस्थानात् सुमहद् वैषम्यम् इति स्थितम् । स्थिते चैवं सूत्रद्वयवन्मायाविशिष्टं ब्रह्म कारणम्, मायाशक्तिमद् ब्रह्म कारणम्, मायाश्रयं ब्रह्म कारणम् इति वा निर्बन्धो निरर्थकः । ब्रह्माधीनसत्ताका हि माया, न तया सद्वितीयं ब्रह्मेति । तस्मात् अध्यारोपितरूपभेदेन ब्रह्मैव जगज्जन्मादिकारणमिति यथा व्याख्यात एव सूत्रार्थो ज्ञेयः ॥

सिद्धान्ते व्यावहारिककार्यकारणभावोपगमः कथम्? - अत्राह यद्येकान्तेनैव कार्यकारणभावो निषेद्धमिष्टः श्रुतिसूत्रयोः, किमर्थं तत्प्रतिकूलतया सृष्टिः श्राव्यते ‘आत्मन आकशः संभूतः’ (तै. २-१), ‘इदं सर्वमसृजत सच्च त्यच्चाभवत् । निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च । निलयनं चानिलयनं च । विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च । सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत् । यदिदं किञ्च’ (तै. २-६) इत्यादिना? सूत्रिते च ‘आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्’ (वे.सू. १-४-२६), ‘भोक्त्रापत्तेरविभागश्चेत् स्याल्लोकवत्’ (वे.सू. २-१-१३) इत्यादिना? न हि निर्विकारस्य चेतनाचेतनरूपजगदाकारेण परिणामो लोकदृष्ट्याप्यसंभाव्यमानः श्रुत्या प्रमाणभूतया स्वेनैव समुदिश्यते, पश्चाच्चापोद्यते स्वेनैव - इति युक्तं कल्पयितुम् । नापि भगवता सूत्रकारेण अविद्यमानो ब्रह्मपरिणामः स्वेनैव संसूत्र्य तदनु ‘तदनन्यत्वम्’ (वे.सू. २-१-१४) इति स्वेनैव प्रतिषिध्यत इति युक्तम् । ‘प्रक्षालनाद् हि पङ्कस्य दूरादस्पर्शनं वरम्’ इति हि न्यायः । अतः कथञ्चित् सृष्टिपरत्वमपि श्रुतीनां सूत्राणां चोपपादनीयम् । तस्मात्, सृष्टिपरत्वमपि श्रुतीनां चोपपादनीयम् । तस्मात्, सृष्टिश्रुतिर्मायाविशिष्टाद् ब्रह्मणः सकाशान्मिथ्याजगत्सृष्टिमाचष्टे; ‘आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्’ (तै. ३-६) इत्याद्या तु शुद्धानन्द लक्षणब्रह्मस्वरूपसमर्पिका- इति व्याख्यानमेव साधु लक्ष्यत इति चेत् ।

अत्र ब्रूमः । नैवं शक्यं विज्ञातुम् । सृष्टिश्रुतीनामन्यपरत्वस्य प्रतिष्ठापितत्वात् । या पुनरुदाहृता परिणामश्रुतिः, यच्च ब्रह्मपरिणामग्राहकं सूत्रम्, तत्र व्यवहारदृष्ट्या प्राप्तस्यैव परिणामस्योपन्यासः प्रयोजनान्तरमुद्दिश्य- इति न दोषः । लोको हि उपलब्धेः समर्थक्रियाकारित्वाच्च बाह्यवस्तूना- मस्तित्वेऽभिनिवेशते । कार्यकारणभावोऽपि वस्तुसन्नेवेत्यभिमन्यते; तथा प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः, क्रियाकारकफलभेदव्यवहारः संसारानुभवश्च- इत्येतत् सर्वं परमार्थसत्यमेवेति दृढाग्रहं धत्ते । तदीदृगविद्यावस्थायां वर्तमानानां कर्मफलार्थिनां मुमुक्षूणां च कृते जन्मान्तरलोकान्तरसंबन्ध्यात्मा- स्तित्वम्, फलसाधनानि, दुरितक्षयार्थानि च कर्माणि, जन्मान्तरेष्टानिष्टप्राप्तिपरिहारोपायविशेषम्, ब्रह्मणो जगज्जन्मादिहेतुत्वम्, ब्रह्मण उपास्यत्वम्, जीवानाम् चोपासकत्वम्, अभ्युदयक्रम- मुक्त्यर्थान्युपासनानि च - इत्येतत् सर्वम् उपदिशति श्रुतिः । वेदान्तवृद्धाश्च तदनुसारेणैवोपदिशन्ति, अधिकारतारतम्यमपेक्ष्य विनेयानाम् । यथाहुः संप्रदायविदः-

उपलम्भात् समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धैः अजातेस्त्रसतां सदा ॥ गौ.का. ४-४२.

आश्रमास्त्रिविधा हीनमध्यमोत्कृष्टदृष्टयः ।

उपासनोपदिष्टेयं तदर्थमनुकम्पया ॥ गौ.का. ३-१६.

इति च । सर्वमिदमध्यारोपदृष्ट्यैव मन्दमध्यमाधिकार्यनुग्रहार्थम् । उत्तमाधिकारिणां तु, अजाद्वयात्मतत्त्वमेवोपदिश्यते श्रुतौ सद्योमुक्तिफलकज्ञानोदयार्थम् । सूत्रकारोऽपि एतामेव साम्प्रदायिकीं सरणिमनुरुद्धे । उक्तं हि भाष्यकृतापि-

(१) “अस्ति वस्तुभावः इत्येवं वदनशीलानाम् दृढाग्रहवतां श्रद्धधानानां मन्दविवेकिनाम् अर्थोपायत्वेन सा देशिता जातिः । तां गृह्णन्तु तावत् । वेदान्ताभ्यासिनां तु स्वयमेव अजाद्वयात्मविषयो विवेकः भविष्यति इति । न तु परमार्थबुद्ध्या । ते हि श्रोत्रियाः स्थूलबुद्धित्वात् अजातेः अजातिवस्तुनः सदा त्रस्यन्ति आत्मनाशं मन्यमाना अविवेकिनः- इत्यर्थः” ॥ गौ.का.भा. ४-४२.

(२) “उपासना उपदिष्टा इयं तदर्थं मन्दमध्यमदृष्ट्याश्रमाद्यर्थम् कर्माणि च । न च आत्मा एक एव अद्वितीयः इति निश्चितोत्तमदृष्ट्यर्थम् ॥ गौ.का.भा. ३-१६

इति । अपवाददृष्ट्या तु द्वैतवस्तुसद्भावो नैवेष्यते वेदान्तिभिः । अजाद्वितीयकूटस्थचैतन्यमात्रं परमार्थतत्त्वम् इति स्वीकारात्-

(३)

उपलम्भात् समाचारान्मायाहस्ती यथोच्यते ।
उपलम्भात् समाचारादस्ति वस्तु तथोच्यते ॥
जात्याभासं चलाभासं वस्त्वाभासं तथैव च ।
अजाचलमवस्तुत्वं विज्ञानं शान्तमद्वयम् ॥
गौ.का. ४-४४,४५.

इति । भाष्यकारश्च सूत्रकाराशयम् एवमेवाभिवर्णयति स्म-

(४) यस्मात् तयोः कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वम् अवगम्यते । कार्यं आकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत्, कारणं परं ब्रह्म; तस्मात् कारणात् परमार्थतोऽनन्यत्वं व्यतिरेकेण अभावः कार्यस्यावगम्यते ॥ सू.भा. २-१-१४.

(५) सूत्रकारोऽपि परमार्थाभिप्रायेण 'तदनन्यत्वम्' इत्याह; व्यवहाराभिप्रायेण तु 'स्याल्लोकवत्' इति महासमुद्रादिस्थानीयतां ब्रह्मणः कथयति । अप्रत्याख्यायैव कार्यप्रपञ्चं परिणामप्रक्रियां चाश्रयते सगुणेषूपपासनेषु उपयोक्ष्यत इति ॥ २-१-१४.

इति । तदेवं मन्दमध्यमदृष्टीनामधिकारिणां कृते जात्याद्युपदेशकश्रुतीनाम् अध्यारोपापवाद-प्रक्रियामवलम्ब्यैव प्रवृत्तिः, न तु तात्पर्येणेति सर्वमनाकुलम् ॥



१२. पञ्चकोशविवेकः

तैत्तिरीयभाष्यार्थविमर्शिनी-उपोद्धाततः ४-खण्डः

पञ्चकोशविवेकप्रक्रिया

यथैवाकाशादिसृष्टिप्रक्रिया ब्रह्मणोऽजाद्वितीयात्मत्वज्ञापनार्थेति गम्यते, एवमेव, अन्नमया द्यात्मपञ्चकवर्णनप्रक्रियापि आत्मनः पञ्चकोशविलक्षणत्वप्रतिपादनेन अद्वितीयानन्दस्वरूपत्वज्ञापनार्थेव, स्वप्रधानेति गम्यते। सा हि प्रक्रिया एवं प्रवृत्ता- आकाशादिक्रमेणान्नसमयपुरुषान्तं कार्यं सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्रविष्टं ब्रह्म बुद्धिसंबन्धेन द्रष्टृत्वश्रोतृत्वादिविशेषधर्मवदिवोपलभ्यते। तत्र यथैवान्नमये देहे आत्मभावेन लोको वर्तते, एवमेव प्राणमये, मनोमये, विज्ञानमये, आनन्दमये च कोशस्वरूपे आत्ममतिं करोति। तत्रान्नमयादीनां पूर्वपूर्वस्मिन् आत्ममतिपरित्याज्यजनार्थं श्रुतिः, उत्तरस्मिन्नुत्तरस्मिन् प्राणमयादौ आत्मबुद्धिमध्यारोपयति, शाखाचन्द्रनिदर्शनन्यायेनात्मतत्त्वं दर्शयितुम्। तत्र च व्यष्टिभूतान्नमयादिकोशस्य विराडाद्युपाधिलक्षणसमष्ट्यनन्यताम्, आत्मनश्च क्रमेण सूत्रात्मतां वेदात्महिरण्यगर्भस्वरूपताम्, समष्टिबुद्ध्युपाधिकहिरण्यगर्भाभिन्नताम्, समष्ट्यानन्दोपाधिकहिरण्यगर्भानन्यतां च बोधयित्वैव अविद्याकल्पितान्नमयादिकोशलक्षणेष्व्वात्ममतिं परिहाप्य पर्यन्ते आनन्दमयपुच्छत्वेनाद्वैतं निर्विशेषं ब्रह्मैव सर्वात्मभूतं आत्मत्वेन विनिर्दिशति। इहापि च भृगुवल्लीवत् समष्ट्यन्नाद्युपासनं तत्फलोक्तिश्च मध्यमाधिकारिणामुपकारावावन्तरतात्पर्येणैव। परमतात्पर्येण तु, आत्मनः सत्यज्ञानानन्तब्रह्मत्वबोधनमेवानुगम्यते इति न प्रकरणविच्छेदः ॥

ब्रह्म चानन्दमयस्य प्रतिष्ठात्वेन निर्दिष्टं निरुपाधिकत्वात्, निर्विशेषत्वाच्च नास्त्येवेति मन्दमतीन् प्रतिभायात् इति, 'जगत्कारणत्वात्, विज्ञानगुहायां जीवरूपापन्नमिवोपलभ्यमानत्वात्, नामरूपात्मना चेतनाचेतनविभक्तत्वेन चावभासात्, सुकृतत्वेन प्रसिद्धेः, आनन्दरसत्वात्, का

12. पञ्चकोशविवेकः

र्यकारणसंघातचेष्टानामुपपादकत्वात्, भयाभयहेतुत्वाच्च तदस्तीत्येवावगन्तव्यम्' इति ज्ञापयति श्रुतिः। तस्मिंश्चाविद्याकल्पितमूर्तामूर्तधर्मान् दृश्यत्वादिलक्षणानपोद्य प्रत्यस्तमितसर्वविशेषे आत्मभावेन यः प्रतिष्ठां गच्छति, स एवाभयरूपं परमपुरुषार्थं गच्छति इति प्रतिजानीते ॥



१३. द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेकप्रक्रिया

वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञातः ३८-खण्डः

द्रष्टृदृश्यप्रक्रियापरिशीलनम्-

३८. नैसर्गिकदृष्ट्या वीक्षितं जगदिदं 'अहमिदमनेन पश्यामि' इति द्रष्टृदर्शनदृश्यत्रिपुटीलक्षणं विभाव्यते। तत्र द्रष्टा करणव्यापारेण विषयान् व्याप्यानुभविता। दर्शनं करणं चक्षुःश्रोत्रादि। दृश्यं शब्दस्पर्शरूपादि विषयलक्षणम्। करणव्यापारस्य फलमपि दर्शनशब्दवाच्यं यस्मिन् जाते 'पश्यति' 'शृणोति' 'मनुते' 'विजानाति'-इत्यादिव्यवहारो भवति। तत्रैवं स्थिते दृश्यविषयाद् विविच्य द्रष्टारं यत्तत् स्वरूपनिर्धारणं तद् 'द्रष्टृदृश्यविवेक' इत्युच्यते। तत्र द्रष्टा तावत् 'अहंप्रत्ययगम्यः' दृश्यं तु 'इदंप्रत्ययगम्यम्' इति द्रष्टृदृश्यविभागे अहमिदं प्रत्ययतन्त्रे स्थिते, यत्रैकान्ततोऽहंप्रत्ययगम्यत्वमेव न जातुचित् इदंप्रत्ययगम्यत्वं, स एव परमार्थद्रष्टा; तदितरे तु गौणा द्रष्टारः, मिथ्याद्रष्टारो वा भवितुमर्हन्ति। तत्र लोके 'राजा चारचक्षुषा पश्यति' इत्यत्र गौणं द्रष्टृत्वम्। राजचारयोर्भेदे प्रसिद्धे सति चारद्रष्टृत्वस्य राज्ञि उपचारात्, देहेन्द्रियादिषु द्रष्टृत्वबुद्धिशब्दौ तु न गौणौ, किं तु मिथ्यैव। तत्र सर्वत्र चक्षुरादौ अद्रष्टृभूतेऽपि 'अहं पश्यामि' इत्येवमादिबुद्धिशब्दयोर्निरुपचरितयोरेवोत्पत्तिदर्शनात्। अत एव हि श्रुतिः "यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति तदितर इतरं जिघ्रति तदितर इतरं रसयते तदितर इतरमभिवदति तदितर इतरं शृणोति तदितर इतरं मनुते तदितर इतरं स्पृशति तदितर इतरं विजानाति" (बृ.४-५-१५) इत्याविद्यकद्वैतविषय एव द्रष्टृदृश्यविभाग इत्याह। सेयम् आविद्यिकी लौकिकी दृष्टिः अन्तःकरणवृत्तिरूपत्वादन्त्या। वृत्तयश्च जायमाना एव चैतन्यव्याप्ता चिदाभासाश्च जायन्त इति लौकिकैस्त एव ज्ञानशब्दवाच्या इति गण्यन्ते। या पुनर्नित्यचैतन्यस्वरूपा आत्मनः स्वभावभूता, सैव पारमार्थिकी दृष्टिः, नित्याविपरिलुप्तस्वाभाव्यात्। तत्र च सवितृतत्प्रकाशवदभिन्नत्वं द्रष्टृदृश्ययोः। एतयैव दृष्ट्या द्रष्टेत्युच्यते परमात्मा तत्प्रकाश्यत्वेन

दृश्यभूतम् अन्तःकरणवृत्त्याद्यपेक्ष्य। अयं तु द्रष्टैव न दृश्यं जातुचिदपीत्यतः परमार्थद्रष्टा। ‘न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येर्न श्रुतेः श्रोतारं श्रुणुया न मतेर्मन्तारं मन्वीथा न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः। एष त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः’ (बृ.३-४-२) इति श्रुतेः। लौकिकं तु द्रष्टृत्वम् अस्मिन् तत्तदन्तःकरण-वृत्त्यधारोपापेक्षम्। इदमेव हि प्रमातृत्वं नामात्मनः यद्देहेन्द्रियमनआदिष्वहंममाभिमानकृतमित्यवोचाम प्राक्(खं.२५.)। अनयैव चानित्यदृष्टिव्यापृत्या स्वीयत्वेनाविद्याधारोपितया ‘पश्यति’ ‘श्रुणोति’ इत्यादिव्यवहारास्पदं भवत्यात्मा। अनयैव हि दृष्ट्या समन्वितत्वेन विभाव्यमानोऽयं प्राणभृत् ‘द्रष्टा स्पृष्टा श्रोता घ्राता रसयिता मन्ता बोद्धा कर्ता विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः’ (प्र.४-९) इति चोच्यते। वस्तुतस्तु नैव नित्यदृष्टिमतः सर्वसाक्षिणः परमात्मनोऽन्यो द्रष्टास्तीति कृत्वा श्रुतिर्विज्ञापयति ‘न हि द्रष्टृदृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते’ (बृ.४-३-२३) इति। ‘नान्योऽतोऽस्ति द्रष्टा नान्योऽतोऽस्ति श्रोता नान्योऽतोऽस्ति मन्ता नान्योऽतोऽस्ति विज्ञाता’ (बृ.३-७-२३) इति च। यदा तु लौकिकीयं दृष्टिर्व्यभिचरत्स्वरूपत्वेन सुषुप्त्याद्यवस्थानुशीलनेन विनिश्चीयते, तदा द्रष्ट्रादित्रिपुटीरहितत्वेनाध्यवस्यते सर्वव्यवहारातीत एवेत्यधारोपापनयनेन विज्ञाप्यते ‘यत्रत्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत् केन कं पश्येत् तत् केन कं जिघ्रेत् तत् केन कं रसयेत् तत् केन कमभिवदेत् तत् केन कं श्रुणुयात् तत् केन कं विजानीयाद् येनेदं सर्वं विजानाति तं केन विजानीयात् स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा’ (बृ. ४-५-१५) इति ॥



१४. श्रवणमननादिस्वरूपम्

पारमहंस्यमीमांसा- अध्याय-४, पृ.५८

श्रवणादिसतत्त्वनिरूपणम्, न श्रवणादयः विधयः

तत्र श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनानां ज्ञाने साक्षात् साधनत्वात् तत्सतत्त्वं निरूपयिष्यते। अत्र केचित् वदन्ति श्रवणविधिप्रयुक्तैव ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा कर्तव्यत्वेन सूत्रिता श्रीमता बादरायणेन ‘अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा’ इति। एवं किल तेषाम् अभिप्रायः “स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यः” (तै.आ. २-१४) इति नित्याध्यायनविधिना अधीतसाङ्गस्वाध्याये “तद्विजिज्ञासस्व” (तै. ३-१), “सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः” (छां ६-८-१), “आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः” (बृ. २-४-५) इति आत्मदर्शनम् अनूद्य तदर्थत्वेन मननिदिध्यासनाभ्यां फलोपकार्यङ्गाभ्यां सह श्रवणं नाम अङ्गि विधीयते। तत्र श्रवणे को अधिकार्यादिविशेषः इति जिज्ञासोः उपकाराय अपेक्षिताधिकारिविषयफलानुबन्धत्रयं न्यायेन निर्णेतुं सूत्रयामास “अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा” इति। तत्र श्रवणं नाम वेदान्तवाक्यतात्पर्यविषयको विचारः। श्रवणमननाभ्यां निर्धारितस्य अर्थस्य अनन्यचित्ततया अनुसंधानमेव निदिध्यासनं च इति ॥

वयं तु मन्यामहे नायं साधुः अभिप्रायः इति। यावता ‘तद्विजिज्ञासस्व’ इत्यादीनि वाक्यानि कञ्चित् कृत्यविशेषं विधातुं न प्रवृत्तानि इति प्रकरणपर्यालोचनया अवगम्यते। तत्र ‘तद्विजिज्ञासस्व’ इति वाक्यं तावत् पितरम् उपसृत्य “अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्म” इति परिप्रश्नं कुर्वाणं भृगुं प्रति पितुः वरुणस्य प्रतिवचनम्। न तत्र अस्ति वचनममृतत्वकामः श्रवणं कुर्यात् इत्येवं विधायकम्। एवम् “आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः” इत्यपि “प्रब्रजिष्यन् वा अरे अहमस्मि” इत्युक्तवन्तं याज्ञवल्क्यं प्रति “किमहं वित्तेन आवृता अमृता स्याम् उताहोस्विन्नेति” इति प्रश्नोपन्यासं कृतवती मैत्रेयी। तत्प्रतिवचनं “यथैव उपकरणवतां जीवितं तथैव ते जीवितं स्यात्, अमृतत्वस्य तु न आशास्ति

वित्तेन” इति प्रतिवचनम् उपश्रुत्य “येनाहं नामृता स्यां किमहं तेन कुर्यां यदेव भगवान् वेद तदेव मे ब्रूहि” इति प्रार्थितवती। तत्र मुनेः प्रतिवचनम् “आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति” इत्यतः “आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः” इत्याह। तदेवं यथोदाहृतवाक्येषु कुत्राचिदपि श्रवणादिविधिः न दृश्यते। अतः श्रवणादिप्रयुक्त एव विविदिषासंन्यासः, अन्यथा विधिं विना विचारे प्रवृत्तस्य आत्मदर्शनम् अकृत्वा तत उपरमे आरूढपतितत्वं च स्यादिति वादोऽत्र न स्वरसः। “यदहरेव विरजेत् तदहरेव प्रव्रजेत्” इति विधिप्रेरितस्यैव आत्मलोकप्राप्तीच्छया पारिव्राज्योपपत्तेः। इतश्च सुस्पष्टं च श्रवणादिषु विध्यभावमाह भाष्यकृत् “किमर्थानि तर्हि आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यः” इत्यादीनि विधिच्छायानि वचनानि? स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तिविषयविमुखीकरणार्थानीति ब्रूमः। यो हि बहिर्मुखः प्रव्रते पुरुषः इष्टं मे भूयात् अनिष्टं माभूत् इति, न च तत्र आत्यन्तिकं पुरुषार्थं लभते। तमात्यन्तिकपुरुषार्थवाञ्छिनं स्वाभाविकात् कार्यकरणसंघातप्रवृत्तिगोचरात् विमुखीकृत्य प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्तयन्ति “आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः” इत्यादीनि। तस्य आत्मान्वेषणाय प्रवृत्तस्य अहेयम् अनुपादेयं च आत्मतत्त्वमुपदिशन्ति “इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा” (बृ. २-४-६), “यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत्, तत्केन कं विजानीयात्”, “विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्” (बृ. ४-५-१५) “अयमात्मा ब्रह्म (बृ. २-५-१९) इत्यादिभिः।” (सू.भा. १-१-४) तस्मात् साधनचतुष्टयसंपन्नस्य श्रुतवेदान्तस्य स्वयमेव जिज्ञासा समुत्पद्यते। श्रवणादिविधिच्छायावचनानि तु प्रत्यगात्माभिमुख्यं कुर्वन्ति न तु कञ्चित् विधिं किञ्चित् विदधति कञ्चिन्नियोजयन्ति वा इति स्पष्टम्। आरूढपतितत्वं तु न श्रवणविधिप्रयुक्तप्रवृत्तित्वात्, किं तु अन्यथैव इत्युपपादितम् “तद्भूतस्य तु नातद्भावो जैमिनेरपि नियमातद्रूपाभावेभ्यः” (सू.भा. ३-४-४०) इति सूत्रभाष्ये- “अत्यन्तमात्मानं आचार्यकुले अवसादयन् इति, अरण्यमियात् इति पदं ततो न पुनरेयात् इत्युपनिषत्, आचार्येणाभ्यनुज्ञातः चतुर्णाम् एकम् आश्रमम्। आविमोक्षात् शरीरस्य सोऽनुतिष्ठेत् यथाविधि॥ इति च एवंजातीयको नियमः प्रच्युत्यभावं दर्शयति। यथा च ‘ब्रह्मचर्यं समाप्य गृही भवेत्’ ‘ब्रह्मचर्यादेव प्रव्रजेत्’ इति च एवमादीनि आरोहरूपाणि वचांसि उपलभ्यन्ते, नैवं प्रत्यवरोहरूपाणि, न चैवम् आचाराः शिष्टा विद्यन्ते। यत्तु पूर्वकर्मसु अनुष्ठानचिकीर्षया प्रत्यवरोहणम् इति। तदसत्। ‘श्रेयान् स्वधर्मो विगुणः परधर्मात्स्वनुष्ठितात्’ इति स्मरणात्, न्यायाच्च। यो हि यं प्रति विधीयते स तस्य धर्मः, न तु यः येन स्वनुष्ठानं शक्यते, चोदनालक्षणत्वाद्धर्मस्य” (सू. ३-४-४०) इति। तस्मात् श्रवणविधिः न अपेक्षते संन्यासिनः आरूढपतित्वोपपादनाय। यत्पुनः श्रवणादिविध्यभ्युपगमदर्शनं क्वचित् तदन्यथा एव नेयम्। तद्यथा--

त्वंपदार्थविवेकाय संन्यासः सर्वकर्मणाम् ।
साधनत्वं ब्रजत्येव शान्तो दान्तानुशासनात् ॥
त्वमर्थं प्रत्यगात्मानं पश्येदात्मानमात्मनि ।
वाक्यार्थं तत आत्मानं सर्वं पश्यति केवलम् ॥
उप. १८-२११, २१२
यथेष्टाचरणप्राप्तिः संन्यासादिविधौ कुतः ।
पदार्थाज्ञानबुद्धस्य वाक्यार्थानुभवार्थिनः ।
उप. १८-२१८

इति दृश्यते उपदेशसाहस्र्याम् । एवम् उपदेशसाहस्र्यामपि संन्यासं सर्वकर्मणां साधनत्वं ब्रजत्येव, ‘शान्तोदान्तानुशासनात्’ इत्यत्र शमादीनां पश्येत् इति विधानात्, शमादीनां च संन्यासिनामेव कात्स्न्येन शक्यलाभात्, संन्यासः ज्ञानाङ्गसाधनं भवतीत्यर्थः । एवं यथेष्टाचरणप्राप्तिः इत्यत्रापि विरक्तस्य पारिव्राज्यविधानात् तस्य च शमादिविधानात् ‘तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत्’ इति गुर्वभिगमनस्य विज्ञानाङ्गत्वेन विधानाच्च न स्वेच्छाप्रवृत्तिसम्भवः इत्येव अभिप्रायः । अत एव श्रवणादिभिः आत्मानुभवार्थः इति पक्षः कण्ठरवेण निराकृतः उपदेशसाहस्रीकारैः-

अशनायादिनिर्मुक्तः सिद्धो मोक्षस्त्वमेव सः ।
श्रोतव्यादि तवेत्येतद्विरुद्धं कथमुच्यते ॥ उप. १८-२०६

इति । तस्मात् अयमत्र निष्कर्ष- वाक्यार्थज्ञानार्थं प्रवृत्तः स्वयमेव श्रवणादिकं करोति इति न तं प्रति तद्विधीयते । अपि तु बहिर्मुखस्य परमपुरुषार्थसाधनम् अपश्यतः आत्मश्रवणादिकमेव आत्मज्ञानजननद्वारा अमृतत्वसाधनम् इति प्रत्यङ्मुखत्वं कार्यते इति तावन्मात्रेण नियमविधित्वं श्रवणादीनाम् । आत्मैव श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यश्च न अनात्मा, स एव अन्वेष्टव्यत्वात्, एवमन्वेष्टव्यः इति च । एतदेव अभिप्रेत्य सूत्रभाष्ये ‘विधिच्छायावचनानि’ इत्युक्तम् । अस्ति तत्र विधिकृत्यं किञ्चित् यावता आत्मैव श्रवणमननरूपान्वेषणेन वेदितुम् एष्टव्यः इति प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्तनं संन्यासिनः चित्तस्य इति । न तु श्रवणज्ञाने मननफलभूतज्ञाने वा प्रवर्तनं शक्यकरणं श्रुत्यापि । वस्तुतंत्रत्वात् ज्ञानस्य इति ज्ञेयम् ॥

मनननिदिध्यासनयोः विवेकः

अथ किंलक्षणं मननं किंलक्षणं वा निदिध्यासनम् इति किञ्चित् विमृश्यते। तत्र ‘मननं नाम श्रुतार्थस्यैव युक्तिभिः विचारः। निदिध्यासनं तु ध्यानेन श्रुतार्थस्य अपरोक्षीकरणम्’ इत्येके। श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनानां

ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारोदयपर्यन्तम् आवृत्तिः कार्या, ‘आवृत्तिरसकृदुपदेशात्’ (ब्र.सू. ४-१-१) इति ते मन्यन्ते। अपरे तु श्रवणादेव साक्षात्कारो भवेत्, मनननिदिध्यासने तु असंभावनाविपरीतभावना रूपप्रतिबन्धद्वयनिरासद्वारेण एव उपयुज्येते इति मन्यन्ते। तत्र श्रवणं नाम वेदान्तवाक्यतात्पर्यस्य अवधारणम् इत्यत्र सर्वसंप्रतिपत्ति अस्ति। मननं तु युक्तिभिः अनुचिन्तनम् इति तु अर्धसत्यं, यतः भाष्यकारः आह-

“यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्थव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम्, नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः संभवति; श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाऽऽश्रीयते स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारात् आत्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, संप्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना संपत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मकत्वम्, प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात् कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः -इत्येवंजातीयकः। ‘तर्काप्रतिष्ठानात्’ (ब्र.सू. २-१-११) इति च केवलस्य तर्कस्य विप्रलम्भकत्वं दर्शयिष्यति।” इति।

अन्येऽपि श्रुत्यनुग्रहीततर्का दुन्दुभिदृष्टान्ताद्युपबृंहिताः अत्र अनुसंधेयाः। श्रुत्यनुकूलोऽपि तर्कः मननशब्देन गृह्येतैव। केवलतर्कस्यैव अत्र निषेधात्। तत्रोदाहरणं अत्रैव “दृश्यते तु” इति सूत्रभाष्ये वाक्यशेषेणदर्शितं “चेतनकारणश्रवणबलेनैव समस्तस्य जगत चेतनतामुत्प्रेक्षेत, तस्यापि ‘विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च’ इति चेतनाचेतनविभागश्रवणं विभावनाविभावनाभ्यां चैतन्यस्य शक्यत एव योजयितुम्।” इति। तस्मात् मननं नाम श्रुत्यनुगृहीतः श्रुत्यनुगुणश्च इति द्विविधतर्क एव इति अवगम्यते ॥

अथ निदिध्यासनं यत्तु पठ्यते निदिध्यासनं नाम श्रवणमननाभ्यां निर्धारितस्य अर्थस्य अनन्यचित्ततया अनुसंधानम् इति। तत्र यदि अयमभिप्रायः- आत्मतत्त्वस्य श्रुत्यनुगुणेन चिन्तनेन तदपिधानस्येव प्रतिभासतो अनात्मनः तिरस्करणेन आत्मभावावस्थानानुकूलः चित्तव्यापारः तत्र ओम् इति ब्रूमः। यत्तु कैश्चिदुच्यते- निदिध्यासनं नाम भावनाविशेषः येन समाधिरवाप्यते, तेन च आत्मसाक्षात्कार इति, तदसत्। आत्मनः नित्यापरोक्षत्वात् “यत्साक्षात् अपरोक्षात्

ब्रह्म” इति श्रुतेः। पदार्थविषयकाज्ञानस्य निरासार्थमेव मननं तच्च अन्वयव्यतिरेकाख्यतर्केण देहाद्यनात्माधारोपस्य अपोहनमेव। न देशकालादिव्यवहितवस्तुन इव व्यवधानापनयनेन साक्षात्करणम्। तदुक्तं- “तत्र येषाम् एतौ पदार्थौ अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययप्रतिबद्धौ, तेषां ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येतद्वाक्यं स्वार्थे प्रमां नोत्पादयितुं शक्नोति, पदार्थज्ञानपूर्वकत्वात् वाक्यार्थज्ञानस्य-- इत्यतः तान् प्रति एष्टव्यः पदार्थविवेकप्रयोजनः शास्त्रयुक्त्यभ्यासः। यद्यपि च प्रतिपत्तव्य आत्मानिरंशः, तथापि अध्यारोपितं तस्मिन् बह्वंशत्वं देहेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिविषयवेदनादिलक्षणम्। तत्र एकेन अवधानेन एकमंशमपोहति, अपरेण अपरम् इति युज्यते तत्र क्रमवती प्रतिपत्तिः; तत्तु पूर्वरूपमेवात्मप्रतिपत्तेः। येषां पुनः निपुणमतीनां न अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययलक्षणः पदार्थविषयः प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति, ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थम् अनुभवितुमिति, तान्प्रति आवृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव” (ब्र.सु. ४-१-२) इति। तदेवं श्रवणमात्रेण उत्तमाधिकारिणात्मानुभवः, तदशक्तानां शास्त्रयुक्त्यावृत्तिलक्षणं मननम् अपि अपेक्षते इति स्थितम्। निदिध्यासनं पुनः प्रत्यङ्मुखीभूय इन्द्रियादीनाम् उत्तरोत्तरं सूक्ष्मव्यापकप्रत्यक्तरे स्वस्वकारणे प्रविलयपूर्वकः आत्मतत्त्वदर्शने यत्नविशेषः प्रणिधानलक्षणः। अत एव काठके “श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्यः” (का.१-२-७) इति श्रवणमात्रेण अलब्धात्मनां मननम् उक्त्वा--

एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशते ।
दृश्यते त्वग्रया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ॥
यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि ।
ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि ॥
का.१-३-१२-१३

इति मननेऽपि असञ्जातात्मदर्शनानाम् अध्यात्मयोगः उपदिष्टः।

विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा १४.श्रवणादिसतत्त्वविचारः

श्रवणादिसतत्त्वविचारः

अथ श्रवणादीनां स्वरूपकार्यादि निरूप्यते। तत्र श्रवणं नाम वेदान्तानामद्वितीय-ब्रह्मात्मावगतिपर्यन्तज्ञानजनकत्वसामर्थ्यनिर्धारणार्थं वाक्यतात्पर्यनिर्धारणानुकूलविचारणा। अत्र विचारणा न केवलं वेदानां वेदत्वेन प्रामाण्यं स्वीकृत्य, किं तर्हि वेदान्तवाक्यानाम् अनुभवानु-

सारिज्ञानकारणत्वम्, ज्ञानस्य स्वतःसिद्धाद्वितीयब्रह्मात्मावगतिपर्यन्तत्वं चाभ्युगम्येत्युक्तम् (खं. ८-३२,३३)। वार्तिककारैरप्युक्तम्- ‘न च वेदोक्तितो वेदः श्रद्धेयार्थ इहोच्यते। किं त्वमानत्वहेतूनां वेदवाक्येष्वसंभवात्’ (बृ.वा. २-४-३२५) इति। अत एव च भाष्यकरो वाक्यश्रवणमात्रेणापि ब्रह्मावबोधो जायते इत्याह-

(१) “या हि चोदना धर्मस्य लक्षणम्, सा स्वविषये नियुञ्जानैव पुरुषमवबोधयति; ब्रह्मचोदना तु पुरुषमवबोधयत्येव केवलम्, अवबोधस्य चोदनाजन्यत्वान्न पुरुषोऽवबोधे नियुज्यते। यथा अक्षार्थसंनिकर्षेण अर्थावबोधे, तद्वत्।” सू.भा. १-१-१.

[वेदान्तश्रवणजन्यज्ञाने न विधिः संभवतीत्युक्तमत्र।]

(२) “ज्ञातुमिच्छा जिज्ञासा। अवगतिपर्यन्तं ज्ञानं सन्वाच्याया इच्छायाः कर्म, फलविषयत्वादिच्छायाः। ज्ञानेन हि प्रमाणेनावगन्तुमिष्टं ब्रह्म। ब्रह्मावगतिर्हि पुरुषार्थः, निःशेषसंसारबीजाविद्याद्यनर्थनिर्बर्हणात्। तस्माद्ब्रह्म जिज्ञासितव्यम्॥” सू.भा. १-१-१.

[अनुभवफलावसानपर्यन्तं वाक्यविचारणा कर्तव्या- इत्युक्तमत्र।]

(३) “लोकेऽपि ‘इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णय’ इति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु प्रणिधानमात्रं कुरु इत्युच्यते, न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुरु इति। ज्ञेयाभिमुखस्यापि ज्ञानं कदाचिज्जायते, कदाचिन्न जायते; तस्मात् तं प्रति ज्ञानविषय एव दर्शयितव्यो ज्ञापयितुकामेन। तस्मिन्दर्शिते स्वयमेव यथाविषयं यथाप्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते।” सू.भा. ३-२-२१.

[लोके श्रवणशब्देन पदार्थज्ञानार्थं श्रोत्रेन्द्रियप्रणिधाने क्रिया विवक्ष्यते; श्रावणं ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणतन्त्रं वस्तुतन्त्रं चेति न विधेयम्- इत्युक्तमत्र॥]

मननं नाम, श्रुतिदर्शितमार्गेणैव अद्वितीयब्रह्मात्मस्वरूपनिश्चयार्थम् अनुस्त्रियमाणः, अनुभवानुसारी अन्वयव्यतिरेकलक्षणस्तर्क इत्युक्तम् (खं. ८, ८४. पा.४१)। न तु प्रमाणान्तरविरोधः शङ्कानिवारणार्थमाद्रियमाणः, अनुमानादिलक्षणस्तर्क इह संभवति। प्रमाणान्तराविषयत्वाद् ब्रह्मणस्तादृशशङ्काया एवानुत्थानात्। यथाह भाष्यकारः-

(४) “न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनं आगममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम्। रूपाद्यभावाद्धि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः, लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनामिति चावोचाम।” सू.भा.२-१-११.

इति। यत्र प्रमाणान्तरप्रवृत्तिशङ्कापि नास्ति, तत्र को वाऽवसरः प्रमाणान्तर-विरोधशङ्कायाः? -इति॥

निदिध्यासनं च ब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वावधारणार्थं पराग्विषयेभ्यो चित्तं व्यावर्त्य स्वात्मन्येव प्रणिधानकरणरूपो मानसव्यापारः। न तु श्रवणमननाभ्यां निश्चितस्यात्मज्ञानस्य, केवलश्रवणज्ञानस्य वा, अभ्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययसंस्कारापनयनार्थम्, यथाहुः प्रसङ्ख्यान-व्यसनिनः। नहि तत्त्वज्ञानम् उत्पन्नम्, मिथ्याप्रत्ययसंस्कारस्तु नापनित इति युक्तियुक्तं स्याद्वचः। यदाह भाष्यकृत्-

(५) “सकृदुत्पन्नैव हि आत्मप्रतिपत्तिः अविद्यां निवर्तयतीति, नात्र कश्चिदपि क्रमोऽभ्युपगम्यते।” सू.भा. ४-१-२. इति ॥

अथ किंरूपा तर्हि श्रवणादीनामावृत्तिः, किंप्रयोजना च? - इत्येतन्न प्रस्मर्तव्यम्। यदाह भाष्यकृत्-

“यथाभूतब्रह्मात्मविषयमपि ज्ञानं न चोदनातन्त्रम्। तद्विषये लिङादयः श्रूयमाणा अपि अनियोज्यविषयत्वात्, कुण्ठीभवन्ति उपलादिषु प्रयुक्तक्षुरतैक्ष्ण्यादिवत्; अहेयानुपादेयवस्तुविषयत्वात्। किमर्थानि तर्हि ‘आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यः’ इत्यादीनि विधिच्छायानि वचनानि ? स्वाभाविकप्रवृत्तिविषयविमुखीकरणार्थानीति ब्रूमः।” सू.भा. १-१-४.

इति ॥

श्रवणादीनामावृत्तिस्तु इत्थमुपपादिता भाष्ये-

(१) “भवेदावृत्त्यानर्थक्यं तं प्रति, यः ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति सकृदुक्तमेव ब्रह्मात्मत्वमनुभवितुं शक्नुयात्; यस्तु न शक्नोति, तं प्रति उपयुज्यत एव आवृत्तिः। तथा हि च्छान्दोग्ये ‘तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो’ इत्युपदिश्य, ‘भूय एव मा भगवान् विज्ञापयतु’ इति पुनः पुनः परिचोद्यमानः तत्तदाशङ्काकारणं निराकृत्य, ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येवासकृदुपदिशति। तथा च ‘श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः’ इत्यादि दर्शितम्। ननु उक्तम् सकृच्छ्रुतं चेत् तत्त्वमसिवाक्यं स्वमर्थमनुभावयितुं न शक्नोति, तत आवर्त्यमानमपि नैव शक्यतीति। नैष दोषः। न हि दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नं नाम; दृश्यन्ते हि सकृच्छ्रुतात् वाक्यात् मन्दप्रतीतं वाक्यार्थं आवर्तयन्तः तत्तदाभासव्युदासेन सम्यक्प्रतिपद्यमानाः।” सू.भा. ४-१-२.

इति। अत्र आवृत्तिर्नाम न ‘तत्त्वमसि’, ‘तत्त्वमसि’- इत्यादिरूपेण वाक्यजपः, नापि उपदिष्टवाक्यानां पुनः पुनः पाठः, किं तर्हि वाक्यार्थविचारणायां प्रवृत्तस्य तत्तद्युक्त्या

अनुभवानुसारिण्या अर्थाभासनिराकरणपूर्वकं यथार्थावस्थिताध्यवसानप्रयत्नः -इति गम्यते।
उपपत्त्यन्तरमपि प्राह भाष्यकृत् शास्त्रयुक्त्यभ्यासस्यार्थवत्त्वे-

(२) “अपि च ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येतद्वाक्यं त्वंपदार्थस्य तत्पदार्थभावमाचष्टे; तत्पदेन च प्रकृतं सत् ब्रह्म ईक्षितुं जगतो जन्मादिकारणमभिधीयते ‘सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म’ (तै.२-१) ‘विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म’ (बृ.३-५-२८) ‘अदृष्टं द्रष्टृ.... अविज्ञातं विज्ञातृ’ (बृ. ३-८-११) ‘अजमजरममरम्’ (बृ.४-४-२५) ‘अस्थूलमनण्वहस्वमदीर्घम्’ (बृ. ३-८-८) इत्यादिशास्त्रसिद्धम्। तत्र अजादिशब्दैर्जन्मादयो भावविकारा निवर्तिताः। अस्थूलादिशब्दैश्च स्थौल्यादयो द्रव्यधर्माः। विज्ञानादिशब्दैश्च चैतन्यप्रकाशात्मकत्वमुक्तम्। एष व्यावृत्तसर्वसंसारधर्मकोऽनुभवात्मको ब्रह्मसंज्ञकस्तत्पदार्थो वेदान्ताभियुक्तानां प्रसिद्धः। तथा त्वंपदार्थोऽपि प्रत्यगात्मा श्रोता देहादारभ्य प्रत्यगात्मतया संभाव्यमानः चैतन्यपर्यन्तत्वेनावधारितः। तत्र येषाम् एतौ पदार्थौ अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययप्रतिबद्धौ, तेषां ‘तत्त्वमसि’ इत्येतद्वाक्यं स्वार्थे प्रमां नोत्पादयितुं शक्नोति, पदार्थज्ञानपूर्वकत्वात् वाक्यार्थज्ञानस्य-- इत्यतः तान् प्रति एष्टव्यः पदार्थविवेकप्रयोजनः शास्त्रयुक्त्यभ्यासः।” सू.भा. ४-१-२.

इति। अत्र ज्ञेयब्रह्मस्वरूपं तत्पदार्थः; स तु समन्वयाध्यायदर्शितनीत्या उपक्रमोपसंहारौ, अभ्यासः, उपपत्तिः, अपूर्वता, फलं चेत्येतैस्तात्पर्यलिङ्गैः, ‘श्रुतिलिङ्गवाक्यप्रकरणस्थान-समाख्यानां समवाये पारदौर्बल्यमर्थविप्रकर्षात्’ (जै.सू. ३-३-१४) इत्युक्तप्रमाणैश्चोत्तरोत्तरं दुर्बलैः पूर्वमीमांसापरिशोधितन्यायादेवावधार्यः। त्वंपदार्थस्तु जिज्ञास्वात्मयाथात्म्यं श्रुत्यनुगृहीतान्वयव्यतिरेकतर्कसाहाय्येनावधार्यम्। तत्र येषां सुकृतिनां प्राक्तनसंस्कारविशेषात् पदार्थविषयकः प्रतिबन्धोऽज्ञानादि लक्षणोऽस्ति, तेषामावृत्तिरावश्यकी यथोपवर्णिता इत्युक्तमधस्तात्। अथ यदुक्तं शङ्कावादिना, आत्मनो निर्विशेषे ब्रह्मणि सामान्यविशेषविभागाभावात्, अभ्यासो नापेक्षित इति, तत्राप्याह भाष्यकृत्-

“यद्यपि च प्रतिपत्तव्य आत्मा निरंशः, तथापि अध्यारोपितं तस्मिन् बह्वंशत्वं देहेन्द्रियमनो बुद्धिविषयवेदनादिलक्षणम्। तत्र एकेन अवधानेन एकमंशमपोहति, अपरेण अपरम् इति युज्यते तत्र क्रमवती प्रतिपत्तिः। तत्तु पूर्वरूपमेवात्मप्रतिपत्तेः॥” सू.भा. ४-१-२.

इति ॥

एवं च वेदान्तमीमांसान्यायानुसारेण त्वंपदार्थः शोधयितव्यः। शोधितत्त्वंपदार्थस्यैव ब्रह्मात्मानुभवो भवेन्नान्यस्य इत्युक्तं भवति ॥

अधिगतपदार्थविवेकिनां तु श्रवणमात्रेणाप्यनुभवो जायेतैवेति तेषां श्रवणादि-
समुच्चयोऽनपेक्षित एवेति सुस्पष्टमाह भाष्यकृत्-

(१) “येषां पुनः निपुणमतीनां न अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययलक्षणः पदार्थविषयः
प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति, ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थम् अनुभवितुमिति, तान्प्रति
आवृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव। सकृदुत्पन्नैव हि आत्मप्रतिपत्तिः अविद्यां निवर्तयतीति, नात्र
कश्चिदपि क्रमोऽभ्युपगम्यते।” सू.भा. ४-१-२.

(२) “यथा विधिविषये कर्त्राद्यनेककारकोपसंहारद्वारेण वाक्यार्थज्ञानकालादन्यत्रानुष्ठेयो
ऽर्थोऽस्ति अग्निहोत्रादि लक्षणः, न तथेह परविद्याविषये, वाक्यार्थज्ञानसमकाल एव तु
पर्यवसितो भवति॥” (मुं. भा. १-१-६)

इति। अतः श्रवणमात्रमेवालं ब्रह्मात्मावगतये उत्तमाधिकारिणाम्; अधिकारितारतम्यस्तु
श्रवणावृत्तिः, श्रवणयुक्त्यभ्यासः, निदिध्यासनं चापेक्ष्यत इति सिद्धम्॥

युक्तं चैतत्, नहि स्वयंसिद्धस्य ब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वस्य वाक्येन स्मारणं मुक्त्वा अन्यत्
किञ्चिदपेक्षितमिति संभाव्यते। अत एवात्र प्रयत्नं विना वाक्यश्रवणमात्रेण संसारानर्थो न
कस्यचिदपि निवर्तेत- इति उपासनादिविधिव्यसनिनां ज्ञानाभ्यासादिव्यसनिनां च शङ्कामुद्भाव्य
पर्यहार्षीद् भाष्यकारः-

“सत्यमेवं युज्येत, यदि कस्यचित् एवं प्रतिपत्तिर्भवेत्; बलवती हि आत्मनो
दुःखित्वादिप्रतिपत्तिः। अतो न दुःखित्वाद्यभावं कश्चित् प्रतिपद्यत इति चेत्। न।
देहाद्यभिमानवत् दुःखित्वाद्यभिमानस्य मिथ्याभिमानत्वोपपत्तेः। प्रत्यक्षं हि देहे छिद्यमाने
दह्यमाने वा ‘अहं छिद्ये दह्ये’ इति च मिथ्याभिमानो दृष्टः। तथा बाह्यतरेष्वपि पुत्रमित्रादिषु
संतप्यमानेषु ‘अहमेव संतप्ये’ इत्यध्यारोपो दृष्टः। तथा दुःखित्वाद्यभिमानोऽपि स्यात्।
देहादिवदेव चैतन्याद् बहिरुपलभ्यमानत्वाद् दुःखित्वादीनाम्, सुषुप्तादिषु च अननुवृत्तेः।
चैतन्यस्य तु सुषुप्तेऽपि अनुवृत्तिमामनन्ति ‘यद्वै तन्न पश्यति पश्यन् वै तन्न पश्यति’
इत्यादिना। तस्मात् सर्वदुःखविनिर्मुक्तैकचैतन्यात्मकोऽहमित्येष आत्मानुभवः। न च एवम्
आत्मानमनुभवतः किञ्चिदन्यत् कृत्यमवशिष्यते॥” (सू.भा. ४-१-२)

इति। अत्र देहेन्द्रियमनस्सु तद्धर्मेषु च अहंममाभिमान आध्यासिक
एवेत्युपपादितत्वादध्यासभाष्ये, यथा देहादेः स्वयमध्यस्तस्य धर्मो दृश्यत्वात् कल्पितत्वाच्च नात्मनो
भवति, एवमेव सांसारिकदुःखमपि नात्मनो भवितुमर्हन्ति, विषयत्वेनोपलभ्यमानत्वात्तदध्यारोपित-

14. श्रवणमननादिस्वरूपम्

त्वाच्च इति तर्कः, सुषुप्ते अद्वितीयात्ममात्रावशेषानुभवश्च प्रदर्शितः, उपदेशमात्रेण दुःखित्वनिवृत्तिः स्यादेवेत्यत्र। अतो यथाप्रदर्शितात् अनुभवतोऽन्यः 'साक्षात्कारो' नाम प्रसङ्ख्यानादिलभ्यः- इत्यास्थितवतां वावदूकानां मतं दूरनिरस्तं भवति। न हि कूटस्थनित्यावगतिरूपस्य तस्य सर्वस्याप्यनात्मनः साक्षात्कारोऽन्यत आकाङ्क्षितव्यः, 'यत् साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः' (बृ. ३-४-१) इति श्रुतेरिति। यथोक्तं उपदेशसाहस्र्याम्-

(२) विज्ञातेर्यस्तु विज्ञाता स त्वमित्युच्यते यतः।

स स्यादनुभवस्तस्य ततोऽन्योऽनुभवो मृषा ॥ उप. १२-८ इति ॥



१५. मोक्षस्वरूपम्-जीवन्मुक्तिः

विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः-अथ कृतकृत्यलक्षणम्

जीवन्मुक्तिः

३१. शिष्यः - ज्ञाननिष्ठया कृतकृत्यानां किं लक्षणम्? कथं लोके ज्ञाननिष्ठो महात्मा अभिज्ञातव्यो भवति मुमुक्षुभिः?

गुरुः - अविद्यया कार्यकरणसङ्घातमहमेवेति तादात्म्येनानुभवन् बद्ध इत्युच्यते। यस्तु विद्यया तामविद्यामत्यन्ताय विनाश्य स्वात्मन्येव अजरे अमरेऽमृतेऽभये अवतिष्ठते, स महात्मा शरीरेन्द्रियादिवर्जितोऽविद्याकामकर्मभिर्मुक्तत्वात् 'जीवन्मुक्त' इति परिभाष्यते वेदान्तेषु। तथा हि श्रुतिः - 'यदा सर्वेप्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥ यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्ध्यनुशासनम् ॥' (का. २-३-१४,१५) इति ॥

जीवत एव मानवस्य कथं शरीरादिराहित्यं स्यात्? जीवनं हि नाम शरीरे स्थित्वा करणव्यापारयितृत्वम् ॥

सत्यम्, व्यवहारदृष्ट्या शरीरेन्द्रियसङ्घातेन व्यापारवत्वमेव जीवनम्। सा तु दृष्टिरविद्याकृता इति प्रदर्शितं प्राक्। पारमार्थिकदृष्ट्या तु शरीरात्माभिमानलक्षणं मिथ्याज्ञानं मुक्त्वा अन्यतः सशरीरत्वं न विद्यत एव। न ह्यसङ्गस्यात्मनस्तत्साक्ष्यभूतेन शरीरेण कश्चित् संबन्धः कयाचिद् युक्त्या दर्शयितुं शक्यते। न चानुभवदृष्ट्या समस्ति शरीरादिकम्, सर्वस्य हि परमार्थसद्रूपानुभवेनैव व्याप्तत्वात् नानुभवातिरेकेणाऽस्ति किञ्चिदपीति। प्रतिभासस्तु व्यावहारिकः शरीरादिसङ्घातस्य स्वाप्नशरीरादिप्रतिभासवदन्यथाप्युपपद्यते। शरीरे 'अहम्' इति

प्रत्ययस्तु नैसर्गिकाविद्याफलमित्यवोचम् । न चायं गौणः प्रत्ययः ‘अयमात्मा, इदं शरीरम्’ इति विविक्तप्रत्ययादर्शनात् । तदुक्तं सूत्रभाष्यकारेण " यथा मन्दान्धकारे स्थाणुरयं इत्यगृह्यमाणविशेषे पुरुषशब्दप्रत्ययौ, स्थाणुविषयौ, यथा वा शुक्तिकायाम् अकस्मात् 'रजतम्' इति निश्चितौ शब्दप्रत्ययौ, तद्वद् देहादिसङ्घाते 'अहम्' इति निरुपचारेण शब्दप्रत्ययौ आत्मानात्माविवेकेन उत्पद्यमानौ कथं गौणौ शक्यौ वदितुम् ? आत्मानात्मविवेकिनामपि पण्डितानाम् अजाविपालानामिव अविविक्तौ शब्दप्रत्ययौ भवतः । तस्मात्, मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात् सशरीरत्वस्य सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषोऽशरीरत्वम् । तथा च ब्रह्मविद्विषया श्रुतिः ‘तद्यथाऽहिनिर्ल्वयनी वल्मीके मृता प्रत्यस्ता शयीतैवमेवेदं शरीरं शेते । अथायमशरीरोऽमृतः प्राणो ब्रह्मैव तेज एव’ (बृ.४-४-८) इति ।’ (सू. भा. १-१-४) इति ॥

अथ एव करणादिव्यापारयितृत्वमपि मिथ्यैव ज्ञानिदृष्ट्या । यथोक्तं भगवता ‘नैव किञ्चित् करोमीति युक्तो मन्येत तत्त्ववित् । पश्यञ्शृण्वन् स्पृशञ्जिघ्रन्नश्नन् गच्छन् स्वपन् श्वसन् । प्रलपन् विसृजन् गृह्णन्नुन्मिषन्निमिषन्नपि । इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेषु वर्तन्त इति धारयन् ॥’ (गी.५-८,९) इति । ‘सर्वकर्माणि मनसा संन्यस्यास्ते सुखं वशी । नवद्वारे पुरे देही नैव कुर्वन् न कारयन् ॥’ (गी.५-१३) इति च । यद्यप्येवं गीतासु इन्द्रियाणाम् इन्द्रियार्थानां च विषयविषयिभावलक्षणः संबन्ध उच्यते सांख्यप्रक्रियानुसारेण, तथापि प्रकृतेरपि मायाऽपरसंज्ञाया अविद्याकल्पितत्वात्, मायापरिणामत्वाच्च शरीरेन्द्रियादेः, अशरीरत्वमेव स्वाभाविकम् । यद्यप्युक्तं भगवता ‘न कर्तृत्वं न कर्माणि लोकस्य सृजति प्रभुः । न कर्मफलसंयोगं स्वभावस्तु प्रवर्तते ॥’ (गी. ५-१४) इति । व्याख्यातं च भाष्यकारेण “कस्तर्हि कुर्वन् कारयंश्च प्रवर्तते इति ? उच्यते- ‘स्वभावस्तु प्रवर्तते’ । स्वो भावः स्वभावः, अविद्यालक्षणाप्रकृतिः, माया प्रवर्तते” (गी. ५-१४) इति ॥

यद्यप्येवं ज्ञानी स्वयं मन्येत ‘नाहं शरीरादिसङ्घातवान्, नापि कर्ता भोक्ता वा’ इति, तथापि कथं परैरसौ विज्ञायते ‘जीवन्मुक्तोऽयम्’ इति ?

एतस्य लक्षणम् ‘स्तिथप्रज्ञत्वम्’, ‘युक्तत्वम्’, ‘भक्तत्वम्’, ‘त्रिगुणातीतत्वम्’, इति च भगवद्गीतासु द्वितीयषष्ठद्वादशचतुर्दशेषु अध्यायेषु वर्णितम् । सङ्क्षेपेण तु तस्य समुदाहरिष्यमाणैः श्लोकैरुन्नेतुं शक्यते । अधिकं तु समग्रगीताशास्त्रार्थविचारणादध्यवसेयम् ॥

जीवन्मुक्तो नाम सर्वविधाविद्याकामकर्मबन्धनैर्मुक्तः, सर्वभूतात्मभूतब्रह्मण्येव

स्थितः, सुखदुःखादिद्वन्द्वातीतः- इति गम्यते। एतदेव वेदान्तविज्ञानफलं ‘हृदयग्रन्थिभेदः’, ‘अविद्याग्रन्थिभेद’ इति च परिभाष्यते श्रुतिषु ‘यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः। अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्ध्यनुशासनम् ॥’ (का. २-३-१४,१५), ‘पुरुष एवेदं विश्वं कर्म तपो ब्रह्म परामृतम्। तद्यो वेद निहितं गुहायां सोऽविद्याग्रन्थिं विकिरतीह सोम्य ॥’ (मुं. २-१-१०), ‘भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः। क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावरे ॥’ (मुं. २-२-८) इत्याद्यासु ॥

अत्र च यानि विदुषो जीवन्मुक्तस्य लक्षणान्युच्यन्ते श्रुतिस्मृतिषु, तान्येव परमपुरुषार्थसाधनानि मुमुक्षोः ; तदुक्तम्- “सर्वत्रैव हि अध्यात्मशास्त्रे कृतार्थलक्षणानि यानि, तान्येव साधनान्युपदिश्यन्ते, यत्नसाध्यत्वात्” (गी.भा. २-५५) इति। अतस्त्वमपि श्रुतिस्मृतिप्रकाशितानि मुक्तलक्षणानि मनस्यनुसंधाय तत्साधनानुष्ठानपरो भव ॥

जीवन्मुक्तिर्न गौणी मुक्तिः

३२. किं जीवन्मुक्तव्यवहारानुकरणमेवालं कृतार्थतायै, उत किञ्चिदन्यदपि अवशिष्यते? यतो व्यवहारे द्वैतदर्शनमनुवर्तते एव, द्वैतदर्शनं चाविद्याकृतम्। अतः किं न यत्नान्तरं न कार्यमेव द्वैतादर्शनार्थम्? किञ्च, केचिद् वदन्ति विदेहमुक्तिरेव मुख्या मुक्तिरिति; श्रुतिश्चात्र भवति ‘विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते’ (का.२-२-१) इति। अतो विदेहमुक्तिलाभाय किं यत्नान्तरमास्थेयम्, किं वा जीवन्मुक्तिरेवालम्? इति मे संशयः ॥

न युक्तस्तव संशयः। यतो नास्त्येव वस्तुतः कस्यचिदपि देहेन्द्रियादिः। ‘अशरीरं शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितम्। महान्तम् विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति’ (का. १-२-२२), ‘अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रः’ (मुं. २-१-२), ‘असङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः’ (बृ. ४-३-१५) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः। अविद्याकल्पितनामरूपविकार एव हि देहेन्द्रियसङ्घातो नाम। अत एवावोचम्- जीवतोऽपि विदुषः स्वाभाविकमशरीरत्वमिति। तस्मात्, सशरीरमुक्त्यशरीरमुक्तिविभागो न कर्तव्यः। यत्तु शूयते ‘विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते’ (का. २-२-१), ‘ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति’ (बृ.४-४-६) इत्यदिस्थलेषु, तत्र व्यावहारिकदृष्ट्या सशरीरत्वमुररीकृत्य विदेहमुक्त्युपदेशः क्रियते इति बोध्यम्। सदा मुक्त एव सन् विद्याप्रभावादविद्यादिभ्यो विमुक्तो भूत्वा विमुच्यते, पुनः शरीरं न गृह्णातीत्यभिप्रायः। तदुक्तं बृहदारण्यकभाष्ये “न हि तस्य अब्रह्मत्वपरिच्छेदहेतवः कामाः सन्ति। तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति, न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम्। न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः, जीवतोऽन्यो

15. मोक्षस्वरूपम्-जीवन्मुक्तिः

भावः; देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते। भावान्तरापत्तौ हि मोक्षस्य सर्वोपनिषद्विवक्षितोऽर्थः आत्मैकत्वाख्यः स बाधितो भवेत्; कर्महेतुकश्च मोक्षः प्राप्नोति न ज्ञाननिमित्तः- इति ॥” (बृ.भा. ४-४-६) इति ॥

यत्पुनरात्थ, व्यवहारे दैतदर्शनमनुवर्तते; द्वैतदर्शनं चाविद्याकृतम्-इति। नैष दोषः। विदुषो दृष्ट्या द्वैतदर्शनाभावात्, ' यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत् '(बृ. ४-५-१५) इति श्रुतेः। लौकिकव्यवहारदृष्ट्या यद्यपि सशरीरत्वं सेन्द्रियत्वं चास्त्येव, तथापि द्वैतदर्शनहेतोर्मिथ्याज्ञानस्य बाधितस्यैवानुवृत्तेः, न तेन जीवन्मुक्तिबाधः स्यात्। यथोक्तं भाष्ये ' अकर्त्रात्मबोधोऽपि हि मिथ्याज्ञानबाधनेन कर्माण्युच्छिनत्ति; बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कञ्चित् कालमनुवर्तते एव '(सू.भा ४-१-१५) इति। तस्मात्, बाधितमिथ्याज्ञानस्य तत्कृतद्वैतदर्शनाभासस्य च व्यवहारदृष्ट्या अनुवर्तनेऽपि न कोऽपि दोषः। न चेदं बाधितानुवृत्तं मिथ्याज्ञानं वास्तविकाविद्यालेशः, येन तत्कृतो बन्धशेषोऽप्यनुवृत्तः शङ्क्येत। तस्मात्, जीवन्मुक्तो व्यवहारे द्वैतं पश्यन्नपि न तथ्यतः पश्यति, कर्माणि कुर्वन्नपि न करोतीत्येव सिद्धान्तः। तथा ह्युक्तं गीताभाष्ये "विद्वांस्तु पुनर्विद्यया अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां शक्नोत्येवाशेषतः कर्म परित्यक्तुम्, अविद्याधारोपितस्य शेषानुपपत्तेः। न हि तैमिरिकदृष्ट्या अध्यारोपितस्य द्विचन्द्रादेः, तिमिरापगमे शेषोऽवतिष्ठते। एवं च सतीदं वचनमुपपन्नम् ' सर्वकर्माणि मनसा ' (गी. ५-१३) इत्यादि, ' स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरः ' (गी. १८-४५), ' स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ' (गी.१८-४६)-इति च ॥

अन्यत्राप्युक्तम्-

सुषुप्तवज्जाग्रति यो न पश्यति द्वयं च पश्यन्नपि चाद्वयत्वतः।

तथा च कुर्वन्नपि निष्क्रियश्च यः स आत्मविन्नान्य इतीह निश्चयः ॥

उ.सा १०-१३ इति ॥

तस्मात्, ज्ञानसमकाल एव या मुक्तिः सैव मुख्या मुक्तिः, विदेहमुक्तिस्तु देहान्तराप्राप्त्यपेक्षया मुक्तिरित्युपचर्यते। एतत् सर्वं व्यवहारदृष्ट्या। परमार्थतस्तु बन्धमोक्षव्यवहारोपि नास्ति कश्चिदभ्युपगतो वेदान्ते। तथाभ्युपगमे ह्यात्मनः बद्धावस्था, मुक्तावस्था चेति द्वे अवस्थे वास्तविके भवत इति विक्रियावान् स्यात् आत्मा, अनित्यश्च; तच्चनिष्टम्। तथा ह्याहुरभियुक्ताः-

न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ गौ.का. २-३२

इति ॥

वेदान्तप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा-पृ. ५२२

अविद्यालेशस्य तत्संस्कारस्य च वा जीवन्मुक्तेऽङ्गीकर्तृभिः सर्वैरप्यद्वैतिभिर्व्यवहारदृष्ट्यैव तदभ्युपगम्यत इति स्पष्टम् । तत्र संस्कारपक्ष एव ज्यायानिति श्लिष्यते । अन्यथा ह्यज्ञानं ज्ञानेन बाध्यमेव ज्ञानेनैव च बाध्यमिति सर्वसंप्रतिपन्नो नियमो भज्येत । जीवन्मुक्ते ज्ञानेन सहाप्यज्ञानानुवृत्त्यङ्गीकारात्, स्वयमेव विनाशाङ्गीकारप्रसङ्गाच्चाज्ञानस्य । वाक्यप्रामाण्याच्छ्रद्धामात्रगम्यश्च स्यात् आत्यन्तिकाविद्यामोक्षः आ शरीरधारणमज्ञानलेशानुवृत्त्यभ्युपगमात् इति स्फुटम् । अत एव भाष्यकारैरुक्तम्-

बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कञ्चित् कालमनुवर्तते एव । अपि च नैवात्र विवदितव्यं ब्रह्मविदा कञ्चित्कालं शरीरं ध्रियते न वा ध्रियत इति । कथं ह्येकस्य स्वहृदयप्रत्ययं ब्रह्मवेदनं देहधारणं च अपरेण प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्येत । सू.भा. ४-१-१५

[अत्र मिथ्याज्ञानं बाधितम् इति वचनात्, न मिथ्याज्ञानशेषः, समर्थक्रियाकारि-मिथ्याज्ञानसंस्कारशेषो वा अभ्युपगम्यते तत्रभवता आचार्येण, किं तु तदाभासानुवृत्तिरेव निश्चितशुक्तितत्त्वस्यापि रजताभासानुवृत्तिवत् । बाधितप्रतीत्यनुवृत्त्या हि प्रत्येतुर्न कश्चिदुपकारोऽपकारो वेति । एवं शरीरधारणमपि बाधित एवेति गम्यते । एतच्चाध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियानुगुणम् । तदाभासानुवृत्तिरेवेति मिथ्याज्ञानानुवृत्तिमध्यारोप्य शरीरधारणादिप्रतीतेः प्रारब्धकर्माभासप्रयुक्तत्वोपपादनात्, तात्त्विकशरीरानुवृत्त्याद्यपवादात् । तस्य बाधिततत्वोक्त्या मिथ्याज्ञानानुवृत्तेरप्यवादाच्च ।]

सुगमा- पृ. ११६

ननु - विदुषामपि द्वैतप्रपञ्चो भासते न वा ? भासते चेत्तेषां का विद्वत्ता ? न भासते चेत्, कथं सम्प्रदायप्रवर्तकाचार्यभावत्वम् ? अथ प्रारब्धकर्मशेषेण तत्फलभोगार्थं द्वैतानुवृत्तिः स्वीक्रियेत । तदा

तदाक्षिप्ताविद्यालेशोऽप्यवश्यमाक्षिप्येत। तथा च विद्वत्त्वमविद्वत्त्वं चैकस्यैव पुरुषस्य सह भवेताम्। तदेवं सर्वथाप्यसमञ्जसैवेयं प्रक्रिया भातीति चेत्। न। प्रारब्धकर्मशेषेण बाधितद्वैतप्रतिभासस्यैव द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवदनुवृत्तिरिति प्रागेवाऽऽवेदितत्वात्। अविद्यालेशस्त्वनभ्युपगमादेव निरस्तः। का तर्हि द्वैतज्ञानस्य विदुष्यप्यनुवर्तमानस्य गतिः ? न हि द्वैतज्ञानं विना गुरुशिष्यादिव्यवहारः सेत्स्यतीति चेत्। बाधितानुवृत्तिरेव गतिः। उक्तं हि बृहदारण्यकभाष्ये - “न च विपरीतप्रत्ययो विद्यावत् उत्पद्यते। निर्विषयत्वात्। अनवधृतविषयविशेषस्वरूपं हि सामान्यमात्रमाश्रित्य विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यमान उत्पद्यते, यथा शुक्तिकायां रजतमिति। स च विषयविशेषाधारणवतोऽशेषविपरीत-प्रत्ययाश्रयस्योपमर्दितत्वान्न पूर्ववत् संभवति। शुक्तिकादौ सम्यक्प्रत्ययोत्पत्तौ पुनरदर्शनात्। क्वचित्तु विद्यायाः पूर्वोत्पन्नविपरीतप्रत्ययजनितसंस्कारेभ्यो विपरीतप्रत्ययावभासाः स्मृतयो जायमाना विपरीतप्रत्ययभ्रान्तिमकस्मात् कुर्वन्ति। यथा विज्ञातदिग्विभागस्याप्यकस्माद्दिग्विपर्यय-भ्रमः। सम्यग्ज्ञानवतोऽपि चेत् विपरीतप्रत्यय उत्पद्यते, सम्यग्ज्ञानेऽप्यविस्रम्भात् शास्त्रार्थविज्ञानादौ प्रवृत्तिरसमञ्जसा स्यात्। सर्वं च प्रमाणमप्रमाणं संपद्येत, प्रमाणाप्रमाणयोर्विशेषानुपपत्तेः” (बृ. भा. १-४-१०, भा.भा १७३) इति ॥

ननु चैवं बाधकेन ज्ञानेन भेदज्ञानकारणस्यानाद्यज्ञानस्य सर्वथा विनष्टत्वात् कथं भेदज्ञानानुवृत्तिः ? तदभावे च कथं शिष्येभ्यस्तत्त्वज्ञानोपदेशः ? तदनुवृत्तौ स्वयमज्ञस्य कथमाचार्यत्वम्? बाधितानुवृत्तिस्वीकारेऽपि कथं मिथ्याविषयत्वनिश्चये सत्युपदेशाय प्रवृत्तिः? कथं च नित्यनिवृत्ताज्ञानस्य भगवतोऽर्जुनं प्रति गीतोपदेशः ? तस्माद्विद्याविद्यास्वरूपविभागोऽयमसमञ्जस एवेति नः प्रतिभातीति चेत्। अत्र प्रष्टव्यो भवान्। किं द्वैतसत्यत्वबाधकमद्वैत-ज्ञानमङ्गीकृत्येदं प्रश्नजालं प्रतायतेऽथवा अनभ्युपगम्येति। तत्र प्रथमे कल्पे तावन्न प्रश्नो नापि चोत्तरम्। न ह्यद्वितीयतत्त्वज्ञाने सति पुनरपि किञ्चिच्चोद्यं भवति। द्वितीये तु कल्पेऽज्ञदृष्ट्या सर्वोऽप्ययं व्यवहारोऽवकल्पत एवेति न कस्यचिदाक्षेपस्यावकाशः। न ह्यद्वैतसिद्धान्ते ज्ञानोत्पत्त्य-ज्ञानबाधगुरुशिष्यभेदोपदेशादिकं परमार्थ इत्यभ्युगम्यते प्रपञ्जसद्भावतन्निवृत्ती वा पारमार्थिके इति। द्वैतज्ञानसन्दूषितचित्तानां तु शिष्याणां क्रमेण बोधनायेदं सर्वं प्रक्रियारचनमिति नात्र किञ्चिदसमञ्जस्यम्। यथाऽऽह भगवान् भाष्यकारः - “एकस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि निरुपाधिके नोपदेशो नोपदेष्टा न चोपदेशग्रहणफलम्” (बृ. भा. २-१-२० भा.भा. ३२६) इति।



English Section

Invited papers-	1-74
Excerpts from Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji's Books.	75-171
Appendix	172-188

Authors of English Papers



Sri V Subrahmanian



Sri Shyam Subramanian



Smt. S Hemalatha




Sri Subhanu Saxena




Sri Swami Kaivalyananda




Sri Chittaranjan Naik



Sri Vidyasankar Sundaresan




Sri Atmachaitanya



Sri V Krishnamurthy



Sri K S Ramanatha Sharma



Sri S N Sastri

Contents

Invited Papers in English

The Nature of Avidyā - अविद्यास्वरूपम्.....	1
V.Subrahmanian	
The Nature of Māyā - Māyā-Svarupam.....	11
Shyam Subramanian	
Śāstra-Prāmāṇyam	18
S. Hemalatha.	
Vidyā Daśakaṃ - विद्यादशकम्.....	24
Subhanu Saxena	
Adhyārōpa-Apavāda Superimposition and Negation.....	29
Sri Swami Kaivalyananda.	
Cause And Effect In The Light Of Adhyārōpa Apavāda.....	31
Chittaranjan Naik.	
How Does An Analysis Of Avasthātraya Help In Self-Knowledge?.....	44
Vidyasankar Sundaresan	
An Examination Of The Three States Avasthātraya Parīkṣā	49
Atmachaitanya	
Successive Negation Of The Five Kōśas Leads To The Absolute	53
Professor V. Krishnamurthy	
Immediate Means To Self Knowledge: Śravaṇa, Manana and Nididhyāsana	60
K.S.Ramanatha Sharma	
The Nature Of Liberation And The Characteristics Of The Liberated	70
S.N.Sastri	

Exerpts from Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji's Book

01. The Method of Adhyārōpa and Apavāda	77
---	----

From the Book How To Recognise The Method Of Vedānta, Section 3 (Pages 29-35).....	77
From the book Śuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara, (Chapter 4, The Method Of Śāṅkara Vedānta, paras 24 and 25)	80
02. Two Standpoints: Empirical and Real	84
From the Book Clarifications of Certain Vedāntic Concepts: Chapter 7: The Empirical and Transcendental Views'	84
From the Book Shuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara, Section 6	87
From the Book Misconceptions About Śāṅkara, Paragraph 16.....	87
From Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijna-Introduction: Sub-sections 1 and 2 of Section IV, The Two Standpoints.....	87
03. The Nature Of Vidyā And Avidyā; And The Way Of Removing Avidyā	92
From the Book 'Śāṅkara's Clarification of Certain Vedāntic Concepts', Chapter 2.	94
04. Origination of apparent things	97
From the Book Vedāntins Meet: (From the Section: An Appeal to Thoughtful Vedāntins) Points to be settled:	97
From Vedāntins Meet: Introduction	98
05. Māyā Nature	99
From the Book Śāṅkaras Clarification of Certain Vedāntic Concepts: Chapter 3, Creation, māyā and Causation. Paragraphs- 12-14.	99
From the Book Essays on Vedānta:	101
From the Book Vedāntins meet : Introduction, paras 5, 8.	105
06. Śāstra Pramāṇyam	108
From the Book Śāṅkara's Clarification Of Certain Vedāntic Concepts	108
From the Book Śuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara	113
07. What is Anubhava.....	117
From the Book Intuition of Reality -	117
Chapter 5: INTUITION AND REASON SUBSERVIENT TO IT	123
08. Anvaya Vyatireka; Tarka Nature	127
From the Book Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ Kleshāpahāriṇī vyākhyāsaḥitā, Introduction:	127
From the Book Salient Features of Śāṅkara's Vedānta.....	127
09. The Nature Of The Self In The Deep Sleep.....	133

From the Book Misconceptions About Śaṅkara.	133
From the Book Intuition of Reality, Section 4 of Chapter 5	136
10. Discrimination Of Three States	137
From the Book Salient Features Of Śaṅkara's Vedānta	137
11. The Method Of Cause And Effect	144
From the Book Śuddha Śaṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara: Chapter 5.	144
From the Book Taittirīya Bhāshyārtha Vimarshinī, Introduction	146
12. The Method Of Five Kōśas	148
From the Book Taittirīya Bhāshyārtha Vimarshinī. Introduction	148
13. Śravaṇa Manana Nidhidhyāsana.....	149
From the Book Salient Features of Śaṅkara's Vedānta, Appendix.	149
From the Book Vision of Ātman	154
14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.....	161
From the Book Essays on Vedānta.	161
From the Book Misconceptions about Śaṅkara:	167
From The Upanishadic Approach to Reality: Chapter 7, Section 11.....	168
From the Book Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijñā (Introduction, Section 7, subsection 4 on Maṇḍana)	170
Appendix: Bhāshya Vākyas related to the topics भाष्यवाक्यानि विषयसंबद्धानि	175-

The Nature of Avidyā - अविद्यास्वरूपम्

V.Subrahmanian

The author Sri Subbu was born in 1956 in Bangalore, India, and graduated in Commerce and worked for the Reserve Bank of India, Bangalore until 1995. He was taught the Advaita Vedanta by a traditionally trained Vedantin, Professor D.S. Subbaramaiya of Central College, Bangalore. Being devoted to the Sringeri Sharada Peetham, Sri Subbu now spends time in sadhana and Vedantic study. His email id: subrahmanian_v@yahoo.com

श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः

In Advaita Vedānta the prime position is occupied by the discussions on the manner in which the jīva is bound, bandha, the method of getting released, moksha and the Knowledge, vidyā that brings about moksha. In the sequel a brief survey of the Āchārya Bhagavatpāda Śaṅkara's Bhāshya is made in order to bring out certain features of 'bandha' (avidyā) .

Avidyā is ignorance. What does this mean? In the adhyāsa Bhāshya the Āchārya has said:

१. तमेतं एवंलक्षणमध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते। तद्विवेकेन वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः।

(This superimposition of the stated nature is called 'ignorance' by the knowers. The determining of the real thing there, by discrimination, they call 'knowledge'.)

A little later, in this document itself He says:

२. अध्यासो नाम अतस्मिन्स्तद्बुद्धिरिति अवोचाम।

(superimposition is verily knowing one thing as another)

Now, here it appears that the Āchārya has given a definition of avidyā. In simple terms avidyā = adhyāsa. Adhyāsa is normally translated as 'misapprehension', wrong cognition, viparīta pratipatti, etc. The main idea is that adhyāsa means seeing/mistaking one thing in the place of another. For example: Mistaking nacre to be silver. This is not the only place the Āchārya has told us what He means by avidyā. For example in the Bhagavadgītā Bhāshyam (13.2) He says:

३ (१) तामसो हि प्रत्ययः आवरणात्मकत्वात् अविद्या विपरीतग्राहकः, संशयोपस्थापको वा अग्रहणात्मको

वा..

(Since ignorance has the nature of covering, it is indeed a notion born of tamas; it makes one perceive contrarily, or it arouses doubt, or it leads to non-perception.)

Here itself, in a subsequent sentence He says:

३ (२) तामसे च आवरणात्मके तिमिरादिदोषे सति अग्रहणादेः अविद्यात्रयस्य उपलब्धेः

(When there is present the enveloping ignorance of the nature of a defect, the three manifestations of avidyā namely non-apprehension and the like are experienced.)

In the Maṅḍūkya Kārikā Bhāshya (I.16) Bhagavatpāda says:

४. तत्त्व-अप्रतिबोधरूपेण बीजात्मना, अन्यथाग्रहणलक्षणेन च, अनादिकालप्रवृत्तेन मायालक्षणेन... ॥

(as the nature of a seed that is characterized by non-apprehension of the Truth, and wrong-apprehension that is coming down from beginningless time as of the nature of māyā...)

In the Brhadāranyakōpanishad Bhāshya (I.iv.10) He writes:

५. अतो ब्रह्मविद्यायां सत्यां अविद्याकार्य-अनुपपत्तेः, प्रदीप इव तमःकार्यस्य ।

[Therefore, when the knowledge of Brahman is present, there is no reason why the effects of avidyā should remain, even as the effects of darkness no longer remain when a lamp is lit.]

In the Brhadāranyakōpanishad Bhāshya (I.iv.16) He writes:

६. वस्तुस्वरूपावरणात्मिका हि सा । प्रवर्तकबीजं तु प्रतिपद्यते अन्धत्वमिव गर्तादिपतनप्रवृत्तिहेतुः ।... स्वाभाविक्यां अविद्यायां वर्तमाना बालाः...

[Avidyā is of the nature of enveloping the true nature of the Thing, Brahman. One, however, does encounter the seed that propels man to action, just as effects such as falling in a pit are the effects propelled by darkness. Immature people continue in ignorance that is natural...]

A little later in this very Bhāshyam (1.4.17) He says:

७. स्वाभाविक्या स्वात्मनि कर्त्रादिकारकक्रियाफलात्मकता-अध्यारोपणलक्षणया अविद्यावासनया वासितः सोऽकामयत कामितवान् ।

[Being tinged by the impressions of ignorance that are natural to one and consist in a superimposition on the Self the ideas of action, its factors such as agent, and its results, he desired.]

In the Bhāshyam for the Gītā verse 15.3 we find a separation made by the Āchārya between avidyā-effect (vikshepa śakti) and avidyā-cause (āvaraṇa śakti): While describing the saṁsāra tree, He says: न रूपमस्य इह.....स्वप्न-मरीच्युदक-माया-गन्धर्वनगर-

समत्वात्...[This is the standard 'manifest' form of avidyā clearly bringing out the अतस्मिन् तद्बुद्धिः definition of adhyāsa. It is this that is popularly termed as 'vikshepa shakti' of avidyā.] The Āchārya concludes this Bhāshyam by saying 'असङ्गशस्त्रेण च्छित्त्वा संसारवृक्षं सबीजं उद्दृत्य'..'['by the sword of detachment having cut the saṁsāra-tree along with its seed/cause'] . Here He says that the saṁsāra tree seen in all its manifest form (adhyāsa/vikshepa) is to be cut along with its root/bījam.

Actually, the word 'mūlam' translates to 'root'/cause, etc. The Gītā context is: 'the saṁsāra tree, the product of the primordial ignorance, mūlam avidyā, has to be 'uprooted' in order to gain liberation.' (ऊर्ध्वमूलं...सुविरुद्धमूलम्). This brings out the special significance of the Bhāshyam: sa-bījam.. This bījam is the cause of the adhyāsa/vikshepa and is what is called 'āvaraṇa '. Thus, it is only based on the Āchārya's statements regarding avidyā, āvaraṇa, adhyāsa, tamas, bījam, mūlam, shakti, etc., spread across the prasthāna traya Bhāshyas that the later Advaita Ācāryas have talked about the Āvaraṇa (concealing) shakti and the Vikshepa (projecting/multiplicating) shakti as pertaining to ajñāna.]

In the 'Upadesha sāhasrī', a work agreed to be genuinely of the Āchārya, we find the use of the word 'vikshepa' in the verse XIII.14. The word 'bījam' is used in the verses: XVII.26,27,28.

This list of quotes from the Āchārya's Bhāshya works mainly, which obviously shows a variety of meanings/senses for the word 'avidyā', tells us that it would be improper to conclude that 'the Āchārya has given a complete and comprehensive definition of avidyā in the adhyāsa Bhāshya by saying that the term 'avidyā' connotes adhyāsa alone' by considering the adhyāsa Bhāshya in isolation.

That the above supposed view of Bhagavatpāda can be seen to be questionable from looking at the quote no.3. Here we find that the Āchārya is mentioning adhyāsa (viparīta-grahaṇam) as only one of the three manifestations of avidyā. Quite interestingly, the Āchārya restricts the meaning of adhyāsa to viparīta-grahaṇa in the quote no.2 above. This leaves us with a strict definition for adhyāsa (= mis-apprehension) and frees the term adhyāsa from over-pervading into the senses of agrahaṇam (non-apprehension) and samśaya (doubt). Thus, according to the Āchārya avidyā can mean three things: 1. agrahaṇam 2. viparītagrahaṇam and 3. samśaya. All these are grouped under 'tāmasa pratyayas'.

Generally tamas is avidyā, ignorance. The word 'Āvaraṇātmatvāt' is also interesting. It says that tamas has the power to cover/conceal/envelop. He reiterates this idea in quote 3 (2). This meaning is brought out by Him specifically in the quote no.6 where He says that avidyā has the power to conceal the true nature of the object/vishaya under consideration. It is only when this is present the 'atasmin tad buddhirūpa adhyāsa' takes place. Hence, avidyā does not mean only adhyāsa/anyathāgrahaṇa/aviveka. The quote no. 6 too conveys this very meaning. He differentiates between avidyā and its effect and gives the analogy of tamas, darkness, the Āvaraṇātmatka, and its effect namely getting into problems, in other

words, atasmin tad buddhiḥ (taking one thing for the other).

The quote no.4 gives another dimension to avidyā. It says it is anādi. It also says that it is of the nature of a seed: bījātmanā. What is the seed He is referring to here? A seed is something that has the potency to give rise to some effect. Here māyā is the seed and it works in two ways:

1.The tattva/svarūpa (of Ātman/Brahman) is concealed resulting in agrahanam, non-apprehension.

2. This results in anyathāgrahaṇam (adhyāsa).

The initial agrahaṇam results in anyathāgrahaṇam and this result begets further results of saṁsāra continuing birth after birth. This creates a vāsana (see quote no.7) which results in further and further saṁsāric experiences in multiple births. In and through all this the basic agrahaṇam is kept intact. The quote no.6 demonstrates this.

The Āchārya compares avidyā to andhatva, impairment of vision, blindness. When a person is blind, he does not know what is in front and he is bound to fall in a pit. The meaning is clear: andhatva is the cause for agrahanam which is the cause for falling in a pit which is anyathāgrahaṇam and its effects. Thus there is an avidyā-paramparā and this is anādi. For all that results in a series from anyathāgrahaṇam which the Āchārya specifies in the quote no. 7 स्वाभाविक्या स्वात्मनि कर्त्रादिकारकक्रियाफलात्मकता-अध्यारोपणलक्षणया अविद्यावासनया वासितः as the basic andhatvam, tattva-agrahanam, as the cause. Thus we can clearly see a 'causal' Avidyā and a 'resultant' avidyā being admitted by the Āchārya.

A reference to this is made by the Āchārya in His Maṇḍūkya Kārikā Bhāshya (I.2):The discussion starts with the words of the Bhāshya: 'कथं प्राणशब्दत्वं आत्मनः?' He goes on to say: 'यद्यपिसद्ब्रह्म प्राणशब्दवाच्यं तत्र (in the Chāndōgya 6.8.2 mantra 'प्राणबन्धनं हि सोम्य मनः' तथापि जीवप्रसववीजात्मकत्वम् अपरित्यजैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतःयदि हि निर्बीजरूपं विवक्षितं ब्रह्म अभविष्यत् 'नेति नेति' ...इत्यवैक्ष्यत्। (pl. read the entire discussion for a clear understanding of the Āchārya's position regarding the persistence of Avidyā in deep sleep.) He says: If we do not admit the persistence of avidyā in deep sleep, there will be the absurd consequence of those who enter suṣṭi/pralaya emerging from those states (since they are wrongly admitted to be merged in the Sat, Brahman, the rule being: He who has merged in the Sat does not return to saṁsāra, 'यद्गत्वा न निवर्तन्ते' -Bh. Gītā 15.6). And the mukta-s are to face the consequence of coming out of Brahman and entering saṁsāra, since the absence of the avidyā-bīja will be common to the mukta-s and baddha-s during sleep. He concludes the discussion by declaring: "तस्मात् सबीजत्व-अभ्युपगमेनैव सतः प्राणत्वव्यपदेशः सर्वश्रुतिषु च कारणत्वव्यपदेशः।" [In all the Śruti passages, therefore, Existence has been referred to as 'prāṇa' ONLY after admitting its seeded (सोपाधिक) nature. So also all references to the causehood of Existence.] Thus, the Āchārya admits of a state of avidyā/māyā-tainted Brahman which is the causal state.

One more thing is discernible from the above study. The Āchārya says avidyā-lakṣhaṇa to be (quote no.4.) (1)tattva-apratibōdha-rūpeṇa bījātmanā [the (seeded) ignorance about the Reality] , AND (2) anyathāgrahaṇalakṣhaṇena ca, anādikālapravṛttena Māyalakṣhaṇena....[of the nature of wrong cognition...having been in existence from beginningless time and of the nature of māyā..]

This brings us to the conclusion that avidyā is not adhyāsa (taking one thing for the other) ALONE but it ALSO is tattva agrahaṇa (not knowing the Truth). It is clear from the above quotes that adhyāsa HAS A CAUSE and that is tattva agrahaṇa. This is of the nature of concealing, Āvaraṇātmaka. The Āchārya admits an āvaraṇātmaka cause that precedes adhyāsa. This has been pointed out by the Ratnaprabha commentary on the Adhyāsa Bhāshya for the quote no.1. The commentary says that here the Āchārya is specifying 'kārya-avidyā'. This implies that there is a 'kāraṇa avidyā'. And that, we saw above, is admitted by the Āchārya.

सर्वज्ञस्य ईश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इव अविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यां अनिर्वचनीये, संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते, सर्वज्ञस्य-ईश्वरस्य मायाशक्तिः, प्रकृतिः इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरुपलभ्येते। ताभ्यामन्यः ईश्वरः....एवमविद्याकृतनामरूपोपाध्यनुरोधी ईश्वरो भवति, व्योमेव घटकरकाद्युपाध्यनुरोधि। स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयान् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापित-नामरूपकृत-कार्यकरणसंघातानुरोधिनः जीवाख्यानं विज्ञानात्मनः प्रति ईष्टे व्यवहारविषये। (२.१.१४)

Belonging to the Self, as it were, of the omniscient Lord, there are name and form, the figments of Nescience, not to be defined either as being (i.e. Brahman), nor as different from it, the germs of the entire expanse of the phenomenal world, called in Śruti and Smṛti the illusion (māyā), power (śaktī), or nature (prakṛti) of the omniscient Lord. Different from them is the omniscient Lord himself, as we learn from scriptural passages such as the following, 'He who is called ether is the revealer of all forms and names; that within which these forms and names are contained is Brahman' (Ch. Up. VIII, 14, 1); 'Let me evolve names and forms' (Ch. Up. VI, 3, 2); 'He, the wise one, who having divided all forms and given all names, sits speaking (with those names)' (Taitt. Ār. III, 12, 7); 'He who makes the one seed manifold' (Śve. Up. VI, 12).--Thus the Lord depends (as Lord) upon the limiting adjuncts of name and form, the products of Nescience; just as the universal ether depends (as limited ether, such as the ether of a jar, &c.) upon the limiting adjuncts in the shape of jars, pots, &c. He (the Lord) stands in the realm of the phenomenal in the relation of a ruler to the so-called jīvas (individual souls) or cognitional Selves (vijñānātman), which indeed are one with his own Self--just as the portions of ether enclosed in jars and the like are one with the universal ether--but are limited by aggregates of instruments of action (i.e. bodies) produced from name and form, the presentations of Nescience.

The scheme of jīva, jagat and Īshwara and Brahman as essentially brought out by Śāṅkara is as follows:

1. By Avidyā, names and forms are projected.

2A. Names and forms form the basis/seed/material for the principle called Īshwara. Names and forms cannot be said to be different from Īshwara as they are ‘nothing’ without the sentience and existence borrowed from Īshwara. Nor can they be said to be the ‘same’ as Īshwara as that would render Īshwara insentient. Being thus inexplicable, anirvacanīya, they form the seed for the saṃsāra of the jīvas and the prapañcha, the world of experience. The word ‘Māyāśaktiḥ’ of the Bhāshyam implies that it is non-different from avidyā, the cause of saṃskāra-s that form the material for Īshwara to engage in creation, etc.

2 B. Names and forms form the basis/seed for the principle called ‘jīva’. These names and forms are a product of avidyā.

3. ‘Īshwara’ is the one that is ‘associated’ with the avidyā-created name-form upādhi.

4. ‘jīva’ is non-different from Īshwara, and is conditioned by avidyā-created, name-form created body-mind apparatus upādhi.

5. Thus Īshwara and jīva have the same avidyā-created upādhis, with a distinction in the nature of upādhis: For Īshwara the śakti is the collective saṃskāras (of all jīva-s) created by avidyā, non-different from māyā, prakṛti, etc. as different names found in the scriptures.

6. Ātman is the locus where the avidyā, avidyā-created upādhi-s rest. When vidyā is secured, it destroys all the upādhi-s and Ātman is known to be ever-free of upādhi-s, both of Īshwara and jīva.

7. The Scriptures temporarily adopt the परिणामवाद-प्रक्रिया, the scheme/method of the pariṇāmavāda, only with the objective of enabling the jīva to engage in karma yōga and upāsanā. This would be possible only when creation of the world is spoken of, Īshwara, the Creator, is specified and Īshwara’s role in the creation, maintenance, etc. Once the purpose of cultivating/preparing the mind is accomplished, the jīva comes to appreciate the upādhi-free Ātman, free of creation, free of Īshwara and jīva upādhi-s. The Ratnaprabha quotes a verse in this connection: कृपणधीः परिणाममुदीक्षते क्षयितकल्मषधीस्तु विवर्तताम् (source not provided). [‘The unprepared aspirant understands only the ‘creation, transformation’ scheme whereas the one who has purified his mind of all dross is able to appreciate the ‘transfiguration’ vivarta of Ātman/Brahman as appearing as the world and jīva-s.’]

8. Śāṅkara does not say ‘avidyā has created māyā’. He only says avidyā has projected names and forms. It is only the Veda that gives the term māyā / avyakta / prakṛti and so on to that power Īshwara uses for creation and managing the creation. Śāṅkara only alludes to this saying that this avidyā-created names and forms are named māyāśakti, etc. by the Śruti. By this much it would be incorrect to conclude that Śāṅkara has treated māyā as a figment of avidyā.

9. It could be contended that ‘since names and forms are called māyā by the śruti and alluded so by Śāṅkara, names and forms themselves could be treated as māyā and in that way why can’t we hold māyā to be a figment of avidyā?’ The reply

to this is: By this same logic, what is wrong in treating māyā as non-different from avidyā since as per the above contention 'māyā is a figment of avidyā'? After all, Śāṅkara has strongly held that the effect, kāryam, is non-different from its cause, kāraṇam. That way māyā is non-different from avidyā indeed.

10. As the study of the Bhāshyam quotes reveal and as the general method of the Upanishads as taught by Gauḍapādācārya and Śāṅkarācārya make it clear, the Upanishads/Smṛti initially talks about the creation and the created world and jīva-s as distinct entities and Īshwara as a distinct All-powerful Creator. In this stage the Upanishads have to maintain that Īshwara's power is māyā/avyakta/avyakṛta and jīva-s' conditioning power is avidyā. From the Bhāshyam (2.1.14) quote we saw above, it is clear that Śāṅkara alludes to this and thereby uses the term: नामरूपे ...संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते.

Here we see Śāṅkara mentioning that the nāma-rūpa combine is responsible for 1. Samsāra which is the jīva-s 'creation' and 2. Prapañcha which is Īshwara's creation.

Elsewhere in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka mantra and Bhāshya we learn that the jīva, owing to avidyā and kāma (ignorance and desire) engages in karma and accumulates apūrvā, saṃskāras. This forms the stock material for Īshwara to provide the jīva with the 'appropriate' prapañcha consisting of the names and forms. We can see here that the jīva creates his saṃskāras and Īshwara provides the appropriate prapañcha for further bhoga and further karma. In this way, avidyā of the jīva provides the material for Īshwara's creation. We are able to immediately appreciate that avidyā-created saṃsāra is non-different from mayashakti, the material for prapañcha.

11. If it is held that avidyā, the power that conditions jīva and makes him subordinate to it, 'creates' māyā, the power of Īshwara who wields it to create the world, etc., a question arises thus: How can the durbala/daurbalya-creating avidyā (for the jīva) ever bring about a mahābala, great power called māyā śakti of Īshwara? It would be most appropriate, therefore, to hold that one Śakti itself is called, owing to upādhi, avidyā with respect to the jīva and māyā with respect to Īshwara.

12. Accordingly, the terms 'avidyā', 'māyā', etc. are all used only in the state of bondage, vyavahāra. Their synonymity and functional difference is also maintained only in this realm. From the Absolute, Pāramārthika, standpoint, however, no words obtain.

Is avidyā an 'existent' entity, 'bhāva rūpa' ?

A straightforward commonsense answer to the above question is: If it is not, the Śāstram would not be prescribing means for its eradication. No one would be spending time, effort and money to treat a diseased hare's horn. The very fact that avidyā is to be consciously addressed by sādhakas is itself proof of the Śāstram

considering avidyā as an existing entity. It is given an ‘asti, bhāva’ status, although not that which is equal to Brahman the pāramārthika Sat. In the Maṇḍūkya Kārikā Bhāshya (I.2) that we have already seen above, the Āchārya says:

ज्ञानदाह्यवीजाभावे च ज्ञानानर्थक्यप्रसङ्गः। [If there is no seed at all that has to be burnt by Knowledge, the very purpose of Atma jñāna taught in the Śruti is a waste.] The word ‘abhāve’ in vyatireka mode in the Bhāshya is the proof of the Bhāshyakāra considering, implicitly, the avidyā that is dispelled by knowledge to be bhāvarūpa. The jñānadāhya bīja avidyā is bhāvarūpa for the Bhāshyakāra.

‘jñāna abhava’, absence of knowledge, cannot bring out a bhāva vastu, saṃsāra, as its effect. Avidyā produces its effect, saṃsāra. Śāṅkara has criticized the proposal of ‘abhāvāt bhāvotpattiḥ’ (an existent entity arising out of non-existence) in several places across the prasthānatraya Bhāshya. For example, in the The Taittiriya Upanishad Bhāshyam for the very introduction of the Upanishad He says:

Besides the non-performance of obligatory duties is a negation, abhāva, from which an evil consequence cannot reasonably follow... there will emerge a positive entity (bhāva padārtha) from a non-entity, which fact will nullify all means of valid knowledge.

Also at the end of the Bhāshyam for the Bhagavadgītā 4.28 the Āchārya makes this comment. It can easily be seen that even though the ‘effect’ Śāṅkarācārya is referring here belongs to the vyāvahārika reality only, still He objects to even such a ‘positive’ effect emerging from any ‘abhāva.’ That makes it very clear that the Āchārya does not admit of any ‘jñāna abhāva’ as the cause for the ādhyāsika prapancha even though such a prapancha enjoys only a vyāvahārika satya.

For the mantra ‘utthiṣṭhata jāgrata prāpya varān nibodhata...’ of the Kathopanishad (I.iii.14) the Āchārya writes:

....अतः तद्दर्शनार्थं अनाद्यविद्याप्रसुप्ता उत्तिष्ठत हे जन्तव आत्मज्ञानाभिमुखा भवत, जाग्रत अज्ञाननिद्राया घोररूपाया सर्वानर्थबीजभूतायाः क्षयं कुरुत।

The gist of the above is:

Therefore with a view to have the vision of the Truth, ye who are immersed in the avidyā-caused sleep (that has no beginning)...wake up...uproot the terrible ajñāna that has given rise to all evil effects..

The Muṇḍakōpanishat says:

...सोऽविद्याग्रन्थिं विकिरतीह सोम्य (the Jnani cuts asunder the knot of avidyā here itself). These are just two of the numerous instances where the Śāstra/Bhāshyam speak of avidyā as an existent entity. One can never talk in such positive terms about any non-existent thing.

By seeing the consummation of sadhana also it is clear that avidyā is not to be seen as abhāva rūpa. There is agrahaṇa of the tattva. The realization of the Truth

removes this agrahaṇa doṣha and THEN ONLY destroys saṃsāra, although there is no time gap in between. This has to be admitted.

Let us consider an example. I go to a doctor with a severe stomach ache. The doctor asks me some questions. I am not interested in all that as I want relief from the unbearable pain. He gives some tablets to be taken thrice a day for two days. I get the cure. Even though from my side there was no concern about the cause of the pain, the doctor would not leave it like that. He has to probe into the cause. Stomach ache can be caused by several factors. It could be viral infection, bacterial infection, food poisoning, over-eating, indigestion, or even a muscular catch while doing some bending activity, or it could be due to gastric causes, etc. He has to ascertain the factor and give a suitable medicine. When the medicine gives me relief from pain, it has addressed the cause and only after that the pain has gone.

In the same way, even though the sadhaka might say: Why bother about what is the cause of adhyāsa or that there is a cause for adhyāsa? Will not the Shruti operate as an independent Pramāṇa even if I hold adhyāsa as the starting point? The answer to such questions would be both yes and no. One may not know the cause of adhyāsa and yet practice the remedial measures prescribed by the Guru/Śāstra and still attain liberation. The Gītā 13th chapter has a verse: अन्ये त्वेवमजानन्तः श्रुत्वाऽन्येभ्य उपासते । तेऽपि चातितरन्त्येव मृत्युं श्रुतिपरायणाः ॥१३.२६॥ “Others, again, who do not know thus, take to thinking after hearing from others; they, too, who are devoted to hearing, certainly overcome death.” Like the medicine giving me the cure even though I am not concerned about the cause of the pain. But as a Darśanakāra the Āchārya has to specify the cause of adhyāsa. He is aware of the fact that the remedial measures will give the fruit ONLY AFTER addressing the cause. He recognizes this and while laying out a system of philosophy He makes it logically tight, elegant and practicable.

So, whether we bother to know the cause of adhyāsa or not, the fact is that there is a cause that precedes adhyāsa and it is this cause that is first eliminated by samyag-darśanam. Says the Āchārya in the Muṇḍaka Bhāshyam (II.i.10):

“स एवं विज्ञानात् अविद्याग्रन्थिं ग्रन्थिमिव दृढीभूताम् अविद्यावासनां विकिरति विक्षिपति नाशयति जीवन्नेव, न मृतः सन्”

Translation: “.....he by virtue of such realization throws away = destroys the knot of ignorance = the tendencies and impressions created by ignorance that are hard to untie like knots here, even while living, and not after death....” The sequence is clear. Sādhana culminates in generating the realization of the Truth, this destroys the ‘non-apprehension of the Truth’, tattva-agrahanam, that was all along present in the seeker in the form of Āvaraṇa, andhatva, tamas. (The Maṇḍūkya kārikā and Bhāshya clarify that ‘tattva agrahaṇam’ is present in all the three states, and only the Turīya is free from this.) This results in the destruction of the effects of such non-apprehension which are the saṃsāric tendencies. ‘jñātvā devam sarva pāshāpahāniḥ’, ‘jñānam labdhvā parām śāntim’, etc. are all pointers

to this sequence. It may not be explicitly spoken of. Yet, it is unmistakable.

Even in the common error of rope-snake, the error goes only when the rope-knowledge is had. When we look at the mechanism we find that the error, adhyāsa, was caused due to non-apprehension, agrahaṇam, of the rope (as rope) in the first place. Now, the proper apprehension of the vastu, rope, resulted in removing the non-apprehension dosha and only then the wrong-apprehension goes.

Here is just one proof from the Bhāshyam about the Āchārya admitting Brahman to be the locus of avidyā:

(The reference is to the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhāshya 1.4.10) -

Objection: We do not say that there is no superimposition on Brahman of attributes not belonging to It, as in the case of a mother-of-pearl, but that Brahman is not the cause of the superimposition of these attributes on Itself, nor the author of ignorance.

Reply: Let it be so. Brahman is not the author of ignorance nor subject to error. But it is not admitted that there is any other conscious entity but Brahman which is the author of ignorance or subject to error. Witness such Śruti texts as,

The point is clear. (Brahman is the locus of avidyā). Then, is it absolutely true that Brahman has/had avidyā? Let us consider an example:

In a dream, a couple of terrorists belonging to a banned outfit knock on my door at midnight. When I open the door, one of them opens a suitcase full of currency notes in bundles. The other one points an AK47 at me. The message is clear. I let them in and they hide themselves in an interior room. Shortly after, I hear the siren of the police jeep. As it nears my house, I tremble in fear. I wake up from the dream. Now, once awake, do I entertain the fear of being questioned by the police for 'sheltering the terrorists'? The case with the locus of avidyā being Brahman/jīva is similar to this.

Bondage/saṁsāra/avidyā is a fact to be reckoned with and addressed in the appropriate manner. But this is only as long as bondage persists. If there is no locus of avidyā, who is it that is called a sadhaka? Why should he bother to do hard sādhana if he is not the locus of avidyā but something else, the mind is? If he has the viveka to say from unshakable conviction: 'Avidyā is only for the mind, I am not the mind', then he is already enlightened. As long as he is a sadhaka, he identifies himself with the mind and suffers the pain of saṁsāra. What is wrong in saying that he is the locus of avidyā?

In the foregoing we have considered in some detail the nature of avidyā, its removal, in the passing and the locus of avidyā, with Āchārya Śāṅkarabhagavatpada's Bhāshyam.

The Nature of Māyā - Māyā-Svarupam

Shyam Subramanian

The author is a student of Swami Paramarthanandaji, from Chennai. By profession he is a physician and a Director of Sleep Medicine and Associate Professor of Medicine at Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA. His email id: shyam_md@yahoo.com. Website - www.adi-shankara.org.

I would like to write an essay on the topic of Māyā – and examine selected excerpts of Āchārya Śaṅkara’s writings about the subject.

In his independent treatise the Upadesha Sāhasri the Āchārya provides a precise definition of Māyā svarūpa:

The Brahman that is immediate and direct, the innermost Self (ya ātma sarvāntarah) ...is by virtue of Its inscrutable power the cause of the manifestation of unmanifested name and form which abide in the Self through its very presence, but are different from It, which are the seed of the universe (jagad-bījam), are describable neither as identical with It nor different from It (anirvachanīyayoh) and are cognized by It alone.

Here-in we find the Āchārya precisely defining māyā as a anirvachanīya and inscrutable b. the Seed c. Brahman’s intrinsic power or Śakti. We find the same idea being emphasized further in the same text: That one seed called Māyā is evolved into three states which come one after another again and again. The Self, the substratum of Māyā, though only one and immutable appears to be many like reflections of sun in water.

In this particular sentence, the substratum of Māyā is unmistakably mentioned as to be the Self alone. And the analogy of the One sun appearing as different due to its reflections in water is provided for enabling an easy understanding of this concept. This point is reiterated for emphasis by the Āchārya once again:

Just as the one seed called māyā is regarded according to the different states such as the Undifferentiated, etc so the Self appears to be different in waking and dream bodies like reflections of the moon in water. Thus we find in numerous instances in his seminal work the Upadesha Sāhasri, that ādi Śaṅkara has provided

a working definition of adhyāsa, precisely assigned its Cause, has illustratively elucidated its substratum, nature and effects, has interchangeably used the terms avidyā and māyā, and has of course asserted all along that with self-knowledge to which it is opposed this Seed of Ignorance can be rendered sterile and incapable of germinating saṁsāra.

Now we will take up for closer scrutiny a few excerpts from his most important and voluminous work - the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya.

BSB 1.2.22

The distinctive attributes mentioned here, such as being of a heavenly nature, and so on, can in no way belong to the individual soul, which erroneously considers itself to be limited by name and form as presented by Avidyā - avidyā-pratyupasthāpita and erroneously imputes their attributes to itself taddharmān svātmani kalpayataḥ

Here we find Śāṅkara talking about Avidyā as the cause of adhyāsa. The erroneous attributes being superimposed on itself is adhyāsa - why does this happen? Because of avidyā. Without avidyā such an error would not be possible. Furthermore continues Śāṅkara. Here the term 'Imperishable' aksharam means that undeveloped avyākṛtam entity which represents the seminal potentiality of names and forms nāmarūpa-bīja-śakti-rūpam, contains the subtle aspects of the material elements bhūtasūkshmam, abides in the Lord, Iśvara-Aśrayam forms His limiting adjunct, tasyaiva upādhi bhūtam.

Here the same saṁsārabījam or seed of saṁsāra is referred to by the term seed of names and forms - nāmarūpabījam. And while it was referred to as avidyā before, here it is referred to by the term śakti. The potential power - Parāśakti Herself. And what does this śakti consist of - the subtle aspects of the material elements. The abode of this Parāśakti is also clearly defined for us - Parameśwara Himself is both Her abode and it this Parāśakti alone that represents as it were His upādhi.

Thus we find the terms Avidyā and Śakti describing the seed potentiality of these diverse names and form.

Elsewhere Śāṅkara very poignantly sums up the entire teaching and subject matter of the whole Brahma Sūtra in one single line! "The theme of this śārīraka-śāstra is thus : There is only one Supreme Lord - Eka eva Parameshwara - Eternal Unchanging - kuṭasthanityo - Absolute Consciousness - vijñānadhatur - and Who, like a magician - māyāvivat - appears multifariously - anekadhā vibhāvya - by means of māyā - māyayā otherwise known as avidyā - avidyayā. Besides this there is no other Consciousness as such.

This one sentence is a direct clincher as it were for many points.

That Brahman alone is the substratum for māyā - and it is none other than

the ParaBrahman's intrinsic innate Śakti - and that it alone is Avidyā. From the standpoint of Brahman there is naught else - there can be no talk of anything. From the standpoint of the jīva who talks about avidyā it is very much a Supreme Power - māyā Śakti. It is in this instance that we find the Āchārya clearly using the very terms avidyā and māyā in one and the same contextual conformity. [One would do well to read this sentence in parallel with Śakti-rūpam Iśwara-āshrayam quoted earlier to arrive at this understanding. That māyā Avidyā Śakti Paraśakti in essence refer to one and only one entity. Truly has it been said of this māyā Śakti

Sukhachidhakhanda vibodhamadvithīyam, Viyadanilādi vinirmatau niyojya,

Bhrāmayati bhavasāgare nithantham, Tvaghaṭitha-ghatanā patiyasī māyā.

Māyā ,which is skilful in accomplishing the impossible, makes the Self, which is of the nature of bliss and consciousness which is impartite and non-dual, whirl round very much in the ocean of saṁsāra by associating it with the created elements - space, air, etc.

Furthermore we find the Āchārya glossing in 1.3.30 - This world when being dissolved (in a mahāpralaya) is dissolved to that extent only that the Śakti (causal potentiality) of the world remains Śaktyavaśeshameva - and (when it is produced again) it is produced from the root of that Śakti - śakti mūlam eva cha prabhavati ; otherwise we should have to admit an effect without a cause itaratha ākasmikatva prasangatvāt.

Here we find Śaṅkara defining for us Śakti as that Primordial Cause unto which this entire manifest Sṛṣṭi dissolves unto and from which alone spurts forth another cycle of this manifold Nature. The term the Āchārya uses in this context is mūla-Śakti. Compare this with another instance elsewhere in the SūtraBhāshya where-in is described our "everyday" pralaya - also known as sushupti. Compare how similar this is with what the revered Bhāshyakāra writes while glossing over a different Sūtra - 2.3.30-- So the contact of the soul with the buddhi exists potentially merely during deep sleep and pralaya, and again becomes manifest at the time of waking and the time of creation, because nothing can be assumed to spring up unless from something else na hi ākasmikī kasyachid utpattih sambhavati atiprasangāt; otherwise we should have to suppose that effects spring up without causes. That the rising from deep sleep is due to the existence of seed avidyā - avidyātmakabījam sadbhāvakāritam We cannot help notice that the Āchārya uses almost identical language in both these instances citing the absurdity of a cause ex nihilo. What is also relevant here is the terminology used to establish that Causal Potency from which both the individual or the Creation emerge are mūla-Śakti and bīja-avidyā. Thus again we find interchangeable use of the terms mūla-avidyā/bīja-Śakti to represent that Supreme avyakta. A more thorough treatment for this avyakta is going to be handed to us by the Āchārya very soon - which we will examine now.

1.4.3: Pūrvapakshin “In order to prove the possibility of the body being called undeveloped - avyakta - you admit that this world - jagadidam - in its antecedent seminal condition - nāmarūpabījātmakam - before either names or forms are evolved - abhivyaktam - can be called undeveloped avyakta, you virtually concede the doctrine that the pradhāna is the cause -pradhānakāraṇa -of the world. For we (Sāṅkhyas) understand by the term pradhāna nothing but that primordial condition of the world.”

Here the Sāṅkhya wants to show that his Pradhāna and Advaita’s Avyakta is one and the same thing. They both talk about an antecedent seed potentiality to all of Creation. How then do you say anything different from what I say - asks the Sāṅkhya. To this Śāṅkara clarifies..”Things lie differently, we rejoin. If we admitted some antecedent state - pragavastham - of the world - jagatah - as the independent - svatantra kāraṇatve - cause of the world, we should indeed implicitly, admit the pradhāna doctrine. What we admit is, however, only a primal state dependent - ādhīna - on the Supreme Lord - Parameśwara, not an independent state - na svatantra.”

Here in we find ādi Śāṅkara clearly delineating for us the two Orders of Reality. One is the independent Real - svatantra - pāramārthika Satyam - Nārayaṇa as ParaBrahman. The other is the dependent Reality or mithyā which is vyāvahārika satyam, and the latter of course borrows its satta from or has its abode on the former. Furthermore - “Such a causal state must necessarily be admitted - āvaśyamabhyupagantavya -, since it is according to sense and reason - arthavatī hi sa. For without it - tayā vinā - the Supreme Lord - Parameshwarasya - could not be conceived as creator - srasṭṛtvam sidhyati-, as he could not become active - pravṛttiyanupapatteḥ- if he were destitute of the potentiality of action -Śakti-rahitasya. The existence of such a causal potentiality -bījam-śakti- renders it moreover possible that the released souls -muktānām- should not enter on new courses of existence, as it is destroyed by perfect knowledge -vidyayā.”

Śāṅkara clarifies here that nirguṇa Brahman cannot be conceived as a Creator - an intelligent Creation that we clearly perceive has to have a Supreme Power that renders this possible - and that is none other than Ma Para- Śakti herself. And it is crucial here to see that the presence of such a Śakti alone would ensure that those souls who acquire the Supreme knowledge that allows them to transcend Her domain get Total Liberation by attaining to their True Nature Vishnor paramam padam. Śāṅkara continues -

“For that causal potentiality is of the nature of Avidyā - avidyātmikā hi sā bījaśakti; it is rightly denoted by the term ‘undeveloped; -avyakta shabda nirdeshya’ it has the Supreme Lord for its substratum -Parameśwara āshraya; it is of the nature of an illusion māyā - mayī; it is a universal sleep -Mahāsuṅpti in which are lying the transmigrating souls -samsāriṇō jīvāḥ, destitute for the time of the consciousness of their individual character -svarūpapratibodha rahitāḥ.

This undeveloped principle is sometimes denoted by the term Ākāsha - so, for instance, in the passage, 'In that Imperishable then, O Gārgi, the ether is woven like warp and woof' (Bri. Up. III, 8, 11). Sometimes, again, it is denoted by the term Akshara, the Imperishable; so, for instance (Mu. Up. II, 1, 2), 'Higher, than the high Imperishable.' Sometimes it is spoken of as māyā - māyeti sūchitam - so, for instance (Sve. Up. IV, 10), 'Know then Prakṛti is māyā, and the Supreme Lord is the Master of māyā.' For māyā is properly called undeveloped - Avyakta hi sā māyā - since it cannot be defined either as that which is or that which is not tattvānyatvanirūpanamya-ashakyatvat. The statement of the Katha Up. that 'the Avyakta is beyond the Mahat' is based on the fact of the Mahat originating from the Avyakta, if the Mahat be the intellect of Hiranyagarbha. If, on the other hand, we understand by the Mahat the individual soul, the statement is founded on the fact of the existence of the individual soul depending on the Undeveloped avyaktādhīnatva jīvabhavasya, i.e. Avidyā. Avidyā hi avyaktam. And it is because of the possession of ignorance by the individual that all kinds of empirical behavior continue forever jīvasya sarvah sanvyavahāra.

How painstakingly does the Āchārya apply the same coat of hue in brush after brush! Here-in we find such a vivid all-encompassing presentation from the benevolence of our beloved Āchārya.

That Primordial Power is Bīja Śakti; That bīja Śakti is Avidyā; This avidyā, this Śakti is termed Avyakta; This Avyakta aloneis Māyā; This Māyā is also called Akshara, the Imperishable; Māyā is also called Prakṛti; Avyakta is Avidyā alone; And this Śakti/ māyā/Avidyā/Prakṛti/Avyakta can neither be characterized as Real nor Unreal, and it has for its substratum the Supreme Lord Parabrahman.

We will finally take note of one more excerpt from the Sūtrabhāṣya - 2.1.14. **Pūrvapakshin:** Since the believers in a changeless Brahman have a predilection for Absolute Unity, the assertion that the Lord is the cause of the world is contraindicated Īshwarakāraṇapratijñāvirōdha, since there will be no distinction of a Ruler and the ruled. Here the interlocutor talks about an absurdity he perceives - in postulating a homogenous Absolute, and the obvious divisions of a jagat with numerous jīvas, and a jagatkāraṇam Īshwara.

Vedāntin: No - since that Omniscience sarvajñatvam is contingent on the manifestation of name and form, which are creations of Avidyā and which constitute the seeds of the world - avidyātmaka nāmarūpabījā. The fundamental tenet which we maintain (in accordance with such scriptural passages as, 'From that Self originated space, Taitt. Up. II, 1) is that the creation, sustenance, and reabsorption of the world jagatjanisthitipralayah proceed from the Lord who is by nature eternal, pure, intelligent and free, omniscient, omnipotent Lord nityaśuddhabuddhamukta svarūpasarvajñāt sarvaśaktīśwara, and not from a non-intelligent achetana pradha or any other principle. To this the Pūrvapakshin counters: But how, the question

may be asked, can you make this last assertion while all the while you maintain the absolute unity atyantātmanam ekatvam advitīyam cha and non-duality of the Self?

The Pūrvapakshin, still insists that there is an incongruity here - a postulate of Absolute non-duality on one hand and a proposition of Brahman and this vastu - Avidyā - which is the seed of the diverse manifold Universe. One plus one makes two - no?

Vedāntin: Listen how. Name and form which constitute the seeds of the entire phenomenal existence, saṃsāraprapañcha bijabhūte and which are conjured up by Avidyā avidyākālpite are, as it were, non-different from the omniscient God sarvajñasya īshwarasya, ātmabhūte iva - and they are non-determinable either as real or unreal, anirvachanīya, and are mentioned in the Śruti and Smṛti as the power called māyā of omniscient Lord sarvajña-Īśwarasya māyāśakti, or as Prakṛti. But Omniscient God is different from them, tābhyāmanya sarvajña Īshwara as is known from the Upanishadic text - 'That which is Space is the accomplisher of all forms and names; that within which these forms and names are contained is Brahman' (Ch. Up. VIII, 14, 1); 'Let me manifest names and forms' (Ch. Up. VI, 3, 2); 'He, the wise one, who having divided all forms and given all names, sits speaking (with those names)' (Taitt. Ar. III, 12, 7); 'He who makes the one seed manifold' (Sve. Up. VI, 12). Evam avidyākṛta nāmarūpa-upādhyānurodhi Īshwaro bhavati.

Thus the Lord conforms (as Lord) to the limiting adjuncts of name and form, the products of Avidyā; just as the universal space Vyōmeva ghatakarakōpādhyānurodhi conforms (as limited space) to the limiting adjuncts in the shape of jars, pots, etc. He (the Lord) stands within the realm of the phenomenal vyavahāravishaye in the relation of a ruler to the so-called jīvas or cognitional Selves - vijñāntmanah, which indeed are one with his own Self svātmabhūtanēva--just as the portions of ether enclosed in jars and the like are one with the universal ether- but are limited by the assemblage of bodies and senses produced from name and form - nāmarūpakṛta kāryakaraṇasanghātānurodhino - and that are conjured up by Avidyā avidyāpratyupasthāpita. Hence the Lord's "Lord"ship, Īśwarasya Īśwaratvam, his Omniscience, sarvajñatvam his Omnipotence, sarvaśaktitvam - are all contingent on the limiting adjuncts conjured up by avidyā avidyātmakōpādhiparichhedāpeksha eva; while in reality na paramārthatō none of these qualities belong to the Self shining in its own nature, by right knowledge, vidyayā, after the removal of all limiting adjuncts. Thus Scripture also says, 'Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite' (Ka. Up. VII, 24, 1); 'But when the Self only has become all this, how should he see another?' (Bri. Up. II, 4, 13.)

Thus we see here the revered Bhagavatpāda explain in clearcut terms the two levels of Reality and their respective ontology. It is also striking to note that while previously the Āchārya had made poignant use of pratibimbavāda, in talking about

the Sun and its many reflections, in here, He is making use of avacchedavāda in using the analogy of Universal Space and Pot Space in explaining the two levels of Reality - pāramārthika and vyāvahārika. As is seen by the perspective He thus provides, these two represent different aspects of one and the same understanding. At the pāramārthika level there is but One NonDual Lord. It is only on account of a Śakti, that the vyāvahārika phenomenal is rendered possible. This māyā Śakti is nothing other than avidyā, the germinal seed, also called Prakṛti. This māyā can be neither characterized as real nor unreal. This māyā non-different from Brahman, in that it is Its intrinsic Power, but at the same time Brahman is other than this, as the NonDual Truth - Thus alone do we understand the true import of both immanence and transcendence.

I will end with a prayer from the sublime words of the Ācārya in the Soundarya Lahari.

Jagat sūthe dhāta harir avati rudrah kshapayate Tiraskurvan etat svam api
vapurisastirayati;

Sadā-pūrvah sarvam tad idamanugṛhṇati cha Shiva-Stavajñam ālambya
kshaṇa-chalitayōr bhru-latikayōḥ.

Brahma creates the world, Viṣṇu sustains it, Śiva destroys it, Īshwara makes them disappear, And also disappears Himself! And Sadāshiva blesses them all, By Your Order given to Him; By a momentary move of your eyebrows!



Śāstra-Prāmāṇyam

S. Hemalatha.

The author is a retired lecturer of Physics. She holds degrees in Physics, Sanskrit and Advaita. Her Ph.D. degree from Bangalore University was on the topic 'The Contributions of Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji to Advaita Vedānta'. She has written several books, articles, poems and stories on assorted topics and themes and she gives spiritual discourses. Her email id: hemalatha1950@yahoo.co.in

Introduction

Etymologically speaking, Śāstra is a treatise that commands and protects the person who obeys it, The word also refers to a systematically composed work dealing with any subject useful to the mankind. The word, 'Śāstra' is derived from the root शास् which means 'to rule' (शिष्यते अनेन इति शास्त्रम्). Its protection is explained as (शास्ति त्रायते इति शास्त्रम्). In this sense, it imparts different kinds of knowledge which is necessary for a decent life. It gives the information about both what should be done and what ought not to be done.

Every religion attaches the highest value to the statements made in its holy books whose authors are assumed to be inspired. Great souls have beheld these truths which are necessary to satisfy the man's deepest cravings and hence their assertions and injunctions are accepted without question. This is the origin of the religious duties ordained on man , so peculiar to every community.

Pramāṇa-अवगति पर्यन्तज्ञानजनने कारणम् is the definition of Pramāṇa. Pramāṇa is needed as both evidence and proof of a matter. The evidence is to show that what is proved is also workable. This is something like theory and experiment in science. Holy Books of Indian philosophical systems - Our 'Śāstras' are mainly the four Vedas and some other spiritual books. The Hindu attitude towards the Vedas is one of trust because it has helped our forefathers and is likely to be of use to us also. Having cast aside the injunctions of the scriptures, he who acts in an arbitrary way will not attain the supreme goal. तस्माच्छास्त्रं प्रमाणं ते says Krishna to Arjuna in Gītā which is a message to all people . They are exclusive and eternal guides of human destiny, the court of final appeal. The Śāstra does not discuss the things which are directly perceptible. Other works are also accepted as pramāṇa

by some philosophic schools. For example, Skānda Purāṇa says,

ऋग्यजुःसामाथर्वा च भारतं पञ्चरात्रकम् ।

मूलरामायणं चैव शास्त्रमित्यभिधीयते ॥

Purāṇas, Āgamas and other texts are also considered as Śāstra by some cults. Even Vedic systems of Philosophy will not believe in the same form of prāmāṇya of them. For example, Nyāya school considers the Vedas as originated from, God who knows everything and hence says its contents are beyond human evaluation. The followers of mīmāṃsā school say that the Vedas are not written by humans and hence free from mistakes. Sankhyās do not agree with this belief and say that it contains the truth experienced by great sages. Vedantins believe that the God releases the knowledge of Vedas at the beginning of every sṛṣṭi which is same as previous one hence it is eternal and true. Thus Pramāṇa center Philosophical have nothing in common as each philosophical trend has its own point of departure. Still, all sects of Hinduism attempts to interpret Veda, particulars the end part called Vedānta in accordance with their own religious views.

Śāstra prāmāṇyam in Advaita- Advaitins consider the texts contained in 'Prasthānatraya' only as Pramāṇa. They are 1. Śruti- The ten major Upanishads, 2. Smṛti - Gītā 3..Nyaya-sūtras constructed by Bādarāyaṇa. These three are classical reservoirs of Vedāntic knowledge. These are endowed with the commentaries of Shri Śāṅkarācārya by which we are now ascertaining their place as 'Pramāṇas' in Advaita Vedānta. In this system Vedas are Pramāṇas not just because they are the sayings of god or a sage, but truth revealed in them are capable of being re-experienced in compliance with ascertained conditions. As Sureswarācārya says in Bṛhadāraṇyaka-vārtika,

न च वेदोक्तितो वेदः श्रद्धेयार्थं इहेष्यते ।

किन्त्वमानत्वहेतूनां वेदवाक्येष्वसंभवात् ॥

प्रामाण्यं वेदवाक्यानां न च मानान्तराश्रयात् ।

अक्षादेरपि मानत्वं यथोक्तादेव कारणात् ॥

We will now discuss the exact nature of Pramāṇa of the Śāstras in Advaita Vedānta with the help of Śāṅkara Bhāshyas.

Śāṅkara's Bhāshya on Bādarāyaṇa sūtras is translated into Kannada by Sat-chidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji. In the introduction of this book, Swamiji has discussed the Śāstra Prāmāṇyam in the light of the Śāṅkara Bhāshya. He poses two questions. Is Śāstra only a tool to get better worlds like heaven etc? Or, will it help to attain the highest goal by understanding 'self'? These questions arise because Vedas contain both Upāsana of 'Saguṇa Brahma' and Parabrahma. He observes that where-ever Upāsana is intended, the result is also mentioned as Lōkāntara-prāpti. The mantras refering to 'Nirguṇa-Brahma' always end with union of it with Jīva. In the commentary of second Sūtra, Śāṅkara explicitly shows

the difference between Dharmajijñāsa and Brahmajijñāsa In the first case, Śruti is to be followed without questioning because the result can't be verified in this world (न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रामाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्). In the second case, the knowledge ends in experience for which no proof is necessary.

The views of Śāṅkara about Śāstra-prāmāṇyam is elaborately discussed in 'Samanvayādhikaraṇa'. He clearly mentions that Brahma is understandable only with the help of Vedānta. He refutes all the views of the opponents considering one by one. For example, the opponent objects that if the Brahma is not an object it can't be constantly held to be known through Śāstra as a valid means of knowledge. Brahma can't be understood by Vedānta as it is not a subject to anything (unobjectifiable). Śāṅkara replies that though it is not an object, Śāstra purports to wipe off the illusions invented by Avidyā. It indeed does not propose to teach Brahma as such. It teaches Brahma as one's innermost self and about its uniqueness. All differences like knowable, knower and knowledge are removed with the help of Vedānta. (अविषयत्वेऽपि ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, न. . .) The real meaning of sentences called 'mahāvākyas' which enumerate the union of Brahman with Ātman can't be understood without the help of Śāstra. It is true that even for the Vedic rites, the eternal Jīvātma is necessary. But there are certain parts in Vedānta which are not meant for such rites. They end up in Advaitic view of Brahma and these parts are the important message of Vedānta. To understand them, the Upāsana and other methods are incorporated. Further, the prāmāṇya of Śāstra can't be established by inference (anumāna) which needs a similar example (आत्मविज्ञानस्य फलपर्यन्तत्वात् न तद्विषयस्य. . .) न चानुमानगम्यम् शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्). Pratyaksha also fails to establish the knowledge of Ātman as it is not detectable by the sense organs. रूपाभावाद्धि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षगोचरः, लिङ्गाभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम् इति च अवोचाम। This entity is beyond perception which is devoid of form, neither it is an object for logical inferences. Therefore Brahma is beyond all other types of pramāṇas though the knowledge is always obtained by pramāṇa. (ज्ञानं तु प्रमाणजन्यम्। प्रमाणं तु यथाभूतवस्तुविषयम्) Hence Śāstra alone is capable of giving the exact knowledge of Brahma.

The Śāstraprāmāṇyam is discussed in detail by Satchidānandendra Saraswathi Swamiji in the appendix of Sūtrabhāshyārthatattva-vivechini (part-3). He considers the opinion of all oriental and modern commentators and compares with that of Śāṅkara. According to him, the two sutras शास्त्रयोनित्वात्, तत्तु समन्वयात्, give the opinion of Sūtrakāra about the place of Vedānta in the knowledge of Brahma. The prāmāṇyam of Śāstra can be obtained by samanvaya of these two sūtras with Vedāntic sentences. These sentences do not characterize Brahma, just show what is not Brahma. Hence he declares that शास्त्रवाक्यानां न वाक्यधर्माङ्गीकारेण प्रमाणत्वं ब्रह्मात्मनि। किन्तु अविद्याकल्पित-अतद्धर्मनिवर्तकत्वेन।

The knowledge of Brahma is obtained by Upanishads is also proved by another fact that Ātma is also known as 'Aupanishada Purusha'. तं तौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि (बृ. ३-९-२९) says Upanishad. Therefore brahmatmabhava is definitely vedapramāṇajanita.

Śāṅkara concludes this Samanvayādhikaraṇa stating that Vedānta gives evidence of both Saḡuṇa and Nirguṇa brahma which are useful in different contexts. Vedānta is an independent proof also known as Brahma. तस्मात् न प्रतिपात्तिविधिविषयतया शास्त्रप्रमाणकत्वं ब्रह्मणः सम्भवति। स्वतन्त्रमेव ब्रह्म शास्त्रप्रमाणकं वेदान्तवाक्यसमन्वयात्। After gaining the knowledge, the pramāṇas are not of much consequence. Vedānta is just a guide to show how to experience this bliss.

After considering Vedānta, Śāṅkara takes Smṛthis and refutes those which consider the plurality of Ātman. The Smṛthis are written by men. They are accepted as pramāṇa if and only if they support the Śruti which is divine. The Śruti is like the Sun who is the pramāṇa for forms of the objects. वेदस्य हि निरपेक्षं स्वार्थे प्रामाण्यं रवेरिव रूपविषये.

कृत्स्नप्रसक्त्यधिकरण deals with the creation of the world. If Brahma is converting himself into the form of Śṛṣṭi, he has to change, thus argue the opponents of Advaita. He can't remain same or a formless Brahma and also can create all the lordly forms. Answering this objection, Śāṅkara replies that there are Śrutis supporting the creation and also remaining the same. Even in physical matters, we find many medicines and magic which give opposite results depending on the way we use them, for which no reason can be attached. If this is the case with ordinary things, how can we explain the action of Brahma which is beyond all Pramāṇas? Hence we should respect Śāstra and believe it even if it is against our physical experience! (श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात्)

In `Arambhaṇādhikaraṇa', also Śāṅkara dismisses the plurality of Brahma. The Sūtra, तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः explains that the cause and effect are one and the same. We can find an analogy to this even in science. Work and Energy are considered as same in Physics and measured in the same unit called 'Joule'. When stored as the capacity to do the work the physical quantity is called energy and when used, it is called work. Similarly 'kārya' and 'kāraṇa' are the same 'Brahma tattva' which is revealed by the Vedānta alone. In this context, Śāṅkara says, अपि च अन्त्यमिदं प्रमाणं आत्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकं नातः परं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति। This means that, after knowing the true nature of Brahma by Vedāntic sentences, there is nothing else to know or to wish unlike 'Karmakāṇḍa' where, after knowing the procedure of a ritual one has to collect the said things and perform it according to the vedic procedure. The same view is endorsed in Gītā Bhāshya, where Śāṅkara says (शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणं अतद्धर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रामाण्यमात्मनः प्रतिपद्यते न त्वज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन।). This means that Śāstra which is the ultimate means of knowledge becomes valid by removing what is not the property of Ātman and not by introducing which is previously unknown. The Advaitic view of Śāstra is well brought out by Śāṅkara in Bṛhadāraṇyakabhāshya also. In the commentary over the Mantra, ब्रह्म वा इदमग्रे आसीत्, Śāṅkara establishes that Veda speaks of two types of Brahma, 'Para' and 'Apara'. He says that Veda always speaks the truth. He gives a number of references to show that Para-brahma is referred to in this context. Vedāntic sentences will not add or remove

any quality to Brahma. It only suggests the method to understand the matter as it is and has no power to alter it (न हि वचनं वस्तुनः सामर्थ्यजनकम्। ज्ञापकं हि शास्त्रं न कारकं इति स्थितिः)

While discussing the results of Upāsana, Śāṅkara decidedly says that it cannot be combined with knowledge. Even the vedic sentences which indicating such a meaning cannot be accepted as pramāṇa. For example, if one says that ‘fire is cold and wet’, we can’t take it as true as it is against our experience. But Vedāntic sentences will not give such a meaning as they always speak the truth. We can’t interpret it according to our wisdom, but understand its proper meaning. The same opinion is repeated in the Avataraṇikā bhāṣhya of Muṇḍaka (नहि विधिश्चेतेनापि शास्त्रस्य अप्रामाण्यं कल्पयितुं शक्यम्)

While commenting on the Mantra पूर्णमदः Śāṅkara argues that Dvaitādvaita is against the Śāstra and also logic. In this context, he clearly brings out the nature of Śāstra-prāmāṇyam as accepted in Advaita. Śāstra advises Karma to the man who is still in the Dvaitic trend. When one tries to find the fault with Karma and wants to go beyond it, he can get the Advaita-tattva from the same Śāstra. After obtaining the siddhi by the guidance of Vedānta, Śāstra itself recedes to the back-stage as it’s work is over. Hence Śāstra is pramāṇa to all types of people. Advaita is beyond all the verbal meaning of Śāstra as it is based on the experience.

Conclusion - In the light of discussion held above, the following conclusions can be drawn-

1. According to Advaita, Śāstra means ‘Vedānta’ only. It contains particularly ten major Upanishads.
2. Śāstra teaches which is beyond perceptions and other pramāṇas like speculation.
3. It is the ultimate means of Advaitic knowledge in that after getting this knowledge, there is nothing more to do.
4. Śāstra is just a reminder of the inner soul. It will not add or remove any qualities to Brahma.
5. It employs two views to enlighten the seekers of the truth depending their level.
6. In advaita, Śruti is not the only pramāṇa as in the case of Pūrva-mīmāṃsā. The vedantic knowledge should be put to experience which is the final goal.
7. After enlightenment, Śruti recedes to the back-stage as its part is over.
8. Advaitic product is not a product of just speculation but of experience which is direct and personal.

References-

1. Śabdārtha- Kaustubha (Sanskrit-Kannada dictionary)
2. Indian Philosophical Systems-collection of papers published by Rāmakrishna

Mission.

3. A Concise Encyclopedia of Hinduism- Swami Harshananda.
4. Vedānta, The science of reality- K.A. Krishnaswamy Iyer.
5. Eassays on Vedānta- Satchidaānandendra Saraswathi Swamiji.
6. Foundations of Dharma- Paramānandabhārathi Swamiji.
7. The call of the Vedas- A.C. Bose.
8. The Hindu View of Life- Dr.S.Radhakrishnan.
9. Sanātana-Dharma- Swami Bharati Krishnateertha. (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan)
10. Jeevanta Vedanta- Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji.
11. Sūtrabhāsyārtha-Tattva-Vivechini- Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji.
12. Śāṅkara Vedantasara- Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji.
13. Brahmasūtra Bhashya- Sri Śāṅkarācārya.
14. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāshya- Sri Śāṅkarācārya



Vidyā Daśakam - विद्यादशकम्

Subhanu Saxena

The author works for the Company Novartis Pharma AG as Member, Pharmaceutical Executive Committee. During his spare time he teaches Veda and Vedanta at Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, London. His email id: subhanu@hotmail.com

1) Brahma ekameva satyam, Brahma chātma cha ekameva vastu.

१. ब्रह्म एकमेव सत्यं ब्रह्म चात्मा च एकमेव वस्तु।

1. Brahman is the One and Only Reality , and Brahman and Ātman are The One and Same Only Entity

The Vedānta Śāstra declares in unequivocal terms that there is only One Reality, given the name Brahman. The Advaita tradition equates Ātman and Brahman as one and the same and “without a second”. As Brahman is the only real entity, anything thought of as not Brahman can only be notional, not real. This begs the question “How do we know this Truth? What is true Knowledge of this Reality and what prevents us from learning this great Truth? Finally, what is the path to realise this Truth? “ These are some of the fundamental questions Vedānta addresses and provides a clear path to a sincere aspirant to realise the Ultimate Truth of what is our true nature. To teach us the highest truth of the teachings of Vedānta the Sacred Texts use a specific method known as adhyāropa-apavāda. The Śāstra superimposes a provisional teaching to remove a false notion and then discards it once the teaching has served its purpose, ultimately to reveal Truth as It is. So, the starting point of enquiry is to delineate what is ātman and what is not ātman for the purpose of the teaching:

2) Ato yadātmā yadanātmā cha aupachārikasatyam upadeshārtham eva

२. अतो यदात्मा यदनात्मा च औपचारिकसत्यं उपदेशार्थमेव।

2. Therefore that which is ātman and that which is anātman are provisional truths assumed for the purpose of teaching alone

In reality there is no such entity as anātman but for those of us who have not

known this fact it is convenient to speak of that which is ātman and that which is anātman. This separation is provisional for the sake of teaching ātman as the only reality, as the separation between ātman and anātman is figurative, not real. In Śaṅkara's introduction to Brahma Sūtra Bhāshyam [BSB], Śaṅkara explains that this separation of the real and the unreal comes about through our innate (naisargika) tendency to confuse the real and the false (satyānṛite mithunīkṛtya), which is given the technical term adhyāsa or superimposition. This superimposition is a false notion known also as Ignorance or Avidyā. This ignorance need not be proved or explained as it is our common universal experience that we mistake one thing for another (atasmin tadbuddhih). This fundamental misconception (avidyā) creates the illusion (māyā) that we are agents acting and reaping the fruits of our actions. Śaṅkara tells us in BSB 2.1.14 that this illusion of name and form is fashioned by our ignorance (avidyākalpita).

3) Yadanātmā tadavidyāmātram jñānena tadavidyānivrittih

३. यदनात्मा तदविद्यामात्रं ज्ञानेन तदविद्यानिवृत्तिः ।

3. That which is perceived as not ātman is due to ignorance, and such ignorance is removed by knowledge.

Ignorance is error. The erroneous notion we hold is that we are seekers striving for some object or result, creating a division between subject and object, knower and known, seeker and sought. This makes us vest an independent reality to objects around us and we see multiplicity when there is none. However, all such distinctions are a result of our ignorance, and it is this ignorance which the Śāstra aims to remove, letting ātman shine of its own accord. This ignorance is therefore only removed by right knowledge. The question arises, what is the nature of this ignorance that is removed by knowledge? Is it real? Is it some inexplicable force that somehow creates the world, or is it simply a false notion?

4) Jñānena na tu vastu nivrittih kevalam pratyayanivrittih

४. ज्ञानेन न तु वस्तुनिवृत्तिः केवलं प्रत्ययनिवृत्तिः ।

4. Knowledge cannot remove an actual thing, it can only remove a notion

Knowledge has never been known to remove an actual thing. It can only eliminate a false notion. Śaṅkara has said in Bri Bhā 1.4.10 jñāpakam hi śāstram na kārakam. Knowledge can inform, not create. This makes perfect sense. If there is only one reality, the view that there is something other than this reality cannot be real, only notional. Śaṅkara tells us therefore that ascertaining the true nature of something through discrimination is knowledge "tadvivekena cha vastusvarūpāvadhāraṇam vidyām āhuh" (BSB intro). This knowledge simply removes false notions.

5) Ato 'avidyāsvarūpam mithyāpratyayasvarūpam na tu vastusvarūpam

५. अतोऽविद्यास्वरूपं मिथ्याप्रत्ययस्वरूपं न तु वस्तुस्वरूपम्।

5. Therefore the true nature of ignorance is that it is a false notion, not an entity of any kind

Śāṅkara describes this ignorance as mithyāpratyaya, a false notion, many times in the Bhāshya texts eg Bh G 13.2 “tāmaso hi pratyayah”, or the introduction to Brahma Sūtra Bhāshyam “mithyapratyayarūpah”. However, an objection may be raised: “But I see the world and there must be a reason for this!”. This is only when we see the world through the eyes of anātman that it appears independently real. Through the eyes of ātman there is only ātman. Suresvara says in Nai Si III.1 “anātmanaśchājñānaprasūtāt”. Anātman is born of ignorance, as we have not known the ātman. It is tempting to seek for a cause of our ignorance, as this seems a perfectly reasonable question. However, the notions of cause and affect are themselves within the clutches of this very ignorance, so such a question can have no meaning: When you struggle in time, space and causation you are bound in time, space and causation. Only Vedānta shows us how to break free from this chimera by negating all that is false, leaving Brahman to shine forth on its own. To realise that the very question “What causes my ignorance?” is an illegitimate question, is a great discovery for an aspirant.

6) Tasmāt jnānenaiva avidyānivrittih avastusvarūpatvāt

६ तस्मात् ज्ञानेनैव अविद्यानिवृत्तिः अवस्तुस्वरूपत्वात्।

6. Therefore ignorance is removed through knowledge alone, as it is not an entity at all

Since it is removed by knowledge, ignorance must be notional, not some entity or force, as has been described by post Śāṅkara commentators. When such knowledge arises, avidyā is seen to not exist, have never existed and to never exist. So, how does this knowledge accrue? How do we create the right conditions for this knowledge to arise? We say as follows:

7) Jnānaprāptih sādhanāsopānakrameṇa shrutivākyādeva

७ ज्ञानप्राप्तिः साधनासोपानक्रमेण श्रुतिवाक्यादेव।

7. Knowledge arises by following the steps of the ladder of spiritual discipline, and then from hearing the sacred text alone

The Vedānta Shāstra tells us we must first create the conditions for knowledge in us, so that it instantaneously accrues when we hear the Śruti texts such as Thou Art That. If we have not created the right conditions, when we hear tat tvam asi, it just passes through us as we cannot fully grasp its meaning. Therefore the Śastra shows us how the correct discipline in life prepares both the desire and

the ground for such knowledge. Śaṅkara describes this discipline as the Sādhanā Chatuṣṭayam. Suresvara in Naishkarmya Siddhi 1.52 gives us the explicit steps of this sādhanā that ultimately reveals reality as it is: By following one's duties, Dharma, or Righteousness accrues: From knowing and following the right path, clarity and purity of mind comes about: This allows us to see the world as it really is, an impermanent sea of name and form: When we have known the world for what it is, dispassion for the world arises, since there can be no desire for that which is transient and impermanent: When dispassion arises and the desire for the transient ceases, the intense desire for the eternal arises. The seeker then searches for the method to attain the eternal and be liberated. The method he finds is to renounce all works. This leads the seeker to question his seeker-hood status and he is absorbed in deep contemplation of the self via adhyātma yōga. This turns the mind inward and away from the external. Now the seeker is ready to understand the purport of the Sacred texts, and by merely hearing tat tvam asi, his ignorance is not only gone, but he realises it was never there in the first place. He then rests in his true nature as the eternally unbound and free ātman.

8) Sādhanāsvarūpam yajñasvarūpam sarvakarmanirāseṇa

८ साधनास्वरूपं यज्ञस्वरूपं सर्वकर्मनिरासेन ।

8. The true form of spiritual discipline is a Sacred Offering, from renouncing all works

8. Śaṅkara uses the phrase Isvarārādhanārtham in Bh G II.48 to describe how we should perform all works: Live life as a Sacred Offering, a yajna, as this is the way to transcend the petty notions of me and mine which confuse and obfuscate reality as it is. The sādhanā described in the previous Sūtra, when performed as a sacred offering, naturally leads the seeker to the point where he is ready for knowledge to accrue. No act is required, for that which is permanent and eternal cannot be attained by an act that creates impermanent results. Our eternal nature is Brahman itself and all that is needed is for our false identifications with that which we perceive as not Brahman to stop. This cancellation of error is the only knowledge worthy of the name. The Bhāllavi Shruti tells us "sarvah sannyastakar-maiva jñānāt kaivalyam ucyate". Through renunciation of all works it is through knowledge alone that one rests as Brahman.

9) Tasmāt yathā yajnam tathā jīvanam bhavitvyam nānyathā

९ तस्मात् यथा यज्ञं तथा जीवनं भवितव्यं नान्यथा ।

9. Therefore our lives must be as a Sacred Offering and nothing else.

Living our lives as a Sacred Offering is the highest expression of our sādhanā in the spirit of total surrender, and creates the conditions for knowledge to dawn, free from the intellectual dialectic and machinations we obsess over when are

still struggling to fathom the truth. Here we see the perfect union of the path of bhakti and jñāna. Nārada in Bhakti Sūtra 19 tells us that the offering of all acts to the Almighty and feeling the highest pang of separation on occasions of losing remembrance of our true nature is the essence of Bhakti. The Supreme Bhakta and the Supreme Jñānī are one and the same, for the spirit of surrender is fundamental to discarding our false notions of who we are and our place in the world. It is only through complete effacement of the self, that knowledge of our unity with Brahman can arise.

10. Tasmāt yatkimapi jīvane kṛtam tadvayam sarvam shivasannidhau samarpayāma iti sarvam shivam!

१० तस्मात् यत्किमपि जीवने कृतं तद्वयं सर्वं शिवसन्निधौ समर्पयाम इति सर्वं शिवम् ॥

10. Therefore whatever we do in our lives we offer at the Sacred Feet of Lord Shiva so that all is auspicious!

We must daily get into the habit of giving and offering everything we do. Ritual gives us one vehicle to create this habit by offering to our chosen deity an archanā of flowers or by offerings into the sacred fire, or through contemplation and japa. Once this offering becomes second nature we are able to mentally renounce and offer all we think and do as our notions of I and mine evaporate. At a stroke, our ignorance can then be removed by the sacred texts which then reveal to us the knowledge of our true nature. Finally we then rest in our natural state, Brahman, which is the Highest Truth. Hariḥ Om!



Adhyārōpa-Apavāda Superimposition and Negation

Sri Swami Kaivalyānanda.

After his education in Tumkur, Karnataka and working for some time in Bharat Electronics, the author resigned his job and went to Himalayas and studied under several Masters, but felt not satisfied. He came in contact with Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji's Book 'The Intuition of Reality' and afterwards was able to find out Advaita in Pure Reality. He keeps travelling in Karnataka and Andhra teaching Advaita philosophy. He has translated Sri Swamiji's Sanskrit commentary on Naishkarmya Siddhi called Kleshāpahārīnī into Kannada and Sri Swamiji's Kannada book 'Paramārtha Chintamaṇi' into Telugu. Sri Swami Kaivalyānanda's telephone number is : +91 8152 221 628

Every human being wants happiness. Naturally he thinks there is un-happiness in him. He thinks there is happiness in the external things. Hence, he starts his life with toys. After certain age, he leaves the toys. Then he collects different type of toys, some are lifeless toys and some are toys with life. Money, power etc are lifeless toys for his play. Wife, children etc are toys with life for his play. Many people spend their whole life in collecting these toys, maintaining them etc. Ultimately he feels his life to be futile.

Why it happens like this? - When he came to this world he was fully ignorant. He was not having any knowledge about the external world. Nor about the internal world. The knowledge of the external things one acquires in the course of time. But he is not going to know any thing about himself. Without any deliberate thinking, he develops a notion about himself. This notion is the real cause of suffering. नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः- Shri Śaṅkara says (wrong) conclusion about himself is नैसर्गिक-अविचारितसिद्ध. Śaṅkara says अध्यास- not knowing about himself, he takes body, mind etc as himself. Taking आनात्मा as आत्मा is the root cause for human suffering. Vedānta removes this root cause.

Vedānta has a method of teaching - अध्यारोप-अपवाद - Superimposition and Negation. Māṇḍukyōpanishad superimposes Jāgrat, Svapna, Sushupti and negating all the three, leaves the Mumukshu in his own true nature- स्वस्वरूप.

Generally man thinks that there is a world, which is अनादि-अनन्त. In this world he

has taken birth. Daily he experiences Jāgrat, Svapna, Sushupti in this world . In this way his आयु (age) is calculated . One day he goes away- dies from this world.

But if one thinks based on Maṇḍūkya Shruti and his Anubhava, he finds that there is no common world for all the three states. The world which appears in his waking state is itself he takes as the permanent world. But the world which appears in his waking state and goes away when the waking ends, cannot be permanent. Other than the waking appearance, there is no other world. In dream also the world appears and goes away when that avasthā ends. In this way the idea , notion of permanent world is negated. “World appears and goes way”- here it is written. It only means appears as though the things exist. They are not at all existing, they appear as though they exist. Really, the world appears to be existing in both the states is like mirage water. I and my world in both the states really do not exist. In waking and dream, the substratum alone exist. Nothing else. The ISNESS in the things is the ISNESS of the substratum.

If we look into the sleep, There is no thing that is there. The entire world of I and my is negated. The pure existence alone remains. The waking intellect, not knowing what it is, wrongly concluded it as sleep. Just as a rope mistaken for snake when one shouts as snake. What is there is only rope. Similarly all the people says sleep. But it is not sleep, it is pure existence, our Swarūpa; Ānanda. Śāṅkara in BrahmaSūtra Bhāṣya says [3.2.7 ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुप्तिस्थानम् इत्येतत् प्रतिपादयामः । तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति, जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणं स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहारवियुक्तत्वावधारणं च तस्मात् आत्मैव सुप्तिस्थानम्।]; ‘Brahma is Sushuptisthānam’ In this way we are doing pratipādana; By his knowledge we can understand that Jīva is nothing but Brahman and also that Brahman is free from transactions of waking an dream. Therefore Ātman is Sushuptisthānam.

In this way during the appearance and non-appearance, there exists only Brahman. No other thing. Hence no suffering. What is there is the only Ānanda.



Cause And Effect In The Light Of Adhyārōpa Apavāda

Chittaranjan Naik.

The author worked for the Company 3i Infotech as a Business Group Head for Software Solutions for South East Asia Geography. He resigned from the job in November 2007 in order to get more time to pursue his Spiritual Interests. His email id: chittaranjan_naik@yahoo.com

Om Sri Gurubhyo Namah

I bow to the Lotus Feet of Mata Annapurneshwari who is always Full, who is the presiding Goddess of the Holy Centre of Kashi, and who out of Her infinite Grace grants the alms of Knowledge and opens the Gates of Mōksha to Her devotees.

ADHYĀRŌPA APAVĀDA

Vedānta is not a didactic science; it is not something that can be imparted through teaching. In Vedānta, the Truth is considered to be not dependent on anything other than the very nature of the thing itself. Knowledge of Brahman is not something that results from action, not even from the act of meditation or the act of knowing. This aspect of Knowledge has been elucidated by Sri Śaṅkarācārya in the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya:

“Hence the knowledge of Brahman is not dependent on human action. On what is it dependent then? It is dependent on the thing itself, as in the case of a thing got through such valid means as direct perception. By no stretch of imagination can such a Brahman or Its knowledge be brought into contact with work. Nor can it be held that Brahman has some association with work by virtue of Its being the object of the act of knowing; for in the text, ‘It is different from the known and also different from the unknown’ (Ke.I.4), as also in the text, ‘Through what should one know that owing to which all this is known?’ (Br.II.iv.14), Brahman is denied to be an object of the act of knowing. So also there is the denial of Its being the object of the act of meditation. For in the text, ‘That which is not uttered by speech, that by which speech is revealed’, it is first declared that Brahman is not an object, and then it is said, ‘Know that alone to be Brahman and not what people worship

as an object.’ (Ke.I.5)” (BSB.I.i.4).

And in order to refute the objection of the pūrva-paksha that the scriptures would be rendered meaningless if Brahman be not an object of knowledge, Sri Śāṅkara clarifies in the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya:

Pūrva-paksha: “If Brahman be not an object (of knowledge), It cannot logically be presented by the scriptures (as stated in BS.I.i.3)”.

Sri Śāṅkara: “Not so, for the scriptures aim at removal of the differences fancied through ignorance. Not that the scriptures seek to establish Brahman as an entity referable objectively by the word ‘this’” (BSB.I.i.4).

The fundamental tenet of Vedānta is that knowledge is svatah-siddha, self-revealed. The aim of the scriptures is not to teach anything new or unknown but to remove the obstructions to the knowledge that is already present within one’s Self. The method that it employs to do so is adhyārōpa apavāda, a dialectical method of affirmation and negation, of deliberate attribution and denial of the attribution. This method belongs to anādi sampradāya and has been mentioned in the Śruti:

“It is only after many births that the desire for liberation arises in man through the ripening of good karma. Then having restored to a good Guru and served under him for a long time, one out of many attains moksha, freedom from bondage. Bondage is through non-enquiry and moksha through enquiry. Therefore there should always be enquiry (of Ātman). The Reality should be ascertained through adhyārōpa and apavāda.” (Paingala Upanishad, Adhyāya-II).

Sri Śāṅkara mentions adhyārōpa apavāda as the traditional method of the sampradāyavids in the Gītā Bhāshya:

“There is the saying of the sampradāya-vids – of those who know the right traditional method of teaching – which runs as follows: ‘That which is devoid of all duality is described by adhyārōpa and apavāda’ i.e., by superimposition and negation, by attribution and denial.” (Gītā Bhāshya.XIII.13):

THE NEED FOR ADHYĀRŌPA APAVĀDA

The Śruti describes Brahman as nirguṇa, nirvikāra, nirviśeṣa, nirvikalpa, and as That from which speech returns after failing to reach It. Moreover, in order to convey that Brahman is absolutely devoid of attributes, the Śruti describes It via-negativa through the words ‘neti, neti’. It would appear from such denials that mere negation should have sufficed to point out the nature of Brahman. Why then is the affirmative part of the dialectic, adhyārōpa, also required to lead one to the knowledge of Brahman? The most commonly proffered explanation is that

the scriptures employ the technique of adhyārōpa to deliberately come down to the level of the seeker, who has superimposed false attributes on the Truth, in order to lead him to the Supreme Truth that is Nirguṇa, devoid of all attributes. While such an explanation appears to be reasonable in so far as it pertains to the scriptures, it fails to explain why the seeker should be asked to deliberately superimpose attributes when his natural state in the world is already conditioned by such superimpositions due to his avidyā. For nobody asks a man who falsely apprehends a rope as a snake to first superimpose the attributes of a snake on the thing and then to rescind those attributes in order to know that it is a rope. It would be far more logical and natural to point out to him that it is a rope and not a snake as he imagines it to be. There is a seeming paradox here that needs to be elucidated because it forms the pivot around which the entire method of adhyārōpa and apavāda revolves. A careful reading of the Bhāshyas reveals that there are two primary reasons why the method of adhyārōpa and apavāda becomes necessary in Vedānta:

1. The entire content of cognition is never denied in a negation

In the case of sublation of an error, as for example when it is realized that the object in front is a rope and not a snake, the content of cognition is not negated in its entirety even though the object seen, i.e. snake, is negated. For while the snake is negated, the shape, i.e., the coil, does not get negated as it actually pertains to the rope which exists in that place. Thus there is something of the truth that is perceived even in an erroneous cognition. Likewise, even in the case of the self, which is mistaken for the non-self by one and all, the self does not remain completely unknown even though one may be mistaking the body for the self. Sri Śaṅkara explains this in the Adhyāsa Bhāshya:

“The Self is not absolutely beyond apprehension, because It is apprehended as the content of the concept ‘I’, and because the Self, opposed to the non-self, is well known in the world as an immediately perceived (i.e. self-revealing) entity.”

Even in the case of an erroneous cognition, the mind does not project an absolutely non-existent entity as the object. Neither through avidyā nor through māyā can the son of a barren woman be ever born or cognized. All cognitions are grounded in the truth. An erroneous cognition too has an indistinct (or partial) cognition of the form of the real object even if the object seen in the erroneous cognition should be false and superimposed. Knowledge can only be sought of thing that is already known, and which presents itself in the world as an unknown thing due to its partial obstruction. In a vitally important part of the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya, this seeming paradox - of already knowing that which is sought to be known - has been dealt with by Sri Śaṅkarācārya:

Pūrva-paksha: “Is that Brahman, again, familiar or unfamiliar? If It be familiar, It need not be deliberated on for the sake of knowledge. Again, if It be unfamiliar, It cannot be deliberated on.”

Vedāntin: “As to that, Brahman does exist as a well-known entity - eternal, pure, intelligent, free by nature, and all-knowing and all-powerful. For from the very derivation of the word Brahman, the ideas of eternality, purity, etc. become obvious, this being in accord with the root brmh. Besides, the existence of Brahman is well-known from the fact of Its being the Self of all, for everyone feels that his Self exists, and he never feels, ‘I do not exist’. Had there been no general recognition of the existence of the Self, everyone would have felt, ‘I do not exist’. And that Self is Brahman.” (BSB.I.i.1)

Denying the entire content of an erroneous cognition would tantamount to negating not only the false attributes superimposed on the truth, but also the truth that presents itself, albeit indistinctly, in the cognition.

2. In Advaita, the ultimate negation is a negation without there being any object to deny

Adhyāsa, or superimposition, is the appearance of one thing as another. A thing by itself can never be unreal. If the negation used in Vedānta is taken to imply that the world is negated like the horns of a hare, then it would preclude the very possibility of knowing the pūrṇatva or material causality of Brahman. In the ultimate darśana of Advaita that ‘All is Brahman’, there cannot be any object to deny as the entire universe is subsumed in the One Reality of Brahman. In the Bhāshya, while asserting that the effect pre-exists in the cause and that the denial of objects prior to creation is merely a negation without there being any object to deny, Sri Śāṅkarācārya states that even now, after creation, the situation is not different than it was before creation.

“Because it can be understood that even today, the effect (universe) has existence only in identity with its material cause (Existence-Brahman), so it had its existence in that very way, even before creation. For even now, this creation does not exist independently of the Self that is its material source, as is shown in the Upanishadic text, ‘All ousts one who knows it as different from the Self’ etc. (Br.Up.II.iv.6). But the existence of the product as the cause before creation is in an indistinguishable form.” (BSB.II.i.7).

Considering these two factors, i.e. that the truth presents itself partially and indistinctly even in an erroneous cognition and that the ultimate negation in Advaita is a negation without there being any object to deny, the dialectic of adhyārōpa and apavāda becomes a necessary device to attain to the Truth.

THE IDENTITY BETWEEN BRAHMAN AND THE WORLD IS RELATIONLESS

Adhyārōpa apavāda primarily arises in all those contexts wherein identity is being asserted between two seemingly disparate entities, as in the case of dravya and guṇa, jñatṛ and jñeya, sāmānya and viśeṣha and kārya and kāraṇa. In this article, we shall look at the identity of kārya-kāraṇa in the light of adhyārōpa apavāda.

According to Vedānta, the effect pre-exists in the cause and is a peculiar condition of the cause itself. Accordingly, the entire universe is said to be nothing but Brahman - 'Sarvam Khalvidam Brahma' (Ch.III.xiv.1). It is at once obvious that this statement presents a logical conundrum by asserting an identity between two entities that are entirely different in their natures. The one is sentient and the other is inert; the one is formless and the other is possessed of form; and the one is eternal and the other is transitory. The identity presented by the scriptures is paradoxical and logically incomprehensible. We come across this paradox throughout the prasthāna traya Bhāshyas whenever the relation between Brahman and the world is brought into context. In the Gītā Bhāshya, for example, we come across the following description indicating the negation of all upādhis in Brahman:

"All the variety caused in Kshetraja by the variety of the upādhis of Kshetra is but illusory, and it has therefore been said - in the words 'It is not said to be sat or asat' - that It should be known as devoid of all variety. Still it is spoken of - in the words that 'It has hands and feet everywhere' - as though it were an attribute of the Knower only with a view to indicate Its Existence." (Gītā Bhāshya.XIII.13)

And yet, in the Bhāshya to the very next verse, we come across the following statement indicating the contrary, i.e., that 'All this is Brahman':

"Wherefore, on account of its subtlety, It is incomprehensible to the unenlightened, though knowable in Itself. It is, however, always known to the enlightened, as revealed in the following texts: 'All this is the Self and the Self alone.' (Br.2.4.6); 'All this is Brahman and Brahman alone' (Br.2.5.1)." (Gītā Bhāshya.XIII.14)

More often than not, modern scholars try to circumvent the paradox by taking the world to be unconditionally unreal thus 'making' the identity of the world with Brahman 'comprehensible' to the thinking mind by leaving aside no world at all for Brahman to be identical with. Unfortunately, those who interpret Vedānta in this way do not realize that negation only negates a thing in a given locus and does not constitute the absolute negation of the thing. If the world were unconditionally unreal, the statement 'All this is the Self' would have no meaning just as the statement 'He is the son of a barren woman' has no meaning. In other words, it would be a meaningless construing of words if the object denoted by the word 'this' is itself denied while asserting that 'All this is Brahman'. Therefore, the paradox of the identity of the world with Brahman does not go away by merely

stating that the world is unreal.

How then is the paradox resolved? Vedānta says that the paradox is never resolved in the realm of thought or speech on account of the impossibility of there being any articulate relationship between Brahman and the world. Knowledge of the non-difference of the effect from the Cause is not different than Knowledge of Brahman, for it is by Knowing Brahman alone that one sees the non-difference of effect from the Cause in the form: 'All this is the Self'. And such knowledge is not obtainable by mere logic or by the exercise of the mental faculty, it being beyond the mind to conceive of it. Sri Śāṅkara elucidates the impossibility of grasping the relation between Brahman and the world in the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya:

Pūrva paksha: "If Brahman be an existing entity, It must be the object of other means of valid knowledge, so that any deliberation on the Upanishadic texts (for the knowledge of Brahman) becomes meaningless".

Sri Śāṅkara: "Not so, for Brahman's relation with anything cannot be grasped, It being outside the range of sense perception. The senses naturally comprehend objects, and not Brahman." (BSB.I.i.2)

The causal relationship between Brahman and the world cannot be known through mental conceptions because mental conceptions are forms of subtle speech whereas the nature of Brahman is beyond speech and is not known through any mental act or through any act of knowing. And it is to prevent one from getting derailed into building fanciful theories arising from speculative thought that the method of adhyārōpa apavāda has been advocated by the sampradāyavids.

ADHYĀRŌPA APAVĀDA AND SVATAḤ PRAMĀṆA

Now, a doubt may arise with regard to adhyārōpa apavāda as follows: If conception cannot lead to knowledge of the non-difference of effect from the Cause, then adhyārōpa apavāda would become a meaningless device in so far as it would result in an interminable series of affirmations of conceptions and their subsequent denials without there being any hope of it leading to knowledge. The Vedāntic reply to this is that it may indeed be so. Knowledge of Brahman does not arise from adhyārōpa and apavāda. Knowledge is svataḥ siddha, and it spontaneously arises when there is lack of obstruction to it.

As regards the doubt that adhyārōpa apavāda may become an interminable sequence of superimpositions and denials, we say that it depends on the presence or absence of conditions that determine whether Brahma-jijñāsa would become fruitful or unfruitful. If it be asked what these conditions are, we say that they are the four qualifications as stated in the Bhāshya to the first Sūtra: 'athāto brahma-jijñāsā'. Sri Śāṅkara explains that the word 'atha' (thereafter) is used in the sense of sequence, and that it follows from something that comes prior to brahma-jijñāsa and which forms the pre-requisite for brahma-jijñāsā to become fruitful. That pre-requisite is the presence of the four qualifications comprising discrimination,

detachment, the six qualities of calmness etc. and a burning desire for liberation. In the case of an *uttama adhikāri*, in whom there is complete absence of obstruction due to the presence of these four qualifications, Knowledge of Brahman rises instantly and spontaneously by merely hearing the Śruti Mahāvākyas. Whereas in the case of those with middling *adhikāra*, for whom there still exist traces of impurities, the three stages of *śravaṇa*, *manana*, and *nidhidhyāsana* are said to be necessary. It is in such cases that *adhyārōpa apavāda* becomes a reasonable device as an aid to *brahma-jijñāsa*. Therefore, we conclude that *adhyārōpa apavāda* is not a device for obtaining knowledge of Brahman, but is a method for safeguarding the mind from building fanciful theories, or from clinging to false notions, which may arise during the course of *brahma-jijñāsa* due to traces of subtle impurities and tendencies that may adhere in the mind. Therefore, the efficacy of *adhyārōpa apavāda* as an aid to *brahma-jijñāsa* is beyond reproach.

CAUSE AND EFFECT IN THE LIGHT OF ADHYĀRŌPA APAVĀDA

It is well known that *adhyārōpa* constitutes the superimposition of the world on Brahman and *apavāda* constitutes its denial in order to reveal that Brahman is *Nirguṇa*. What is not so well-known is that this superimposition and denial is only the first level of *adhyārōpa apavāda* and that the application of the method (of *adhyārōpa apavāda*) does not stop here. It applies to every conception that one forms of Brahman until the Truth that is *svataḥ-siddha* stands revealed effortlessly and naturally. The scriptures contain various levels of *adhyārōpa* and *apavāda* as we shall presently demonstrate. In this section, we shall consider four cases of *adhyārōpa apavāda* in relation to Cause and effect to show how the effect (the world) being non-different from the Cause (Brahman) defies all attempts at mental conception and that the identity is to be accepted just as it has been mentioned in the scriptures until the Truth stands revealed effortlessly and naturally in the light of *sākshi-jñāna*. In each case, we shall provide the reasoning, based on the scriptures, to show why the superimposition needs to be rescinded.

CASE 1: *Adhyārōpa*: The world that we perceive is the reality. *Apavāda*: Brahman is the only reality and this world is unreal

A *jīva* naturally thinks that the world is the only reality. But the scriptures point out that Reality is Conscious, Transcendent and Formless and that the world we perceive through our senses is unreal. Moreover, from reasoning too we know that the world being a perceived thing, there must be a perceiver of the world who is of the nature of Consciousness and who is distinct from all that is perceived and without whom the perceived world cannot exist.

CASE 2: *Adhyārōpa*: The world is unreal and is non-existent in Supreme Brahman. *Apavāda*: The world is not unreal (because words are eternal).

In this level of *adhyārōpa apavāda*, the conception that the world is unreal itself becomes a superimposition (on the nature of Brahman) and such a conception

(which is a superimposition) is rescinded.

According to the tenets of Vedānta, words are eternal. It is also stated in the Bhāshya that an object is not different from the word. Therefore, an object denoted by a word can never be absolutely non-existent. Atyantābhāva, or absolute non-existence, in all places and at all times, can be asserted only in the case of word-formations such as 'son of a barren woman' that do not denote any object and have no capacity (yogyatā) for manifestation at any place at any time. But the negation of a thing denoted by a word can never indicate its absolute non-existence; it can only indicate its non-existence in a particular locus. Therefore, the four kinds of negations enumerated in logic known as previous non-existence, non-existence due to destruction, absolute non-existence and mutual non-existence, when applied to an object indicates only its non-existence in the particular locus in which it is denied, i.e. to its obstruction to manifestation in that locus, and does not deny its pre-existence in Reality. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhāshya, Sri Śāṅkara brings out this aspect, i.e., that the words 'existence' and 'non-existence' as used in ordinary language indicate manifestation and non-manifestation respectively and do not deny the pre-existence of objects in reality:

“The effect too exists before it is produced. How? Because its manifestation points out its pre-existence..... Manifestation means coming within the range of perception. Every effect such as a jar has two kinds of obstruction. When it has become manifest from its component clay, darkness and the wall etc. are the obstructions; while before its manifestation from the clay the obstruction consists in particles of clay remaining as some other effect such as a lump. Therefore, the effect, the jar, although existent, is not perceived before its manifestation, as it is hidden. The terms and concepts 'destroyed', 'produced', 'existence' and 'non-existence' depend on this two-fold character of manifestation and disappearance.” (Br.I,ii.1).

Sri Śāṅkarācārya specifically refutes the view of those who think that the non-difference of the effect from the Cause indicates the unconditional unreality of the world (Br.I,ii.1):

Sri Śāṅkara: “Moreover, if the jar before its manifestation be an absolute nonentity like the proverbial horns of a hare, it cannot be connected either with its cause or with existence (as the logicians hold), for connection requires two positive entities.”

Objection: “It is all right with things that are inseparable.”

Sri Śāṅkara: “No, for we cannot conceive of an inseparable connection between an existent and a non-existent thing. Separable or inseparable connection is possible between two positive entities only, not between an

entity and a nonentity, nor between two nonentities. Therefore we conclude that the effect does exist before it is manifested.”

Thus, the scriptural vākya ‘All this is Brahman’ has to be understood without resorting to an interpretation wherein the ‘all’ is understood to be unconditionally unreal. The unreality of the world arises only when the world is seen with the notion that it is different from Brahman and not when it is understood to be non-different from Brahman. Those who construe the scriptural vākyas to postulate that the world is unconditionally unreal so that the scriptures may appear comprehensible to the mind actually sink into an acutely illogical position by violating the very nature of negation. The negation of the world in Vedānta pertains to the notion of duality alone and not to the world per se. This is brought out unequivocally in the Chāndōgya Upanishad Bhāshya:

“Since it is Existence itself that is perceived otherwise through the duality of different forms, therefore, there is no non-existence of anything anywhere. That is what we say..... As the Nyāya school, after assuming that a thing is different from existence, says again that it has no existence before its birth and after its destruction – it is not assumed by us in that way, at anytime or anywhere, that any word or anything denoted by the word can be there differently from Existence. But all words and all things that are spoken of with the idea of their being different from Existence, are Existence only, just as in the world a rope itself is spoken of as a snake, under the idea that it is a snake.” (Ch.VI.ii.3).

It may be noted that what is negated in the analogy is the ‘idea of the snake’ and what is sought to be illustrated through the negation is the negation of ‘the idea of difference of names and forms from Existence’. And in order to show that it is not names and forms themselves that are negated, Sri Śāṅkara first states that there is no non-existence of anything anywhere and then later, while presenting the analogy of the snake in the rope, further reiterates that at no time and at no place can any word or anything be there differently from Existence. Thus what is negated is not the world but the notion of duality between Brahman and the world. And moreover, since words and objects are not really different from Existence and have no non-existence at anytime or anyplace, their existence in identity with Brahman is trikāla abhāditham and is hence pāramārthika sathya.

CASE 3: Adhyārōpa: The identity (of cause and effect) spoken of in the scriptures is with respect to Saguṇa Brahman. Apavāda: The identity spoken of is not with respect to Saguṇa Brahman (because it is by knowing the Supreme Brahman alone that All becomes known).

This level of adhyārōpa apavāda concerns a doubt which may arise, while considering that the scriptures speak of both things, i.e. of the world being unreal as well as of the world being non-different from Brahman, that the non-difference of

the world with Brahman may be spoken of with respect to Saguṇa Brahman.

In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhāshya (I.iv.10), while refuting the view that Brahman knowing All is a result of (the act of) knowing, Sri Śāṅkara shows that Brahman being All is svatah-siddha and that it is revealed when the superimpositions due to avidyā are removed and hence the Brahman spoken of in the Upanishad (in the context of knowing all) is the Supreme Brahman Itself:

Br.I.iv.10: “This (self) was indeed Brahman in the beginning. It knew only Itself as, ‘I am Brahman.’ Therefore It became all.”

Bhāshya: “Prima facie view: Brahman here must be the conditioned Brahman, for then only can the identity with all be the product of effort. The Supreme Brahman cannot become all as a result of knowledge. But this identity with all is spoken of as a result of knowledge: ‘Therefore It became all.’ Hence the Brahman referred to in the passage, ‘This was indeed Brahman in the beginning,’ must be the conditioned Brahman. Or since men alone are qualified (for this identification with all), the word Brahman may refer to a future knower of Brahman who will be identified with It.”

Reply: “Not so, for that kind of identity with all would be open to the charge of transitoriness. There is no such thing in the world that really assumes a different state through some cause and still is eternal. Similarly, if identity with all be due to the (acquired) knowledge of Brahman, it cannot at the same time be eternal. And if it be transitory, it would be, as we have already said, like the result of an action. But if by identity with all you mean the cessation, through the knowledge of Brahman, of that idea of not being all which is due to ignorance, then it would be futile to understand by the term ‘Brahman’ a man who will be Brahman. Even before knowing Brahman, everybody, being Brahman, is really always identical with all, but ignorance superimposes on him the idea that he is not Brahman and not all, as a mother of pearl is mistaken for silver, or as the sky is imagined to be concave, or blue, or the like. Similarly, if you think that here also the idea of not being Brahman and not being all that has been superimposed on Brahman by ignorance, is removed by the knowledge of Brahman, then, since the Vedas speak the truth, it is proper to say that what was really the Supreme Brahman is referred to in the sentence, ‘This was indeed Brahman in the beginning,’ for that is the primary meaning of the word ‘Brahman’.” (Br.I.iv.10)

Thus the identity of the world with Brahman is spoken of with respect to the Supreme (Nirguṇa) Brahman and not with respect to Saguṇa Brahman. Moreover, the Śruti presents the Supreme Brahman through words ‘knowing which all this becomes known’ and such statements would get negated if all objects are held to be different from Brahman:

BS.II.iii.6: “The (Vedic) assertion (that ‘all things become known when the One is known’) can remain unaffected only if all the objects are non-different from Brahman; and this is confirmed in Vedic texts”

Sri Śaṅkarācārya’s Bhāshya: “In all the Upanishads, individually, we come across a declaration on the following line, ‘That by knowing which all that is not heard becomes heard, all that is not thought becomes thought, all that is not known becomes known’ (Ch.Vi.i.3),..... ‘What is that, Sir, by knowing which all this becomes known’ (Mu.I.i.3). ‘There is no knowledge of all outside Myself’. ‘That declaration can remain unaffected’, unhampered, ‘only if all things (without exception) are non-different from the Brahman that is to be known. For if anything be different from Brahman, the declaration that ‘all becomes known when one is known’ becomes stultified..... Hence it is to be understood that the All-Knowingness is concerned with the knowledge of everything without exception, and that this statement is made from the point of view that everything is an effect of Brahman.” (BSB.II.iii.6)

CASE 4: Adhyārōpa: The pre-existence of the effect does not refer to the object but to its potential existence only. Apavāda: The pre-existence of the effect refers to the object itself and not to its potential existence (because of the denial of transformation)

The adhyārōpa-apavāda here is concerning the doubt that may arise in the following manner: Since Brahman is Nirguṇa, the non-difference of the effect from the cause is possible only if the effect exists in the Cause not in the form of the object but as some kind of potential of the object in the Self.

But such a view is not tenable. If the potential does not refer to the object itself, then it implies that there would be a transformation from the potential form (of the object) to the actual form of the object. Such a view would amount to pariṇāmavāda on account of there being a transformation. And moreover, it is incongruous to say that the object exists not as the object but as a potential in some other form because an object divested of its intrinsic form and intrinsic characteristics would not be the object just as milk would not be milk without its whiteness, and this would contradict the assertion that the object pre-exists in the cause and would lead to a kind of asat-kāryavāda, i.e. that the object does not exist prior to its manifestation. If it is held that the potential pertains to the object along with its intrinsic characteristics, then it is the object itself that exists when it is said that it pre-exists in the cause. Sri Śaṅkarācārya points out the incongruity of holding the view that the object would come into production (on account of whatsoever reason) in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāshya:

“From our divergent notions of the past and future also we infer this. Our notions of a jar that was and one that is yet to be cannot, like the notion of

the present jar, be entirely independent of objects. For one who desires to have a jar not yet made sets oneself to work for it. We do not see people strive for things which they know to be non-existent..... If on seeing a potter, for instance, at work on the production of a jar one is certain in view of the evidence that the jar will come into existence, then it would be a contradiction in terms to say that the jar is non-existent at the very time with which it is said it will come into relation. For to say that the jar that will be is non-existent, is the same thing as to say that it will not be. It would be like saying, 'This jar does not exist'." (Br.I.ii.1)

In Advaita, the object itself is said to pre-exist in the cause. When an object is non-manifest, it is not because it is non-existent but because of its existence being obstructed just as a statue, which already exists in a block of granite, is obstructed from being manifested before the sculptor chips away the obstructing pieces of granite to reveal the form of the statue. Moreover, even things such as production of pot from clay are due to the removal of obstructions to their manifestations.

"Obstruction is of two kinds. Every effect such as a jar has two kinds of obstruction. When it has become manifest from its component clay, darkness and the wall etc. are the obstructions; while before its manifestation from the clay the obstruction consists in particles of clay remaining as some other effect such as a lump. Therefore, the effect, the jar, although existent, is not perceived before its manifestation, as it is hidden. The terms and concepts 'destroyed', 'produced', 'existence' and 'non-existence' depend on this two-fold character of manifestation and disappearance." (Br.I.ii.1)

Moreover, the view that it is the object itself and not its potential form that is said to be non-different from Brahman is substantiated by Sri Śāṅkara in the Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya wherein it is pointed out that even after creation the effect is non-different from Brahman:

"Because it can be understood that even today, the effect (universe) has existence only in identity with its material cause (Existence-Brahman), so it had its existence in that very way, even before creation. For even now, this creation does not exist independently of the Self that is its material source, as is shown in the Upanishadic text, 'All ousts one who knows it as different from the Self' etc. (Br.Up.II.iv.6). But the existence of the product as the cause before creation is in an indistinguishable form." (BSB.II.i.7).

If it be asked what this indistinguishable form is, we reply that it is one of the conditions of name and form and is not the non-existence of the object. For Sri Śāṅkara says:

"The condition in which name and form become evolved is different from the condition in which name and form is not so evolved. Hence although the

effect exists as non-different from the cause before creation, still from the standpoint of this difference in conditions the effect is declared to be non-existent before creation..... Therefore this declaration of non-existence of the effect before creation is made from the standpoint of a difference of conditions. Since in the world a thing is said to exist when it manifests itself through name and form, therefore, as a concession to common sense, the universe is said to be non-existent before being evolved through name and form.” (BSB.II.i.17)

The differences in the conditions of names and forms are four in number corresponding to the four spheres of Vishva, Taijasa, Prājña and Turīya. They are also called ‘the four quarters’. The object in all the four quarters is the same object, but the conditions of the object in the four quarters are different as characterized by the terms gross, subtle, non-manifest and ‘same with Brahman’. This is the doctrine of vivartavāda in which the object exists in all the four quarters but presents an illusion of transformation of the object due to the differences in the conditions of words and objects. In other words, the object persists in all the four stages and there is no transformation of the object, in its pure capacity as object, at anytime or at anyplace or in any of its conditions. The seeming creation and destruction of the object is an illusion of māyā and it pertains to the illusion of transformation of the object from one condition of speech to another whereas in truth the object is always existent and is non-different from Brahman. Thus, the negation in Advaita is a negation of duality between Brahman and the world and is not an unconditional negation of the world. For a jīva transmigrating through the sleep of saṃsāra, the world appears to be created and destroyed, but in the Self-Revealed Light of Jñāna it is aja, unborn, for there is neither creation nor destruction because all things exist as non-different from Brahman always.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it may be stated that adhyārōpa-apavāda has no termination as long as the mind tries to form fanciful conceptions about the non-difference of the world from Brahman because such non-difference cannot be conceived by the mind. But in spite of the paradox that the identity of the world with Brahman presents to the mind, the words of the scriptures are to be accepted just as they have been stated until the truth, which is svatah-siddha, is effortlessly revealed in the knowledge ‘Aham Brahmāsmi’ for it is in such knowledge alone that the Self is revealed to be All:

“While realizing this (Self) as that Brahman, the seer Vāmadeva knew, ‘I was Manu and I was the Sun’” (Br.I.iv.10)



How Does An Analysis Of Avasthātraya Help In Self-Knowledge?

Vidyasankar Sundaresan

The author is a Lead Technologist for GE Water and Process Technologies. He maintains an authoritative website on Advaita Vedānta- www.advaita-vedanta.org. He is an administrator of the email discussion group Advaita-L, where the discussions center around Advaita Vedānta as taught by the Sankara sampradāya. His email id: svidyasankar@hotmail.com

An examination of the waking (jāgrat), dream (svapna) and deep sleep (suṣupti) states is of central importance in logically establishing the Advaita Vedānta position that the true nature of oneself is Pure Consciousness. The reader of this volume would be well familiar with the discussions of these three states in the Brahmasūtra and the Upaniṣad-s, particularly the Māṇḍūkya text, and the Bhāṣya-s thereon. In this essay, I choose a slightly different track, by concentrating on the independent treatises of Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda and Sureśvarācārya, namely Upadeśasāhasrī and Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, before moving on to a couple of Brahmasūtra and Chāndogya Bhāṣya references on this topic.

We all go through the recurring states of being awake, dreaming and sleeping, passing through each of these in a periodic manner. In the waking state, we process sensory inputs received from the external world, through our senses. In the dream state, our minds create our own worlds, which we populate with our dream selves and other objects and beings created out of our dream imaginations. In the deep sleep state, we are aware of nothing, not external objects and not ourselves, unlike what is customary in the waking and dream states. The second prose chapter of Upadeśasāhasrī presents an analysis of these states in the form of a dialogue between disciple and teacher, leading to the conclusion that one's ultimate reality is pure consciousness, which is ever present and permanent, denoted by terms such as nityopalabdhi, avagati, kūṭastha-nitya and caitanya-svarūpa. What is remarkable about this chapter is that in answering the disciple's questions and resolving doubts, the teacher goes through a rigorous and logical exposition of Advaita precepts, but makes no direct quotation of any Śruti or Smṛti passage. Nevertheless, the discussion touches upon all the key points made

in the Śruti sources and their Bhāṣya-s, thereby making some implicit references to them.

I begin in the latter half of this discussion, where the disciple asks, if one's true nature is unchanging, as in deep sleep, how does the change to waking and dreaming states happen (yadi bhagavan, suṣupta iva mama vikriyā nāsti, katham svapna-jāgarite?). Upon questioning, the disciple further admits that the waking and dreaming states are experienced piecemeal, not continuously (vicchidya vicchidya, na tu saṁtatam). The teacher then explains that as these states have beginnings and ends, they are temporary (āgantuke, vyabhicāritvāt). The real nature of any thing is intrinsic to it, not incidental (yasya yat svarūpaṁ tad avyabhicāri dṛṣṭam). The disciple then raises a most important doubt. During deep sleep, as he is not conscious even of himself, then perhaps consciousness itself is only a temporary phenomenon (caitanya-svarūpaṁ apy āgantukaṁ prāptam, svapna-jāgaritayor iva suṣupte 'nuplabdheḥ) and cannot be his true nature. Is one's true nature then, non-consciousness (acaitanya-svarūpo vā syām aham)? In response, the master states that this doubt is inappropriate, as one's nature as consciousness (caitanya-svarūpasya tv ātmanaḥ) is self-established (svataḥ-siddheḥ), independent of external factors (anya-anapekṣatvaṁ) and being intrinsic to oneself, cannot be denied by anyone (na kenacid vārayitum śakyam, avyabhicārāt). The disciple's doubt still persists, as he thinks that not perceiving oneself in deep sleep indicates otherwise (nanu vyabhicāro darśito mayā suṣupte na paśyāmīti). The master's response to this doubt cuts to the heart of the chase, as it were. What can be denied are objects of sight (dṛṣṭam eva pratiśedhasi), not sight (na dṛṣṭim) itself. That by which the disciple knows that he did not see anything (yayā tvam vidyamānayā na kimcit dṛṣṭam iti pratiśedhasi), that sight is his true consciousness (sā dṛṣṭis tvac caitanyam). Guided by the master's reasoning, the disciple finally comes to the conclusion that as with objects seen in dreams (yathā svapne), objects from the waking state also do not have an existence independent of consciousness (evam jāgraty api) and that the true nature of the conscious person is consciousness (avagater anyo 'vagantā nāsti). Note that earlier in this discussion, the master has already stated emphatically that the conscious knower is none other than eternal knowledge itself (nityopalabdhi-mātra eva hy upalabdhā). The master concludes with a reiteration that this insight, this knowledge, obliterates ignorance and that the disciple will no longer experience the saṁsāra that is characterized by returning repeatedly to waking and dream states (nātaḥ param jāgrat-svapna-duḥkham anubhaviṣyasi).

It would seem from the above that the deep sleep state is specially privileged in this discussion and almost, if not entirely, equated to one of liberation. However, we should remember that the objective of the Vedāntic discussion is not to glorify the deep sleep state or to denigrate the waking and dream states, but to reveal that in all states, the real nature of the Ātman is pure consciousness. It is one thing to accept the scriptural statements to this effect on faith and it is quite

another to arrive at this conclusion after a logical examination of consciousness. Therefore, in order to appreciate the logic of Vedānta, we must return to one of the fundamental theses set forth by Śāṅkara Bhagavatpāda, i.e. that mutual superimposition does not require the respective entities to be known entirely separately. When a post is mistaken for a man, the error happens in spite of one's prior knowledge of a post as distinct from one's prior knowledge of a man. In other words, we know post-ness distinctly from man-ness and are still liable to make a mistake of perception. On the other hand, the mutual superimposition of the body and the self is done with no prior knowledge of the body as distinct from the self or of the self as distinct from the body. As the teacher in the second prose chapter of Upadeśasāhasrī puts it, na hy ayam deho 'yam ātmeti viviktābhyāṁ pratyayābhyāṁ dehātmānau grhṇāti yaḥ kaścit. ata eva hi momuhyate lokaḥ. That this mutual superimposition is operative can be seen from the way in which we habitually use the word "I". Although the real referent of the word "I" is the self, every man superimposes the qualities of the body, such as its white or black colour, upon himself (gauro 'haṁ kṛṣṇo 'haṁ iti deha-dharmasya ahaṁ-pratyaya-viṣaye ātmani), and himself upon the body (ahaṁ-pratyaya-viṣayasya ca ātmanō dehe, ayam ahaṁ asmīti).

We are able to say of the deep sleep state, "I did not even know myself," only because we always tend to refer to ourselves with reference to external objects, and form our ego and sense of self with respect to the not-self. Not experiencing any external objects in the deep sleep state, we fail to appreciate our self as an independent reality. The Vedāntic examination of the waking, dream and deep sleep states shows us that our usual sense of "I"-ness, being absent in deep sleep, is not invariably associated with the self. The deep sleep state, then, lends itself naturally to an analogy with the state of liberation, as this analysis helps us to logically understand how there is no longer a sense of "I" then. In the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, Sureśvarācārya develops this line of reasoning and points out that ultimately our sense of "I"-ness is also not-self, ātmanaś ced ahaṁ-dharmo yāyān mukti-suṣuptayoḥ, yato nānveti tenāyam anyadīyo bhaved ahaṁ (2.32). How then should one understand the word "I" in the scriptural sentence, ahaṁ brahmāsmi? Sureśvarācārya explains this in terms of indication (lakṣaṇā), rather than direct reference, again by drawing an analogy with deep sleep. The statement, "I knew nothing in deep sleep", is made after waking up, although the habitual "I" of the waking state was quite inoperative in the state of deep sleep. That the self persisted through the state of deep sleep is indicated indirectly by this usage of the word "I" here. Similarly, although the logic of Vedānta shows that the sense of "I"-ness is not-self, the scriptural statement, ahaṁ brahmāsmi, indicates that the real self is the highest Brahman, of the nature of pure consciousness. Thus, Naiṣkarmyasiddhi 2.54 says, nājñāsiṣam iti prāha suṣuptād utthito 'pi hi, ayo-dāhādi-vat tena lakṣaṇaṁ paramātmānaḥ. In other words, true understanding of the highest Vedāntic truth arises when one's habitual "I"-ness is discarded

as not-self.

This, in turn, leads us to the conclusion that the true self, being independent and of the nature of pure consciousness, is not a doer of action at all. Returning to Upadeśasāhasrī, in the process of coming to the correct Vedāntic conclusion about the non-agency of the Ātman, the disciple draws an analogy with the agency of the carpenter (kārya-karaṇair asaṁhatya takṣādīnām iva vāsyādhibhiḥ kartṛtvam nopapadyate). Interestingly, there is also one Brahmasūtra that makes an analogy with the agency of the carpenter (yathā ca takṣobhayathā - sūtra 2.3.40). The gist of this sūtra and its commentary is that a carpenter is designated as such only due to his association with the tools of his trade, and not with respect to his own body (takṣā hi viśiṣṭeṣu takṣaṇādi-vyāpāreṣv apekṣyaiva prati-niyatāni karaṇāni vāsyādīni kartā bhavati. sva-śarīreṇa tv akartaiva). Similarly, the Ātman is not intrinsically an agent, but only in association with adjuncts (upādhi), beginning with the mind (evam ayam ātmā sarva-vyāpāreṣv apekṣyaiva mana-ādīni karaṇāni kartā bhavati. svātmanā tv akartaiveti). This analogy is acknowledged to be only partial (takṣa-dṛṣṭāntaś caitāvatā amśena draṣṭavyaḥ), because the body of a carpenter has limbs that can grasp tools, unlike the Ātman, which is partless. Therefore, the association of the Ātman with the mind and other adjuncts is only due to avidyā. In this passage, just before making the above points, Bhagavatpāda makes a comment about the waking, dreaming and deep sleep states, which concisely summarizes almost all the key points made in different Upaniṣad commentaries on this topic.

In the dreaming and waking states (svapna-jāgarita-avasthayoḥ), due to an association with duality projected by ignorance (avidyā-pratyupasthāpita-dvaita saṁprkta), one becomes, as it were, a doer of actions and suffers (kartā duḥkhī bhavati). Getting tired of this, in the state of deep sleep (saṁprasāda-avasthāyām), one seeks relief (tac chrama-apanuttaye) in one's own Self, the Highest Brahman (svam ātmānam param brahma praviśya), free of association with the totality of the senses (vimukta-kārya-karaṇa-saṁghātaḥ) and rests blissfully, doing nothing (akartā sukhī bhavati). Similarly, in liberation (mukty-avasthāyām api), with the darkness of ignorance having been dispelled by the light of knowledge (avidyā-dhvāntam vidyā-pradīpena vidhūya), the Ātman rests alone (kevalaḥ), blissful (sukhī) and doing no actions (nirvṛtaḥ). Again, the deep sleep state is compared to that of liberation, but as with all analogies in Advaita Vedānta, it is clear that this comparison is not complete in all respects. The state of deep sleep is a natural return of the Ātman to itself, in order to cast off the strain of the limitations imposed by duality in the waking and dreaming states. It is not an end of the ignorance that causes the duality in the first place. Only knowledge removes ignorance and leads to liberation. We must remember that according to Advaita Vedānta, knowledge does not cause the Ātman to enter into a new state, but only reveals the real and natural state of the Ātman as being intrinsically always liberated (nitya-śuddha-buddha-mukta), even when seemingly under the sway of ignorance. It is not as

if the one who enters into deep sleep achieves non-dual liberation daily and gets again ensnared into duality upon waking up. Rather, the point is that one is already always liberated and the Vedānta analysis of these states helps unravel this fact within one's own experience.

I will not enter into a discussion of other contentious issues regarding the state of deep sleep here. Instead, I would like to note that nowhere does Śāṅkara Bhagavatpāda unreservedly equate the ignorant man in deep sleep with the liberated man. Indeed, in the Chāndogya Bhāṣya 8.3.2-4, we have explicit statements to the contrary. The knower attains to heaven, as it were, in his heart daily (ahar-ahar vai praty-aham evaṁvit hr̥dy ayam ātmeti jānann svargaṁ lokam hārdam brahma eti - Chāndogya Bhāṣya 8.3.3). Ignorant people (avidyāvatyaḥ ... prajāḥ) also attain Brahman in their heart every day, in deep sleep (hr̥dayākāśākyam brahmalokaṁ ... pratyahaṁ gacchantyo api susupta-kāle), but do not know this fact (na vindanti na labhante, "eṣo 'haṁ brahmaloka-bhāvam āpanno 'smy adya" iti). They are under the sway of falsehood (anṛtena hi pratyūḍhāḥ) and are turned away from their own nature by ignorance (svarūpād avidyādi-doṣair bahir apakṛṣṭāḥ - Chāndogya Bhāṣya 8.3.2). Whether ignorant or not, all beings are indeed Brahman and all attain to that Reality in deep sleep (jānann ajānaṁś ca sarvo jantus sad brahmaiva; vidvān avidvāṁś ca susupte yadyapi sat sampadyate). However, it is only the one who knows "I am that Real, not other", who can be said to have attained to Reality (vidvān "sad eva na anyo 'smi" iti jānann sad eva bhavati; evaṁvid eva svargaṁ lokam etīyucyate - Chāndogya Bhāṣya 8.3.3) This is the prayojana of the Vedāntic analysis of the human experience of waking, dream and deep sleep. It is meant to liberate, to awaken us to the fact that we are only seemingly bound to saṁsāra and are already liberated in our real nature.



An Examination Of The Three States Avasthātraya Parīkṣā

Ātmachaitanya

The author (Ira Scheppetin, 1948) spent over five years from 1969, in India. He initially was with Sri Swami Dayananda Saraswathi for two years and later spent two years with Sri Swami Satchidanandendra Saraswathi before returning to USA and is in the pursuit of Advaita Vedanta ever since. Professionally he was in the import export business. His email: sophiaschep@yahoo.com

Of all the methods used in Vedānta to reveal the truth of the Non-Dual Self, the method of 'Examining the Three States' is truly a gem. In as much as the three states are the common experience of all people, regardless of caste, creed, nationality, etc., the Vedāntic teaching adopting these states as its bases can be accepted as a universally applicable methodology. The purpose of this paper is to point out and emphasize one particular and rather subtle point concerning our 'experience' of the three states that is often overlooked by scholars and pandits of Vedānta and which I have come to believe is crucial to a fruitful inquiry into the Vedāntic scriptures.

The Vedāntic teaching begins with the common assumption that we are all passing through three states. First we experience the waking state, then we pass onto the dream state, then we go into the deep sleep state, and once again we awake. For example the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad starts with the teaching that the 'Self has four quarters', 'so 'yamātmā catuṣṣpāt', (Mān. 2). It then goes onto say that the Self, which is associated with the waking state, is called Vaiśvānara, and is the first quarter, 'jāgaritasthāno... vaiśvānaraḥ prathamāḥ pādaḥ' (Mān. 3). That same Self when associated with the dream state is called Taijasa, the second quarter, 'svapnasthano... taijaso dvitīyaḥ pādaḥ' (Mān.4) And that same Self when it is not aware of anything in deep sleep is called Prājña, and that is the third quarter, 'yatra suptō prājñastṛtīyaḥ pādaḥ' (Mān. 5). The Upaniṣad then goes on to describe the 'so-called' fourth quarter of the Self as follows: 'They consider the Fourth to be that which is not conscious of the internal world, nor conscious of the external world, nor conscious of both the worlds, nor a mass of consciousness, nor conscious, nor unconscious; which is unseen, beyond empiri-

cal dealings, ungraspable, un-inferable, unthinkable, indescribable; whose valid proof consists in the single belief in the Self; in which all phenomena cease; and which is unchanging, auspicious and non-dual. That is the Self, and That is to be known' (Mān.7).

From a superficial examination of the above one may get the impression that, in fact, the Self has three states through which it is passing and that there seems to be a 'fourth state' different from these three that is called Turīya. The way most Vedāntic scholars and teachers present this, so that through such an inquiry one can arrive at the conclusion that the True Self is really the Non-Dual Reality and is ever free from all states, may be summarized as follows:

Although the Self is One without a second, in order to teach this oneness a certain methodology is adopted by Vedāntins known as deliberate superimposition and rescission (adhyāropa apavāda). When this method is applied to the three states, at first a fourfold nature is superimposed on the Self. When the Self has the limiting adjunct (upādhi) of the waking state, it is considered to be the Witness of the whole state, which includes the inner realm (ādhyātmika), the material realm (ādhibhaudika), the divine realm (ādhidaivika). By doing so, the Upaniṣad is negating the notion that we are merely individuals existing in the waking state and that, in fact, the whole of the waking state is appearing to us as the 'Witnessing Self'. When that state is sublated, and the dream state is appearing to the Self, the Self is then seen as the Witness of the whole of the dream state, in the same manner as it was the Witness of the waking state. When both these states have subsided that state is called deep sleep, and at that point, the Self, which is still the Witness, is not aware of any 'thing'. However, because we once again 'seemingly' emerge from deep sleep, the Upaniṣad tells us that this state has the 'seed of causation' within it. And, finally, to present the Self as it really is, free from these three 'apparent limiting adjuncts' (upādhis), the Upaniṣad describes the Self as the Fourth, which is the negation (apavāda) of the previous 'three superimpositions'.

We are then told by many of these Vedāntic teachers that the correct way to do this type of inquiry is not to view the states as they are 'remembered' from the waking point of view, for this will result in seeing dream only as a false imagination caused by the impressions gathered from the 'real' waking and seeing sleep as merely an unconscious interval before waking again. In other words, we should not conduct this examination merely from the bias of the waking perspective (the mono-basic view) but, if we want to get to the 'truth' of the states, we should examine each state impartially as it was 'actually experienced' at the very time of its occurrence (the tri-basic view). When we do this, when we conduct our inquiry in this experientially unbiased manner, we are told that at least three things will become abundantly clear:

1. Waking and dream are equal in that they both come and go, they mutually

sublate each other, they are both 'seen' and, therefore, they are both ultimately false.

2. The so-called deep sleep state is not really a causal state at all, and no one is 'unconscious' in that state because when examined from the viewpoint of the 'actual experience of deep sleep' we will come to understand that there is neither time, space, or causality in that state nor do we really become unconscious therein, in as much as we are still remaining there as the Pure Witnessing Self to which no duality is appearing.

3. Since waking and dream are false and sleep is only sleep when seen from the bias of the waking viewpoint, then all that really exists is the Non-Dual Self alone, One without a second.

Now the purpose of this paper is to point out that all of the above might be acceptable if it were really the case that we could somehow 'remember' what our 'actual experience' of dream and sleep was at the very time of their occurrence without the bias of the waking state. But this, I have come to believe, is NOT possible at all for the following reasons:

1. Because the three states do not share a common time series, no particular state can be seen as a past event in the waking time series, which we are now able to 'remember'. The waking time is confined to the waking state, the dream time is confined to the dream state, and in 'deep sleep' there is no time at all. So no one can remember his actual experience of the other two states.

2. Because there is no common ego that is continuing in all three states it cannot be said that the waking ego experienced the dream or deep sleep and now one is able to 'remember' them. The waking ego comes and goes with the waking state, the dream ego comes and goes with the dream state, and in 'deep sleep' there is no ego. So the waking ego can never claim to have 'experienced' the other two states or that it now 'remembers' them.

If this is true then, it may be asked, what exactly is the status of our so-called 'memory' of the other two states? The rather astonishing Vedāntic answer is that they must be merely 'imagination' (vikalpas) of the waking ego! The great Vedāntic scholar, Śrī Saccidānandendra Sarasvatī in his introduction to the Māṇḍūkya-rahasya-vivṛti(MRV), after much reasoning alludes to this fact in the following words:

And so, He who is the knower in the waking state and believes that he has the memory in the form of 'I slept happily' or 'I saw a dream'—this should be determined to be merely an imagination. MRV pg. 96

ata eva ca yo 'pi sukham ahamasvāpsamiti svapnamadrākṣamiti vā jāgarite
smarṇābhāsaḥ pramātuḥ, tadapi vikalpamātramiti niṣcetavyam. MRV pg. 96

This answer also implies that the only 'valid' Vedāntic inquiry must take place

exclusively here and now in our waking state alone and that we examine our waking experience in a very unique and comprehensive manner. It was Śrī Guḍapāda who was the first one in the available Vedāntic literature to bring out this subtle fact and to point us in the right direction. In his Kārikās he states the following:

Viśva is met with in the right eye, which is his place of experience. But Taijasa is inside the mind. Prājña is in the space within the heart. IN THREE WAYS HE EXISTS WITHIN THE (WAKING) BODY (GAUD. K. 1:2)

Śrī Śāṅkara explains the Kārikā as follows: “This verse aims at discovering how all the three, starting with Viśva, are experienced in the waking state alone. Viśva, the Witness of the gross objects, is primarily experienced in the right eye, ... thus the Self with it’s abode in the right eye perceives some external form; and then closing the eyes and recollecting that very form, sees it manifested inside the mind, in the form of impressions as in a dream. As it is the case here (waking), so it is in dream. Therefore, though Taijasa is within the mind, he is really the same as Viśva. On the cessation of activity called memory, Prājña, sitting in the space within the heart, becomes free from the diversity and continues to be a mere mass of consciousness, for then there is no functioning of the mind... That supremely real state — free from causality, relation with the body, etc. and modes of waking, etc. — of that very entity that is called Prājña will be spoken of separately in its aspect as the Turīya, the Fourth. The causal state, too, is verily experienced in the body, inasmuch as an awakened man is seen to have such a recollection as, ‘I did not know anything (in my deep sleep)’. Hence it is said, ‘Existing in three ways in the (waking) body’. (G.K. Bh. 1:2)

However it was left to the genius of Śrī Śāṅkarācārya to clarify and simplify this approach even further. While commenting on these Kārikās, he reduced all experience into two basic categories: A. I am aware of something (darśana vṛtti). This includes waking and dream. B. I am not aware of anything (adarśana vṛtti). This includes ‘deep sleep’. And while it may be acceptable in the beginning to speak of our ‘experience’ of the other states like dream and sleep, in the final analysis it is this approach, which at once encompasses and exhausts the full spectrum of waking experience, that must be resorted to. And it is on this basis and this basis alone that any valid inquiry into the Vedāntic teachings can and must proceed.



Successive Negation Of The Five Kōśas Leads To The Absolute

Professor V. Krishnamurthy

The author is a Retired Professor of Mathematics, BITS, Pilani. He is an author of several books on Science and Spirituality, Hinduism and Philosophy. His email id: profvk@yahoo.com

How do we bring about the destruction of the great evil of saṃsāra? This is the purpose of all our scriptures and particularly of the Upanishads. Our experiences in life are through the layers of our personality. These layers are called kōśas in the language of the Upanishads. A kōśa is a sheath, like a scabbard for a sword. Five of them are mentioned as predominantly experienced by us in our day-to-day life. These are the so-called anna-maya (consisting of food), prāṇa-maya (consisting of prāṇa or life's vital force), manō-maya (consisting of the perceptual mind), vijñānamaya (consisting of intellect) and Ānanda-maya (consisting of bliss) kōśas. These kōśas are, in a sense, like peels of an onion growing one over the other. However, the latter ones are independent and not connected with one another, whereas the kōśas are not so independent. The Taittiriya Upanishad in its second chapter takes up the exposition of these five kōśas of man and resolves each kōśa into that which precedes it in evolution. In other words each effect is resolved into its immediate cause till the Ultimate Cause is reached. We are thus led on to a knowledge of Brahman, which is neither the cause nor the effect and thereby to a knowledge of the unity of the Self with Brahman. Each sheath is represented as made up of a head and other limbs for the purpose of contemplation.

The first sheath is the annamaya-kōśa, which is nothing but the physical body. It is certainly made up of a head and other limbs; whereas the remaining four kōśas, starting from the prāṇa-maya-kōśa, are not actually made up of a head and limbs. But as molten metal poured into a mould takes the form of that mould so also the four kōśas which lie within the anna-maya-kōśa are declared to be moulded after it. Such a representation is intended to facilitate the meditation and discrimination of all the kōśas. It is due to avidyā (ignorance) that Man takes Ātman to be the five kōśas one by one and it is the same avidyā that makes him

also take the sufferings or the experiences of the five kōśas to be those of the Ātman . In other words he involuntarily identifies himself with one or other of the kōśas. The Upanishad, taking hold of this natural bent of the human mind, enables man to resolve by meditation, each kōśa into what is behind it till he reaches the Self behind all kōśas and then enjoins him to hold on to that Self alone.

This physical body of man is anna-rasa-mayaḥ, a product, a transformation or modification (vikāra), of food-essence. That is why it is called the anna-maya-kōśa. The word 'maya' (not 'māyā') is used with three meanings in Vedānta. One is in the sense of 'prāchurya' (meaning 'excess' or 'abundance') as in the simple sentence: jala-mayaḥ grāmaḥ, meaning, the village is full of (or flooded with) water. The second sense is in the usage: Brahman cin-mayam, meaning, the very nature (defining lakṣhaṇa, svarūpa) of Brahman is cit, consciousness. The third meaning is in the sense of 'vikāra' as in the present usage: sthūla-sharīraḥ anna-mayaḥ, meaning, the physical body is a modification of the food that was taken in.

The physical body being the most accessible representation of a person, the immediate impression is to take this as the person per se. The Upanishad starts at this point and makes the declaration that this is the Ātman. But this is only a tentative statement, as we understand by proceeding further with the Upanishad. For instance, suppose we want to show the moon, which is neither full nor brightly shining, to some one seated in the midst of trees. What do we do? We direct the other person's eye to a particular tree and a particular branch of the tree (as if that is the moon), so that the eye is now withdrawn from all other directions and then we point the actual moon itself to be not the end of that branch but what is seen in the distant sky against that branch-end of the tree. This process is so common in our miscellaneous activities that we don't realise the great Vedāntic technique that lies underneath. A child of three asks the mother where its baby-sister (that arrived the day before) came from. The child is told that the baby came from the hospital. In due course of time the child (when it is no more a child) gets to learn the truth of the matter. And then it knows and recognises (and is also told) that the earlier information passed on to it was (and had to be) only a temporary answer and probably the only possible answer in that context and circumstance.

In Vedānta this process of giving and accepting a temporary answer to a difficult question and later negating it in favour of (or in the direction of) truth has a special name, namely, adhyāropa-apavāda. The word adhyāropa means: superimposition, wrong imputation, attribution of a false characteristic, assumption. The word apavāda means: negation, withdrawal, denial, rescission, elimination of what has been imputed, attributed, assumed or superimposed. This technique (prakriyā) of earlier acceptance and later negation is a standard way of presentation and teaching, particularly of Advaita Vedānta, since we all begin only as children in the world of spirituality. Thus when we are told by the Upanishad that anna-maya-kōśa is the Ātman, it is only an adhyāropa. It is going to be negated

(legitimately) in the very next paragraph.

The next paragraph, after glorifying the annaṃ (food) for the reasons why the kōśa consisting of food may be considered as a first approximation to the Ātman, says: Different from and inside of the anna-maya-kōśa is the self that is made of prāṇa (anyontara-Atmā-prāṇa-mayaḥ). “By that this is filled. This too, is man-shaped. This, in its man-shape, matches the man-shape of that one” (te-naisha pūrṇaḥ; sa vā esha purusha-vidha eva; tasya purusha-vidhatām; anvayaṃ purusha-vidhaḥ); anvayaṃ is anu + ayaṃ, meaning ‘according to this one’. So the literal translation of the last two sentences in the above quote would be: “This person-shaped one is according to the person-shapedness of that one”.

The Brahman which permeates everything can be ‘visualised’ in the Purusha, namely our own person. First we have the physical body. What we see as this body is the corporeal self (annamaya kōśa). Within this corporeal self there is a subtler self called the vital self (prāṇa-maya kośa). It (the vital self) fills the corporeal self like heat filling a metal piece put in the fire. So the vital self (or sheath, kōśa) permeates the corporeal self totally. The Upanishad uses the word Purusha for each of these ‘selves’. So the vital Purusha fills up the corporeal Purusha. Within the vital Purusha there is the manōmaya Purusha (the mental self). Within the latter one there is the vijñānamaya Purusha (the intellectual self). And within the vijñānamaya there is the Ānandamaya Purusha (the blissful self). The word ‘within’ here in each case is an understatement, a failure of words. In each case the succeeding sheath fills up the preceding one. Each Purusha follows the preceding one, is more subtle than the preceding one, and fills up the preceding one. This subtle sequencing is referred to by the terminology anvayaṃ Purusha-vidhaḥ repeatedly by the Upaniṣad.

Another way of understanding the five kōśas is to look at the correspondence between them and the three constituents of the jīva, namely, the sthūla-sharīra (the physical body), the sūkshma-sharīra (the subtle body) and the kāraṇa-sharīra (the causal body). Obviously the annamaya-kōśa is the sthūla sharīra. The prāṇa-maya-kōśa corresponds to that part of the subtle body consisting of the five vital airs (namely, prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, udāna and samāna) and the five organs of action (karmendriyas). The manō-maya-kōśa corresponds to that part of the subtle body consisting of the mind, that is, the faculty that receives stimuli from the outer world through the organs of perception (jñānendriyas) and which is the seat of emotions and feelings, together with the jñānendriyas. The vijñānamaya-kōśa corresponds to that part of the subtle body consisting of intellect (deciding faculty) and ahamkāra (the ego who claims agency for all action). Thus the sūkshma-sharīra corresponds to the aggregate of three kōśas, namely, prāṇa-maya, manō-maya and vijñāna-maya. Finally the Ānanda-maya kōśa corresponds to the kāraṇa-sharīra (Causal body) of the deep sleep state wherein the person experiences blissful ignorance.

The second chapter of Taittiriyaopaniṣad begins its very first paragraph (anuvāka) with the magnificent declaration: The knower of Brahman attains the Supreme. The latter part of this paragraph introduces the annamaya-kōśa as the Ātman. Following this first paragraph, there are four paragraphs of which three are one kind. These three take up the prāṇa-maya-kōśa, manōmaya-kōśa and vijñānamaya-kōśa in that order. The pattern of the three paragraphs is almost the same. These three kōśas correspond to the sūkshma-sharīra. In each case the adhyāropa-apavāda technique comes to the fore as follows. Different from and inside of the self that is made of food \ prāṇa \ mind is the self that is made of prāṇa \ mind \ intellect, respectively. Thus the anna-maya-kōśa is discarded as non-self and prāṇa-maya-kōśa is declared to be the self. Then the prāṇa-maya-kōśa is discarded as non-self and manō-maya-kōśa is declared to be the self. And then, in the fourth anuvāka, the manō-maya-kōśa is discarded as non-self and the vijñānamaya-kōśa is declared as the Self. The following table gives a panoramic view of this sequencing.

Para. No.	Glorification of	Kōśa negated as non-self	Kōśa declared as self
1			anna-maya
2	Food	anna-maya	prāṇa-maya
3	prāṇa	prāṇa-maya	manō-maya
4	Mind	manō-maya	vijñānamaya
5	Intellect	vijñānamaya	Ānanda-maya

There are five paragraphs (anuvākas) depicting this treatment of sequencing of the five kōśas. In each case the particular Puruṣa is imagined to be a bird with wings, head, tail, etc. The comparison in each case is to a brick fire-altar, which is symbolically both a man and a bird.

In a 'pseudo-scientific' way we may understand the whole sequencing as follows. In every cell of the body it is the life force that is functioning. This life force in every cell sends responses to the mind from every sensation it receives. So the mind is permeating the life force in every cell. But there is an agent of the mind, who cognises that it is 'I' and that it is the owner of all these sensations and responses. That is the vijñānamaya self. He is the agent and experiencer. He is proximate, in a metaphorical sense, to the Ātman, the pure spirit within. But it is not itself the pure spirit. It has the notion of agency. Stripped of this notion of agency it is only the experiencer of joy. That is the bliss-self (the Ānandamaya kōśa). Even this is not the Ātman. The Upaniṣad says that the Ātman is the support, base, substratum of even this Ānanda-maya-kōśa.

To understand this last sentence we must go to the fifth anuvāka. This anuvāka

has given rise to certain controversies among the commentators and scholars because it concerns the crucial question whether the Ānanda-maya-kōśa itself is Brahman or Brahman is again something other than the Ānanda-maya-kōśa. Śaṅkara's considered emphatic conclusion is that the Ānanda-maya-kōśa is also the non-self and that Brahman (the Self) is other than all the five kōśas. The question itself arises because, in the style of anuvākas 2,3,4 and 5 where each previous kōśa is discarded as non-self, there is no sixth anuvāka which discards the Ānanda-maya-kōśa as non-self. This is the point of contention. Brahmasūtras I-1-12 to 19 (known as Ānanda-mayādhi-karaṇam) discuss this question in detail and Śaṅkara spends considerable time on this in his commentary on these Sūtras and also in his commentary on Taittiriyaopaniṣad in its 2nd chapter and also once again in the third chapter.

First, let us keep before us a translation of the relevant latter half of the fifth anuvāka, which in its original, reads as follows: ...

tasmād-vā etasmād-vijñāna-mayāt□ anyo'ntara Atmā-Anandamayah□
 tenaisha pūrṇah□ sa vā esha Purusha vidha eva□
 tasya Purusha vidhatām□ anvayaṃ Purusha-vidhah□
 tasya priyameva shirah□ mōdō dakṣiṇah□ pakṣah□ pramōda uttarah□ pakṣah□
 Ānanda Ātmā□ brahma-pucchaṃ pratishṭhā□
 tadapyesha shlōkō bhavati□□

Verily, different from and inside the self which consists of vijñāna (knowledge, understanding), is the self consisting of bliss. By that this is filled. This, verily, has the form of a person. It too, is man-shaped. According to that one's human form is this form with the form of a man. Dearness (priyam) is its head; Happiness (mōdah) is its right wing; Delight (pramōdah) is its left wing. Bliss (Anandah) is its self. Brahman is its (tail) support. There is also this verse about it.

Now Śaṅkara's conclusions are based on the following eight main arguments of his, among many more:

1. The very fact that a form (with head and wings) has been prescribed for Ānandamaya-kōśa shows that it cannot be the impersonal Brahman.
2. The whole chapter starts with the topic of Brahman and continues with it till the end. So the 'puccha' (whose literal -vācyārtha - meaning is 'tail') word that goes with Brahman should be understood (at this context) only in its secondary (lakshyārtha) meaning, namely, 'support' (Adhāra), though, in the other four anuvākas, the 'tail' idea does not conflict with the context.
3. 'pucchavat puccham' is the sense in which it is used in brahma-pucchaṃ pratishṭhā. That is, Brahman is the support (puccham) of this Ānanda-maya in the manner of the puccham (tail) being the base (support) of the body in the trans-

actional world; because Brahman is the support of the entire universe. Not only that. The bliss of Brahman is the source and support of all the varieties of bliss in the ordinary world. – pucchavat pucchaṃ, pratishṭhā parāyaṇaṃ ekanīdaṃ laukikasya Anandajātasya brahmānandaḥ ityetaḍ-anena vivakshyati. (Brahma Sūtra Śāṅkara Bhāshya: I-1-19).

4. For all the four earlier kōśas the word ‘māya’ has been taken by all as ‘modification’ (vikāra), and so in this case of the Ānanda-māya also, it should be taken only as ‘modification’ of bliss and not ‘abundance or excess’ (prācurya) of bliss as some commentators would like to take.

5. ‘Abundance’ of bliss would make sense only when there is the possibility of ‘less’ or ‘more’ of bliss. Therefore it would not make sense in the case of Brahman, which is nothing but a mass of bliss (Ānanda-ghanam, like prajñāna-ghanam)-recall ‘satyam jñānam anantaṃ brahma’ declared at the very start of the chapter.

6. If Brahman is taken to be the ‘tail’ of Ānanda-māya-kōśa, then it becomes a part or limb (‘avayava’) of Ānanda-māya-kōśa. Then the latter cannot be Brahman, because Brahman has no ‘parts’. In other words the same object cannot be its own attribute. This will be ‘asāmanjasyam’ (a misfit) in Śāṅkara’s words.

7. Ānanda-māya is an effect, by nature, as also because, the Upanishad says later in the same second chapter, that ‘etaṃ Ānandamayā-mātmānam-upasankrāmati’ meaning, (He) reaches the self which consists of bliss. Therefore Ānanda-māya cannot be Brahman. The very concept of reaching or obtaining Brahman is ill-defined since Brahman is beyond time and space. Only that which is finite can be ‘reached’ or ‘obtained’.

8. Since Ānandamāya is within the vijñānamāya-kōśa and distinct from it, the last vestige of the notion of agency or ego is not there. However, it is not absolutely free from all trappings, because there is still the thin upādhi of intelligence transformed as happiness resulting from thought and action. And this happiness is limited, so it is not the bhūmā of Chāndōgya Upanishad. It means it is not Brahman. So the Upanishad does not mention here any reward for the contemplation of Ānanda-māya-Self as it has done in the case of the four earlier Selves. Instead it directly states that Brahman is its support and foundation.

The experience of bliss is a manō-vṛtti. There are gradations in this. When we see something we like there is a subtle bliss or joy; this is priya-vṛtti (thought-flow of dearness). When we get what we like there is a subtler bliss; this is moda-vṛtti (thought-flow of happiness), the joy of gratified desire. When we practically enjoy by consumption or consummation of what we like there is the subtlest bliss; this is pramoda-vṛtti (thought-flow of delight), moda at its apex. But all these are tiny specks of the Ānanda (happiness) reflected from the Ānanda-svarūpa of the Absolute. The Ānanda-māya-kōśa is nothing but the aggregate of priya-moda-pramoda-vṛtti plus the reflection (in the mind) of the Ananda-svarūpa of the Absolute. None

of the worldly happiness that we experience comes from the objects of the world; the intensity of experienced happiness is directly proportional to the subtlety and purity of the thoughts of the mind. The more subtle (sūkshma) the thoughts, the more intense is the happiness. Ānanda-maya-kōśa is inert. But it directs us to the source which is the Ānanda, the Absolute. The beings only 'live upon a small part of this infinite Bliss' says the scripture. Every other experiential bliss is this bliss alone. That infinite bliss is the Self. That is Brahman.

All the above is Śruti. Śruterivārthaṃ smṛtir-anvagacchat (The smṛtis followed the path of the Śruti, as if to convey their meanings) said Kalidasa in a marvelous upamā. The above pancakōśa-viveka of the shruti finds expression in several places in smṛti. One excellent example is the name 'panca-koshāntara-sthitā' (the One who is located within all the five kōśas) in Lalita-sahasra-nāma.



Immediate Means To Self Knowledge: Śravaṇa, Manana and Nididhyāsana

K.S.Ramanatha Sharma

The author was a Professor of Computer Science, Principal and Administrator at an Engineering College in Bangalore, until 2009. After retirement, he is fully engaged in the pursuit of Vedanta as blessed to Humanity by the past Masters Gowdapada, Śaṅkara, Sureswara and Satchidanandendra Saraswathi. His email id: ksramanatha@yahoo.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present paper is to understand the nature and function of śravaṇa (hearing the teaching by a preceptor about the nature of the Ātman, Self), manana (reflection on the teaching) and nididhyāsana (contemplation or spiritual concentration, for corroborating the teaching with one's own experience). Sri Śaṅkarācārya has said that these are the immediate means to Self knowledge: "... for the reason that śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana are the immediate means (of Self knowledge)", Tai.1.11. साक्षादेव च कारणत्वात् श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनानाम्। तै.१.११.

In the Maitreyi Brāhmaṇa of the second chapter of Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad, sage Yājñavalkya draws the attention of his wife Maitreyī to the most lovable nature of the Self and then exhorts her to make an earnest effort to intuit the Self: "Ātman alone, my dear, is to be seen. He is to be heard about, reflected upon and ascertained by spiritual concentration O Maitreyī, Ātman having been seen, heard about, reflected upon and known, all this becomes known." Br.2.4.5., आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो ... इदं सर्वं विदितम्। बृ.२.४.५.

First we make a brief study of the nature of Self and the purport of Vedāntas. From this study the meaning of 'seeing or knowing of the Self' and 'hearing about the Self' can be understood. We then determine from Bhāshya vākyas the nature and function of manana and nididhyāsana. It will be seen that among the highest grade of aspirants, some need śravaṇa alone for intuiting the Self, some others resort to a combined practice of śravaṇa and manana, and yet others may need nididhyāsana also. We discuss and conclude that nididhyāsana and upāsana are different, Ātman cannot be presented as an object of meditation and therefore no injunction is possible in this regard and there is no scope for prasankhyāna or

jñānābhyāsa once Self knowledge is attained.

2.1. ĀTMAN IS TO BE SEEN, HE IS TO BE HEARD ABOUT

The essence of teaching of all Upanishads is this: “All this is Brahman; this Self is Brahman”, Ma.1., सर्वं ह्येतद् ब्रह्म अयमात्मा ब्रह्म। मा.१. The meaning is that Brahman is the Reality underlying the phenomenal universe. According to Sri Śāṅkarācārya, the purport of all the Upanishads is to teach that Brahman alone is the real Self of the universe and that each of the individual selves in the universe is essentially identical with that Brahman.

The Self is one, common to all beings, and is the Witness (साक्षी, Sākshī), who is the Seer even of the so called Jivātman, ego, the object of the ‘me’ notion. The Self cannot be denied by anyone since “he is the Self of even the person who denies”, Su.Bha.1.1.4. य एव हि निराकर्ता तस्यैवात्मत्वात्। सू.भा.१.१.४.

“All perishable effects can perish up to and exclusive of the puruṣa. This Self is imperishable, for there is nothing extraneous to him to cause His destruction. There being nothing else to affect Him, He is unchangeably eternal (कूटस्थनित्यः), and therefore He is of nature eternally pure, conscious and free. Su.Bha.1.1.4. ... नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावः। सू.भा.१.१.४.

The common man, without knowing the nature of his own Self, naturally superimposes the body, mind and senses upon the Real Ātman, transfers by mistake the properties of the not-self to the Self and vice versa. It is this superposition (adhyāsa) which is due to a misconception that Sri Śāṅkarācārya calls as ignorance (avidyā). So long as man is under the influence of this natural avidyā, he conceives the real Ātman as something to be known, and appears to undergo a transmigratory life with all its suffering. “Thus, this innate superimposition of the nature of misconception, is beginningless and endless and is primarily responsible for the nature of agent and enjoyer as is well known to all people. All Vedāntas have been revealed in order to destroy this cause of evil by the attainment of the knowledge of the sole reality of Ātman.” (Adhyāsa Bhāshya.) एवमयमनादिरनन्तो...वेदान्ताः आरभ्यन्ते। (अद्यासभाष्यम्).

Since the Self is self-established, He is not new to anyone. Means of knowledge like perception are told in order to establish objects unknown, in the case of those who consider themselves knowers. But Self, the real Knower, need not be and cannot be established by any means of knowledge. Therefore, Vedāntas teach Him only by removing the avidyā of the person who, by a misconception, considers himself to be a knower. “The Śāstra aims at the removal of distinctions conceived by ignorance. It does not attempt to define Brahman as such and such an object. Aiming as it does to reveal Brahman as never objectifiable because of its being the inmost subjective Self, the Śāstra only removes all the idea of the distinctions conceived by ignorance, such as of the knowable, knower and the knowledge.” Su.Bha.1.1.4., अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वात् शास्त्रस्य। ... भेदमपनयति। सू.भा.१.१.४.

From the above discussion it is clear that the Self being the eternal Seer, is the real Subject and therefore cannot be known by any of the faculty of mind or directly visualized. The Self is of the very essence of consciousness which is in no need of being lighted upon to be seen. To intuit this, is to see the Self. The meaning of the word drasṭavyaḥ, 'to be seen', therefore, is to be understood thus and not as some sort of vision that is the result of meditation.

Since superimposition (adhyāsa = avidyā) is of the nature of a misconception, the ignorant person needs only to be told that he is seeking his own Self, to correct the error. At the very instant of the teaching by the Śrutis or the Preceptor (ācārya) about the nature of Self, he sees the Self in himself, giving up all the notions that has caused the delusion that he is something else: "The mere reminder of one's being the non-transmigratory Self, would be fruitful by wiping off the delusory notion that one is an individual self suffering from the ills of mundane life, in the same way as reminding one that a particular phenomenon is only a rope and not a serpent would be effective in dispelling all fear due to delusion." Su.Bha.1.1.4. वस्तुमात्रकथने अपि 'रज्जुरियं नायं सर्पः' इत्यादौ ... संसारित्वभ्रान्तिनिवर्तनेन अर्थवत्त्वं स्यात्। सू.भा.१.१.४.

Even this reminder of the form of a Vedāntic proposition like 'Tat Tvam asi' (That Thou Are), is required only because of the avidyā due to which the human mind has a tendency to look outwards. Presupposing this avidyā for the purpose of teaching, the scriptures teach that Self is to be seen (known), He is to be heard about, and immortality has to be attained by means of knowledge. This is the famous method of teaching called the method of deliberate superimposition and rescission' (adhyārōpa apavāda prakriyā) that is in-built in the scriptures.

2.2 Inward Focused Mind, Four-fold Basic Qualification, Teacher's Instruction

According to Sri Śāṅkarācārya, therefore, śravaṇa is only listening to and trying to understand the teaching of the Śrutis and of the teacher, about the real nature of the Self. However, the seeker needs to be endowed with an 'inward focussed mind' (प्रत्यक्प्रवणता) in order to be able to grasp the teaching. In Katha Upanishad it is said that "A rare discriminating man, desiring immortality, turns his eyes (senses) away from its objects and then sees the indwelling Self". Ka.2.1.1. कश्चिद्धीरः ... अमृतत्वमिच्छन्। कठ.२.१.१.

Man has a natural propensity to look outwards seeking the sense objects. Withdrawing from the sense objects and focusing on the indwelling Self is what needs to be achieved. Performance of daily obligatory duties, cultivation of Bhakti and upāsana help the seeker in removing his sins, cleansing his mind to attain purity (chitta shuddhi) and equip him with the four fold basic qualifications and an inward focused mind that renders him eminently eligible for śravaṇa. The four fold qualifications are 'discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal; dispassion for enjoyment of fruits of works here and hereafter; a perfection of such practices as control of mind (calmness), control of senses and organs etc.;

an intense desire for liberation.’ Su.Bh.1.1.1.

The Highest grade aspirants (uttama adhikāris) are those who, because of the discipline they have undergone in this or in previous lives, possess an inward focused mind and the four-fold qualifications. Among such uttama adhikāris, those who are capable of grasping the teaching imparted in the śruti either by śravaṇa alone or by resorting, repeatedly, to śravaṇa and manana, are given upadesha, instruction, primarily from the point of view of anubhava, intuition (अनुभवप्रधानदृष्ट्या उपदेशः). Others are guided through the steps of contemplation, nididhyāsana, and the instructions for them are primarily from the point of view of the mind (मनःप्रधानदृष्ट्या उपदेशः). In either case the aspirant intuits the Self and all the misconceptions are removed.

Sri Śaṅkarācārya says: “Those of sharp intellect on the other hand who have no obstruction like ignorance, doubt, and confusion with regard to the object to be known can realize the meaning of the sentence ‘That Thou Are’ even from the first utterance, so that repetition in their case is certainly useless.” Su.Bh.4.1.2. येषां पुनर्निपुणमतीनां ... प्रत्यावर्त्यनर्थक्यमिष्टमेव। सू.भा.४.१.२.

However for those uttama adhikāris who cannot intuit the Self by a mere reminding of the nature of the Self, that is, by śravaṇa alone, repeatedly resorting to śravaṇa and manana would be required, as Sri Śaṅkarācārya clarifies: “ ..., the proposition ‘That Thou Are’ cannot produce a direct realization of its own meaning in those people to whom these two entities (That, Thou) remain obstructed by ignorance, doubt, and confusion; for, understanding the meaning of a proposition presupposes the understanding of the meaning of the words (constituting it). Thus it is for such people it becomes necessary to resort repeatedly to the scriptures and reasoning.” Su.Bha.4.1.2. येषामेतौ पदार्थौ अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययप्रतिबद्धौ ... शास्त्रयुक्तभ्यासः। सू.भा.४.१.२.

The instruction, upadeśa regarding śravaṇa, manana, and nididhyāsana, for the aspirant has to be imparted by a teacher to be effective. “The seeker shall approach a teacher well versed in the vedas (and the traditional way of teaching called āgama) and who is absorbed in Brahman.” Mu.1.2.12. “तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम्। मुं.१.२.१२. A statement in Katha Upanishad says: “ ... when taught by one who has become identified with It, there is no non-comprehension (non-realization).” ... अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्ति। कठ.१.२.८. Such a teacher just reminds about the nature of the Self with a proposition like ‘Tat Tvam asi’ to those very rare seekers for whom śravaṇa alone is sufficient, and in the case of others, imparts upadesha using the traditional and efficacious method called Āgama and guides them through in manana and nididhyāsana as may be required.

3. REFLECTION ON THE TEACHING, MANANAM

The words ‘mantavyah’ (should be reflected upon) and ‘mananam’ (reflection) are derived from the root ‘mun’ which means ‘to think’, as is implied in the sentence- ‘think over and come to your own conclusion’. Therefore, when one has not

grasped the meaning of the text directly on hearing it, one will have to ponder over on the nature of the thing taught and verify his conclusion by repeated reflection till one is free from all doubt or misconception.

Texts like 'this wisdom is not to be attained through speculation; nor can it be refuted by speculation' Ka. 1.2.9., नैषातर्केण मतिरापनेया। कठ.१.२.९., appear to suggest that knowledge of Ātman has nothing to do with reason. This statement, however, has its next part- 'unless it is communicated through a teacher (well versed in the Āgama method) other than the ordinary ratiocinist' प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka statement Br.2.4.5. quoted in the beginning, of course, teaches that reasoning is needed. (Ātman alone ... is to be reflected upon; आत्मा वा ... मन्तव्यः). In the Chāndōgya Upanishad there is a statement: That intelligent and reflective man having received instruction reaches the country of Gandhāras indeed, by asking his way from village to village, in this way indeed a man who has received due instruction from a teacher can realize Ātman, Ch.6.14.2." स ग्रामाद् ग्रामं पृच्छन् पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसंपद्येत एवेमेवेह आचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद। छां.६.१४.२.

It follows from the above that an aspirant should make use of revelation from the Śrutis as well as reasoning for the purpose of Self knowledge. The Bhāshya statement Su.Bha.4.1.2., quoted earlier also recommends resorting repeatedly to scriptures and reasoning for those who do not grasp the teaching directly on hearing.

Sri Śāṅkarācārya, however, denies any role for mere speculation and what is termed as 'dry reasoning' to be of any help in Self knowledge. "For the truth relating to this Reality which is conducive to final release is too deep even for a conjecture without revelation." Su.Bha.2.1.11. नहीदमतिगंभीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनं आगममन्तरेणोत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम्। सू.भा.२.१.११. "Speculation is unbridled It is impossible to expect finality from speculations, for men's minds are diversely inclined. Su.Bha2.1.11. उत्प्रेक्षायाः निरंकुशत्वात् ...। न प्रतिष्ठितत्वं तर्काणां शक्यमाश्रयितुम्। पुरुषमतिवैरूप्यात्। सू.भा.२.१.११.

What is recommended, however, is Vedāntic reasoning: "Enquiry into Brahman demands primarily the consideration of the Vedāntic text and, as subservient to it, reasoning not in discord with it." Su.Bha.1.1.1., तस्माद्ब्रह्मजिज्ञासोपन्यासमुखेन वेदान्तमीमांसा तदविरोधितर्कोपकरणं निःश्रेयसप्रयोजना प्रस्तूयते। सू.भा. १.१.१. "As for the statement (by the Sāṅkhya) that the vedic word enjoining manana in addition to śravaṇa, itself shows that reason also has to be given a place (here), we reply that dry reason cannot gain access here under this cloak. For, reason proffered by the Śruti itself alone, is accepted as subservient to intuition." Su.Bha.2.1.6., यद्यपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं ... श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कः अनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाश्रीयते। सू.भा.२.१.६.

The reason recommended by the Śruti being meant to be conducive to intuitive experience is never in conflict with experience. Further, Vedāntic reasoning is based on universal intuition which can never be challenged. For instance, the teaching that the inmost Witnessing Principle in us is our own Self can never be disputed by anyone, for It is the Self of even the denier. Vedāntic reasoning takes

into account the entire range of the knowable and examines all the three states of experience-waking, dream, and deep sleep. “These three states have been called ‘the knowable’, because there cannot be anything knowable which falls outside the three, since the postulates of the advocates of any other school must necessarily be included in one or the other of these states.” GK.Bha.4.88., ज्ञेयं एतान्येव त्रीणि । ... अत्रैवान्तर्भावात् । गौ.का.भा.४.८८.

Sri Śaṅkarācārya cites two examples of the kind of Vedāntic reasoning based on universal intuition: “Reasoning of this type, for instance, which argues that Ātman is not tainted by the avasthās (states) since both the waking and dream are each absent when the other obtains and that the empirical self is essentially of the nature free from all plurality since it shakes off all the dual world and becomes one with Ātman as Pure Being in deep sleep; and also reason of the type that since the pluralistic universe arises out of Brahman, it cannot be other than Brahman on the principal of non-distinction of effect from the cause.” Su.Bha.2.1.6., स्वप्नान्तर्बुद्धान्तयोः ... ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः इत्येवञ्जातीयकः । सू.भा.२.१.६. Sri Śaṅkarācārya’s reference to ‘reasoning of this type’ (इत्येवञ्जातीयकः) above may be taken to cover the method of ‘the universal and the particular’ (सामान्य-विशेष) as well as the reasoning based on ‘the five sheaths’ (पञ्चकोश-प्रक्रिया), according to Sri Swami Satchidānandendra Saraswathi.

In concluding this section it may be said that Vedāntic reasoning helps one to clearly grasp the meaning of the words ‘That’ and ‘Thou’. An aspirant, who is suitably qualified for instruction which is primarily intuition oriented will, therefore, under the guidance of a teacher, have all doubts and misconceptions cleared by resorting repeatedly to manana. The meaning of the Vedāntic proposition ‘That Thou Are’ is then correctly conveyed and the aspirant intuits the Self.

4. SPIRITUAL CONCENTRATION, NIDIDHYĀSANAM

Nididhyāsana, spiritual concentration or intense contemplation is a means of Self Knowledge and is meant for corroborating the teaching grasped by śravaṇa and manana. Qualified aspirants who have not intuited the Self either by śravaṇa alone or by a repeated practice of śravaṇa and manana have an alternative in nididhyāsana.

Nididhyāsana and Upāsana (meditation) appear to be similar in that they are both mental acts: “Moreover, by the words ‘upāsana’ and nididhyāsana’ is denoted a mental act exclusively implying repetition.” Su.Bha.4.1.1., अपि च उपासनं निदिध्यासनं च ... क्रिया अभिदीयते । सू.भा.४.१.१. nididhyāsana also is a kind of steady flow of thought just as any other upāsana.

Nididhyāsana, however, is a mental process of focusing one’s closest attention in order to realize the nature of the self. “Come, sit down, I shall explain it to you. You had better try to assimilate it by close attention.” Br. 2.4.4., एहास्व व्याख्यास्यामि ते ... निदिध्यासस्वेति । बृ.२.४.४. In this passage sage Yājñyavalkya in using the word nididhyāsasva evidently exhorts Maitreyī to concentrate her mind upon

what he says, so that she might understand the thing without doubt or difficulty. Nididhyāsana is meant for intuiting the Self : “Reflection and contemplation are both meant for the intuitive knowledge.” अवगत्यर्थत्वाद् मनननिदिध्यासनयोः ।

Upāsānā, meditation, is different from nididhyāsana in that it is not meant for producing a result to be experienced in this very life. Even the subtlest of the upāsānās, the Omkāropāsana, is to yield its result of Brahmaloḥka after the present life. Further, the upāsaka who has attained Brahmaloḥka may get liberation (krama mukti) there or he may return to empirical life again in the succeeding Kalpa. (Refer Su.Bha.4.2.10)

Upāsānā as a process also is different from nididhyāsana: “But meditation, upāsānā, is taking up some object proposed by the Scriptures and setting up a stream of ideas in relation to it, uninterrupted by any idea dissimilar to it. This is the difference.” (Ch.Bha.Intoduction), उपासनं तु यथाशास्त्रसमर्पितं किञ्चिदालम्बनमुपादाय ... इति विशेषः । छां.भा.अव. In upāsānā, therefore, there is ‘tripuṭi’ a triple of aspects, upāsaka, upāsānā, upāsya. Since nididhyāsana is a special kind of concentrated contemplation upon Ātman which culminates in the merging of the mind in and the direct intuition of the Self, there is no tripuṭi that thrives here.

Since upāsānā requires an object on which to meditate, Brahman not being an object, it is conclusive that upāsānā cannot culminate in the knowledge of the Self. “Know that alone to be Brahman and not what people meditate on as an object.” तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते । के.१.५. But nididhyāsana is an immediate means to Self knowledge.

Nididhyāsana, although involves repetition, is not required after attaining Self knowledge. “Among them, those contemplations that are meant for complete enlightenment can well be understood to have a limit to their repetition, in as much as they end with the object aimed at, as is seen in the process of husking the paddy (which stops with producing rice). When the result consisting of full enlightenment, is achieved, no other effort can be prescribed, since a man goes beyond the domain of scriptures when he realizes the oneness of the Self with Brahman. Su.Bha.4.1.12., यानि तावत् सम्यग्दर्शनार्थान्युपासननि ... किञ्चिच्छासितुं शक्यम् । सू.भा.४.१.१२.

We now discuss briefly the Bhāshya on Maṇḍūkya Kārikas to conclude that Manōnigraha (control of mind) mentioned there is indeed nididhyāsana. In Ma.Ka. Bha.3.32 it is said that “Realization of that Truth of the Self which follows from the instruction of scriptures and teacher, the mind attains the state of not being the mind (It merges with the Self).” आत्मैव सत्यं आत्मसत्यं ... तस्य शास्त्राचार्योपदेशं अनु अवबोधः आत्मसत्यानुबोधः । तेन... अमनोभावं याति ... । मा.का.भा.३.३२. Obviously the Bhāshya is referring here to śravaṇa and manana by uttama adhikāris, for realization of the Self. Subsequently in the Kārikā3.40 it is said that: “But for the yōgis other than these, who are still treading the path, who have inferior or medium outlook and think of mind as something different from Self, though associated with It-for those who are not possessed of the Realization of the Self that is the Truth- fearlessness, the

removal of misery, knowledge of the Self, and everlasting peace are dependent on the control of the mind. (Refer Bhāshya for Ma.Ka.3.40: मनसो निग्रहायत्तं अमयं ... प्रभोदश्चाप्यक्षयाशान्तिरेव च ।) For those aspirants who have not been successful in obtaining the Knowledge of Self by śravaṇa and manana, manōnigraha is recommended here. Further the Kārikas 3.41 to 3.47 provide an outline for manōnigraha, and as in the case of uttama adhikāris, here too the culmination is the mind becoming identified with Brahman. Therefore it can be concluded that what has been referred to as nididhyāsana elsewhere, is referred to as manōnigraha by Sri Gowḍapāda Ācārya.

Sri Swami Satchidānandendra Saraswathi writes in several of his books and confirms that : Dhyāna as in Dhyāna yōga of Bhagavadgītā (Refer 6.29., इदानीं योगस्य यत्फलं ब्रह्मैकत्वदर्शनं सर्वसंसारच्छेदकारणं तत्प्रदर्श्यते। and 18.52., ध्यानं आत्मस्वरूपचिन्तनं योग आत्मविषय एवैकाग्रीकरणम्।), Samādhi as in Sūtra Bhāshya 2.3.29., योयमौपनिषदात्मप्रतिपत्तिप्रयो जनः समाधिरुपदिष्टो वेदान्तेषु।, Samrādhana as in Su.Bha.3.2.24., अपि चैतमात्मानं निरस्तसमस्त-प्रपञ्चमव्यक्तं संराधनकाले पश्यन्ति योगिनः। संराधनं च भक्तिज्ञानप्रणिधानाद्यनुष्ठानम्।), Adhyātmayōga as in Katha Upanishad (Refer Ka.1.2.12., अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति। and its Bhāshya, विषयेभ्यः प्रतिसंहृत्य चेतसः आत्मनि समाधानः अध्यात्मयोगः।), and Manōnigraha of the Kārikas are all different nomenclatures for nididhyāsana which culminates in the identification of mind with Brahman (अमनस्ताम् तदा याति, Ma.Ka.3.32., निष्पन्नं ब्रह्म तत्तदा, Ma.Ka.3.47.).

5. ŚRAVAṆA AND OTHER MEANS ARE NOT ENJOINED

The texts like drasṭavyah (is to be seen) and śrōtavyah (to be heard about) that resemble injunctions are only directions to the seeker of Truth to look inwards. “As for expressions like ‘(the Self) is to be seen’ (Br.2.4.5.) which one met with in the context of Supreme Knowledge, they are meant mainly for attracting one’s mind towards Reality, but do not aim mainly at enjoining any injunction about the knowledge of Reality. In ordinary parlance also when such directive sentences as ‘look at this’, ‘lend ear to that’ etc. are uttered, all that is meant is ‘Be attentive to these’, but not ‘Acquire this knowledge directly’..... When this is done (attention is drawn) the knowledge arises naturally in conformity with the object and the means of knowledge.” Su.Bha.3.2.21. द्रष्टव्यादिशब्दा ... यथाप्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते। सू.भा.३.२.२१.

It is only for the case of an unseen result that an injunction is possible, as in the case of a religious rite or upāsana. The result of a religious rite or upāsana is to occur after the death of the present body. It is not in existence either during or at the conclusion of the performance of the rite. But this is not so in the case of an existing thing. “As for the notion of fire with regard to the well-known fire it is not dependent on an injunction or on a person’s will, but being dependent on the nature of the object of perception, it is only Jñāna (knowledge) and no (mental) action. This applies to objects of all other means of knowledge also. This being so, knowledge having for its object Brahman as it is, is not dependent on any injunction.” Su.Bha. 1.1.4. (Knowledge, jñāna, is vastutantra.) या तु प्रसिद्धेग्नावग्निबुद्धिः,

न सा चोदनातन्त्रा, नापि पुरुषतन्त्रा ... ज्ञानं न चोदनातन्त्रम्। सू.भा.१.१.४.

In Chāndōgya Bhāshya it is said : “This injunction ‘It is to be known, It is to be enquired into for Realization’ is only a regulative one (for a perceptible result) (नियमविधिः), and not a fresh one (for an unseen result) (अपूर्वविधिः). The meaning is that It has to be known and enquired into in this way, because the result of knowing It and enquiring It for realization is a perceptible one.” Ch.Bha.6.7.1. अन्वेष्टव्यो विजिज्ञासितव्यः इति च एषः नियमविधिरेव नापूर्वविधिः। ...। छा.भा.६.७.१.

The Brhadāranyaka statement Br.2.4.5. quoted in the beginning of this paper has been explained in the Bhāshya thus: ‘First one has to listen to the teaching about Him by the teacher as well as scriptures. Then one has to think over the teaching by reasoning. Then one has to contemplate on the Reality. For thus it is that He is seen when all these disciplines of listening, reasoning and contemplation are all accomplished. When these are all harmonized, then only the true vision of the One Brahman is achieved and not otherwise, by mere listening’, Br.Bha.2.4.5. This statement may appear to support the contention that śravaṇa alone is not sufficient for the intuition of One Brahman, and it must be followed by the other two means which are also enjoined for the purpose. However this view is not accepted by the Bhāshyakāra: “As for the argument again that manana and nididhyāsana also being enjoined subsequent to śravaṇa, Brahman must be subservient to an injunction and not self-sufficient, we reply, ‘no’. For, manana and nididhyāsana (also) are for the purpose of intuition. If Brahman already intuited were utilized for some other action to be done (such as manana and nididhyāsana), then perhaps It might be considered to be subservient to an injunction. But it is not so, for manana and nididhyāsana are also meant for intuition like śravaṇa.” Su.Bha.1.1.4. यत्पुनरुक्तं श्रवणात् पराचीनयोः मनननिदिध्यासनयोः श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वात्।सू.भा.१.१.४.

This statement clarifies two things: 1.Śravaṇa can itself lead to intuition of Brahman and for those that are not able to do so by that means alone, the other means may be called for. 2. There is no injunction implied with respect to these means in the statements like Br.2.4.5. or Ch.6.7.1. In the Bhāshya statement Br.Bha.2.4.5. quoted above, therefore, the phrase ‘mere listening’ should be taken to mean listening which is not in harmony with reasoning and contemplation.

6. PRASANKHYĀNA VĀDA

There are proponents of prasankhyāna vāda who hold that the knowledge that is attained by śravaṇa is not the ultimate for Brahman Realization. Prasankhyāna vāda is about the need for jñāna-abhyāsa to retain firmly the jñāna obtained through a Vedānta-vākya. Jñāna-abhyāsa is repeated active thinking of the meaning of the Vedānta vākya along with manana. The Prasankhyāna-vādins think that the anādi samskāra, due to which one believes that one is a kartā, bhōktā, sukhī, dukhī and so on, is so strong that it overrides the jñāna obtained by the Vedānta-vākya and hence the need for jñāna-abhyāsa to ward off all wrong impressions and steady the jñāna. This view has been emphatically rejected by Śāṅkara on the ground

that there is no kriya or action in samyak jñāna and therefore, once samyak jñāna is attained by śravaṇa of Vedānta vākya, there is no question of its reversal. The prasankhyāna vāda can be seen to be discarded in the Sūtra Bhāshya vākya 1.1.4 quoted above (Section 5) to show that Brahman is not subservient to any injunction. All practice or order of steps is only before the dawn of knowledge of Ātman through śravaṇa and manana (Su.Bha.4.1.2., ... तत्तु पूर्वरूपमेवात्मप्रतिपत्ते:).

7. CONCLUSIONS

I conclude this rather long paper by giving a summary: According to Advaita of Sri Śaṅkarācārya, śravaṇa alone is self sufficient for the intuition of the Self and therefore liberation, in the case of uttama adhikāris. Manana is required for those who cannot intuit the Self by śravaṇa alone. Manana is for the removal of obstructions in the understanding of the meaning of the words Tat and Tvam constituting the Vedānta vākya. With the obstructions removed, the meaning of the Vedānta vākya is correctly conveyed and the aspirant is liberated. Yet other aspirants may require guidance through nididhyāsana for liberation. Manōnigraha of Maṇḍūkya Karikas, Adhyātma Yōga of Katha Upanishad, Dhyāna Yōga of Bhagavadgītā, Samādhi and Samrādhana of the Sūtra Bhāshya, all mean nididhyāsana only.

There is no injunction implied with respect to the immediate means of Self Knowledge. Prasankhyāna vāda is wrong and against Bhāshya. All practice or order of steps in the case of immediate means of Self knowledge is prior to the dawn of Self Knowledge. Once the Self Knowledge dawns, all ignorance is gone, there remains nothing to be done and this is liberation (Sadyōmukti /Jīvanmukti).

Finally, I offer this little 'paper flower' and reverentially prostrate at the lotus feet of Sri Śaṅkarācārya, Sri Swami Satchidānandendra Saraswathi and all the past Masters whose writings have provided all the inspiration.



The Nature Of Liberation And The Characteristics Of The Liberated

Mōkshasvarūpam - Muktalakṣhaṇam

S.N.Sastri

The author was in the service of the Govt of India as an IRS Officer and retired in June 1980 as Member, Central Board of Direct Taxes, Ministry of Finance. He studied Vedānta in Sankaragurukulam, Chennai under Goda Venkateswara Sastrigal and Dr. R. Krishnamurthi Sastrigal. His email id: sn.sastri@gmail.com

The essence of advaita Vedānta is that Brahman, which is pure Consciousness, is the only reality. 'Reality' is defined as that which does not undergo any change at any time. By this test, Brahman, which is absolutely changeless and eternal, is alone real. The world keeps on changing all the time and so it cannot be considered as real. At the same time, we cannot dismiss it as unreal, because it is actually experienced by us.

The example of a rope being mistaken for a snake in dim light is used to explain this. The snake so seen produces the same reaction, such as fear and trembling of the limbs, as a real snake would. It cannot therefore be said to be totally unreal. At the same time, on examination with the help of a lamp it is found that the snake never existed and that the rope alone was there all the time. The snake cannot be described as both real and unreal, because these two contradictory qualities cannot exist in the same substance. It must therefore be said that the snake is neither real nor unreal. Such an object is described as 'mithyā'.

Just as the snake appears because of ignorance of the fact that there is only a rope, this world appears to exist because of our ignorance of Brahman. Thus the world is also neither real nor unreal; it is also 'mithyā'. Just as the snake is superimposed on the rope, the world is superimposed on Brahman.

We are in reality none other than Brahman, but because of ignorance of this fact we consider ourselves to be the body-mind complex. This wrong identification is what is called avidyā or ajñāna or nescience. This ignorance not only covers Brahman, but it projects the world as a reality. The world has no reality apart from

Brahman, just as the snake has no reality apart from the rope. When the knowledge of Brahman arises, the world is seen as a mere appearance of Brahman.

Another example may be taken to explain this. Ornaments of different sizes and shapes are made out of one gold bar. Their appearance and the use for which they are meant vary, but the fact that they are all really only gold, in spite of the different appearances and uses, cannot be denied. The appearance may change, a bangle may be converted into rings, but the gold always remains as gold. Similarly, on the dawn of the knowledge of Brahman (which is the same as the Self), though the different forms continue to be seen by the jñāni, he sees them all only as appearances of the one Brahman. Thus the perception of difference and the consequences of such perception, such as looking upon some as favourable and others as the opposite, and the consequent efforts to retain or get what is favourable and to get rid of or avoid what is not favourable, come to an end. The realization of one's identity with Brahman and the cessation of identity with the body-mind complex is what is known as liberation.

The Nature Of Liberation

The jīva, or individual, is Brahman itself, but because of identification with the body, mind and senses he looks upon himself as different from Brahman and as a limited being, subject to joys and sorrows caused by external factors. This identification with the body, mind and senses is what is called bondage. In reality the jīva is the pure Brahman and is different from the body-mind complex. When this truth is realized, the identification with the body-mind complex ceases. This is liberation. Thus liberation is not the attainment of a state which did not exist previously, but only the realization of what one has always been. The illusory snake never existed. What existed even when the snake was seen was only the rope. Similarly, bondage has no real existence at all. Even when we are ignorant of Brahman and think of ourselves as limited by the body, we are really none but the infinite Brahman. Liberation is thus only the removal of the wrong identification with the body, mind and senses.

This liberation is to be attained in this life itself and on this earth and not after death in some other world. This has been stated thus by Śrī Śaṅkara in his Bhāṣya on br. up. 4.4.7 thus:-- अतो मोक्षो न देशान्तरगमनाद्यपेक्षते। Thus liberation does not involve going to another world.

Also, अत्र इहैव प्रदीपनिर्वाणवत् सर्वबन्धोपशमनात् ब्रह्म समश्नुते। ब्रह्मैव भवति इत्यर्थः। कठ. उप. भा. २.३.१४. - Here itself, owing to the cessation of all bondage, like the blowing out of a lamp, he attains Brahman. He becomes Brahman itself- kaṭha up. bhā-2.3.14.

किंतु विद्वान् स इहैव ब्रह्म यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते, स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति। यस्मान्न हि तस्याब्रह्मत्वपरिच्छेदहेतवः कामाः सन्ति, तस्मादिहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम्। न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिर्जीवतोऽन्यो भावो, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येतीत्युच्यते। भावान्तरापत्तौ हि मोक्षस्य सर्वोपनिषद्विवक्षितोऽर्थ आत्मैकत्वाख्यः स बाधितो भवेत्। बृ. उप. भा-४.४.६

- The man of realization is Brahman in this very life, though he seems to have a body. Being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman. Because he has no desires that cause the limitation of non-Brahmanhood, therefore being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman in this very life, not after the body falls. A man of realization, after his death, has no change of condition--something different from what he was in life, but he is only not connected with another body. This is what is meant by his becoming merged in Brahman; for if liberation was a change of condition, it would contradict the unity of the Self that all the upanishads seek to teach—br.up. bhā- 4.4.6.

न हि तत्त्वमसि इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः तत्त्वं मृतो भविष्यसि इत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः। ब्र.सू.भा.३.३.३२.

The sentence, “That thou art” cannot be construed to mean that you will become That after death—br.su. bhā- 3.3.32.

अतोऽविद्याकल्पितसंसारित्वनिवर्तनेन नित्यमुक्तात्मस्वरूपसमर्पणान्न मोक्षस्य अनित्यत्वदोषः। ब्र. सू.भा.१.१.४.-

Therefore there can be no question of liberation becoming impermanent for in it is revealed the reality of the eternally free Self, after eliminating from the Self the idea of its being under the bondage fancied on it through ignorance. br.su.bhā.1.1.4.

तस्मात् मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात् सशरीरत्वस्य सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषः अशरीरत्वम्। ब्र.सू.भा.१.१.४.- Thus, since embodiedness is the result of a false perception, it is established that the enlightened man has no embodiedness even while living—br.su.bhā.1.1.4.

It will also be seen from the above that liberation is nothing but the cessation of the wrong notion that one is the body-mind complex. Shri Śāṅkara says in his Bhāshya on br. up. 4.4.6:-- तस्मादविद्यानिवृत्तिमात्रे मोक्षव्यवहार इति चावोचाम। यथा रज्ज्वादौ सर्पाद्यज्ञाननिवृत्तौ सर्पादिनिवृत्तिः। बृ. उप. ४.४.६-भा-

Therefore we have already said that the cessation of ignorance alone is commonly called liberation, like the disappearance of the snake for instance, from the rope when the erroneous notion about the existence of the snake has been dispelled.

ज्ञानं च तस्मिन् परात्मभावनिवृत्तिरेव।- बृ. उप.४.४.२०-भा-- The knowledge of Brahman means only the cessation of the identification with other things (such as the body)—br.up.4.4.20.

The characteristics of the liberated (mukta)

The liberated person (jīvanmukta) has the realization, not only that he is no longer in bondage, but that he was never in bondage even in the past, and that he will never be in bondage in the future. That means that bondage never existed and it was thought to exist only because of ignorance of his real nature. This is made clear in the following statements of Śri Śāṅkara:--

पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपिकालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वाऽहमासं, नेदानीं, नापि भविष्यत्काल इति, ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति। एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते। ब्र.सू.भा.४.१.१३.- The knower of Brahman has this realization: “As opposed to the entity known before as possessed of agentship and experiencership by its very nature, I am Brahman which is by nature devoid of agentship and experiencership in all the three periods of time. Even earlier I was never an agent and experiencer, nor am I at present, nor shall I be so in future”. Only in this manner can liberation be justified—br.su.bhā-4.1.13.

नावगतब्रह्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम्। वेदप्रमाणजनितब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्। ब्र. सू.भा.१.१.४.

- For one who has realized that he is Brahman it cannot be shown that his mundane life continues as before, for this contradicts the knowledge of the identity of Brahman and the self arising from the vedas which are a valid means of knowledge—br.su.bhā.1.1.4.

गुणानेतान् यथोक्तान् अतीत्य जीवन् एव अतिक्रम्य मायोपाधिभूतान्, त्रीन् देही देहसमुद्भवान् देहोत्पत्तिबीजभूतान्, जन्ममृत्युजरादुःखैः, जीवन् एव विमुक्तः सन् विद्वान् अमृतमश्नुते। गी.भा.१४.२०.-

Having gone beyond, even while living, these three guṇas as have been described, which constitute the limiting adjuncts of māyā, and which are the seed of the birth of the body, the enlightened one, becoming free, even in this life, from birth, death, old age and sorrow, attains immortality—Gītā,bhā- 14.20.

दर्शयति च “यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत् केन कं पश्येत्” (बृ.उप.४.५.१५) इत्यादिना ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शिनं प्रति समस्तस्य क्रियाकारकफललक्षणस्य व्यवहारस्याभावम्। ब्र.सू.भा.२.१.१४.- It is further shown by such passages as, “But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what?” (br. up. 4.5.15) that in the case of one who has realized Brahman as the Self, all dealings cease that are concerned with action, instruments and results—br.su.bhā.2.1.14.

On the attainment of Self-knowledge the accumulated karma of past births together with the karma that has accrued in the present birth till the dawn of knowledge (sancita karma) is burnt off. No karma accrues after the dawn of knowledge. The prārabdha karma which gave rise to the present body will, however, continue, until it is exhausted by being experienced, and then the body of the jīvanmukta falls and he becomes a videhamukta. This has been brought out by Śrī Śaṅkara in the following statements:-

br.up.bhā.1.4.7.— शरीरारम्भकस्य कर्मणः नियतफलत्वात्, सम्यग्ज्ञानप्राप्तावप्यवश्यम्भाविनी प्रवृत्तिर्वाङ्मनःकायानां, लब्धवृत्तेः कर्मणो बलीयस्त्वात् मुक्तेष्वदिप्रवृत्तिवत्।

The past actions that gave rise to the present body must necessarily produce their results and so the body, mind and organs will continue to function even after the attainment of Self-knowledge, since the karma that has already taken effect is stronger (than the operation of Self-knowledge, just as an arrow that has already

been discharged must continue to move forward until its force is exhausted.

chā.up.bhā.6.14.2.--- यानि प्रवृत्तफलानि कर्माणि यैः विद्वच्छरीरमारब्धं तेषामुपभोगेनैव क्षयः।
यथारब्धवेगस्य लक्ष्यमुक्तेष्वादेः वेगक्षयादेव स्थितिः।

Those actions which have started yielding results and by which the body of the man of knowledge was brought into existence get exhausted only by their results being actually experienced, just as an arrow that has gathered momentum after having been discharged stops only when the momentum is exhausted.

br.up.bhā.4.4.22.--- शरीरारम्भकयोस्तु उपभोगेनैव क्षयः।

Actions that caused the present body are exhausted only by the results being experienced.

गीताभा. ४.३७.--- सामर्थ्यात् येन कर्मणा शरीरं आरब्धं तत् प्रवृत्तफलत्वात् उपभोगेन एव क्षीयते।

Since the karma because of which the present body came into existence has already taken effect, it gets exhausted only by being experienced.

अकर्त्रात्मबोधोऽपि हि मिथ्याज्ञानबाधनेन कर्माण्युच्छिनत्ति। बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कंचित्कालमनुवर्तत एव। अपि च नैवात्र विवदितव्यं ब्रह्मविदा कंचित्कालं शरीरं ध्रियते न वा ध्रियत इति। कथं ह्येकस्य स्वहृदयप्रत्ययं ब्रह्मवेदनं देहधारणं चापरेण प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्येत? श्रुतिस्मृतिषु च स्थितप्रज्ञलक्षणनिर्देशेनैतदेव निरुच्यते। ब्र.सू.भा.४.१.१५.

- The knowledge of the Self as the non-performer of any act destroys the results of actions by sublating nescience. The nescience, even when sublated, continues for a while owing to past tendencies like the continuance of the vision of two moons. Moreover, no difference of opinion is possible here as to whether the body is retained (after knowledge) for some time or not by the knowers of Brahman. For when somebody feels in his heart that he has realized Brahman and yet holds the body, how can this be denied by somebody else? This very fact is elaborated in the upanishads and the Smṛtis in the course of determining the characteristics of the man of steady wisdom.

In bhagavadgītā it is said that the sthitaprajna, who is the same as jīvanmukta, remains unperturbed in sorrow, is free from longing for pleasures and has gone beyond attachment, fear and anger. He is not elated by anything good happening, nor depressed by anything adverse. He looks upon all with an equal eye.



**Excerpts from Sri Satchidānandendra
Saraswati Swamiji's Books in English**

01. The Method of Adhyārōpa and Apavāda

From the Book How To Recognise The Method Of Vedānta, Section 3 (Pages 29-35)

1. HARMONY OF UPANISHADIC TEACHING - HOW DISCOVERED

The Vedānta is not a closely reasoned system attempting to prove everyone of its doctrines, it none the less is in possession of a comprehensive view of reality in all its aspects, a view based upon universal Intuition. It has also a traditional method of suggesting the view to the earnest enquirer, who has the necessary qualification to assimilate the truth. To recognize this method is to recognize the harmony of all Upanishadic teachings. Instead of following the modern critics, who stand aghast on looking at some of the apparent inconsistencies or certain unscientific statements made in individual cases, the earnest student will do well to be guided by traditional interpreters like Śaṅkara and recognize this method. There is much truth in what Dr. Radhrkrishnan writes about these sacred writings: “Notwithstanding the variety of authorship and the period of time covered by the composition of these half-poetical and half-philosophical treatises, there is a unity of purpose, a vivid sense of spiritual reality in them all, which become clear and distinct as we descend the stream of time” (IP, p. 139)

2. THE TRADITIONAL METHOD OF VEDANTA

And what is this method which, when recognized, transforms the all-seeming chaos into cosmos with regard to these sacred writings ? Śaṅkara was perhaps the first after Gauḍapāda to refer to it in the Gītā Bhāshya by name. That its employment for revealing the nature of Reality was known long before him, is disclosed by a quotation of his in that commentary:

तथा हि संप्रदायविदां वचनम् “अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते” इति ॥

“Accordingly, knowers of the traditional method have declared ‘That which is devoid of all distinctions and details is explained through deliberate Superimposition and Rescission’ “ (G. Bh. 13-14). Super-imposition (Adhyārōpa) literally means laying something on something else, falsely imputing the nature or property of something to something else. It is a postulate of Vedānta that, owing to a natural tendency of the human mind, a beginningless Superimposition called

Avidyā compels us all to look upon Reality as infected with manifold distinctions. Now, in order to educate the mind to interpret Reality as It is, the Upanishads uniformly employ the aforesaid method of Adhyārōpāvāda or deliberate Superimposition or provisional ascription and subsequent Rescission or abrogation. An example taken from the Gītā will illustrate the principle :

सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत्सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम् ।

सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥

सर्वेन्द्रियगुणाभासं सर्वेन्द्रियविवर्जितम् ।

असक्तं सर्वभृच्चैव निर्गुणं गुणभोक्तुं च ॥¹ -G. 13-13, 14.

In the first of the above two Ślōkas Reality or Brahman is said to possess hands and feet, eyes, heads, faces and ears on all sides; whereas in the second, it is declared to be devoid of all senses even while it appears to be able to perform all sensory functions. Śāṅkara observes that “the special features noticed in the Kshetrajñā (the Self) owing to the limiting conditions caused by the different forms of Kshetra (the body etc.) being unreal, have been rescinded in the previous Ślōka and Kshetrajñā has been taught to be realized as neither being nor non-being. But here (in Ślōka 13), even the unreal nature manifested through the limiting conditions has been treated as though it were the property of the knowable, just to bring its existence home, and hence the knowable Kshetrajñā is spoken of as ‘possessed of hands and feet etc., everywhere’. Accordingly, there is the well-known saying of the knowers of tradition : ‘That which is devoid of all details is set forth in detail through deliberate Superimposition and Rescission.’ Hands and feet and the rest which seem to be limbs of each and every body, owe their respective functions to the presence of the power of Consciousness inherent in the Ātman to be known. So, they are evidential marks indicating the presence of Ātman and are therefore spoken of as pertaining to It in a secondary sense” (G. Bh. 13-13, p. 204). Śāṅkara means to say that Brahman is first brought to our notice by the Śruti as the one Self of us all, which functions through all our senses. The Self seizes things with our hands, walks with our feet, sees through our eyes and hears through our ears, as it were. This way of describing It is for convincing us of Its undeniable existence. Once we recognize this, the Śruti revokes the wrong ascription of sensory acts, to enable us to interpret Reality as it is, as the one Universal Self. The ascription of the sensory activities was merely a device to familiarize our mind with the existence of the Self, very much like the temporary scaffolding used for the erection of a building, to be altogether removed after that object is accomplished. Accordingly, Śāṅkara summarizes the purport of the second Ślōka thus :

उपाधिभूतपाणिपादादीन्द्रियाधारोपणात् ज्ञेयस्य तद्वत्ताशङ्का मा भूत् इत्येवमर्थः श्लोकारम्भः-

1. These Ślōkas are a verbatim reproduction of Śvetāśvatara III-16,17 except for the second half of the second Ślōka.

“Lest it be supposed that this Brahman to be known is really possessed of the senses such as hands and feet etc., just because they have been imputed to It, the next verse is begun”

3. SPECIAL VARIETIES OF THE VEDĀNTIC METHOD

This one scheme works in all the modes of approach employed in the Upanishads to lead the aspirant to the intuition of Reality. Reality as such transcends all our concepts of the objective world, for all conceptual reasoning pre-supposes the fundamental Super-imposition or Adhyāsa already (p. 29) mentioned. Hence it follows that the only legitimate method of realizing It is to wade through this Super-imposition. Hence the concepts of cause and effect, the universal and the individual, the knower and the known, the Self and its limiting sheaths, Consciousness and its states - these and other general notions like them, are all discussed in the Upanishads merely to teach the seeker how to transcend all such distinctions and attain what is forever attained, to wit, union with Reality. This can be verified by noticing the fact that in each one of such discussions, the Upanishads invariably rescind the initial ascription at the close.

Thus in the Chāndōgya, after positing Being or Brahman as the cause of Fire, Water and Earth - the primordial elements which produce the world - Uddālaka concludes :

एवमेव खलु सोम्य अग्नेन शुङ्गेन आपोमूलमन्विच्छ अद्भिः सोम्य शुङ्गेन तेजोमूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा
सोम्य शुङ्गेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलाः सौम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सदायतनाः सत्प्रतिष्ठाः ॥ छां ६-८-४

“Through the off-shoot of food (the Earth), my dear son, seek out the root Water, through the off-shoot of Water, my dear son, seek out the root Fire, and through the off-shoot of Fire, my dear son, seek out the Real. All these creatures, my dear son, have the Sat (Being or Brahman) for their source, the Sat for their abode, the Sat for their dissolving goal” (Ch. 6-8-4) That is to say, there is nothing that is not born from Brahman, that does not subsist in Brahman, that is not finally dissolved in It. So then the substance of all things created is Brahman only. Accordingly, Uddālaka in this Upanishad, reiterates this one statement at every step of his teaching to “Aitadātmyam Idam Sarvam Tat Satyam Sa Ātma Tat Twamasi Śvêtaketō” (ऐतदात्म्यम् इदम् सर्वम् तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत् त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो।). That is why too he illustrates what he means by citing clay etc, where he emphasizes that the material cause such as clay alone is real while its effect is unreal, its name being a mere play of words - Vacārambhaṇam (वाचारम्भणम्). That what is meant to be proved is the unreality of the so-called effect as distinct from the cause or rather the sole reality of the cause as the substance of its effects, is evident from texts like the one already quoted from the Chāndōgya.(यदग्ने रोहितं रूपं तेजसस्तद्रूपं यच्छुक्लं तदपां यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्यापागादग्नेरग्नित्वं वाचारम्भणं विकारोनामधेयं त्रिणि रूपाणीत्येव सत्यम् ॥ Ch. 6-4-1.

It is clear that fire, a product of the original non-tripartite Bhutas after being mentally resolved into the original factors, is here stated to become ‘no fire’ (Apāgāt Agneragnitvam), modification being only a name arising from words, and

the three colours alone being real. Accordingly, Śāṅkara explains “Before the dawn of the discriminating knowledge of the three colours, you entertained the notion that it was fire; that notion of fire as well as the name fire, has now gone away.”. We thus see that the narration of creation was intended only to show that the world as an effect is merely a name ‘constructed by speech’ and that essentially is nothing other than Brahman. This interpretation is quite in consonance with Bādarāyaṇa’s Sūtra : It is not other than the cause, as can be seen from the texts like the one teaching Ārambhaṇa, the construction (of the effect) by speech (VS., 2-1-14).

Of course, Śāṅkara never meant to say that pots and other modifications of clay are not there when we see and use them for practical purposes, or that our senses deceive us when they report that there are such objective existences. But nobody would venture to assert that these so-called modifications are distinct from clay and have reality of their own apart from that of clay of which they are different forms. From this point of view, then, the world we see is no ‘baseless illusion’ for it has for its basis the original Being (Sat) or Brahman with which it is essentially one (Aitadātmyam Idam Sarvam ऐतदात्म्यमिदम् सर्वम्). And we shall never be doing injustice to the essential reality of the world when we declare with Angiras of the Muṇḍaka:

ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्ताद् ब्रह्म दक्षिणतश्चोत्तरेण ।

अधश्चोर्ध्वं च प्रसृतं ब्रह्मैवेदं विश्वमिदं वरिष्ठम् ॥

“All this spread out before us, behind, to the right and to the left, above and below, is but the immortal Brahman, all this universe is the Supreme Brahman”. Mu. 2-2-1.

As Śāṅkara sums up, “The notion of non-Brahman is merely Avidyā just like the notion of a serpent in a rope, Brahman alone being the Highest Reality. Such is the teaching of the Vedas.”

This rather protracted discussion of causality and creation will be enough, I hope, to illustrate the method of Adhyārōpa and Apavāda (Imputation and Rescission). The Upanishads do not undertake to examine the concept of causality as such and to pronounce their judgment in the matter. They rather take up the concept as accepted in the empirical world and utilize it to teach us that the real nature of Brahman is above the notions of cause and effect.

From the book Śuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara, (Chapter 4, The Method Of

Śaṅkara Vedānta, paras 24 and 25)

THAT BRAHMAN IS KNOWN ONLY THROUGH THE NEGATION OF THE SUPERIMPOSED IS A TEACHING COMMON TO ALL THE THREE PRASTHĀNAS

That Brahman being devoid of specific features and never objectifiable has to be made known only by the negation of the superimposed attributes foreign to it, has been expressly stated in the Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa; it has been taught in the Upanishads and announced in the Bhagavadgītā also. This harmony of the three Prasthānas has been pointed out by the commentator Śaṅkara. The student should ponder over the texts cited in the Bhāshya on the two aphorisms :

(१) दर्शयति चाथो अपि च स्मर्यते। VS. 3-2-17

‘The Śruti shows this and it is declared in the Smṛtis also.’

(२) अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत्।

‘Hence the simile of the replexion of the sun etc’

The following are the texts to be gone into in particular :

“Now therefore, the teaching (of Brahman) : “not such, not such”(Bṛ 2-3-6) , “It is certainly other than the known. and is higher than the unknown” (Ke. 1-4)., “That (bliss) from which words turn back along with the mind, failing to reach it” (Tai. 2-9): “This Ātman is (perfect) silence” (?); “It is neither being nor non being” (G. 13- 12)., “Do not think that I am invested with the qualities of all these elements (such as the earth etc.)” (Mō. Dh. 339-45)., “He is made to appear to be of a different form only through the associating adjunct” (?); “He is seen to be one and many like the reflection of the moon in the water” (?). Su.Bh. 3-2- 17, 18.

TEACHING BY MEANS OF SUPERIMPOSITION IS ONLY FOR NEGATING WHAT IT IS NOT

The sub-varieties of the Adhyārōpa-apavāda method are innumerable. Only a few of them are known by particular names. Some of them, we are going to consider in the next section. In order to forewarn the student that they are to be regarded as samples only, we now set forth some more varieties of superimposition implying the negation of certain other features :

Although Brahman is devoid of all specific features, and although it is ever attained because of its all-pervading nature and because of its being the very Self of every one, ‘attainability’ is imputed to it in certain Śrutis such as this one for instance : ‘The knower of Brahman attains the Highest’ (Tai. 2- 1). This is only to negate that it is attainable by some means other than knowledge. It also implies that Brahman should not be regarded as something to be reached after travelling towards it, as is the case with regard to Lower Brahman (Hiraṇyagarbha) whose attainability is taught in Śrutis like ‘He attains Swārājyam (his own kingdom, as Hiraṇyagarbha)’ (Tai. 1 -6). Sometimes ‘knowability is attributed to Brahman by

superimposition, as for instance in Śrutis like the following : ‘This is to be known, for it is always in the form of one’s own Ātman’ (Sve. 1-12)., ‘Nārāyaṇa the great knowable’ (Tai.Na. 13-29)., ‘(That teaching) by which even that which is not heard becomes heard, that which is not thought over becomes thought over, and that which is not understood becomes understood’ (Ch. 6- 1-3). And this superimposition is to reveal that ignorance is utterly destroyed by knowledge and that there remains nothing else to be known henceforth. And in certain cases knowership is superimposed to negate knowability as for instance in the Śruti : ‘By what means, my dear, can the knower be known ?’ (Bṛ2-414). And by certain Śrutis again the nature of being a witness is imputed to Ātman to deny even knowership to Ātman as in the text ‘He is the witness, conscious and devoid of all attributes’ (Sve.6-11). And by certain other texts the very essential nature of Ātman is pointed out as in the text ‘(He is) neti neti, not such, not such’ (Bṛ 2-3-6) in order to negate all specific attributes including the nature of being a witness. Similarly knowability by Vedāntic text only is superimposed sometimes to teach that Ātman is not knowable by perception and other empirical means, as may be seen from texts like ‘Those who have quite correctly ascertained the truth by means of intuition arising from Vedāntas...’ (Mu. 3-2- 6). Ascertainability by the mind is sometimes taught to indicate that it is not known through sensuous knowledge, as is done in texts like ‘By mind alone is this (Brahman) to be seen, there is no plurality whatever here’ (Bṛ 4-4-19). And in other instances it is taught that Brahman is beyond both the mind and speech in order to reveal that Ātman is known exclusively through intuition distinct from both (mind and speech). As for instance. in the case of texts like this : ‘From which words fall back. along with the mind failing to reach it - one who has intuited that bliss of Brahman, is not afraid of anything’ (Tai. 2-9). Discriminating students may similarly interpret for themselves other instances of deliberate superimposition.

Nor is it a rule that each superimposition aims at removing only one particular thought-construction. To illustrate by an example : Superimposition of knowability of Ātman not merely wards off the supposition that some other thing deserves to be known, but also suggests that one becomes omniscient by the knowledge of Brahman and that all his ignorance is removed once and for all. It is also implied that ignorance of Ātman alone is responsible for the appearance of all duality, and that subsequent to the dawn of Self-knowledge there would no longer continue the distinction of knower, means of knowledge, and the object of knowledge. And so on. It will thus be seen that the one superimposition of knowability on Brahman implies the dispersal of all constructs of imagination such as (1) the supposition of the actual existence of something other than Ātman. (2) the presumption that assumption of duality is the only imagination- construct to be removed by its knowledge, (3) the imagination that ignorance might recur at some future time, even after the knowledge of Brahman, (4) the supposition that actual existence of

duality is responsible for its appearance, (5) the unfounded lease of continuance for knowership even after the knowledge of Ātman has dawned, and so on.

We have here adduced only a few instances to indicate that some particular superimpositions are intended to negate some other particular thought-constructs. The intelligent reader can now proceed for himself and infer the implied negations in similar cases. It should be never forgotten that wherever reality free from all attributes is presented as endowed with any particular attribute, it is only intended to negate some other property commonly imputed to it by the human mind, but never implies that the particular attribute employed for the purpose of teaching, really characterizes Reality as it is. For it will be seen that even this attribute is in its turn expressly negated elsewhere.



02. Two Standpoints: Empirical and Real

From the Book Clarifications of Certain Vedāntic Concepts: Chapter 7: The Empirical and Transcendental Views'.

THE EMPIRICAL AND THE TRANSCENDENTAL VIEWS

37. Avidyā is the most fundamental of all the concepts we have so far considered. Man, as he is born, including the most intelligent of his kind who can distinguish truth from error, least suspects that deep down in his mind there might be a wider ignorance which engulfs within its range both the truth and error which he recognizes in ordinary life.

That is why Śaṅkara begins his Introduction to Vedānta Sūtra with a concise and brisk statement of the nature of that error:-

(१) सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्' 'ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥

"It is a natural procedure on the part of man to base his conduct on the notions of me and mine, mixing up the real and the non-real." -Introduction to Sūtra Bhāshya.

And the set purpose of the Upanishads is to blot out this fundamental error.

(२) अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणाय, आत्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥

"To destroy this basic cause of all evils, all the Vedāntas (or Upanishads) are begun in order to teach the Knowledge of the Unity of Ātman." -Introduction to Sūtra Bhāshya.

38. This leads us to a consideration of the distinction of naive view of Reality and Truth and the Vedāntic view of the same. Śaṅkara contrasts these two viewpoints by the terms Lōka-dṛṣhti, and Śāstra-dṛṣhti respectively, as for instance in the following passage:

(१) 'उपसंहारदर्शनान्नेति चेन्न क्षीरवद्धि' (२-१-२४) इत्यत्र तु बाह्यनिमित्तनिरपेक्षमपि स्वाश्रयं कार्यं भवति-
इत्येतत् लोकदृष्ट्या निर्दिशितम्; - शस्त्रदृष्ट्या तु पुनः सर्वत्रैश्वरापेक्षकत्वमापद्यमानं न पराणुद्यते ॥

"In the Sūtra 2-1-24, the illustration of the milk was adduced to show that there may be a change in the substance of a thing even without an external cause, and that was only from' Lōkadṛṣhti (the commonsense view). But from Śāstradṛṣhti (the Vedāntic view), however, which entails the uniform dependence of an effect upon the Lord is not discarded." Su.Bh. 2-2-3.

Śaṅkara however, uses another pair of names for these views, the Vyāvahārika (the practical) and the Pāramārthika (Really Real), as in the following statement;

(२) अभ्युपगम्य चेमं व्यावहारिकं भोक्तृभोग्यलक्षणं 'विभागः स्याल्लोकवत्' इति परिहारोऽभिहितः;
न त्वयं विभागः परमार्थतोऽस्ति ॥

“The previous rejoinder, citing the illustration of the sea and its waves, was given while granting this Vyāvahārika distinction (of practical life), of the experiencer and the experienced, but from the Pāramārthika (Really Real) stand-point, however, there is no such distinction.” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

We shall use these more familiar terms in our further discussion of these two stand-points.

39. The Sanskrit word Vyavahāra comprehends not only thought and expression but also conduct based upon them. To think and talk of mother-of-pearl as silver, and proceed towards it with the intention of taking up the supposed silver, is Mithyā-vyavahāra (wrong behaviour), while treating actual silver as silver in these three ways is Samyagvyavahāra or right behaviour. Now the Vedāntic view is that all our ideas, speech and conduct based upon practical life (व्यावहारिक) are really due to ignorance from the Pāramārthika (transcendental, Really Real) stand-point. So then, Vyāvahārika view is the same as the view of ignorance (अविद्यकदृष्टि) or the view that distinguishes the knower and the known (प्रमाणप्रमेयदृष्टि), or the view of ordinary life (लोकदृष्टि), or the view based upon waking life (जाग्रदृष्टि). It is on the inborn tendency of the human mind to falsely superimpose the Self and the not-Self (the body, the senses and the mind of the waking state) upon each other that this Vyāvahāric view is based.

How is the waking point of view known to be the result of an error? We have already seen how this view takes the body and the organs of sense etc. to be real without any warrant, and mixes up the real Witnessing Ātman and the unreal not-Self. The following description of waking as Laukika rehearses the same idea at full length.

(१) सवस्तु संवृतिसता वस्तुना सह वर्तते इति सवस्तु। तथा च उपलब्धिः उपलम्भः। तेन सह वर्तते इति सोपलम्भं च। शास्त्रादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदं ग्राह्यग्राहकलक्षणं द्वयं लौकिकम्; लोकादनपेतं लौकिकम्। जागरितम् इत्येतत्। एवंलक्षणं जागरितमिष्यते वेदान्तेषु ॥

“ ‘With a thing’ means that it contains objective things which are real from the stand-point of Avidyā and ‘with knowledge’ means that it contains the knowledge of these things. That which is the field of all Vyavahāra including that of the Śāstra, the duality consisting of the knowing subject and the knowable objects, is called Laukika, the ordinary life, which is the same thing as the waking state. This is waking as described in the Vedāntas.” GKBh.4-87.

41. It may appear to be a bold statement to say that even the Śāstraic Vyavahāra has reality only in the field of Avidyā, Is it not self-stultifying to say that the unreal Śāstra reveals Reality? And why should we shamelessly call perception and other means of knowledge unreal while we have to deal with them all our life willy-nilly? Śāṅkara replies:

नैष दोषः, सर्वव्यवहारणामेव प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताविज्ञानात् सत्यत्वोपपत्तेः स्वप्नव्यवहारस्येव प्राग्बोधात्;

यावद्धि न सत्यात्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्तिः तावत् प्रमाणप्रमेयफललक्षणेषु विकारेष्वनृतत्वबुद्धिर्न कस्यचिदुत्पद्यते । विकारानेव तु ‘अहम् ’ ‘मम’ इत्यविद्यया आत्मात्मीयेन भावेन सर्वो जन्तुः प्रतिपद्यते स्वाभाविकीं ब्रह्मात्मतां हित्वा । तस्मात् प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रबोधात् उपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः । यथा सुप्तस्य प्राकृतस्य जनस्य स्वप्ने उच्चावचान् भावान् पश्यतो निश्चितमेव प्रत्यक्षाभिमतं विज्ञानं भवति प्राक् प्रबोधात्, न च प्रत्यक्षाभासाभिप्रायस्तत्काले भवति, तद्वत् ॥

“This fault cannot be imputed to our position; for, all the Vyavahāras can be consistently real before Enlightenment dawns, like the Vyavahāra in a dream before waking. (To explain:) So long as the Knowledge-of the one real Ātman has not arisen, the idea of the unreality of the effects, that is, of the nature of the means of knowledge, objects of knowledge and the resultant knowledge never occurs to anyone; on the other hand, every one takes the effects alone to be himself and his own and says ‘this is me, this is mine’, forgetting his own true nature of being Brahmātman, Therefore all Vyavahāra (procedure), secular and Vedic, is consistent so long as one is not awakened to the Knowledge of one’s being the Ātman of Brāhmic nature. This is just like the case of an ordinary person seeing all sorts of phenomena in a dream. He is sure that he actually perceives those things before he is awakened, and does not suspect they are only simulacra of perception.” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

Add to this the conception of Śāstra as the ultimate means of Knowledge as described in the previous section (p. 50) and we have a complete picture of Śāṅkara’s distinction of the empirical view and the transcendental or Śāstraic view.

42. It would be Interesting and profitable to contrast the significance of the several concepts we have discussed so far, from these two distinct points of view. To aid the memory of the beginner, the results of such a contrast are subjoined in a tabular form.

Concept	Vyavahāric significance	Pāramārthic significance
Ātman	The individual soul	The witnessing principle
Avidyā	Ignorance of a thing	Superimposition of the Self and non-Self.
Vidyā	Knowledge of an object	Intuition of the Brahman as the universal Self.
Sṛṣhti	1)Creating or inventing something.	1) Projection of an appearance.
	2) The thing so created	2) The world superimposed on Brahman.
Īsvara	Ruler.	Ātman existing independently of the world.
Bondage	Suspension, confinement	Apparent limitation.
Release	Setting free, becoming free	Getting rid of Avidyā etc.

From the Book Shuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara, Section 6

4. ALL CHARGES REBUTTED BY ASSUMING TWO DIFFERENT STANDPOINTS.

52. So then, in this system, the Universe is real only from the empirical standpoint based upon Ignorance. The recognition of Jīvas as knowing agents and experiencers of their action, the distinction of the meditator and that which is meditated upon, the validity of what is said in the Śāstra or by an Ācārya, the performance of spiritual acts of discipline, the sublation of Avidyā by knowledge and the states of bondage and release all these are admitted from the empirical standpoint based upon Avidyā, while from the transcendental point of view, there is nothing whatever other than the featureless Brahman.

Inasmuch as this doctrine is proved to demonstration in accordance with the Śruti, reason and universal intuition, there is no Vedāntic position which remains unestablished and no charge not rebutted. Hence in this system Vedāntic texts are explained according to the exegetical principles of Mimāṃsa appealing to the pertinent passages from the Śrutis, Smṛtis and the Purāṇas; earnest seekers of truth are taught on the basis of Śāstra and reasoning suited to the capacity of each individual by adopting the rules of fair discussion subservient to and in harmony with the Śruti, reason and intuition; and in order to wean aspirants for final release from being misled by the propaganda of other schools of thought, needful attempt is made to show the futility of their reasoning by having recourse to logical disputation and refutation etc. as well. All this becomes intelligible in the light of the two view-points mentioned above. The other systems in contrast, have no such basis for their procedure, since they do not recognize this distinction of views. Hence there is very great disparateness of the Vedāntic system and the other systems in this respect.

From the Book Misconceptions About Śāṅkara, Paragraph 16.

THE USEFULNESS OF THE DISTINCTION OF THE TWO VIEWS

This distinction of absolute Reality and Vyavahāra from the standpoint of empirical life, should be unfailingly borne in mind in order to reconcile the several seeming self-contradictory statements in Śāṅkara-Bhāshya. Apparent contradictions with regard to fructifying (Prārabdha) karmas, Upāsanās, transmigration, the three states of consciousness, the state of beginninglessness of Samsāra, gradation in Mōksha, the distinction of the Higher and the Lower Brahman and other doctrines with which the Sūtra-Bhāshya is teemed with, are all resolved when one reminds oneself with the principle on which this important distinction of the two standpoints, is based. Ignoring this distinction, has been mainly responsible for the imputation of incorrect views to Śāṅkara and the unjustifiable criticisms of this school of Vedānta by adverse critics.

From Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijna-Introduction: Sub-sections 1 and 2 of Sec-

tion IV, The Two Standpoints

1. THE USES OF THE EMPIRICAL VIEW

From the foregoing exposition of the method of Vedānta, it will be clear that the teaching of Śrutis pre-supposes two different points of view in its procedure. One of these is the natural view, the empirical view which persuades a man to look upon himself as an ego endowed with mind and senses, and stationed in a manifold universe along with other embodied beings like himself, knowing, acting, reaping and experiencing the fruits of his actions good or bad. This view the Śruti calls the view of Avidyā in contrast to the correct view, the view of Vidyā, from the standpoint of ātman as He is. The Upanishads, however, do make use of the empirical view to a very large extent in connection with their peculiar method, the Adhyāropa-Apāvāda employed as a device to reveal the absolutely Real.

It must not be supposed that the Śrutis condemn the empirical view altogether as wholly illusory and useless. For, they utilise it to prescribe not only the modes of conduct and discipline necessary to qualify the seeker for acquiring the correct Knowledge of Brahman, but also certain meditations (Upāsanās) and adaptations of Vedic rituals which would indirectly help the aspirant to prepare himself to attain Self-Knowledge later on. There are minor Upāsanās too prescribed from this point of view, which would be instrumental in securing, for the qualified followers, fruits similar to those vouched for rituals in the Karmakāṇḍa portion.

2. THE TWO ASPECTS OF BRAHMAN

These two views account for the double character of Brahman as presented in the Upanishads. Certain passages present Brahman as totally devoid of all specific features, while others describe It as possessing a number of distinctive attributes. How is this apparent contradiction to be resolved? Bādarāyaṇa in his Vedānta Sūtras and Śāṅkara in his commentary on the same, have laid down a principle to be observed in interpreting such texts : "It has been established in VS. 1-1-4 that passages like Br 3-8-8, K. 1-3-15, Ch. 8-14-1, Mu. 2-1-2, Br 2-5-19 etc., have for their purport the Reality which is differenceless Brahmātman and do not principally aim at teaching anything else. So in passages of this nature, Brahman should be definitely understood to be devoid of all forms. As for the other passages which treat of Brahman with form, they are not primarily meant to teach It, for their main purport is to lay down injunctions for meditation. As long as they are not opposed to the former texts, they have to be taken to mean what they say; where, however, there is contradiction, the texts whose purport is to teach the nature of Brahman would be of greater force than those whose ultimate purport is not the determination of the nature of Brahman. This is the reason why Brahman is to be regarded as altogether without form and not otherwise, even while texts of both the classes are to be found in the Upanishads.' SB., 3-2-14.

Thus, from the highest standpoint, Brahman has no attributes whatever of Its

own, has no second to It and is, in fact, the sole Reality. But yet, from the empirical standpoint, the same Brahman is also to be meditated upon as endowed with attributes. As, for instance, in the passage “All this is verily Brahman, since it originates from It, dissolves into It and moves in It. So let a man meditate upon It in peace. “Made up of mind, having Prāṇa for his body, of the nature of effulgence, having a will never thwarted, all-pervasive like ether, creator of all, possessing all pure desires, all sweet odours, all delicious tastes, all-pervading, without any sense-organs as that of speech and without flurry. This is my Self within the heart, this is Brahman, and this, I am going to attain after departing from here.’ Whoever has such firm conviction and entertains no doubt, attains this goal. So says Śaṇḍilya, yea, Śaṇḍilya.” Ch., 3-14-1, 2, 4.

Brahman may even possess a form, such as the one described in Ch., 1-6-6. “Now the golden person who is seen in the sun, the Purusha with a golden beard and golden hair, everything golden to the very tips of his nails.”

It is not to be supposed that such attributes and forms are illusory and no more, since they are to be regarded as unreal from the Paramārtha standpoint. For, being enjoined in the Śruti for meditation, they are as real as anything that we see and touch, as any real ideas that we entertain in the empirical world. Śaṅkara observes: “When one is told to bring the king’s man or the owner of the variegated cow, one makes no effort to bring the attribute--the king or the cow also. Lest it be thought that the same principle applies here, the attributes such as ‘creator of all’ are repeated here for meditation.” Similarly, with regard to the form of Brahman, that commentator remarks, “Even the Supreme Lord may, at his pleasure, assume a bodily shape formed of Māyā in order to favour his devotees. Accordingly, the Smṛti says “O Nārada, that thou seest me in this form is the Māyā projected by me; you should not think that I am really endowed with the properties of the five elements.” Moreover, where the essential nature of the Supreme Lord devoid of all specific features is taught, only then would apply the Śāstra such as “without sound, without touch, without form, undecaying.” As the cause of all, however, the Highest Lord is described as possessing some of the properties of the effects also for purposes of meditation by texts like the following one: “The creator of all, possessing all desires, all odours, all tastes.” The text representing Him as having a golden beard etc. may be treated likewise. As to the objection that He cannot be the Highest Lord since the Śruti speaks of an abode, we reply, even the Lord who rests in His own glory, may be taught as having an abode just for meditation, since being all-pervasive, Brahman may be taken to be within everything like ether. And the Śruti teaching a limitation to his authority is also for the sake of meditation, the limitations taught being relative to the Adhyātma (the sphere of the human body) and the Adhidaiva (the sphere of the gods, respectively.)” SB., 1-1-20.

This long extract is very instructive with reference to some important points in Śaṅkara Vedānta. (1) Brahman as It is in Itself as well as Its special aspect

taught for meditation has been designated by the same word “Īsvara”. (2) The attributes or forms of Brahman recommended for meditation are, notwithstanding that they are the products of Māyā, no more illusory than any concrete things that one deals with in the empirical world, inasmuch as they are assumed by the Lord for favouring the devotees. (3) The meditation of Brahman as qualified by these limiting conditions, does lead ultimately to the highest result or Mōksha where the devotee attains the same Brahman which is his very Self. “Esha Ma ātmā Etad Brahma Etam Itah Pretya Abhisambhāvitāsmi, एष म आत्मा एतद् ब्रह्म एतम् इतः प्रेत्याभिसंभवितास्मि”, (4) There is a relatively higher value attached to the qualities, forms, abodes etc., ascribed to Brahman than to those of embodied beings, including the gods, since the Lord is taught to be emphatically distinct and different from these Jīvas “Bhedavyapadeshāccanyaḥ’ (भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः VS., 1-1-22).

Two different epithets “Para’ Brahman and “Apara’ Brahman have been used in the Śrutis to enable the student to distinguish these two aspects of Brahman :

- (१) एतद्वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोङ्कारः। प्र. ५-१
- (२) एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं परम्। का. १-२-१६.

This distinction of the aspects is also recognised in the Vedānta Sūtrās :

“कार्यं बादरिरस्य गत्युपपत्तेः ‘ (वे. सू. ४-३-७)

The “Apara’ or Lower Brahman is also called the Kārya Brahman. The variants for “Apara’ and “Para’ (Brahman) are to be found in the following Bhāshya : “With regard to the passage “He leads them to Brahma’ the doubt arises whether he leads them to the Kārya (effect), Apara (lower) Brahman or to the Para (higher), Avikṛta (not effected), Mukhya (principal) Brahman. Whence this doubt ? Because the common name Brahman is used without any qualifying epithet, and because this particular Śruti speaks of “going’. Here the teacher Bādari is of opinion that the person who is not a man, leads them only to the Kārya (effect), Saguṇa (qualified), Apara (lower) Brahman”. SB. 4-4-7. Hence it is evident that Śāṅkara uses the words Para (higher), Mukhya (principal), Nirguṇa (having no qualities), and Kāraṇa (cause) for Brahman as It is, while Apara (lower) Gaūṇa (secondary), Saguṇa (having qualities), and Kārya (effected) for Brahman recommended for meditation. This is clarified further on where Śāṅkara observes “Owing to its proximity to the Higher Brahman, it is not inconsistent to use the word Brahman, with reference to the lower Brahman also. For it is the same Higher Brahman which is designated as the Lower (Brahman) when it is sometimes recommended to be meditated upon as endowed with certain qualities, such as being “made up of the mind’ (Ch., 3-4-12)”.

Or again:-

“But would not such (distinction of a higher and a lower Brahman) militate against the Śruti text teaching non-duality? No. For we have removed this objection by the remark that (the distinction) is only due to the limiting conditions of

name and form created by Avidyā.” SB., 4-3-14.

Readers will have been convinced by now that the epithets Para, Mukhya, Nirguṇa etc. (in contrast to Aparā, Gauṇa, Saḡuṇa etc.) are merely convenient terms used to point to Brahman as It is, and are meant neither for sharply distinguishing It from the lower Brahman, nor for disparaging the rank of the latter. These contrasting epithets should never be supposed to interfere with the identical nature of Brahman in whichever context the Śruti may present It. This explains why Śāṅkara uses the appellations Parameswara and Paramātman indifferently for both the aspects of Brahman. This is why, too, that Śāṅkara does not hesitate to make use of the term Para Brahman even while he is discussing Brahman as the object of meditation, for there he has only to contrast Brahman with Jīva or some other entity, and not with Brahman to be known as such. Failure to notice this subtle distinction has been responsible for many uncalled-for criticisms of Śāṅkara by G. Thibaut and Col. Jacob consideration of which has to be postponed as not germane to the present discussion. Students who wish to steer clear of similar pitfalls will do well to rivet their attention upon the following important passage in Śāṅkara’s Sūtra Bhāshya.

एकमपि ब्रह्म अपेक्षितोपाधिसंबन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसंबन्धं च उपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेषूपदिश्यत इति
प्रदर्शयितुं परो ग्रन्थ आरभ्यते ॥

“One and the same Brahman is taught in the Vedānta as an object of meditation, when It desiderates certain limiting conditions or as an object of knowledge when It is regarded to be free from all limiting conditions. The sequel is begun to show how this is.” S.B. 1-1-2.



03. The Nature Of Vidyā And Avidyā; And The Way Of Removing Avidyā

From the Book Introduction to 'Vedāntins Meet'

1. Adhyāsa (superimposition) is nothing but mistaking one thing for another. And Avidyā, as Śaṅkara has defined in so many words, is the mutual superimposition of the Self, the only Reality, and the not-self. There is no other Ignorance worth the name, which according to Śaṅkara is directly sublated by Vidyā or the discriminative knowledge of the Self as it is. Doubt and misconception are, it is true, are comprehended in the connotation of the term and are even expressly stated to be such. But since no human thought process is possible without the presupposition of Adhyāsa, this latter is pre-eminently entitled to be called Avidyā. (Su.Bha.Intro. , G.Bha.13.2).

Therefore, those who imagine that the object superimposed is primarily meant by term Avidyā, and it is that which has got to be removed by true knowledge not only do violence to Śaṅkara's words, but also disregard a fact of nature and even common sense, in as much as no one believes that the apparent silver in the nacre has got to be removed first by the true knowledge of nacre, and not one's own false notion of it. (Su.Bha.Intro.)

2. It is universally accepted by Vedāntins that in Śaṅkara's system, knowledge is the one means of the Summum Bonum of life and the Upanishads expressly say so. Śaṅkara avers that knowledge vipes off all ignorance or Adhyāsa, the source of all ills of life. And it goes without saying that knowledge can dispel nothing else than subjective ignorance. (Tai., Mu., Su.Bha.Intro.)

It is therefore clear that thinkers who assert that the source of all ills spoken of by Śaṅkara is the Mūla-avidyā alone, have to maintain their position only by going against the express statement of Śaṅkara and the Śrutis, and quietly ignoring the essential nature of knowledge, which can never destroy existing things.

3. Śaṅkara's very proposition that Upanishadic knowledge of Brahman is meant for the annihilation of Adhyāsa, is sufficient in itself to convince anyone that the Bhāshyakāra never thought of tracing Adhyāsa to its cause. For, no one could think of going in search of ignorance after it has been blotted out. And no one is conscious of his ignorance while he is in its grip. But it is no mere guess by which

one has to infer that Śaṅkara does not demand a cause Avidyā, for he definitely announces that Adhyāsa is beginningless. Nor could one think of a beginning to it, since even time is a creation of Adhyāsa, and causal relation is inconceivable without the presupposition of time. No doubt Śaṅkara does declare that all superimposition derive its breath from non-discrimination (aviveka), but it is self-evident that he is not thinking of a temporal relation between non-discrimination and superimposition. He only means to say that Adhyāsa disappears as soon as discriminative knowledge dawns. The Upanishads are never tired of declaring that the individual self as well as all this apparent universe is really Brahman and nothing else. (Mu.2.2.1, Br̥3.7.23, G.Bha.13.26, Su.Bha.Intro.)

It is therefore nothing but a wild goose chase to start in pursuit of a cause for Adhyāsa.

4. Such being the case, illustrations like that of the silver in the nacre or snake in the rope interspersed in Śaṅkara's commentaries, meant as they are to contrast truth with error, only imply that false appearances being only the figment of ignorance, cease to impose upon us the moment the real nature of their substrate is ascertained. These appearances in themselves are neither born nor destroyed by true knowledge, in fact they never exist in any way as entities, for they are merely thought constructs. (G.Bha.13.21, 2.16, 4.24, Ch.Bha.2.23.1)

It is therefore so much labour lost to enter into speculation about the nature, cause and process of birth or destruction of these false appearances.

5. The seed form of the universe, known by several names such as the Avyakta, Akshara, Avyākṛta, Akāsha, Prakṛti and so on, is only the object of inference based upon the false conception of duality. This seed evolving itself into the individual aggregate of the body and the senses, lends itself to the mutual superimposition of the Self and the not-self. It is this superimposition, as we have already seen, which is known by the name of Avidyā in Śaṅkara's system, while the inferred seed of all phenomena-including the aggregate of the body and the senses-is called by that significant name of māyā, false appearance due to ignorance. In the Bhagavadgītā, where the terminology of the Sankhyas has been also pressed into service, it is observed that "the Purusha staying in Prakṛti enjoys the Guṇas born of Prakṛti, and the reason for his being re-born in good, bad, or indifferent lives is his clinging to the Gunas" (G.Bha.13.21). Śaṅkara explains this as meaning that the superimposition of Prakṛti (māyā) and Purusha, as well as the resultant desire, is at the bottom of all empirical life. Thus, according to Śaṅkara, Avidyā being the occasion of the appearance of the not-self and the ruinous identification of the Self with it, should not be confounded with Avyākṛta, Prakṛti, or māyā, which is only an illusory appearance. (Su.Bha.2.1.9, G.Bha.13.20, 14.5, 18.48)

From the Book 'Śāṅkara's Clarification of Certain Vedāntic Concepts', Chapter 2.

5. The word Ātman really means that which pervades (Āpnōti) all. And we have seen that our genuine Ātman is the only Reality underlying all the phenomenal universe, according to the Upanishads. Indeed the Chāndōgya declares:

“Now, therefore, the teaching concerning Ātman is begun. Ātman alone is below, Ātman above, Ātman behind, Ātman in front, Ātman on the right, Ātman on the left. All this is Ātman alone.” Ch.7.25.2.

How then is it, it will be asked, that we see this manifold universe in which live so many individual beings? How is that I, you, or anybody else in this world, firmly believes that each one of us is a limited being full of desires and not this great Ātman?

6. The Upanishads reply: It is because of Avidyā or ignorance. When Nachiketas asked Yama, the God of death, to reveal the nature of Ātman to him, the latter replied: These two are wide apart, running in opposite directions, Avidyā and that which is known as Vidyā. I consider thee Nachiketas as longing for Vidyā, for the numerous desires have not weaned you away from the right path. Resting in the midst of ignorance, but considering themselves discriminative and wise, deluded persons go round and round through crooked ways like blind men led by one who is himself blind. Ka. 2.4. 2.5.

How and when is this darkness or nescience to be dispersed? The Upanishad replies: “All this karma and tapas is Purusha, the highest immortal Brahman alone. Whosoever knows this as hidden in the cave of the heart, cuts the knot of ignorance, my dear boy.” Mu. 2.1.10.

7. Now what exactly does this concept of ignorance stand for? Since it is the ignorance concerning Brahman or the real Ātman, the Self of us all, it cannot be, obviously, a function of the mind, which consists in not knowing or misconceiving an object. The Ātman, as we have already seen, the Witnessing Consciousness in each of us, and there is nothing of which it is not the witness. So it can never be the object of the intellect, which is itself one of the objects of that Consciousness. But, nevertheless, we have no other instrument of knowledge, associated with which we can talk of ourselves as ignorant of, or knowing anything. What then can the Upanishads possibly mean, when they speak of the ignorance of Ātman?

8. This question of the nature of the concept of Avidyā was never raised by the ancient advaitins, nor has it received the close attention it deserves, at the hands of Post-Śāṅkaras. The author of Pañcapādika regarded it as a postulate of Vedānta, for he says: “This power called Avidyā must needs to be assumed as clinging to the very nature of all internal and external things; for otherwise, false appearances can never be accounted for.” PP. P41.

But it is evident that this power is not really a logical necessity, since none of

the other thinkers have recognised it and their systems have not suffered in any manner just because they dispensed with the postulates.

Śaṅkara's explanation of this enigmatical concept follows from two passages from the famous introduction to his Sūtra Bhāshya, whose sum and substance is this: Ātman, the real I of each one of us, is the Witnessing Consciousness. That alone is really real according to Vedānta, since it is absolutely undeniable as we have seen previously. The non-self which is made up of the body, the senses and the mind is an unreal appearance set up by ignorance or privation of knowledge. Now the human intellect has an innate tendency to project the non-real not-self and confound the identity of the real and the unreal whenever it functions. This mixing up of the real and the unreal and the delusion which prompts the mind to submit itself to a mistaken transference of the mutual properties of the self and the non-self, is what is called Avidyā. This tendency is so natural to all mankind that no one suspects that he is under the influence of this primary ignorance due to want of discrimination when he talks of 'me and mine'. It follows that this Avidyā or ignorance is finally wiped off as soon as one discriminates the real and the unreal and determines their true nature. This discrimination and determination of the true nature of these, is what is termed Vidyā, knowledge.

9. How and when was this mutual superimposition of identity and mistaken transference of properties caused? This question is obviously illegitimate, for we have learnt that it is an innate tendency of the human mind to confound the real and the unreal. All human action and experience of the fruits of action presuppose intellection and intellection itself is based on this natal error. Human behaviour is on a par with animal behaviour in this respect for both are the result of this natural want of discrimination. Śaṅkara's dicta on this point are incontrovertible for they are all based upon universal intuition:

"It is on the presupposition of this mutual superimposition of the Self and the non-self, called Avidyā that all conventions of the means and objects of right knowledge-whether secular or sacred-proceed, as also all the sātras dealing with injunction and prohibition or final release." (Su.Bha.Intro.)

"And because there is no difference between the (lower animals) like beasts and man. (To explain:) Beasts and other animals run away from any sound etc. that contact their ear and other organs of sense whenever the knowledge is unfavourable, but proceed towards them whenever the knowledge is pleasant. As for instance, when they see a man approaching with a raised hand with a club, they begin to run away from him fearing that he intends to beat them, but when they see one with a tuft of green grass in his hand they proceed towards him. So also, even men with intellect developed, turn away when they see strong fierce-looking persons shouting with upraised swords in hand, but come forward towards

those who are opposite to this in nature. It is well-known that knowledge through perception of the lower animals presupposes non-discrimination. Since the behaviour of even intelligent persons is seen to be similar to that of animals, their perception etc. also at the time can be concluded to be similar.” (Su.Bha.Intro.)

The meaning is that while men do have the faculty of rethinking about their behaviour, the process of behaviour itself is the result of superimposition due to want of discrimination. This shows that all human activity based upon perception and other means of knowledge is in the field of an innate error due to want of discrimination between the real and the unreal.

“Thus, this beginningless and endless innate superimposition of the nature of a false notion engenders agency and experience of the fruits of action that all humanity is familiar with. In order to destroy this source of all evil, all the Upanishads are begun to propound the Vidyā of the oneness of Ātman.” (Su.Bha.Intro.)

10. The clarification of the concept of Avidyā then, is a special contribution of Śāṅkara to Vedānta, Nowhere else, in the whole range of Vedāntic literature do we find this precision of thought which distinguishes this root-Avidyā, which is responsible for the whole process of human knowledge and activity, from the individual instances of the ignorance of objects in ordinary life. This Avidyā is beginningless not because, as has been egregiously ill-conceived by some followers of Śāṅkara, there is beginningless series of individual Avidyā flowing in a continuous stream, but because it is itself the conjurer of time in which any series can be conceived to exist. Avidyā is no actual concept of Ātman, because Ātman can never be perceived or conceived by the mind, the mind itself being a superimposition on the Self. So it is a notion having the semblance of a false concept (mithyāpratyaayarūpah). And Vidyā, in its turn, is not knowledge of Ātman in the ordinary sense, for the simple reason that Ātman can never be an object of knowledge. It is rather the intuition of Ātman by Ātman himself.



04. Origination of apparent things

From the Book Vedāntins Meet: (From the Section: An Appeal to Thoughtful Vedāntins) Points to be settled:

3. The points to be settled, as stated at some length in the Sanskrit portion of this pamphlet, are as follows-

1) What is the nature of Avidyā ultimately according to Śaṅkara? Does he take the mutual super-imposition (Adhyāsa) of the Self and the non-Self as the only Avidyā sufficient for his system, or does he rely upon another Avidyā called Root-Ignorance (Mūla-Avidyā) which is the material cause of the aforesaid super-imposition?

2) What is the significance of the illustrations of the illusion such as the silver in the nacre, or a rope-snake? Does Śaṅkara merely take the silver etc., to be only an appearance conjured up by the imagination, or does he mean that a species of apparent silver is actually produced during the illusion?

Śaṅkara's position:

4. The second alternative in each of the above cases is the one upheld by the commentators. To me however, Śaṅkara's position seems to be crystal-clear from his declarations like the following-

“This superimposition as described above, wise men consider Avidyā, and they call the discriminative ascertainment of the nature of Reality as it is, by the name of Vidyā.” (Su.Bha. Introduction)

“He merely takes it for silver, but there is no silver there (in the nacre) at all.”(Su.Bha. 4.1.5.)

“The snake in the rope, being but a mental construction, is neither born, nor dissolved in the rope. Nor is that snake born or dissolved in the mind. Neither can it be said to be born or dissolved in both of these together.” (Ma.Ka.Bha.2.32.)

From Vedāntins Meet: Introduction

(In the previous part, it is argued that for Śāṅkara, the mutual super-imposition, Adhyāsa, is Avidyā.) It is therefore nothing but a wild goose chase to start in pursuit of a cause for Adhyāsa.

4. Such being the case, illustrations like that of the silver in the nacre or snake in the rope interspersed in Śāṅkara's commentaries, meant as they are to contrast truth with error, only imply that false appearances being only the figment of ignorance, cease to impose on us the moment the real nature of their substrate is ascertained. These appearances in themselves are neither born nor destroyed by true knowledge, in fact they never exist in any way as entities, for they are merely thought constructs. (G.Bha.13.21, 2.16, 4.24, Ch.Bha.2.23.1)

It is therefore so much labour lost to enter into speculation about the nature, cause and process of birth or destruction of these false appearances.



05. Māyā Nature

From the Book Śaṅkaras Clarification of Certain Vedāntic Concepts: Chapter 3, Creation, māyā and Causation. Paragraphs- 12-14.

12. And now for the concept of māyā in the Upanishads:

छन्दांसि यज्ञाः क्रतवो व्रतानि भूतं भव्यं यच्च वेदा वदन्ति ।
अस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वं एतत्तस्मिंश्चान्यो मायया संनिरुद्धः ॥
मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरं ।
तस्यावयवभूतैस्तु व्याप्तं सर्वं इदं जगत् ॥

“The various Chandas (metres), Yagñas and Kratus (sacrifices with and without the Yūpa-post), austerities (like the Cāndrāyana), and the existent entities as well as results to be achieved, which the Vedas reveal- all these are born of this (Great Being), The Māyin (magician) creates all this Universe, and in it is another bound by māyā. Prakṛti is to be known as the māyā, the Great Lord as the Māyin (magician). All this world of moving and non-moving beings is pervaded by (individual souls) which are his parts.” Sve. 4-9, 10.

Here appears the word ‘Māyā’ which has scared many a scholar. Bhaskarācārya, Yamunācārya and others, took advantage of the employment of this word and argued that Advaitins who employ the Māyā-doctrine are the crypto-Buddhists and some oriental scholars have openly charged Gauḍapāda with having borrowed the doctrine from the Buddhists, while some of them have gone to the length of concluding that the Śvetāśvatara must be a later Upanishad just because it contains this bugbear of the word Māyā. And yet, what is there in this innocuous epithet of Māyin as applied to Īsvara and Māyā, as the material out of which he creates the world? No section of the Buddhists ever postulated an Īsvara or invested him with Māyā, whether as a power or anything else. And when we closely examine Śaṅkara’s Bhāshya, we find that there is nothing to be afraid or ashamed of when we entertain this highly philosophical doctrine which so satisfactorily explains the phenomena of life while keeping the Advaitic Absolute perfectly intact.

14. And in the second place, some thinkers misled by the word ‘Śakti’ occurring in Śaṅkara’s Bhāshya as well as in the Śrutis, think that Māyā is a power exercised by God to delude souls. The following excerpts not only dispel any doubt as to

what Śāṅkara exactly means by this word, but also lay down a clearcut principle which enables us to distinguish the concept of Māyā from Avidyā.

परमेश्वराधीना त्वियमस्माभिः प्रागवस्था जगतोऽभ्युपगम्यते, न स्वतन्त्रा। सा चावश्याभ्युपगन्तव्या। अर्थवती हि सा। न हि तया विना परमेश्वरस्य स्रष्टृत्वं सिध्यति। शक्तिरहितस्य तस्य प्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः। मुक्तानां च पुनरनुत्पत्तिः। कुतः? विद्यया तस्या बीजशक्तेर्दाहात्। अविद्यात्मिका हि सा बीजशक्तिः आव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासृष्टिः, यस्यां स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः। तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम् ‘एतस्मिन्नु खल्वक्षरे गार्ग्याकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्च’(३-८-११) इति श्रुतेः। क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम् ‘अक्षरात्परतः परः’ (मुं २-१-२) इति श्रुतेः; क्वचिन्मायेति सूचितम् ‘मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्’ इति मन्त्रवर्णात्; अव्यक्ता हि सा माया, तत्त्वान्यत्वनिरूपणस्याशक्यत्वात् ॥

“What is admitted by us is, however, only a previous state of the world dependent on the Supreme Lord, not independent of Him. And it has to be necessarily admitted, for it serves a purpose. To explain: Without it, the Supreme Lord cannot be a creator, since without this potentiality, He cannot be active. And on this supposition only, the released souls cannot be reborn, for in this case the causal potentiality is burnt up by Vidyā, The causal potentiality is called Avyakta (or the Unmanifest), having its locus in the Supreme Lord is the illusory universal sleep, in which all the transmigratory souls are sleeping deprived of the knowledge of their true nature. Now this Avyakta is sometimes denoted by the word Akāśa (ether), as for instance in the Śruti ‘It is in that Imperishable indeed, O Gārgi, that the Ākāśa is woven as the warp and the woof (Bṛ 3-8-11). Sometimes it is denoted by the term Akshara, as for instance in the Śruti ‘He is greater than the great Akshara’ (Mu. 2-1-2). And sometimes it is called Māyā. For the Mantra says Prakṛti is to be known to be Māyā, and the Supreme Lord to be the Māyin.’ (Śve.4-10).” Su.Bh.1-4-3.

[Here it is clear that Śakti is synonymous with Prakṛti, the causal potentiality of the world, and is called Māyā also. The individual souls in that state, are enveloped in ignorance of their true nature, to wit, perfect identity with Brahman.]

The causal potentiality or Māyā is said to be Avidyātmika (of the nature of Avidyā) which expression may be wrongly understood by the unwary to have a meaning identical with Avidyā. The following extract effectively wards off the possibility of such a mistake.

सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते ॥

“Fictitiously imagined by Avidyā as though they were identical with the omniscient Lord, name and form undefinable either as (Īśvara) Himself or

distinct from Him, the cause of this manifold world of mundane life, are called in the Śruti and the Smṛti, 'Māyā', causal potentiality and Prakṛti." Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

Here we find māyā described as the figment of Avidyā, and identified with Prakṛti; the original state of the world before creation. It is called Māyā (illusory appearance) clearly because it cannot be defined to be identical with Īsvara or Brahman or quite distinct from Brahman. Elsewhere, in the Bhāshyas, the expression Anirvacanīya (तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीय) has been explained by the illustration of foam which is not quite the same as water, but yet not a different entity either. This expression, by the way, gave rise to the theory of Sadasadanirvacanīya (apparent things which are neither being nor not-being) developed in the sub-commentaries on Śaṅkara's works. In this passage, not quoted here at full length, we find variants for the expression Avidyākālpa, such as Avidyāpratyupasthāpita, Avidyākṛta, and Avidyātmaka (presented by Avidyā, made up of Avidyā, and of the nature of Avidyā) all of which mean the objective appearance due to Avidyā, māyā, then, according to Śaṅkara is the illusory causal seed of the world, due to Avidyā (Adhyāsa or mutual superimposition of Ātman and un-Ātman, occasioned by want of discrimination).

From the Book Essays on Vedānta:

Chapter 6. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD (Avidyā and Māyā)

39. We have seen that the one teaching of the Upanishads, is that Reality is the All, the one without a second, and that Reality is called Brahman, greater than the greatest entity, because it is not limited by anything else. It is also called Ātman, because it is the real Self of everything and everyone of us. The so called Universe as people understand it, is only an appearance. To think otherwise, is Avidyā (ignorance) and to ascertain this as it is, is Vidyā (wisdom).

40. This way of explaining truth and reality on the basis of the Upanishads, belongs to the tradition of Śaṅkarācārya and Gauḍapādācārya, his grand preceptor. There have been other schools of Advaitins antecedent and subsequent to Śaṅkara, and even among the followers of Śaṅkara, differences of opinion have sprung up as to what exactly is the genuine interpretation of the Upanishads. These differences have arisen mainly owing to ignoring the Upanishadic method of Adhyārōpāpavāda, which Śaṅkara stresses in his Bhāshya. As it is neither possible nor desirable to enter into these details² here, we shall rest content with stating the genuine teaching of the Upanishads and quoting relevant passages supporting our view directly from Śaṅkara's works themselves:

41. It will be helpful to remember that the Upanishads generally restrict the terms Vidyā and Avidyā to right knowledge and wrong knowledge respectively, and

2. The critical reader interested in this subject is recommended to study these details in the author's work 'How To Recognize the Method Of Vedānta' published in the Karyalaya.

the terms Prakṛti and Māyā to the objective appearance projected by ignorance.

दूरमेते विपरीते विषूची अविद्या या च विद्येति ज्ञाता ।

विद्याभीप्सिनं नचिकेतसं मन्ये न त्वा कामा बहवोऽलोलुपन्त ॥

“Wide apart, mutually opposed and moving in different directions, are these two, viz., Avidyā (ignorance) and what is known as Vidyā (wisdom), I regard (thee) Naciketas as an aspirant for Vidyā; for, the many objects of pleasure have not made thee break off from your purpose.” Ka.2-4.

[This is Yama’s introduction to Atma-Vidyā.]

मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात् ॥

“One should know Prakṛti to be Māyā” Sve. 4-10

Accordingly Śāṅkara writes:

सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते
सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते ॥

“Name and form conjured up by Avidyā a as though identical with the omniscient Lord, (but) undefinable either as identical with or other than (Him), which constitute the seed of the entire expanse of the world of Samsāra (mundane life), are spoken of in the Śrutis and Smṛtis as the Māyā, Śakti and Prakṛti, of the Omniscient Lord.” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतेतराविवेकेन, अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणो-
र्मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य “अहमिदम्”, “ममेदम्” - इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥

“Notwithstanding this, there is the natural human behaviour (of thinking, speaking and acting) in the form, ‘I am this’, ‘This is mine’, mixing up the real and the unreal, owing to wrong knowledge of both of these and their attributes which are absolutely disparate, by superimposing of the nature and of the properties of the one on the other on account of non-discrimination of the one from the other.” Su.Bh. Intro.

42. In the face of the above unmistakable definitions of both Avidyā and Māyā, the sub commentaries on Śāṅkara-Bhāshya, have started a procession of the blind led by the blind, in emphatically affirming the identity of both Avidyā and Māyā, and defining Avidyā not as subjective ignorance but as something objective clinging to Ātman, and thus distorting his nature by converting the all-pure Brahman into a transmigratory soul by enveloping his essential nature.

We shall quote here a single excerpt from the Pancapadika, perhaps the earliest Tika on the Sūtra-Bhāshya, which initiated this departure from Śāṅkara’s tradition:

‘येयं श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणेषु नामरूपम्, अव्याकृतम्, अविद्या, माया, प्रकृतिः, अग्रहणम्, अव्यक्तम्, तमः, कारणम्, लयः, शक्तिः, महासुप्तिः, निद्रा, अक्षरम्, आकाशम्- इति च तत्र तत्र बहुधा गीयते चैतन्यस्य स्वत एवावस्थितलक्षणब्रह्मस्वरूपतावभासं प्रतिबध्य जीवत्वापादिका, अविद्या-कर्मपूर्वप्रज्ञा-

संस्कारचित्रभित्तिः सुषुप्ते प्रकाशाच्छादनविक्षेपसंस्कारमात्ररूपस्थितिरनादिरविद्या-.... ॥’

In the above extract intended to describe Avidyā as the Material Cause of Ahamkāra (or the form of the mind which is supposed to be the conditioning adjunct of Ātman by virtue of which Ātman is turned into the individual experiencer of the fruits of actions), it is particularly noteworthy that nāma-rūpam (name and form), avyākṛtam (undifferentiated state of the world), Avidyā (ignorance) Māyā, Prakṛti, agrahaṇam (non-apprehension) and avyaktam, are all given as synonymous names of Avidyā in direct contradiction of the Bhāshya which expressly says that māyā or Avyākṛtam is ‘Avidyākalpitā or invention of Avidyā or Adhyāsa (superimposition).

We shall quote one more passage from Śāṅkara which expressly states that nāmarūpa (name and form) or avyākṛtam (undifferentiated seed of the world) is an invention of Avidyā (ignorance).

अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते ।
सू.भा. २-१-२७.

“Brahman becomes the object of ‘transformation’ and other modes of expression in its special aspect of name and form superimposed by Avidyā, which, whether differentiated or undifferentiated, is undefinable as that [Brahman] or other than it. In its real nature, however, it remains beyond all such modes of expression.”
Su.Bh. 2-1-27.

43. Even according to Śāṅkara, however, it would not be wrong to speak figuratively of Avidyā as Māyā, and Māyā as Avidyā also. In its primary sense, no doubt, Avidyā means ignorance and therefore refers to a subjective notion; but in a secondary sense, the word may be extended to cover any object that is imagined by ignorance. In that case, usage would permit statements like ‘All this is Avidyā’ where we only mean that everything objective, is a figment of avidyā, and not really real. Similarly, when the term avidyā is taken to mean a modification of the mind, it is evidently included within the phenomenal world and therefore may be appropriately called Māyā. To avoid confusion, we shall restrict the use of these words Avidyā and Māyā to denote ignorance and name and form respectively; and ‘avidyā’ shall be the name of mutual superimposition of the self and not-self alone, whatever the signification of these words may be in any other system.

44. One word more before concluding this section. These terms are used in Vedānta for the particular kind of wrong knowledge and the objective phenomena respectively, only as a device to introduce the reader (by means of Adhyārōpāpavāda) to the transcendental entity or the Witnessing principle called Ātman, and not for formulating theories which the system undertakes to defend. This latter misconception prevails in certain quarters even now. Rāmānujācārya, for instance, confounds Śāṅkara’s teaching of Avidyā and Māyā with the Post-Śāṅkara theory of Avidyā, and with the Māyā doctrine of the Buddhists. He has considerably exercised

himself in undertaking an elaborate refutation of the Avidyā Theory and in calling the Advaitins opprobriously 'Pracchanna Māyāvādins' (Crypto-Buddhists). And Dr. Murti has these remarks with regard to Śāṅkara and Gauḍapāda:

“Gauḍapāda and Śāṅkara merely bring out the implications of this standpoint (of the older Vedāntins) when they declare change, difference and plurality as illusory; they formulate the complementary doctrine of avidyā to explain the appearance of difference.” C. P. B., p. 122.

That Śāṅkara has not formulated any 'doctrine of Avidyā' to explain something, but has merely drawn our attention to a natural tendency of the human mind, has been made abundantly clear by citing his express statements. That Gauḍapāda is equally innocent of any such doctrine, and that he is merely concerned with inviting the attention of enquirers to the undeniable Non-dual Being and Consciousness or Ātman of the Upanishads, will be clear from the following:

अन्यथा गृह्णतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।

विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥ गौ.का. १-१५

“Dream appertains to him who takes (Reality) to be otherwise, and sleep to him who knows not Reality; when the misconception of both these is removed, one attains the fourth abode.” GK.1-15.

Gauḍapāda is here characterizing both waking and dream as only dream or wrong view of Reality, and deep sleep as not-knowing. Both of these are 'misconception' (विपर्यास) from the standpoint of the real Ātman who transcends both consciousness and unconsciousness. Gauḍapāda has not used the word 'avidyā' anywhere in his work. For him anyathāgrahaṇa (misconception) and agrahanam (unconsciousness) which he calls kārya (effect) and kāraṇa (cause) respectively, are both 'error' (viparyāsa).

मायामात्रमिदं द्वैतमद्वैतं परमार्थतः गौ.का. १-१७

“This duality is only māyā, it is only non-dual in reality.” GK.1-17

Here the word māyā is applied to the world of duality. There is no theory of māyā to account for anything.

There is one seeming exception to this use of the word in Gauḍapāda :-

नेह नानेति चाऽऽम्नायादिन्द्रो मायाभिरित्यपि ।

अजायमानो बहुधा मायया जायते तु सः ॥ गौ.का. ३-२४

“For there is the Śruti 'There is no duality whatever here' (Ka. 4-11), and also Indra (The Supreme Lord) appears as many formed through 'Māyās' (Br, 2-5-10), Not being born, He is yet born in diverse forms through Māyā” (Tai. Aran, 3-13). GK. 3-24.

These are Śrutis, and therefore there is no theory advanced here. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka text 'through Māyās' means through sensuous perceptions, for in the Vedas, the word māyā is also used in the sense of knowledge according to Yāska's Nirukta. There are five senses each of which presents Reality in a particular form, such as sound, touch etc. This kaleidoscopic variety of knowledge, is evidently illusory with reference to Reality as it is. Here the name 'Māyā' is applied to the variety of sense-perception.

45. If one remembers the precise nature of Avidyā, its function and effect as defined by Śaṅkara in the Adhyāsa-Bhāshya, a number of unnecessary doubts and differences about it, would vanish altogether. (1) In the first place, avidyā is only a technical name to denote the inveterate natural tendency of the human mind (नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः) and no theory, (2) And in the second place, this is used by Vedānta only as a device for the purpose of teaching the truth (अध्यारोपापवादाम्ब्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते।), and never as a really real something to be defended. (3) Its function consists in setting up an unreal not-self as a second to the really real Self, and in mixing up the Real and the unreal (सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य) and in misleading one to mistake the identity and attributes of one for those of the other, although in fact the unreal not-self is not another entity beside the real Ātman, since Ātman is absolutely without any attribute and as such is not numerically one desiderating a second. (4) And finally its effect is to induce one to imagine that one is really an agent of actions and experiencer of the fruits thereof (कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः) although all actions, instruments useful to produce actions as well as the fruits thereof (क्रियाकारकफलानि) are really māyā (false appearance only).

Niether the form of the māyic Universe is perceived as such, nor its end, nor yet its persistence, while it appears (न रूपमस्येह तथोपलभ्यते नान्तो न चादिर्न च सम्प्रतिष्ठा। Gītā 15-3). Avidyā which gives rise to this appearance is equally beginningless, endless and is no more than a natural superimposition of the humanmind and only an erroneous notion (अनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः).

Therefore it is futile to indulge seriously in speculative discussion about its cause, locus, object or number as many post-Śaṅkara Advaitins have done; for all these categories pertain to the magic phenomena invented by avidyā and can never be applied to avidyā itself which projects these phantoms.

The Upanishads therefore recommend the wisdom of the unity of Ātman as the only antidote to remedy this malady, the mother of all evils of life (अस्यानर्थहेतोः प्रहाणायान्मैकत्वविद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ता आरभ्यन्ते ॥)

From the Book Vedāntins meet : Introduction, paras 5, 8.

5. The seed form of the universe, known by several names such as the Avyakta, Akshara, Avyākṛta, Ākāsha, Prakṛti and so on, is only the object of inference based upon the false conception of duality. This seed evolving itself into the individual aggregate of the body and the senses, lends itself to the mutual superimposition

of the Self and the not-self. It is this superimposition, as we have already seen, which is known by the name of Avidyā in Śāṅkara's system, while the inferred seed of all phenomena-including the aggregate of the body and the senses-is called by that significant name of māyā, false appearance due to ignorance. In the Bhagavadgītā, where the terminology of the Sāṅkhyas has been also pressed into service, it is observed that "the Purusha staying in Prakṛti enjoys the Guṇas born of Prakṛti, and the reason for his being re-born in good, bad, or in different lives is his clinging to the Guṇas" (G.Bha.13.21). Śāṅkara explains this as meaning that the superimposition of Prakṛti (Māyā) and Purusha, as well as the resultant desire, is at the bottom of all empirical life. Thus, according to Śāṅkara, Avidyā being the occasion of the appearance of the not-self and the ruinous identification of the Self with it should not be confounded with Avyakṛta, Prakṛti, or Māyā, which is only an illusory appearance. (Su.Bha.2.1.9, G.Bha.13.20, 14.5, 18.48)

8. To sum up, the only Avidyā in Śāṅkara's Vedānta, is the mutual identification, and the mistaken transference of the properties, of the real Self and the unreal not-self, which may be illustrated by the instance of the mis-conceiving a rope to be a snake. All human proceeding whether secular or sacred, is prompted by, and is wholly within the sphere of, this Avidyā. Man is ignorant, lured by the sense-objects, and acts and reaps the fruit of his actions within the field of this Avidyā. That he reverts to a more discriminating and considerate mode of life, and acting upon the advice of Vedānta and a wise teacher, gets enlightenment and realizes his unalienable identity with Brahman, is also within the purview of this Avidyā. Throughout his career, extrovert or introvert, Avidyā alone is responsible for all the display of his activities, though the individual himself never suspects it until he finally emerges from the somnambulism by knowing the truth taught by Vedānta. Hence it has been most aptly called the Avyakta (unmanifest) in the Katha text 'महतः परमव्यक्तम्' "The Unmanifest is greater than even the great living self". In a secondary sense, the primordial matter - the potential seed-form of the world undifferentiated into names and forms, is also called Avyakta, since, it is unmanifest as compared with the manifold world, and since, it is hard to define as either identical with or distinct from the Self. Moreover, it is also called Avyakta or Akshara (imperishable) just to distinguish it from the Supreme Self, which is metaphysically, the subtlest principle transcending all that is knowable and perishable.

Incidentally, it may be remarked that Śāṅkara always styles this primordial matter Prakṛti by the significant name Māyā, but never by the name of Avidyā or any other synonym of ignorance. And conversely, he invariably calls the mutual super-imposition of the Self and the not-self by the name of Avidyā or some equivalent of it, but we do not meet with any instance where it is called Māyā. Coming down to the commentaries, we see that this rule is observed more in the breach than in practice. In the school of the Mūlāvidyā theory where the law of causation takes precedence of the principle of truth and error, this usage is of

course justifiable. But can we use the terms “Māyā” and “Avidyā” indiscriminately even while strictly adhering to Śaṅkara’s Adhyāsa-Vāda?

This question has been neither posed nor critically considered in any Vedāntic discussion so far as I am aware. I shall therefore, venture my own opinion in the matter, and leave the readers to judge for themselves. In so far as Māyā or Prakṛti is a figment of Avidyā proper, I think that one is perfectly justified in calling it Avidyā in a secondary sense, just as one may say “This is all his foolery” meaning thereby the result of that person’s foolish pranks. And conversely in so far as Avidyā is regarded as a function of the mind and is included in the world of names and forms, it may be also called “Māyā” meaning thereby an illusory appearance. But keeping in mind the fact that “Avidyā” primarily denotes a species of knowledge and “Māyā” an illusory object, we cannot but exclusively follow Śaṅkara’s practice in using the terms, if we do not wish to confuse the minds of our readers.

One thing, however, should be clearly borne in mind. All this distinction of Vidyā and Avidyā, Avidyā and Mayā, and so forth, is only a concession to the empirical view, and only a device adopted for the purpose of teaching the truth. Metaphysically speaking, neither Avidyā nor Māyā called into being by it, ever existed as entities side by side with Brahman; nor is there any need for Vidyā to actually destroy either of the two. Hence Sri Gauḍapāda declares: “This is the whole truth: There is neither dissolution nor origination; neither a soul in bondage nor anyone that has got to accomplish one’s freedom; neither an aspirant for release nor any one actually released from Samsāra.” G. K. 2-32. (S. B. 1-4-3, 1-2-23, 2-1-27; G. Bh. 8-20, 21, 13-5, 13-19)



06. Śāstra Pramāṇyam

From the Book Śāṅkara's Clarification Of Certain Vedāntic Concepts

Chapter 6: The Validity of Śāstra.

30. 'Śāstra' is a name assigned by Vedāntins to the Vedas in general and to the Upanishads in particular. Thus in commenting on the third Sūtra of Bādarāyana, Śāṅkara writes:-

महतः ऋग्वेदादेः शास्त्रस्य अनेकविद्यास्थानोपबृंहितस्य प्रदीपवत्सर्वार्थावद्योतिनः सर्वज्ञकल्पस्य योनिः
कारणं ब्रह्म । न हीदृशस्य शास्त्रस्य ऋग्वेदादिलक्षणस्य सर्वज्ञगुणान्वितस्य सर्वज्ञान्यतः संभवोऽस्ति ।

"Brahman is the source, the cause of the great Śāstra consisting of Rigveda etc. enlarged by various branches of learning which illumines all things like a big lamp, and which is almost omniscient. For the origination of such a Śāstra consisting of Rigveda etc., which is accompanied by the quality of omniscience, can hardly be conceived to proceed from anything but from an omniscient Being." Su.Bh. 1-1-3.

[In the sequel to this para, it is argued that omniscience reaches its culmination only in the Great-Being from whom Rigveda etc. comes forth spontaneously like an expired breath.]

31. The present section is exclusively devoted to a consideration of the validity of the Śāstra in its aspect as the Upanishads. How are the Upanishads to be considered as a valid means of right knowledge? Are they the source of knowledge regarding Brahman, in the same way that the Vedas are with regard to heaven (स्वर्ग), the gods (देवताः) etc., whose existence is to be taken for granted on the exclusive authority of the Vedas enjoining certain rituals which lead to them, the performer of those religious works after death? Here is Śāṅkara's answer:

न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायम् । किंतु श्रुत्यादयोऽनुभवादय च यथासंभवमिह
प्रमाणम्, अनुभवावसानत्वाद्भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य । कर्तव्ये हि विषये नानुभवापेक्षास्तीति
श्रुत्यादीनामेव प्रामाण्यं स्यात्, पुरुषाधीनात्मलाभत्वाच्च कर्तव्यस्य ।... न तु वस्तु 'एवम्, नैवम्' 'अस्ति,
नास्ति' इति वा विकल्प्यते । विकल्पनास्तु पुरुषबुद्ध्यपेक्षाः । न वस्तुयाथात्म्यज्ञानं पुरुषबुद्ध्यपेक्षम् । किं
तर्हि वस्तुतन्त्रमेव तत् ।

"Śruti etc, alone are not the means of knowledge in the case of the enquiry into the nature of Brahman, as it is in the enquiry with regard to the nature of Dharma

(religious work), but Śruti etc. and intuition etc. also as the case may be, are here the means, for the Knowledge of Brahman is to culminate in Intuition, and relates to a factual existent Entity. (To explain:) With regard to a religious duty, there being no need of any Intuition, Śruti etc. alone can be deemed to be the valid means, and this for the additional reason that the origination of religious duty entirely depends upon the will of a person ... but an existent thing cannot in this manner be conceived alternatively to be such, or not such, existent or non-existent at one's will. Alternative thoughts with regard to a thing depend entirely upon the imagination of a person, but the truth of a thing does not depend upon the will of a person but depends entirely upon the nature of the thing." Su.Bh. 1-1-2.

Elsewhere Śāṅkara makes his view clearer with regard to the matter in hand:-

कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादावनुभवानारूढे स्यादाशङ्का -भवेद्वा न वा इति; अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् --
 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म' (बृ.३-४-१) इति श्रुतेः, 'तत्त्वमसि' इति सिद्धवदुपदेशात्; न हि 'तत्त्वमसि'
 इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः, तत् त्वं मृतो भविष्यसि इत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः।

"In the case of the results of religious works, which is not within the range of Intuition, a doubt may possibly arise as to whether it would come true or not. But the result of knowledge is within the range of Intuition, for the Śruti refers to it as 'That which is actual and directly known' (Br 3-4-1), and teaches the identity of the individual self and the Universal Self, in these words 'That thou art' (Ch, 6-8-7) as an ever-existing fact. Surely the sentence 'That thou art' cannot be stretched to mean 'That thou shalt become after death' ". Su.Bh.3-3-32.

32. A doubt may possibly rear its head here: How can the Upanishadic texts convey an idea of what Brahman is to us? Sentences are made up of words and words can denote or connote only objective things which possess predictables like genus, quality, action or relation. But in the Upanishads, Brahman is not only denied all attributes, but also declared to be strictly inexpressible by words and unthinkable by the mind:

एतद्वै तदक्षरं गार्गी ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलं अनण्वहस्वं अदीर्घं अलोहितं अस्नेहं अच्छायं
 अतमोऽवाय्वनाकाशं असङ्गं अरसं अगन्धं अचक्षुष्कं अश्रोत्रं अवागमनोऽतेजस्कं अप्राणं अमुखं अगात्रं
 अनन्तरं अबाह्यं न तदश्नाति किञ्चन। न तदश्नाति कश्चन ॥

"This indeed, O Gārgi, Brahmanas regard to be the Akshara (the Imperishable). It is neither gross nor subtle; neither short nor long; not red, not viscid, without shadow or darkness, not air, not ether, unattached; without taste, without smell, having no eyes, having no ears, having no organs of speech, having no mind, having no light, having no life-breath, having no opening, having no measures and having neither inside nor outside. It eats nothing whatever. No one eats it." Br 3-8-8.

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते। अप्राप्य मनसा सह।

"Whence speech (and other organs of sense) return unable to reach it, along with the mind." Tai. 2-9.

It is ineffable not because words are inadequate to describe it, but because it is the eternal subject which objectifies everything else and so can be objectified by no words.

यद्वाचाऽनभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युद्यते...
यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतम्।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥

“That which speech cannot express, but which itself expresses speech That which the mind cannot think of, but which itself, they say, thinks of the mind. Know that alone to be Brahman, not this which they meditate upon as an object.” Ke. 1-5, 6.

Thus, Brahman is beyond the region of the senses and the mind which alone are the instruments through which one can know objective things in ordinary life. On the other hand, it is of such a nature that it shines forth by its own inherent light and lights up both the senses and the mind and enables them to throw light on their respective objects. If so, it will be asked, how can even the Śruti describe Brahman which is the light of eternal Witnessing Consciousness, which is the prerequisite to know even the Vedas as such?

33. Śāṅkara points out that there being no need for any means to establish the existence of Brahma-Ātman (Brahman that is our very Self), the Śrutis are called Pramāṇa (means of knowledge) by courtesy insofar as they remove the distinctions superimposed upon Brahman by Avidyā, We have seen that Avidyā is the mutual superimposition of the Self and the not-Self, and it is only through ignorance that we speak of the means and objects of knowledge:

(१) तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः। सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि ॥

“It is by presupposing this mutual superimposition of the Self and the not-Self, called Avidyā, that the conventions both secular and sacred of the means and object of right knowledge obtain in life. And so do the Śāstras dealing with injunctions and prohibitions and even with final Release.” Su.Bh.Intro.

(२) न ह्यात्मा आगन्तुकः कस्यचित्, स्वयंसिद्धत्वात् ॥

“Ātman or Self, as is well-known, is no adventitious thing for anyone, for He is self-established.” Su.Bh.2-3-7.

अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, न;अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य। न हि शास्त्रमिदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति। किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेनाविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति ॥

“Objection: If Brahman is not an object of any action, then it cannot be maintained that the Śāstra is the means of knowing It.

Reply: Not so, for the Śāstra purports to wipe off the distinctions superimposed on Brahman by Avidyā (To explain:) The Śāstra does not indeed propose to teach Brahman as such and such an object, but it teaches Brahman as no object at all, being the inmost Self and removes all distinctions created by Avidyā such as the knowable, knower and knowledge.” Su.Bh.1-1-4.

The word such as(अदि) in this passage includes the distinctions of (1) desired object, desirer, and desire, (2) deed, doer and doing, and (3) experienced fruit of action, experiencer and experience. All of these, being superimposed on Brahman, vanish the moment that Brahman is Intuited as Reality devoid of all distinctions and differences. Appearances, as is well-known, have no existence of their own apart from the substrate on which they are superimposed and their sublation merely means the knowledge of their essential oneness with the substrate.

34. The Śāstra therefore, is a valid means of knowledge regarding Brahman insofar as it brings on the Intuition of Brahman by showing how all distinctions and differences are mere appearances superimposed on Brahman. Even the empirical means of knowledge, like perception, are held to be valid for this very same reason that they ultimately produce actual intuition of their object. Our effort to see a thing, for instance, ends with the dawn of sight, the intuition of the thing sought to be seen. But then there is this difference between the ordinary means of right knowledge and the Śāstra as a means of knowing Brahman: Even after we have perceived or inferred the existence of a phenomenal thing, the distinction of the knower, knowable and knowledge stays on as before; whereas when the Knowledge of Brahman-Ātman dawns, this distinction is sublated for good. The following remarks of Śaṅkara about this final Intuition are worthy of note:-

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणमात्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकम्--- नातःपरं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति; यथा हि लोके ‘यजेत’ इत्युक्ते, किम् ? केन ? कथम् ? इत्याकाङ्क्ष्यते, नैवं ‘तत्त्वमसि’ ‘अहं ब्रह्मास्मि’ इत्युक्ते, किञ्चिदन्यदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति, सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वादवगतेः। सति ह्यन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणोऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात्; न त्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति, य आकाङ्क्ष्येत ॥

“Moreover, this means of knowledge revealing the unity of Ātman is final; and there is nothing else that can be sought to be known subsequently. (To explain:) When, for instance, in common usage it is laid down that ‘One should sacrifice’, it is at once sought to be known, what, by what means, and how (one is to sacrifice); but there is nothing else to be sought to be known when it is said ‘That thou art’, ‘I am Brahman’; for the resulting Intuition relates to the Unity of the Self of all. It is only when something else remains, that the desire to know it can possibly arise. But there is nothing else which remains to be known over and above the Unity of Ātman” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

न चेयमवगतिर्नोत्पद्यत इति शक्यं वक्तुम्, ‘तद्वास्य विजज्ञौ’ इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यः।

“Nor is it possible to maintain that no such Intuition is ever produced, for

there are Śrutis like the following ‘He was convinced of this instruction of his father’ (Ch. 6-13-3).” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

[The Śruti is not quoted here as a mere authority, for preceding this statement there is a series of questions and answers in the train of arguments based upon Intuition.]

न चेयमवगतिरनर्थिका भ्रान्तिर्वा इति शक्यं वक्तुम्; अविद्यानिवृत्तिफलदर्शनात्, बाधकज्ञानान्तराभावाच्च ।
प्राक्चात्मैकत्वावगतेरव्याहतः सर्वः सत्यानृतव्यवहारो लौकिको वैदिकश्च चेत्यवोचाम ।

“Nor, again, is it possible to assert that this Intuition is useless, or that it is a hallucination, for we do see that Avidyā is effectively removed, and there is no other knowledge to sublate it. We have already remarked that all talk of the true and the false is only before the dawn of the Knowledge of the Unity of Ātman.” Su.Bh.2-1-4.

[There can be no question of error in the sphere of non-duality.]

35. This unique conception of the finality of knowledge and extinction of all means of knowledge, the Śāstra no less than the other ordinary means, at the dawn of enlightenment, has been expressly stated in so many words elsewhere by Śāṅkara:

तस्मात् अहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्येतदवसाना एव सर्वे विधयः सर्वाणि चेताराणि प्रमाणानि । न हि
अहेयानुपादेयाद्वैतात्मावगतौ सत्याम्, निर्विषयाण्यप्रमातृकाणि च प्रमाणानि भवितुमर्हन्तीति ॥

“Therefore, all injunctions and all other means of knowledge, end with the dawn of the Intuition ‘I am Brahman’. For when the Intuition of the secondless Ātman, neither to be accepted or shunned, arises, Pramāṇas (or means of knowledge) cannot continue to thrive, since there will be neither a knower nor objects to be known then:’ Su.Bh. 1-1-4.

‘अत्र पितापिता भवति’ इत्युपक्रम्य, ‘वेदा अवेदाः’ इति वचनात् इष्यत एव अस्माभिः श्रुतेरप्यभावः
प्रबोधे ॥

“Since there is the text beginning with ‘Here the father ceases to be the father’ which says ‘the Vedas are no Vedas’ (Bṛ 4-3-22), non-existence of even the Śruti is certainly accepted by us in the state of Enlightenment.” Su.Bh.4-1-3.

36. As a corollary from the validity of the Śāstra it follows that the words of a duly qualified teacher are as valid a means as the holy revelation itself, not because he is an authority on the subject, but because he has become one with the Supreme Ātman. One would reach at the truth provided that he follows the line of reasoning shown by such a teacher, but not by any independent ratiocination:-

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ ॥

“This knowledge, my dearest boy, cannot be acquired or refuted by speculation, but only as revealed by a teacher other than a speculator, can it lead to convic-

tion.” Ka.2-9.

न नरेणावरेण प्रोक्त एष सुविज्ञेयो बहुधा चिन्त्यमानः ।

अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्ति अणीयान् ह्यतर्क्यमणुप्रमाणात् ॥

“Taught by a person of inferior knowledge, this Ātman cannot be well-ascertained even if one should reason in various ways. There is no not-knowing, however, when taught by a teacher who has become one with this Ātman. For, He (this Ātman) is subtler than even the subtlest thing and beyond all reason.” Ka.2-8.

From the Book Śuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara

HOW ŚĀSTRA IS THE FINAL Pramāṇa

18. We have seen that the idea of Pramāṇa etc. are realized to be unreal as soon as one becomes aware of the true nature of Ātman as a result of the teaching by the Śāstra and the preceptor. It may be asked at this stage, why should not the knowledge of Non-duality also be sublated, say by the knowledge of Śūnya (essencelessness) of things, in the same way as the notion of duality is sublated by the knowledge of non-duality? How are we to be assured that the knowledge of the Non-dual Ātman is final? The notion of waking that accompanies a dream enclosed in another dream, is well known to be sublated by the conviction that the enveloping dream is waking, but subsequently that waking notion also is in its turn sublated by the consciousness of the real waking state. One’s knowledge of Non-duality might well be imagined to be sublated in like manner. Here is the reply of the Gauḍapādācārya, an authority on the tradition of Advaita - Vedānta :-

विकल्पो विनिवर्तेत कल्पितो यदि केनचित् ।

उपदेशादयं वादो ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते ॥ GK. 1-18.

“Vikalpa might be sublated if it were the construction of imagination pertaining to some particular person. This is only a device for the purpose of teaching, and so there can be no duality subsequent to the knowledge of truth.”

This is the idea underlying the Ślōka : Vikalpa is an empirical notion arising out of ignorance, as for instance the notion of the sun being only a span in length, or the notion of water with reference to a barren soil, or that of a snake attached to a rope etc. Such a Vikalpa would be sublated by correct knowledge of the substrate so falsely imagined to be something else, as for instance the notion of a span’s length etc. disappearing in the case of those that know the true measurement of the sun etc. Similarly it is but reasonable that the notion of the body being the Self, the notion of the soul’s being subject to ills of mundane life, or the soul’s being related to duality, is sublated by the knowledge of Non-duality since these notions are the outcome of innate ignorance. But the vikalpa of the distinction of teaching, teacher, taught etc. are no such imaginary notions conjured up by an ignorant brain. It is only a device adopted by the knowers of Brahman for the

purpose of teaching. When the truth of Advaita is realized, one comes to know that the duality of the distinction of teaching etc., does not actually exist any more than the duality fancied by people, ignorant of Vedāntic truth. The suspicion that at this rate even what is called Advaita may also be possibly only a construction of imagination has no foundation. For by the term Advaita is used only to indicate what cannot be thought away after all duality is negated. Nor can there be the distinction of the knower, means of knowledge and the object of knowledge as a residue even when the truth of the essence of things is realized. So as to allow room for the doubt whether even Advaita may not be sublatable. Nor can it be objected that even the Veda itself may cease to exist if all duality is obliterated. For that is a consummation we welcome. That is why Vedāntins call the Veda the 'final Pramāṇa, i.e. a Pramāṇa that brings knowledge sublating all idea of Pramāṇas including Vedic Pramāṇa itself.

It is on the strength of this axiomatic Vedāntic principle that Śāṅkara writes:

1. If it be argued that in the absence of perception etc., even the Śruti would cease to exist, we say that there is nothing unwelcome here. for we do admit that even the Śruti will cease to exist when one is awakened to truth. There is the Śruti text which endorses this. Beginning with the statement 'The father becomes no father here', it proclaims that the Vedas become no Vedas in the state of enlightenment. SB. 4-1-3,

[This is really a text relating to deep sleep. Nevertheless, Śāṅkara quotes it here in connection with enlightenment because there is unity of Ātman in both the cases.]

2. Moreover, this is the final means of knowledge (antyaṃ Pramāṇam revealing the oneness of Ātman desiderating nothing else beyond it. Unlike the injunction 'One should sacrifice' in ordinary usage which rouses further enquiry as to 'what?', 'with what?' and 'how', the statement 'I am Brahman' rouses no further enquiry, for the knowledge arising out of it relates to the unity of the Self of all. Nor can it be maintained that this knowledge is useless or delusive, for there is the definite result of doing away with Avidyā, and there is no subsequent knowledge sublating it. SB. 2-1-14

[Consequent on the intuition of the Secondless Self, there would remain nothing else distinct from it, relating to which a further enquiry might be occasioned, and there could be no sublating knowledge then for the simple reason that the very distinction of knower, and means of knowledge would have been wiped out by then.]

3. All Pramāṇas are such only up to the realization of Ātman for subsequent to that there can be no talk of the means and objects of knowledge. The

final Pramāṇa (or the Śruti) takes away the very nature of being a knower pertaining to Ātman, and simultaneously with taking it away, invalidates itself as a means just as a means of knowledge obtaining in a dream does on one's waking. GBh. 2-69.

[Here is a reason adduced for holding the Śāstra as the final means of knowledge, to wit, that the Śāstra-knowledge does away with the knowing-nature of Ātman. That has been stated to be the reason too, why Śāstra itself ceases to be such after enlightenment.]

4. For the Śāstra does not propose to describe the nature of Brahman as such and such an object, but it only teaches that it is no object since it is the innermost Ātman, and in doing so it removes the distinction of the object of the knowledge, its knower and knowledge, etc. SB. 1-1-4.

5. The Śāstra, the final Pramāṇa happens to be a means of knowledge only on account of its pointing out and removing what is not the property of Ātman, but not because of its making known what was previously unknown. GBh. 2-18.

[Śāstra is a means of knowledge only because it removes the nature of being a knower and other features that are not the properties of Ātman, and also because it deprives the Pramāṇas of their continuing as such. This is an indirect allusion to the traditional saying 'siddham tu nivartakatvāt' quotation on page 32.]

THE METHOD OF ŚĀSTRA PRĀMĀNYA

29. Similarly when it is maintained that Ātman is known only through the Upanishads, on the strength of texts like "I ask thee of the person known in the Upanishads" (Bṛ 3-9-26), "That position of which all the Vedas sing (Ka. 1-2-15) it is only for the purpose of intimating that He is not knowable by perception and other empirical means of knowledge and not to convey the idea that He is actually known through the word. So says the author of the Sūtra-Bhāshya :

1. The intuition of Brahman is indeed achieved through the ascertainment of the import of Vedic text and not by other empirical means of knowledge like inference. Su.Bh. 1-1-2.

2. For this entity is no object of perception because it has no colour and other properties. Nor is it the object of inference and other means for it has no indicative mark etc. (necessary for those means to function). This entity can be known through Āgama (revelation) alone like Dharma. SB. 2-1-6.

It is for the purpose of teaching that Brahman is known only through Agama that the revered Bādarāyaṇa has written the aphorism 'शास्त्रयोनित्वात्' (for it has Śāstra for its means). And the author of the Bhāshya has explained it thus "The meaning is that Brahman, the cause of the origin etc. of the Universe, is knowable

through the Śāstra-Pramāṇa alone.” But because of this, one should not delude oneself into the belief that the distinction of Pramāṇa and prameya (means and object of knowledge) sanctioned by common usage is really real, and that Śāstra is also a means of knowledge just like perception etc. enabling one to know Brahman which is not known through other means. For the s’ruti says “That which is not expressible by speech, but by which speech itself is expressed (known) - that alone is Brahman.” (Ke. 1-5). And there is a further reason for this warning, for all Pramāṇas and S’astras function under the presupposition of Avidyā for their basis. This is stated by the author of the Bhāshya.-.

As for Śāstra, it is the Final Pramāṇa; it derives its validity only by pointing out and removing what is not the property of Ātman, but not by directly making known what is not known through other means. GBh. 2-18.

[In the Sanskrit original the word ‘mātra’ (only) has to be read after ‘nivar-takatva’ to yield the intended meaning.]

2. The Final Pramāṇa removes the knowership itself and while so removing it loses its own validity, just as the means of knowledge in a dream, is invalidated on waking. GBh. 2-69.

[The idea is that the Śruti also is spoken of as a means of knowledge only in a secondary sense, from the stand-point of Avidyā; since all talk of Pramāṇas or means of knowledge depends on the presupposition of a knower, who is himself really a product of Avidyā.]

3. All usage of the means and object of knowledge, whether ordinary or Vedic, proceeds on the presupposition of the mutual superimposition of the self and the not-self known by the name of Avidyā; so also do the S’astras purporting to lay down injunctions or to prohibit certain acts or to teach release. Su.Bh.p.2.

[The word ‘all’ being a general term, the talk of one who desires to be released and one who is released is also to be understood as the outcome of Avidyā. Since the S’astras include those that purport to teach ‘release’ also (Mōksha-parāṇi) even the Śāstra relating to Ātman is to be taken to be within the ambit of the usage of Pramāṇas based on Avidyā.]

Thus it is evident that for the Vedāntins the convention of the means and objects of knowledge as also that of Śāstra etc. is only a device subsumed under the comprehensive method of Adhyārōpa-apavāda contrived for the purpose of teaching.



07. What is Anubhava

From the Book Intuition of Reality -

Chapter 4: THE GENUINE INTUITION OF ATMAN

अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभूरित्यनुशासनम् ॥ बृ. २-५-१९.

“This Ātman is the Brahman. He is the intuitor of all; this is the teaching.”
Br 2-5-19.

We are now in a position to consider the direct investigation of the nature of Vedānta- Vijñāna, the main subject-matter of our enquiry. The word ‘Vijñāna’ which occurs in the title of this booklet has many variants in Sanskrit. Avagati (ascertainment), Adhyavasāya (final understanding or determination) and Anubhava (Intuition) are some of these equivalents that are used by Śaṅkara. We shall employ the English word ‘Intuition’ uniformly while translating them all.

1. Vedāntic Intuition as Distinguished from the Sensuous and the Intellectual Intuitions

We must be careful, however, to keep the distinctive meaning of this word in mind when it is applied to the Knowledge of Brahman. The word ‘Anubhava’ in Sanskrit is used to denote ‘immediate apprehension’, whether by one of the senses or by the mind itself. It is well-known how we intuit colour with the help of the organ of sight and how we intuit joy or sorrow, fear or curiosity without any assistance of reason. All such intuitions, however, are events in time, and so, they are all born and cease to exist in time. But how are we aware of the senses or of these sensations themselves? How do we come to know the mind or its intuitions themselves? And how do we come to know the presence or absence of the mind itself together with its various modifications? The senses cannot objectify and know themselves; nor can the mind know itself, and much less is it possible for the mind to become aware of its own absence. Nevertheless, it is common knowledge that we do know when the mind or the senses function, or when they cease to function, in such states, for instance, as deep sleep. Now this faculty which enables us to have this direct insight is what is called Anubhava in Vedānta. This is what has been rendered by the term ‘Intuition’ here.

The sensuous and the mental intuitions can be remembered and recollected

when a person makes the necessary effort to do so. 'I can quite recall the colours of the rainbow', 'I can recollect the excruciating pain I felt when I was operated upon' or 'I well remember the shock I felt on hearing the tragic end of my friend' -these and other such statements of recollection of sensuous and psychic experiences, we are familiar with in every-day life, confirm this fact. Now, the question is, what is It that enables us to be aware of these temporal happenings without undergoing any change in Itself? This is what is called Anubhava in Vedānta.

2. How Sensuous and Mental Intuitions Pre-suppose a Changeless Intuition

The senses and the mind have no doubt the power of reaching external objects by their inherent nature to see things spontaneously, but when there is neither light nor sound to guide, what is that Light, guided by which, this aggregate of body and the senses is enabled to go through all its activities? This question was posed by Janaka, to which Yājñavalkya gave a significant reply.-

अस्तमित आदित्ये याज्ञवल्क्य चन्द्रमस्यस्तमिते शान्तेऽग्नौ शान्तायां वाचि किञ्ज्योतिरेवायं पुरुष इति ।
आत्मैवास्य ज्योतिर्भवतीति । आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिषास्ते पत्ययते कर्म कुरुते विपत्येतीति ।। बृ. उ ४-३-
६.

“When the sun has set, when the moon has set, when the light of fire has gone out, and when even the sound of voice is hushed, what Light, O Yājñavalkya, has this Purusha (the aggregate of body and organs)? To this, Yājñavalkya answered, ‘Ātman alone is its light, it is by the Light of Ātman alone that this Purusha sits, goes out, does any work and returns’.” Br 4-3-6.

This inner Light of Ātman is the Intuition which constitutes the inherent nature of man or any other individual creature. That Light or Intuition can directly apprehend and It serves as the eternal guide for all procedure for the assemblage of body and senses, called man, in ordinary life.

It might be suspected, perhaps by some that this so-called Intuition is only the mind that inspires the aggregate to move about and perform its functions. This might be justified if it were only a question of inference; but how could the mind work except through the gateways of the senses insofar as the external world is concerned? Moreover, there is, as we all know, a faculty of the mind, which apparently enables it to compare or contrast two concepts of things either in juxtaposition in space or perceived successively in time. But the process of knowing for the mind being possible only through forming a modification of itself, it is evident that it can never have two thoughts simultaneously.

This fact forces us to admit that, over and above mental intuitions, there must be a constant something which enables it to perform these functions. The idea of similarity or dissimilarity or even identity of two things in two points of time or in two different situations, therefore, necessarily presupposes a sustained Witnessing Consciousness which endures independently, and is beyond all time or space.

3. Intuition Unaffected by Waking or Dream

The Upanishads draw our attention to another characteristic of life, which compels us to admit the axiomatic nature of this changeless Intuition which maintains Its self-identity independently of time or space Intuited by the mind:-

स यत्र प्रस्वपित्यस्य लोकस्य सर्वावतो मात्राम् अपादाय स्वयं विहत्य स्वयं निर्माय स्वेन भासा स्वेन
ज्योतिषा प्रस्वपित्यत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिर्भवति ॥ बृ.उ.४-३-९

“When he dreams, he takes a little of this all-embracing world; he himself casts aside (the body) and he himself creates (a new body) and through his own semblance and through his own light, he dreams. Here this Purusha becomes self-luminous.” Br 4-3-9. While a person is dreaming, he sees seeming bodies and senses and seeming objects. And what is the Light which aids him to see this replica of waking? Apparently, none of the waking associates passes on to that state, and so, there can be neither consciousness of the waking mind, nor the sensations of the waking state. Nevertheless, He objectifies all the dream-phenomena with the help of His own Consciousness! Now this constant Consciousness is the Intuition which is identical with Ātman. The Ātman does not make use of any Light, which has to operate actively as the mind does, when it becomes aware of external objects in the waking state. Obviously, therefore, Ātman is His own light when He objectifies dream as a whole, just as He is when He is Conscious of waking as a whole.

4. The Intuition of Deep Sleep

Besides the evidence of the Witnessing Consciousness in waking, and of the Ātman’s intrinsic Consciousness unaffected by the appearance and disappearance of waking and dream, we have the Intuition of the invariable Consciousness of Ātman which continues to maintain its self-identity in deep sleep, where not only the modifications of the mind and the functions of the senses, but even the ego. The locus of all these, are all conspicuous by their absence. The Śruti describes this unique state in these terms.-

तद्वा अस्यैतदतिच्छन्दा अपहतपाप्माभयं रूपं। तद्यथा प्रियया स्त्रिया संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद
नान्तरमेवमेवायं पुरुषः प्राज्ञेनात्मना संपरिष्वक्तो न बाह्यं किञ्चन वेद नान्तरं तद्वा अस्यैतदाप्तकामं
आत्मकामं अकामं रूपं शोकान्तरं ॥ बृ. उ.४-३-२१

“Now now this is verily (His) form beyond desires, beyond (all) evil (of Karma), fearless. In the same way as one, firmly embraced by his beloved wife, is aware of neither the exterior nor the interior (world), so also this Purusha, (the individual self), firmly embraced by the Prājña-Ātman (the Ever-Conscious Self), knows nothing external or internal. And this, verily, is the form, which has accomplished all desires, whose Self is Itself all the desires, which is desireless and devoid of grief.” Br, 4-3-21.

5. Intuition Which is Constant Throughout All States

That the genuine Ātman, who is the Witness of even the ego, is never affected by the appearances or changes of the external or internal world can be known from the fact that His essential nature of Pure Consciousness or Absolute Intuition persists even while He appears to pass through the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep; birth and other stages of life and death; creation, sustenance and dissolution of the universe. The following remarks of Śāṅkara should be considered and studied with due care for being convinced of the changeless nature of Ātman as identical with the Essence of Intuition:-

यथा स्वयं प्रसारितया मायया मायावी त्रिष्वपि कालेषु न संस्पृश्यते, अवस्तुत्वात्, एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यत इति ॥ सू.भा. २-१-९

‘Just as a magician is not touched throughout the three points of time by the magical display of a thing projected by himself, for the (simple) reason that it (the projected thing) is unsubstantial, so also the real Ātman remains untouched by the magic display of Samsāra:” Su.Bh. 2-1-9.

यथा च स्वप्नदृगेकः स्वप्नदर्शनमायया न संस्पृश्यते, प्रबोधसंप्रसादयोरनन्वागतत्वात्, एवमवस्थात्रयसाक्षी एकोऽव्यभिचारी, अवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृश्यते । मायामात्रं हेतत्, यत्परमात्मनोऽवस्थात्रयात्मना अवभासनम्, रज्ज्वा इव सर्पादिभावेनेति । अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थसंप्रदायविद्विराचार्यैः-‘अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते । अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥ ‘इति ।

“And just as the one dreamer is untouched by the magical experience of dreams, for that does not persist in waking and deep sleep, so also, the one Witness of all the three states, who remains unchanged, is untouched by the triad of states which is changeful. For, that the ‘real Ātman appears in the form of the triad of states is but a magical show, just like the appearance of a rope as a snake etc. Here it has been proclaimed by the respected teacher (Gauḍapāda), who is well-conversant with the genuine tradition of Vedānta, in the following verse:- ‘When the Jīva (the individual soul) awakes from the beginningless dream of māyā, he comes to know the birthless, sleepless, dreamless Non- dual Principle’ {GK. 1-16}.” Su.Bh.2-1-9

6. Why Do Distinctions In Ātman Re-appear Even After Their Disappearance?

An objection is likely to rear up its head here. If freedom from all distinctions is the intrinsic nature of Ātman, as the Advaitin asserts, why do distinctions re-appear again and again even after they disappear altogether in states like deep sleep? Does not this point to something potentially persistent in Ātman, which compels the latter to re-manifest these distinctions? Here is Śāṅkara’s reply to this objection:

अयमप्यदोषः, दृष्टान्तभावादेव-यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादावपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्याम् अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितत्वात् पूर्ववत् पुनः प्रबोधे, विभागो भवति, एवमिहापि भविष्यति । श्रुतिश्चात्र

भवति- 'इमाः सर्वाः प्रजाः सति संपद्य न विदुः सति संपद्यामह इति, त इह व्याघ्रो वा सिंहो वा वृको वा वराहो वा कीटो वा पतङ्गो वा दंशो वा मशको वा यद्यद्भवन्ति तदा भवन्ति' इति।

Śāṅkara is here offering his reply to the objection as to why, even after complete dissolution of all distinctions at the end of a cycle, they appear again. He says:

“This is no defect either. For, there is an illustration here also. Just as in the case of deep sleep, trance or in any other similar state, where there is the innate non-distinction, distinction reappears as before as soon as one awakes, for the simple reason that false knowledge has not been wiped off, so also this may well happen even here. There is this Śruti also to this effect: 'All these creatures have become one with Pure Being (Brahman) but they are not aware that they have. become one with Pure Being. Whatever they have been, a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, Or a boar, or an insect, or a butterfly, or a gad-fly, or a mosquito - that they become again' (Ch.6-9-2).”
Su.Bh.2-1-9.

7. Is There an Actual Merging of Distinctions in Ātman During the states Like Deep Sleep?

It should not be thought that Ātman is actually infested with distinctions now, and that we have got to attain a state of non-distinction called Mukti or Release after undergoing some course of spiritual discipline. The truth is that our Real Nature is ever-free from all distinctions and differences, even while it appears to be sullied and tainted with them owing to our innate nescience, and so long as this is not wiped out, we persist in imagining that they continue to be in a potential form even when nature repeatedly merges us in undifferentiated Reality in such states as deep sleep. Śāṅkara draws our attention to this popular blunder in these words:-

यथा ह्यविभागेऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहतः स्थितौ दृश्यते, एवमपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते। एतेन मुक्तानां पुनरुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गः प्रत्युक्तः, सम्यग्ज्ञानेन मिथ्याज्ञानस्यापोदितत्वात्॥ सू.भा. २-१-९.

‘Just as during the period of sustenance of the universe the practical life of distinctions is found to thrive even in the distinctionless Ātman, as it does in dreams, owing to wrong knowledge, so also a potency, consequent on that self-same wrong knowledge, is inferred (from the empirical point of view) to persist even in the state of dissolution. This disposes of the objection regarding the possibility of rebirth of even the Released, For, in their case, wrong knowledge has been destroyed by Right Knowledge.”
Su.Bh. 2-1-9.

8. Conclusion

This, then, is the essence of Vedāntic Intuition. It is not something to be generated by effort. Whenever we are said to have knowledge of a thing as it is, we use some valid means of knowledge such as perception. The only function of all such means is merely to remove our ignorance of the thing, that is to say, to remove the misconception that has been projected by the absence of contact of the Light of Intuition and the object which is desired to be known. As the author of the Maṇḍūkya-Bhāṣhya writes:-

यदा पुनः घटतमसोर्विवेककरणे प्रवृत्तं प्रमाणम् अनुपादित्सिततमोनिवृत्तिफलावसानं छिदिरिव छेद्यावयवसंबन्धविवेककरणे प्रवृत्ता तदवयवद्वैधीभावफलावसाना तदा नान्तरीयकं घटविज्ञानम् न तत् प्रमाणफलम्। न च तद्वत् अत्रापि आत्मन्यध्यारोपितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिविवेककरणे प्रवृत्तस्य प्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणस्य अनुपादित्सितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिनिवृत्तिव्यतिरेकेण तुरीये व्यापरारोपपत्तिः। अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिनिवृत्ति समकालमेव प्रमातृत्वादिभेदनिवृत्तेः ॥ मा.भा. ७.

“If, on the other hand, we accept that the valid means, which has undertaken the discrimination of the pot and the ignorance thereof culminates only in eliminating the ignorance which is not desirable-in the same way as the act of cutting undertaken to sever the connection of the two parts of a log of wood culminates in its two parts being made asunder-then, the knowledge of the pot necessarily arises of its own accord, and as such, cannot be regarded as the result of the function of the means. So also, the means of negating inward consciousness etc., undertaken for the discrimination of the nature of being inwardly conscious etc., can have the only effect of eliminating the nature of being inwardly conscious etc. and cannot exercise the additional function of operating on (Ātman) the Fourth also. For, Simultaneously with the elimination of the nature of being inwardly conscious etc., the distinction of being a knower etc., removes itself automatically.” Man. Bh. 7.

Ātman, as Intuition, is the only Reality existing in Its own right. The right knowledge of anything invariably culminates in revealing its real nature as Intuition (or Ātman), only by removing the Ignorance which intervenes and envelops its real nature. When we speak of understanding a particular thing, our mind really removes ignorance of that thing, and rests in the Ātman, who, in this particular case, reveals Himself as the Intuition of that thing. Ātman, as Intuition, is spoken of as the Intuition of waking and other states of empirical consciousness only relatively, just as we speak of the sun throwing his light on objects when darkness disappears owing to sunrise. The so-called sensuous and mental intuitions are really this self-same Intuition as particularized by the conditioning associates called the senses or the mind.

Chapter 5: INTUITION AND REASON SUBSERVIENT TO IT

1. How is Intuition Tested?

All intuition, whether sensuous, mental or of the nature of direct insight, is direct apprehension. Intuition only sheds its light on its object and does not deliver any judgment as to whether or not the object is really what it appears to be. The question, therefore, naturally arises: 'How are we to conclude whether or not any particular object of Intuition is real? How are we to be sure about the Truth of the entity called Ātman which the Upanishads teach?'

In the first place, sensuous intuition or perception is commonly tested in three ways in common life; firstly, by seeing whether our Intuition, at first sight, is confirmed by our knowledge of it on closer examination; secondly, by seeing whether the thing possesses the causal efficiency expected of it; and thirdly, by seeing whether our experience is common to all persons possessing normal faculties, For instance, when we see something at a distance what our Intuition reports to be what we call water, we go nearer, and see by experimenting whether the liquid in front of us can moisten our cloth or quench our thirst and whether this property, attributed to it, is verifiable by all persons in like manner; and when it is found to be so, we arrive at the conclusion that it is really what we know as water.

A mental intuition, like that of a dream object, may satisfy all the above-mentioned tests while the dream lasts, but it is dismissed as untrue when it is found to be sublated on waking, and so, all that we saw before is now decided to be only an individual intuition very much like that of an insane person. So then. we see that, besides satisfying the tests of causal efficiency and of universality, an Intuition must be such that its sublatability is inconceivable.

2. Is Intuition Of Ātman in Conflict with Perception and Means of Right Knowledge?

It is sometimes argued that Intuition of the unity of Ātman has to be rejected as being unfaithful to fact, inasmuch as the Pramāṇas or valid means of knowledge uniformly point to a pluralistic universe. But the truth is just the other way round, For every Pramāṇa or valid means of knowledge is accorded that pride of place only insofar as it culminates in the Intuition which certifies its validity, that is, when it conforms to the nature of the object.

Besides, the veracity of perception or any other Pramāṇa rests on the pre-supposition that Ātman is really a knower. But this is in itself a presumption without any warrant. For as Śaṅkara remarks:-

न हीन्द्रियाण्यनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षदिव्यवहारः संभवति । न चाधिष्ठानमंतरेणोद्वियाणां व्यवहारः संभवति ।
न चानध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद्ब्रह्माप्रियते । न चैतस्मिन् सर्वास्मिन्नसति असंगस्यात्मनः
प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते । न च प्रमातृत्वमंतरेण प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति । तस्मादविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि
प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि च ॥ अध्यास भा.

“Function of perception and the like is not possible, as we all know, without making use of the senses. And the senses cannot possibly function without a body as their resting place. Nor can anyone be active with a body on which the idea of its being one’s own Self is not superimposed, Nor can there be cognizership in the Ātman, who is by nature untainted by anything else, unless all this has been presumed. And no Pramāṇa can proceed to function without cognizership (in Ātman). Therefore, (it is clear that) perception and other Pramāṇas and the Śāstras likewise are only for persons influenced by nescience.” Su.Bh.Intro.

The Intuition of Ātman can never be called in question for a further reason:-

अपि चान्त्यमिदं प्रमाणम् आत्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकम् नातःपरं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति; यथा हि लोके ‘यजेत’ इत्युक्ते, ‘किम्?’, ‘केन?’, ‘कथम्?’ इत्याकाङ्क्ष्यते, नैवं ‘तत्त्वमसि’ ‘अहं ब्रह्मास्मि’ इत्युक्ते, किञ्चिदन्यदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति, सर्वात्मैकत्वविषयत्वादवगतेः। सति ह्यन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणेऽर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात्। न त्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति य आकाङ्क्ष्येत॥ सू.भा. २-१-१४.

“Moreover, this Pramāṇa propounding the unity of Ātman is absolutely final; for, there is no further question that can possibly arise when it has dawned. When it is said, in ordinary life, that one should sacrifice, it can be asked ‘What (should be sacrificed), with what, and how (should the sacrifice be conducted)? But there is no question which can possibly arise in like manner when it is said: ‘That thou art’, ‘I am Brahman’; for, the Intuition (that dawns here) relates to the unity of Ātman as the All. For, a question can arise only when there is something left over, but there is nothing left over besides the unity of Ātman, about which a question may naturally arise.” Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

3. Intuition Of Ātman Is Not Opposed To Reason

But is it not possible that this Vedāntic teaching is opposed to reason? For, after all, Vedāntic teaching is only a statement made about an actual fact and can be deemed to be unassailable only when it is not against reasoning. Reason, on the other hand is often used to infer something unknown on the strength of something already known by perception, and so is more approximate to Intuition than a mere traditional statement. Moreover, the Upanishad says that one should study the teaching about Ātman (श्रोतव्यः) and adds that the teaching should be reflected upon (मन्तव्यः), evidently implying that the textual teaching should be checked by reasoning also. And, in the Upanishads themselves whatever has been taught is invariably found to be reasoned out, as, for instance, when the Śruti brings forward examples from ordinary life to illustrate and support the truth of what has been already taught. Would it not, therefore, appear that the truth of a mere statement has to be rejected whenever it is in conflict with reason? And anyone could see easily that reason can never breathe in the rarified atmosphere of Absolute Unity.

This misgiving is altogether unjustified; for, the obvious reason that all ratiocination is only a by-product of the wonderful manifestation of Intuition itself in the shape of empirical life. The Upanishads no doubt employ reason in the course of teaching the Absolute, but this is only insofar as it is based upon partial intuitions, just to lead the seeker to a gradual unveiling of Reality; but they never encourage mere reasoning for reasoning's sake. Śaṅkara distinguishes this Vedāntic reasoning used as a device' for the purpose of teaching the Absolute Truth-from barren reasoning or syllogistic reasoning as follows:-

नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः संभवति; श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाऽऽश्रीयते स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारात् आत्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, संप्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना संपत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मकत्वम्, प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात् कार्यकारणानन्यत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः -इत्येवंजातीयकः ॥ सू.भा. २-१-६.

“This argument cannot be used in excuse of finding room for dry reasoning here. For, it is reasoning advanced by Śruti alone that is resorted to here as subservient to Intuition- reasoning, for instance, of the following type:- (1) Ātman is not followed up with any of the characteristics of either dream or waking inasmuch as both these appear exclusive of each other, and since the individual self sheds all plurality and becomes one with the Ātman as Pure Being in deep sleep, that Ātman is really of the nature of Being devoid of all plurality. And (2) Since the universe is born from Brahman, it cannot be other than Brahman, if one respects the law of the effect not being other than its cause.” Su.Bh.2-1-6.

Here, evidently, the Śruti brings forward reason based upon universal Intuition and not founded upon logical induction or syllogistic deduction. Besides, no reasoning whatsoever is necessary for one who can directly refer oneself to the nature of the genuine Ātman Himself as the Witnessing Self of the ego which corresponds to the notion of 'I'. For, the Witness is, by His very nature, altogether independent of all objective not-Self, which can never claim any independent existence of its own as a real second to the Witness.

4. The Place of Non-dual States like Sleep in Vedāntic Reasoning

Vedāntins, following the footsteps of Bādarāyana as interpreted by Śaṅkara, cite deep sleep and other states of non-duality only to confirm their contention that this Ātman maintains His absolute identity in spite of the appearance or disappearance of the pluralistic universe along with the waking state. But no waking or dream actually sticks on to the Witnessing Self when we remember that waking or dream is only for the individual self which identifies itself with a body and fancies that its senses actually reside in the body while they function.

The so-called merging in the Pure Being or Ātman (सत्सम्पत्ति) in deep sleep is only a concession to the credulous who persist in the belief that each one of them is actually an individual distinct from the real Ātman. Accordingly, Śaṅkara makes this shrewd observation on the self which apparently undergoes the three states

of consciousness:-

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्; स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते। 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति। अतश्च सुप्तावस्थायां कदाचित् सता संपद्यते, कदाचिन्न संपद्यते - इत्ययुक्तम्। सू.भा. ३-२-७.

“Moreover, there is no time when the Jīva (the living soul) has not become one with Brahman, for the inherent nature of a thing can never be alienated from it. It is (only) relatively to its apparent transformation into a foreign form in dream and waking that the Jīva is supposed to attain his own form in deep sleep. So, for this reason also, it is improper to aver that the Jīva becomes one with Pure Being on one particular occasion and not on any other.” Su.Bh.3-2-7.

The critical student of Vedānta will have noticed by now how the so-called Vedāntic reasoning is merely leading the enquirer from one aspect of Intuition to another till he finally intuits his intrinsic nature by his own self without desiderating any intellectual reasoning whatever.



08. Anvaya Vyatireka; Tarka Nature

*From the Book Naiṣkarmyasiddhiḥ Kleshāpahāriṇī vyākhyāсахitā, Introduction:
Sureśvara's Interpretation Of The Vedāntic Text*

Preparatory Step

In perfect contrast with all other schools of Vedānta, Sureśvara's holds that the Vedānta Vākya teaching the unity of ātman, is the only means of obliterating all Avidyā. If one does not realize the meaning of Tat-Tvam-Asi (That thou art) even on having been taught by the śruti, it is only because he has not understood the meaning of the word "thou'. Hence the second chapter is devoted to the way of discriminating its meaning (2-1). Two types of discrimination (अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ) concomitance or continuance and exclusion), are serviceable in arriving at the entity denoted by the word "Thou'. The self as the seer continues, or persists throughout while the non-self as the seen is excluded at some stage; this is द्रष्टृदृश्यान्वय व्यतिरेक type, where द्रष्टृ (seer) is the knower and all the rest is दृश्य (the seen). After we have gone through this first stage of discrimination (1-19 to 2-57), we take up the next one, viz., the self as witness and the rest as the witnessed (2-58 to 2-83) subject to appearance and disappearance (3-54). This two-fold discrimination, however, as the author warns (2-97) must be taken to last only so long as the nature of the self is not realized. And this realization dawns only when the teaching of the text "That thou art' is intuited.

From the Book Salient Features of Śaṅkara's Vedānta

CHAPTER 4: REASON SUBSERVIENT TO SELF-REALIZATION

31. It is stated in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad that Yājñavalkya instructed his wife Maitreyī in the knowledge of Ātman in these words "Ātman, verily, my dear, is to be seen by listening to teaching about Him, by thinking over His nature and by contemplation" (Bṛ. 2-4-5). And in the Chāndōgya, it is taught that just as the intelligent reflective man in the story reached his country Gandhāra after enquiries made on the strength of the instruction received from a wayfarer, so also, one who has had due instruction from a teacher can realize Ātman (Ch. 6-14-2). It follows from this that an aspirant should make use of reasoning as well as revelation from the Śruti for the purpose of realization.

32. Those who are able to arrive at the truth by the teaching of the Śruti alone,

do not of course stand in need of any reasoning, since they have reached the goal. For such as have fully grasped the meaning of the two words 'That' and 'thou' used in the sentence "That thou art'-require nothing more to understand what the sentence means. "But in the case of those who are hindered by ignorance, doubt or misconception from having a correct appraisal of the signification of these words, the sentence 'That thou art' cannot possibly convey its true import. For understanding the meaning of a proposition pre-supposes the understanding of the meaning of the terms involved in it. Such aspirants, therefore, would require repeated study of the Śāstra as well as application of reasoning ancillary to it" (Su.Bh. 4-1-2). Accordingly the Śruti says "This Ātman is not accessible to many even for hearing about, and many there be who know Him not, even after a study of the Śāstra" (Kā. 1-2-7).

33. "It is beyond speculation, for it is subtler than the subtlest" (Kā. 1-2-8). "This knowledge is not to be had through speculation" (Kā. 1-2-9) nor can it be refuted by speculation. So says the Śruti. At first sight, it would appear from this pronouncement, that knowledge of Ātman has nothing to do with reason. But the Śruti only means that Ātman is not within the reach of dry reasoning which is not based upon the instruction of a teacher initiated in the traditional method of imparting the knowledge. Accordingly it has been declared "There cannot be any failure to understand it, when it is communicated by one who has become identical with Ātman" (Kā. 1-2-8). Again "It can be well understood when taught only by an Ācārya other than the ordinary ratiocinist" (Kā. 1-2-9). Āgama is the peculiar traditional method of efficacious teaching by virtue of which the aspirant is enabled to see his identity with Ātman. The Śruti (Ch. 6-14-2) relating to the intelligent and reflective man of Gandhāra (referred to in para 31) demands the aid of reasoning ancillary to such teaching. Hence that text is not in conflict with the one which rules out speculation unsupported by this means of right knowledge.

34. The Sanskrit term 'tarka' has been used in different senses by different schools of thought. Some give that appellation to syllogistic inference. There ought to be fire on the yonder hill, for we see smoke there. Since we actually guess the existence of fire in this inference, the name 'tarka' may well be applied to it. An additional reasoning may also be advanced in support of this inference. 'No smoke would be visible if there were no fire there.' This reasoning substantiating the original inference has been also termed 'Tarka' by the Naiyāyikas. But neither of these two kinds of reasoning is meant in the text 'It is to be thought over and contemplated' (Br. 2-4-5). "For the truth relating to this Reality which is conducive to final release is too deep even for a conjecture without revelation" (Su.Bh. 2-1-11). Enquiry into Brahman demands primarily the consideration of Vedāntic text and, as subservient to it, reasoning not in discord with it.

35. The difference between the reasoning proposed by the Śruti and mere speculation is this: The reasoning recommended by the Śruti being meant to be

conducive to intuitive experience is never in conflict with experience. Independent reasoning, however, is merely the outcome of the conjecture of one's own mind. "Speculation is unbridled.... It is impossible to expect finality from speculations, for men's minds are diversely inclined" (Su.Bh. 2-1-11).

36. Is it not itself a reason to argue that no reasoning is final since certain speculations have not arrived at finality? And reason approved by Śruti is in any case reason to be sure. For otherwise the injunction 'It must be reflected upon' (Br. 2-4-5), would be meaningless. Such being the case, what is there anything peculiar to it which makes it superior to other reasonings? Logicians too base their reasoning on something found true to experience 'From the known to the unknown' — is that not a principle to be acquiesced in by all?

Our reply to all this is as follows : Non-Vedic reasoning proceeds on some basic principle assumed in each individual case. But all do not subscribe to the basic assumption of a particular school. Even in cases where the fundamentals may appear unassailable for the present, there is no guarantee that they will continue to be so for all future. For instance, the doctrine of the pradhāna (primordial matter) of the Sāṅkhyās, and the doctrine of the paramāṇus (atoms) of the Vaiśeshikas, have been assumptions based upon mere speculation. These fundamental postulates not being universally accepted, conclusions drawn from arguments based upon them have likewise failed to command universal acceptance. Similarly the fundamentals postulated by the Buddhists, the Jains and the various schools of Western thought, have all been questioned. Śāstraic reasoning on the other hand, is based on universal intuition which can never be challenged. For instance, the teaching that the inmost Witnessing Principle in us is our own Self can never be gainsaid by anyone, for It is the Self of even the would-be denier. "Besides, Ātman cannot possibly be denied, for the simple reason that It is one's own Self" (Su.Bh. 2-3-7). That is why the reason proposed by the Śruti, claims superiority over any other ordinary speculative reason. It is based upon universal experience while the other speculations are barren since they have no such support. Therefore no dry reasoning can be admitted here under the pretext that there is a text recommending reason" (Su.Bh. 2-1-6).

37. It is true that other schools of thought likewise claim to base their arguments on experience; but that so-called experience does not cover the whole ground of life. Reason based upon that partial experience cannot stand the onslaught of a higher reasoning based upon a wider experience. "For we see that there is conflict of opinion among system-founders of even recognized fame for mental eminence like Kapila and Kaṇāda" (Su.Bh. 2-1-11). So we cannot take that all of them have given us correct ideas of truth and reality, for such mutually contradictory doctrines cannot all be absolute truth. "Right knowledge ought to be uniform throughout, since it must conform to an existent fact. That is to be considered real which consistently maintains its self-identity, and knowledge of

that reality, is commonly called right knowledge, as for instance, the knowledge that fire is hot” (Su.Bh. 2-1-11).

There have been a number of schools of speculative thought, both in our own country and in the west, which have each built different systems of their own, and there is scope for many more such schools to appear in the future. “But it would not be possible to assemble all the speculators of the past, present and future times at one place or time so that we might decide by their consensus of opinion that a particular conclusion is the ultimate truth in respect of any one fact to be regarded as real” (Su.Bh. 2-1-11), whence it follows that no speculative thinker can be taken to have said the last word on the matter. “The Veda, on the other hand, being eternal and always capable of yielding the same knowledge, may be justly relied upon to let us know Reality as it is, and that universal knowledge which arises from it cannot be assailed by any of the speculators of the past, present or future” (Su.Bh. 2-1- 11). This is because the Vedic reasoning takes into account the entire range of the knowable and examines all the three states of experience, to wit, waking, dream and deep sleep. “These three states have been called ‘the knowable’, because there cannot be any thing knowable which falls outside the three, since the postulates of the advocates of any other school must necessarily be included in one or the other of these states” (GK. Bh. 4-88). Hence the Vedic dialectic which arrives at the final conclusion after an examination of all the three states is based upon the most comprehensive ex-perience. This experience being in entire harmony with that of persons of all places and times, Vedic reasoning based upon it is the only one that can be accepted as infallible.

Even the Vedic reasoning employed to ascertain the nature of Ātman does involve duality of course. This is so because “Even the unreal forms of Ātman due to upādhis (concomitant conditions) are provisionally assumed as though they were a property of Ātman to be known ; this, however, is only a device just to make us aware of the existence of Ātman” (GBh. 13-13). This dual characteristic is, however, invariably shown subsequently not to belong to Ātman as a matter of fact. Ācārya Śāṅkara quotes in this context the maxim of the experts in the traditional method of right teaching. “That which is really devoid of all plurality has to be explained by the method of superimposition and subsequent rescission” (GBh. 13-13). It is this method of provisional attribution and subsequent abrogation that is followed by the Śruti while it approves reasoning referring to the triad of states, causality and the like. This makes it clear how the employment of logic involving duality, does not adversely affect Advaita.

Two examples have been cited in the Sūtra- Bhāshya to illustrate the kind of Vedāntic reasoning based on universal intuition.(1)“Since waking and dream exclude each other, the Self is unaccompanied by them, and since in the state of deep sleep He leaves the phenomenal world behind and becomes one with Pure Being, He is really of the nature of Pure Being altogether free from the world of

plurality. (2)As the world comes forth from Brahman it cannot be different from Brahman in accordance with the principle of the effect being not different from the cause”(Su.Bh. 2-1-6). Śāṅkara’s reference to ‘reasoning of this type’ in this connection may be taken to cover the method of the sāmānya-viśeṣha (the universal and the particular) as well as the reasoning based on the pañca-kōśas (the five sheaths). As one example of the former may be cited the argument that “as everything is unfailingly accompanied by Pure Consciousness it must essentially be Pure Consciousness itself. By the perception of sound in general produced by the beating of the drum, the particular notes coming under the class are also perceived, for as particulars they have no independent existence of their own. So also no particular thing either in waking or dream can be perceived as distinct from Consciousness” (Bṛ.Bh. 2-4-7). As for ‘the five sheaths’ made up of food, vital air, mind, intellect and blissful feeling, since they are each penetrated by the succeeding inner sheath, and Ātman is the most all- pervading innermost principle, none of the sheaths has any being of its own apart from Him. Here in the first of the four examples mentioned above, the three states are provisionally assumed to belong to the Self. In the second, Brahman is taken to be the cause of the world, and in the third, it is regarded as a genus, while in the fourth pervasiveness and the nature of being the inmost of all are temporarily ascribed to the Self for the sake of facilitating instruction. Of course, all these attributions are subsequently rescinded when Pure Reality comes to be pointed out.

40. It is sometimes argued that acceptance of Advaita as the ultimate reality would run counter to perception, inference, and the portion of the Vedas enjoining rituals. Moreover, there would be no teacher of Advaita; neither the teaching nor anyone to be taught according to the system which assumes Absolute Non- dualism. If all this be allowed, would not the Advaitic Śruti prove suicidal to its own validity besides abolishing the universally accepted canons of evidence?

Now all this is only bad logic. For we have already shown that Ātman is no object of perception or inference. True, the Karma- kāṇḍa (Portion of the Veda prescribing religious works) pre-supposes the distinction of action, its means and results. But “a man naturally takes for granted the distinction of action, its means and results projected by avidyā, just as it obtains in ordinary life. Taking his stand on that distinction, he is engaged in adopting whatever is, in general, the means to accomplish something good and to avoid anything which is bad. But he has no idea of what particular means tend to what particular ends, desirable or undesirable. The Śruti only informs him of that means. But it says nothing about either the reality or unreality of the distinction of actions, means and results well-known in common life, nor does it try to prevent him from proceeding in that line” (Bṛ. Bh. 2-1-20). So no means of knowledge is invalidated if Advaita is taken to be the ultimate Reality. For as already remarked (in para 29), “The means of right knowledge are dominant in their respective individual spheres (and not elsewhere)” (Bṛ. Bh. 2-1-20). “When unconditioned Brahman is taken to be the sole reality, there

is certainly no teaching, no teacher, and no end to be achieved by understanding the teaching” (Br.Bh.2-1-20). And hence no charge of contradiction can be laid at the door of Advaita. Nor can it be objected that the teaching of the Śāstra would be fruitless in the case of one who has realized Advaita, for one who has known the truth, has nothing else to know. “Even in ordinary life, no means of proof is seen to urge one to seek knowledge again about anything when once it has been known” (GBh. 2-69).

41. Even the mutual opposition and attempted refutation of the speculative systems, indirectly prove the truth of Advaita. For the schools presume duality to be real and put forward the claims of their respective theories and try to confute those of the other schools. Not one of them has been so far able to defend itself against all attacks and to convince all others of the truths of its own position. It follows that duality as such is the one fertile source of all conflict, and fallacies are inevitable if it is taken to be real. On the other hand, there is none to dispute the reality of the Ātman of Advaita, for He is the very Self of every one as Intuitive Consciousness. It is from this view-point that Śāṅkara quotes a traditional Ślōka which purports to say that “The knower of Vedic teaching, leaves the cause of disagreement exclusively to the disputants themselves, and rests in perfect peace, because of the consciousness of reality safe-guarded by them all” (Pra. Bh. 6-3).



09. The Nature Of The Self In The Deep Sleep

From the Book Misconceptions About Śāṅkara.

VARIOUS VIEWS CONCERNING DEEP SLEEP

35. A number of misconceptions have assailed Vedāntins of different levels of thought, concerning the state of deep sleep, simply because of ignoring this distinction of Vyavahāra and Paramārtha :-

(1) A famous writer on Advaita Vedānta, committed this mistake when he undertook to examine the three states of consciousness with the sole purpose of demonstrating that Ātman alone as सँवित् (intuition) is really real in as much as all things objectively experienced in the waking state, are found to be absent in dream and dreamless sleep, while Ātman continues to maintain his self-identity. The writer was not content, however, with showing that Ātman remains intact in all the three states. He insisted that ignorance also continues in sleep as is guaranteed by the waking memory of sleep, in the form 'I did not know anything in sleep'. This was because he forgot to remember that the examination of the three states, was only a device in concession to Vyavahāra, only Adhyārōpa or a deliberate superimposition to be rescinded after the sole reality of Ātman has been shown. What is more important is that the waking memory of sleep, is no real memory from the transcendental view, because the three states are not actually happenings in any particular time-series, and that the time experienced in waking cannot be reasonably regarded as the substrate of all the three states.

(2) A noted Bhāshyakāra, also, who undertook to prove that the individual self is always the object of the notion of 'me' has made use of this indefensible argument of trusting the waking memory of deep sleep for the purpose of inferring the continuance of the individual nature of the self.

(3) Another Dvaita Vedāntin has gone to the length of employing this waking memory of sleep for proving that not only the individuality of the self, but also that 'time and ignorance' also persist to exist in that state of unconsciousness !

The reader should be able to see that all such vagaries are founded on the dogma that memory is possible even without a corresponding experience antecedent to it in the past.

DIVERGENT VIEWS ABOUT AVIDYA IN TRANCE

36. Another misconception of this same ilk, is to believe that all duality due to ignorance, is absent only in the state of Samādhi (trance), even while conceding that a trace of ignorance may continue to taint a knower of Brahman in waking till his fructifying karma is exhausted. Some teachers, who pursue this line of thought, have conceded that subtle impressions of avidyā lie dormant even in this Samādhi. These impressions have to be inferred according to them to be the cause of his coming back to the normal state!

ŚĀṅKARA'S STATEMENTS REGARDING THE POTENCY OF DISTINCTIONS IN SLEEP AND DISSOLUTION

37. The readers who must be familiar with the wrong track generally pursued by later Vedāntins with regard to avidyā, will surely be expecting by now that some statement of Śāṅkara's touching avidyā in sleep and samādhi, must have surely allured them to fall into the trap of misconceptions mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs. And he will not be surprised to find that the word Mithyā-jñāna in the following quotations, has been the source of misapprehension:-

(१) यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादावपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्याम् अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितवात् पूर्ववत् पुनः प्रबोधे विभागो भवति, एवमिहापि भविष्यति। सू.भा. २-१-९.

“Just as in deep sleep and Samādhi, there is attained the intrinsic state of absence of distinctions, and yet distinction reappears in waking as before on account of mithyājñāna not being removed, so also it may well happen in this case (of dissolution) also” Su.Bh. 2-1-9.

[One can very well surmise that an interpreter imbued with the idea of mithya (undefinable), ajñāna (the theoretical avidyā-śakti), can take this passage to mean that even in deep sleep and samādhi, that 'śakti' persists to be in a latent form].

यथा ह्यविभागेऽपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धो विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवदव्याहतः स्थितौ दृश्यते, एवमपीतावपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धैव विभागशक्तिरनुमास्यते। सू.भा. २-१-९.

“Just as even in the Supreme Ātman without any distinctions, it is seen in practical life that distinctions based upon Mithyājñāna (or Avidyā of the nature of adhyāsa) function unobstructed even in the period of sustenance of the world as they do in a dream ; so also one may infer the potency of distinctions owing to Mithyājñāna.” Su.Bh. 2-1-9.

Needless to say that the school holding the theory of avidyā-śakti clinging to Ātman, may imagine here a voucher for inferring the continuance of that śakti during the dissolution period also.

MISCONCEPTION WITH REGARD TO THE IDENTITY OF JĪVA WAKING UP FROM SLEEP

38. A similar misconception has persisted with regard to the identity of the Jīva awaking from deep sleep. Bādarāyaṇa says in a Sūtra (VS. 3-2-10) that the identical Jīva should be concluded to awake after sleep for (1) this Ātman continues to proceed with what he had left half done during the previous day, and (2) remembers what he had experienced in the past. Moreover (3) the Śruti also says expressly that the same Jīva awakes. (4) And fourthly if we suppose that each Jīva becomes finally free from saṁsāra on his becoming one with Brahman during sleep and quite another gets up, that would go against the Veda enjoining karma or Upāsana whose fruit is to be experienced at some distant time.

Here Śaṅkara anticipates an objection: Inasmuch as the Jīva has become absolutely one with Brahman, how can we discriminate any particular Jīva from others? Is it not impossible to take the same drop of water after it had been thrown into a sheet of water ? The teacher answers :-

युक्तं तत्र विवेककारणाभावात् जलबिन्दोरनुद्धरणम्, इह तु विद्यते विवेककारणम् -कर्म च अविद्या च- इति वैषम्यम्॥ सू.भा. ३-२-९.

“It is in the fitness of things that there being no means of discrimination, the drop of water cannot be taken up ; in the present case, however, we do have a means for discriminating (the jīva), to wit, karma and avidyā, Hence there is no similarity between the two cases.” Su.Bh. 3-2-9.

A sub-commentator has twisted this Bhāshya to suit his pet theory of avidyā-sakti as follows:

एवमनाद्यनिर्वचनीयाविद्योपादानभेदोपाधिकल्पितो जीवो न वस्तुतः परमात्मनो भिद्यते; तदुपाध्युद्धवा-
भिभवाभ्यां चोद्धूत् इव, अभिभूत इव प्रतीयते। ततश्च सुषुप्तादावपि अभिभूत इव, जाग्रदवस्थादिषूद्धूत
इव। तस्य चाविद्यातद्वासनोपाधेरनादितया कार्यकारणभावेन प्रवहतः सुविवेचतया तदुपहितो जीवः
सुविवेच इति॥ भामति, ३-२-९

According to this theory :

“Jīva being imagined to be such because of the conditioning associate which is a species of the beginningless undefinable avidyā, is really not different from the real Paramatman, Owing to the manifestation or being overpowered by that conditioning associate, he himself seems to be manifest or unmanifest. Hence in deep sleep and the like states, he happens to be overshadowed and in states like waking etc., to become manifest. And that conditioning associate flowing in a stream consisting of avidyā and its impression in the relation of cause and effect being easily distinguishable, the jīva associated with it, can also be distinguished.” Bhamati,3-2-9.

Needless to say that this supposition of conditioning associate of the avidyā - Vāsana (impression of avidyā) is directly opposed to Śaṅkara’s Bhāshya on Sūtra

3-2-7. न कदाचिदपि जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सम्पत्तिर्नास्ति etc.

From the Book Intuition of Reality, Section 4 of Chapter 5

4. The Place of Non-dual States like Sleep in Vedāntic Reasoning

Vedāntins, following the footsteps of Bādarāyana as interpreted by Śāṅkara, cite deep sleep and other states of non-duality only to confirm their contention that this Ātman maintains His absolute identity in spite of the appearance or disappearance of the pluralistic universe along with the waking state. But no waking or dream actually sticks on to the Witnessing Self when we remember that waking or dream is only for the individual self which identifies itself with a body and fancies that its senses actually reside in the body while they function.

The so-called merging in the Pure Being or Ātman (सत्सम्पत्ति) in deep sleep is only a concession to the credulous who persist in the belief that each one of them is actually an individual distinct from the real Ātman. Accordingly, Śāṅkara makes this shrewd observation on the self which apparently undergoes the three states of consciousness:-

अपि च न कदाचिज्जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्; स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते। 'स्वमपीतो भवति' इति। अतश्च सुप्तावस्थायां कदाचित् सदा संपद्यते, कदाचिन्न संपद्यते - इत्ययुक्तम्। सू.भा. ३-२-७.

“Moreover, there is no time when the Jīva (the living soul) has not become one with Brahman, for the inherent nature of a thing can never be alienated from it. It is (only) relatively to its apparent transformation into a foreign form in dream and waking that the Jīva is supposed to attain his own form in deep sleep. So, for this reason also, it is improper to aver that the Jīva becomes one with Pure Being on one particular occasion and not on any other.” Su.Bh.3-2-7.

The critical student of Vedānta will have noticed by now how the so-called Vedāntic reasoning is merely leading the enquirer from one aspect of Intuition to another till he finally intuits his intrinsic nature by his own self without desiderating any intellectual reasoning whatever.



10. Discrimination Of Three States

From the Book Salient Features Of Śaṅkara's Vedānta

Chapter 7. ĀTMAN AS ABOVE ALL STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS

66. The empirical view that one is a knower is the view of ignorance, Avidyā. It is from this point of view that all secular and Vedic activities proceed. For the idea that one is a knower, is the result of a mental superimposition of the real Witnessing inner Ātman and the unreal object witnessed, to wit, the body, the senses and the mind. "This secular and Vedic activity being the effect of Avidyā, ceases on the cessation of Avidyā in the case of one who is possessed of the steady knowledge due to the dawn of the discrimination of the Self; and Avidyā ceases because it is opposed to Vidyā (enlightenment) just as darkness is dispersed as soon as the sun rises" (GBh. 2-69). This point may be made still more convincing on an examination of the three states of consciousness. (Avasthātraya Parīkshā).

67. The three states i.e. waking, dream and deep sleep are to be subjected to an orderly scrutiny. "That by which 'the worldly (waking), the pure worldly (dream) and the ultra-worldly (sound sleep)' states become known is 'the knowledge'; these very states are 'the knowable' inasmuch as there is nothing to be known beyond them and all the basic principles postulated by the different schools of philosophy are included within their limits. And the Vijñeya, the specially knowable, is the highest reality known as the Fourth (Turiya), the essential nature of the non-dual, unborn Ātman (GK. Bh. 4-88). When the knowledge of the worldly (waking) and other states is attained and when the threefold knowable is realized by a gradual process, that is to say, the process which consists in understanding the worldly (waking) first of all, then realizing the pure-worldly (dream) by noticing the disappearance of the waking in it, then being aware of the ultra-worldly (sound sleep) by noticing the disappearance of the previous dream state in it - and when by such a process noticing the disappearance of all the three states in it, the really real, the Turiya (the Fourth), the non-dual, unborn, fearless (entity) is intuited, the aspirant has taken his stand in his own Self, his true nature" (GK. Bh.4-89). Here knowing the waking and the other states means nothing else than to intuit the Reality underlying them all and thus to reduce them into that Reality which is known as 'the Fourth'.

68. Vaiśvānara, Taijasa, Prājña and the Turiya have been called the pādas (liter-

ally feet), aspects of Ātman. Ātman conditioned by the waking state is 'Vaiśvānara', The entire waking world divided into the Ādhyātmika (internal), Ādhibhautika (external) and the Ādhidaivika (of the presiding deities) -forms the conditioning factor for Ātman here. This is the first of the four aspects of the real Ātman. Similarly Tajasa conditioned by dream is the second and Prājña conditioned by sleep is the third aspect. "The knowledge of the fourth is attained by merging each of the preceeding, the Viśva and the other aspects in the succeeding one. So the word pada applied to them is to be understood in the sense of the instrumental case" as that by means of which Turīya is attained (padyate anena iti). But in the case of Turīya, it is to be understood in the sense of the objective, that is, as that which is attained (padyate iti)". So says Śāṅkara (Man.Bh. 2).

Such being the case, the text 'Now this Ātman is four-footed' should not be understood as teaching actually four feet to Ātman additively. What is really meant here is that one and the same Ātman can be seen in four different ways, only the fourth being the reality about Him.

69. 'Viśva', 'Virāt-purusha' and 'Vaiśvānara' -all these three are names of the witnessing Ātman conditioned by the waking state. 'Tajasa' and 'Hiraṇyagarbha' are both the names of the Ātman conditioned by the dream state. 'Prājña', 'Avyākṛta' and 'Prāṇa' - these three are the names of the Ātman conditioned by deep sleep. "All the world inclusive of the region of the gods together with this Self, is proposed to be presented as forming the four several aspects of Ātman. Only thus is Advaita established after the abolition of all duality, and only thus is the one Ātman visioned in all beings as also all beings in that Ātman Otherwise only the innerself delimited by one's own body would have to be taken to be the Ātman, as for instance it is taken by the Sāṃkhyas and others. And if it be so taken, Advaita, the unique teaching of the Śrutis, would be missed" (Man. Bh.3).

70. People commonly believe that the waking state represents the real while the dream state represents the unreal. But this opinion is not grounded in fact. "The wise consider both the states waking and dreaming as of the same value, for the well-known reason that the different phenomena in each are of the same nature presented as they are in the relation of perceiver and perceived"(GK.Bh.2-5). The things in each state equally possess causal efficiency in their respective sphere. For instance fire burns, food satisfies hunger, and so on. That the efficiency of things felt in one state is stultified in the other, applies to both. External things perceived are considered real, and mere imaginary ideas in the mind are thought to be unreal in both the states. Again, in both the states, ideas in the mind last for a time living a lonely life, while each of the external phenomena enjoys a life coeval with another. That mental impressions are unmanifest while external things are manifest, is equally true in the two states. All these are common characteristics of both the states. Time, space and causality peculiar to the particular state, are experienced in both. Hence these two states are quite independent, and equally

unreal, since each is totally abolished while the other state lasts. This has been explained at length in the Bhāshya on the second chapter of Gauḍapāda's work (GK.Bh.2-6 to 15).

71. Chitta (the mind) manifests itself in the form of duality as much in the waking state as in dream. We see many souls in the waking state just as in dream. The phenomena noticed in dream are not independent of the mind there; nor is that mind independent of the dream- observer. The same is true of the waking state. The phenomena there do not enjoy an existence of their own apart from the mind noticing them; nor has the mind any existence of its own independent of the waking observer. Apart from the Witnessing Self neither the mind nor the phenomena enjoy any absolute existence, for they are relative to each other. The souls which one comes in contact with during one's waking, are all imaginary, just like dream- souls, souls created by magic or souls conjured up by virtue of spells, yogic power and the like. Every thing there is really the mind, and the mind really Ātman. This is set forth at length in Śaṅkara's commentary on the Alātaśānti Prakaraṇa (GK. Bh. 4-61 to 72).

72. Both in dream and waking is to be found time in its dual aspect, subjective and objective. In both are experienced time, space and causality appropriate to each. Hence it follows that these two states are not related to each other in point of any particular time, space and causal relation common to both. One might take illusory appearances for reality in a dream just as much as he does in the waking state. So we conclude that one confronts phenomena in dreams "then and there and not those arising out of waking experience" (GK.Bh. 4-41). It is quite wrong to suppose that there is a real cause-and-effect relation between the two states.

73. We thus arrive at the conclusion that waking and dream do each present a world peculiar to each, "Knowing that the infinite and all-pervading Ātman by means of whose light one is enabled to see both the dream-state and the waking state, the wise one grieves no more"(Ka. 2-1-4).

74. Waking and dream are each the result of mind-vibration peculiar to the respective states. "The waking consciousness, provided as it is with various gateways of knowledge, appears as though it had external things for its objects. But being really no more than mind-vibration it deposits corresponding impressions in the mind. And the mind thus impressed, behaves like a canvas on which a picture has been printed. Urged by ignorance, feelings and the effects of previous actions it presents itself as a replica of waking in spite of the fact that it is not equipped with external aids" (Ma.Bh, 4). This description of waking is from the empirical standpoint. But really speaking, there is no relation whatsoever between the two states. It is generally believed that waking is a public experience common to all, whereas dream is an experience private to each individual. The truth, however, is this: "Just as a dream appears to be an experience common to all, though in fact it is an individual experience of the dreamer, so also waking which we suppose to

be its cause, ought to be only apparently common to all and not really a state of public experience, any more than a dream” (GK.Bh. 4-37). We have already seen that both waking and dream are unreal and there is nothing exclusively distinctive about either state. Nor is it right to imagine a causal relation between the two since they have neither temporal nor special connection. The misconception of taking the non-dual Ātman for a knowing Self related to means and objects of knowledge is a feature common to both the states.

75. This conclusion that either of the states waking or dream is no more than a dream, a misconception of reality, has the sanction of the Śruti also. Here is a statement in support of this view: “Now this same Ātman enjoys himself and roams about in the waking state merely seeing good and evil (deeds), and again comes back in the inverse order to his former condition to the dream state direct” (Bṛ 4-3-17). If the Śruti did not consider waking also to be a dream, it would have said ‘does good and evil deeds’ in contrast to merely ‘seeing’ them in a dream. Similarly while defining sound sleep, the Śruti designates it as “that state wherein one never desires any pleasures, and sees no dream whatever” (Brā-3-19). Ācārya Śāṅkara remarks in this connection “The Śruti considers even the experience of waking a dream, and hence it says ‘where one sees no dream whatever’ “(Bṛ Bh. 4-3-19).

76. In sound sleep we do not see things distinct from one another as in waking or dream state; nor are the ideas of things or the pleasures and pains derived from them distinctly experienced as in the two other states. “Prājña whose limiting condition is sound sleep, who is unified, one mass of homogeneous consciousness, full of bliss and enjoying bliss only and the door to distinct awareness, is the third pāda” (Man.5). “The Ātman here is called ‘Prājña’ because Pure Consciousness (Prājña) is his special feature since the Ātman in the other two states have individualized consciousness also” (Man. Bh. 5). It should be noted that the Ātman in sleep is not only Pure Consciousness, but also Pure Being and Pure Bliss likewise.

77. In sound sleep the soul (jīva) the knower divests himself of the nature of a knowing self. “When that mind suffused by which and stationed in which the soul is capable of thinking, seeing, hearing and performing other similar functions, when that is dissolved, the soul assumes its own divine nature” (Ch. Bh. 6-8- 1). The Śruti says “When a man is spoken of as sleeping (svapiti), then, my dear boy, he is in union with Pure Being, he is dissolved (apito bhavati) into his own (svam) nature” (Ch. 6-8-1). Śāṅkara remarks that Uddālaka proposes to show his son, his own divine nature, divested of his soul-nature, in sleep alone.

78. The Śruti describes in a variety of ways the Self in sound sleep in order to bring its divine nature home to the listener. “Pure like clear water, One, the Seer without a second. This is the Brahma-world, O Supreme Ruler” - so said Yājñavalkya.”This is its supreme good, this is its highest attainment, this is its highest heaven, and this is its supreme bliss. Other beings live on a particle of

this self-same Bliss” (Br̥ 4-3-32). “Here a father becomes no father, a mother no mother, the worlds no worlds, the gods no gods, the Vedas no Vedas. Here a thief becomes no thief, the killer of an embryo no such killer, a cāṇḍāla no-cāṇḍāla, a paulkasa no-paulkasa, a monk no-monk, a hermit no-hermit. This nature is untainted by good, untainted by bad; for he is then verily beyond all woes of the heart” (Br̥ 4-3-22). The experience of sound sleep is quite in consonance with this teaching. For there is universal experience supporting the view that Ātman is of the nature of supreme bliss, above all distinctions of the knower and the known; and of doer, deed and means and results of deeds.

79. Distinction of names and forms experienced in waking or dream, is entirely absent in deep sleep. No time, space or causality is experienced there. Hence the Ātman in deep sleep has been characterized in the Śruti as the undifferentiated Self. “He is the Lord of all, He the All-knowing one; He is the Inner-Controller, He is the Source of all, the Generator and Dissolver of beings” (Man. 6). This description quite fits in with the experience of the Self in sound sleep. Another Upanishadic text tells us how all this world comes out of the Ātman in sleep: “As a spider stretches itself out in the form of a thread, and as from a fire dart out tiny sparks, so also from this Ātman come out all organs (of sense and activity), all the worlds, all the gods and all creatures” (Br̥ 2-1-20). In deep sleep we do not find the world distinguished by deeds, instruments of action and results thereof. The witnessing Self there continues to show itself in both waking and dream. But a special feature of these latter states is that there are a number of distinct souls and details of deeds, instruments and results. When we ponder over these two facts we have no grounds to suppose that there is either any material or efficient cause for this world except Ātman. We have therefore to admit that the witnessing Ātman is Himself the origin as well as the resort of the dissolution for this world, that the world is held up by Ātman, and shines in the light of His consciousness, and that Ātman alone is the Self of all beings. Here again we have the support of universal experience for the statement made by the Śruti that the Self in sleep is really the omniscient Lord of all and the Inner-Controller.

80. Looked at from this stand-point, Ātman would appear to present himself in two different forms, one with and the other exempt from multiplicity. But inasmuch as the multiformity is experienced only in waking and dreaming, and as that is only a false appearance as we have seen before, we have to conclude that the manifold aspect is only the figment of ignorance. Compared to Ātman, all phenomena are unreal and have only Ātman for their essence. All selves to be distinguished as Viśva, Taijasa or Prājña actually exist as identical with the causal Ātman before they make their appearance in their illusory forms of names and forms shaped by ignorance. Just as the snake is existent as the rope before its appearance so also all beings do exist as identical with the causal Ātman as their seed, prior to their creation” (GK. Bh.1-6).

81. It is stated in the Śrutis that Brahman first wished to become many and be born as the many, and then manifested Itself as the world. This becoming many is nothing but the differentiation of the ignorance-fabricated names and forms which were one with Ātman before their appearance. “When the unmanifested names and forms previously existent in and as Ātman are differentiated, then those names and forms are differentiated in all circumstances without renouncing their nature as Ātman, never distinct in time, space from Brahman. This differentiation of names and forms is the ‘becoming many’ spoken of here, for there can be no other possible way of becoming many for Brahman which has no parts” (Tai Bh. 2-6). Since Brahman is without parts, It cannot actually assume the form of the manifold like a seed which breaks up into parts and exhausts itself in a tree branching off in many forms; nor can it shrink itself in size, rolling up its multiple forms into one. An illusory snake never abandons its nature of being a rope even while it appears to be a snake. Similarly the world of innumerable beings and things will not have shaken off its real nature as the witnessing Ātman non-different from the non-dual Brahman, even while manifesting itself in its manifold form during waking or dream.

82. On this view, it is clear that Ātman remains the same for ever. “The evolution of sound sleep, dream and waking, is like a rope thrown up by a magician. Prājña, Taijasa and Viśva are like the illusory magicians created by him for climbing up the rope, and the reality called the Fourth is like the self-same real magician altogether distinct and different from both the created rope and the illusory juggler who, all the while remained standing on the ground though screened by magic from the sight of the on-lookers” (GK. 1-7). Neither the three states nor the Ātmans in those states have any existence apart from the real Ātman.

83. And why does Ātman create the world of names and forms, while remaining intact? This is not a legitimate question, for metaphysically speaking, Ātman has never transformed Himself into the world. “No reason can be assigned for substances like the rope illusorily appearing like a snake and so on; one can only say that it is their nature to appear so through the perceiver’s ignorance” (GK. Bh. 1-9). Similarly Ātman naturally appears to have assumed the form of the manifold from the stand-point of ignorance. We cannot attribute this appearance to anything else but natural Ignorance.

84. What is the upshot of the examination of the three states? “Manifestations like inward consciousness or outward consciousness are unreal because they annul one another just like the snake, a streak of water or any other fancy construction on a rope. And the nature of Consciousness itself is real because it is never annulled in any state” (Man.Bh. 7). Outward consciousness appears only in waking and inward consciousness appears only in dreams, while unconsciousness characterizes sleep only. Hence none of these phases which manifest themselves in the states peculiar to them, can be regarded as pertaining to the essential

nature of Ātman. Waking, dream and sound sleep do not, for a like reason really belong to the essence of Ātman. So we arrive at the conclusion that neither the manifold world nor its absence enters into the nature of Ātman. Pure Consciousness alone is his real nature.

85. But, it will be objected, even consciousness forsakes Ātman during deep sleep. For do we not remember on waking that we knew nothing during our sleep? “No, consciousness does not desert him in sleep, for one is conscious of sleep” (Man. Bh.7). That consciousness which intuits sleep, is the consciousness of Ātman.

86. It is reasonable to ask why we are unconscious of everything, if, as it is alleged, consciousness persists even then. The reply is this: That is because everything becomes one with Prājña in that state. “This purusha firmly embraced as he is by Prājña is quite unaware of anything either external or internal” (Br, Bh. 4-3-21). So “Oneness is the cause of unconsciousness” (Br4 Bh. 4-3-21). The Śruti says “True, he does not know anything there, but it is only while being a knower that he knows not; for the knowing power of the knower never disappears, only there is nothing second to and distinct from Him there, which he could possibly know” (Br 4-3-30).

87. Ātman is Pure Consciousness in waking and dream states too, just as much as He is such in deep sleep. Only there is, in these two states, the appearance of a world which looks as though it were a second to Him. “Dream is to him who sees the truth otherwise, and sleep to him who does not know it; when the misconception about these two ceases, one has attained the state of the Fourth” (GK. Bh. 1-15). Since dream is seeing truth otherwise, both waking and dream may be metaphysically considered to be dreams. Unconsciousness of the truth is deep sleep; so sleep or ignorance of the true nature of Ātman may be said to continue in all the three states. Of these three, deep sleep is characterized by ignorance alone, whereas misconception preponderates in waking and dream. But on closer scrutiny along the lines we have indicated so far, no ignorance whatever is seen to be actually lurking in deep sleep, for Ātman of the nature of Pure Consciousness alone remains there, while people mistake and look upon him as enveloped in ignorance from the waking point of view. And as there can be no misconception without ignorance underlying it, the same Ātman should be considered to maintain Himself free from dream or waking. We are thus justified in concluding that the notion of the existence of the three states is itself a grand misconception. Accordingly the Śruti proclaims ‘These three are his dreams’ (Ai. 1-12). The final conclusion, then, is that Ātman is eternally free from all the three states.



11. The Method Of Cause And Effect

From the Book Śuddha Śāṅkara Prakriyā Bhāskara: Chapter 5.

THE METHOD OF CAUSE AND EFFECT

31. Now I explain the method of cause and effect. The Śruti teaches that Jīvas are born from Brahman and are dissolved again in Brahman. As for instance, “Just as similar sparks dart forth in thousands from a fire aflame, so also, my dear friend, various beings are born from the Imperishable (Aksharam), and are dissolved in that very same (Aksharam)” (Mu. 2-1-1). And it also announces that all things of the world subjective and objective are born from Brahman alone thus “From this alone are born the vital force, the mind and all the senses; the ether, air, fire, water, and the earth supporting all” (Mu. 2-1-3). So also another Śruti beginning with “It thought - ‘Let me become plenteous, let me be born’. It created fire” (Ch. 6-2-3) says that Brahman itself was born in the form of fire and other elements. From all this, it would appear that a cause-and-effect relation is intended to be taught between Brahman and the Universe. From the rescission of this very relation of cause and effect, however, we have to conclude that this method of cause and effect has been devised only for the purpose of revealing the non-difference of the effect from the cause. For there are Śrutis like the following: “He is born in diverse ways, while he is really never born” (Tai. A. 3-13-39), “Prakṛti should be taken to be Māyā (an illusion) and the Great Lord to be the Māyāvin (the magician) and by parts of his, all this universe is pervaded.” (Sve. 4-10).

This has been indicated by the author of the Sūtra also thus:

“Their non-difference is concluded on the basis of the word Ārambhaṇa and other texts.” VS. 2-1-14.

And the author of the Bhāshya has thus explained the drift of the Sūtra :-

1. The ‘effect’ is the universe comprising the panorama of ether etc., and the cause is the Highest Brahman. And we can conclude that the effect is non-different from the cause. How? On account of the word Ārambhaṇa and other texts. We shall first take up the word ‘Ārambhaṇa’. After laying down the proposition asserting the possibility of knowing all things by

11. The Method Of Cause And Effect

knowing one particular entity, it is said, by way of supplying an illustration which is demanded by that proposition : "Just as, my dear boy, all that is made up of clay is known through the knowledge of a lump of clay, since the effect is only a name conjured up by speech and the only reality is what is known as clay". The meaning is this: When one lump of clay is ascertained to be really clay, all that is made of clay, such as a pot, a lid or a pail also becomes known, since they are likewise essentially clay. For an effect is Vacārambhaṇam Nāmadheyam i.e. the effect is conjured up as existing only by speech, which calls it 'a pot', 'a lid', or 'a pail'. But as a matter of fact there is nothing which may be called an effect; for it is only a name, unreal; what is known as clay is the only real thing. This is the illustration cited in the Śruti for Brahman. By the word Vācārambhaṇa used therein, we have to infer that even in the case of that of which it is an illustration that no effects exist apart from Brahman. Again, after stating that fire, water and food (earth), are the effects of Brahman, the Śruti says that the effects of fire, water and food, do not exist apart from fire, water and food, in these words: "The fireness of fire has gone away, for the effect is only a name conjured up by speech, the only reality being the three colours (Ch. 6-4-1)" etc. Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

2. By the word 'Ādi' (etc.) in the expression "Ārambhaṇa shabdādibhyah' in the original, we have to understand and cite such texts as 'All this has this (Sat) for its essence, that alone is real, that alone is the Ātman, that thou art'; 'All this is verily what we know as this Ātman' which (texts) teach the unity of Ātman. Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

Here by the assertion that the effect is non-different from the cause, what is intended to emphasize is that all effect is spoken of as being born only illusorily, just to impart the knowledge of the oneness of Ātman. As a matter of fact, however, there is no effect as such, it is only superimposed upon the cause by Avidyā. so says the author of the Bhāshya :-

3. Therefore in the same way that the ether spaces limited by a large pot or a little one (for drinking water) or by any other vessel, are non-different from the cosmic ether, and in the same way that mirage water etc. are non-different from the barren soil etc., just appearing and vanishing away as they do, and being of a nature undefinable, so also we have to understand that this universe of manifold ness in the form of experiencer and experienced etc. is non-existent apart from Brahman. Su.Bh. 2-1-14.

We shall now cite three Kārikās just to ratify that the above quoted extracts from the Bhāshya are quite in harmony with the Vedāntic tradition:-

सतो हि मायया जन्म युज्यते न तु तत्त्वतः ।

तत्त्वतो जायते यस्य जातं तस्य हि जायते ॥ GK. 3-27.

“Of a real being an illusory birth alone can reasonably happen; for him whose opinion it is really born, it would be tantamount to say that what is born alone can be born.” GK. 3-27.

न कश्चिज्जायते जीवः सम्भवोऽस्य न विद्यते ।

एतत्तदुत्तमं सत्यं यत्र किञ्चिन्न जायते ॥ GK.3-48

“No Jīva is born, and there is no cause for him (from which he is to be born). This is the highest Reality wherein nothing is born.”GK. 3-48.

उपलम्भात्समाचारादस्तिवस्तुत्ववादिनाम् ।

जातिस्तु देशिता बुद्धैः अजातेस्त्रसतां सदा ॥ GK. 4-42.

“Birth is taught as a doctrine by the wise ones to those who hold to the doctrine that things exist because of their appearance and practical efficiency and who are always afraid of that which is unborn.” GK. 4-42.

From the Book Taittirīya Bhāshyārtha Vimarshinī, Introduction

Brahman as the Cause

There are three methods of approach adopted here to lead the aspirant to the intuition of Brahman. All of these may be comprehended under one heading - Adhyārōpa-Apavāda (the method of deliberate imputation and subsequent negation). This method consists in attributing certain characteristics to the featureless Brahman in order to fix the attention of the student on it, and then passing on to a higher point of view from which the assumed characteristic becomes sublated. The attribution itself, is a concession to the empirical intellect, to enable it, to rise to the higher standpoint later on.

The Modus operandi of the method, may be illustrated by applying it to the notion of causality. The time-bound human intellect is inherently used to the notion of causality so much, that it demands a cause for the entire universe, naively forgetting that this relation, if at all, can obtain within the universe, only between phenomena in time or place. The Upanisad, therefore, starts from a definition of Brahman as Reality, Consciousness and Infinity and declares outright, that even Ākāsha (ether, the primary element concomitant with time), is produced from Brahman. All creation, or rather evolution, is only a manifestation of Brahman, Paramātman, or God as the true Self of all, Who wills to become many, to become this manifold world. He Himself enters into the aggregate of the body and senses as Jīva - the supporter of senses - and transforms Himself into all that we see - gross and subtle, sentient and non-sentient, real and unreal. Now, this is only for the purpose of pointing out that there can be nothing apart from Brahman, the effect being only the cause in another form. We thus arrive at the conclusion

11. The Method Of Cause And Effect

that Brahman is the only Reality, the only Consciousness, and is Infinity itself. Hence, there is no second to limit It. For all limitation is due to space, or time, or a second thing beside the one which it limits. But everything including time and space is produced from Brahman, is in fact an appearance super-imposed upon It, and, nothing, which is merely a construction of the mind, can possibly limit or otherwise affect its real substrate. And the individual soul being no other than Brahman Itself, is only a seeming distinct on account of the superimposed adjunct, the mind (8-11, 50-. 64). According to Śāṅkara, then, the Śruti apparently teaching creation, only purports to convince the inquirer of his identity with the non-dual Brahman which brooks no second.



12. The Method Of Five Kōśas

From the Book Taittirīya Bhāshyārtha Vimarshinī. Introduction

‘The Method of Five Sheaths’

Again, the Śruti in the course of describing the evolution of Brahman into the universe, states that from the earth came plants, and from plants food, whence this human being. As related above, Brahman has Itself entered this human body and manifests Itself as Jīva with his various specific properties such as seeing, hearing, thinking and understanding. Now man generally looks upon himself as a body, though he is daily aware of the vital force, mind, and understanding also as a part of himself. The Śruti therefore, starts from this false Ātman (or body) as the most familiar man and takes the enquirer to the real Ātman or Brahman, step by step, through Prāṇamaya, Manōmaya and Vijñānamaya selves, each subtler than the previous one, each pervading all the previous Kōśas or sheaths, and hence more entitled to be considered as one’s own self. In each case, however, the Śruti also broadens his ordinary outlook. Thus it identifies the Anamaya with the Cosmic Virāt, the Prāṇamaya with the Cosmic Sūtrātma, and the Manōmaya with Hiraṇyagarbha as Vedātma, while it identifies the Vijñānamaya with Hiraṇyagarbha, the cosmic Buddhyātma, till at last even the Ānandamaya or enjoying self is transcended and Brahman as the real self of all is realised as such (24, 25-44, 45).

Here too, the Śruti does not mean to aver that there are actually five different Kōśas like scabbards covering a sword - each literally enclosed within the next one. All Kōśas are really super-impositions of Avidyā, the only Reality being Brahman. Only each successive Kōśa being subtler than the preceding one, claims to be more entitled to be regarded as the real Self, as the enquirer looks deeper and deeper.



13. Śravaṇa Manana Nidhidhyāsana

From the Book Salient Features of Śaṅkara's Vedānta, Appendix.

6. Śravaṇa (study of sacred revelation), Manana (reflective thinking) and Nidhidhyāsana (concentrated contemplation), are all means for realizing Ātman. Highly developed souls, however, who can immediately grasp the true meaning of the Vedic teaching, do not stand in need of any additional effort.

Not taking this principle into account is responsible for the divergence of opinion among commentators of Śaṅkara Bhāshya about the relation of Śravaṇa and Nidhidhyāsana. Of these, some aver that Śravaṇa is the principal means and the other two are only ancillary to it; while others insist that nididhyāsana is the one means to direct realization and without it mere Śravaṇa would be of no avail.

7. Śravaṇa and the other means are enjoined only in so far as they turn the seeker inwards and direct him to stay his mind on Ātman, but the resultant knowledge is no object of any injunction.

Those who cannot distinguish between the effort required for Śravaṇa &c. and the resultant knowledge in each case, have made it a matter for controversy whether or not 'śrōtavyah' and similar texts constitute true injunctions. Some of them maintain that these are all injunctions while others insist that they are seemingly injunctions in form but are really statements of fact. Some even think that they are merely eulogistic statements.

8. Manana refers to the type of reasoning suggested by the Śruti itself conducive to experience. Hence the term 'experience' here should be understood to mean the supersensuous intuition which results from our enquiry which takes in one sweep the whole field possible of whatever is knowable.

From this the reader has to understand that use might be made of ordinary reasoning also in so far as it is conformable to the reasoning suggested by the Śruti, Advaitins do try to disclose the hollowness of other systems according to the course of reasoning accepted by themselves. But Advaita itself cannot be established by means of pure logical ratiocination. People who are not aware of this fact, often try to apply speculation or inferences based upon partial experiences to Vedānta also. Others condemn all reasoning and affirm that reasoning is of no use in matters taught by the Śruti. So they interpret Śruti according to their own

predilection and place their own convictions before seekers as the final Vedāntic truth.

9. Nididhyāsana is that kind of spiritual discipline by means of which one concentrates one's mind on the subtle principle, Ātman. At the end of this discipline, one becomes conscious of the fact that the mind itself is a superimposition on Ātman. Then the mind becomes no mind, that is to say, it is realized essentially as Ātman himself.

Many confound Nididhyāsana with 'Upāsana' and believe it to be a sort of spiritual imagination. It is this confusion that prompts some to believe that Nididhyāsana must end in 'trances', Savikalpa and Nirvikalpa (with and without consciousness of distinctions).

CHAPTER FIVE -SPIRITUAL CONCENTRATION

43. 'Ātman verily, my dear Maitreyī, is to be seen by listening to teaching about Him, by thinking over and by contemplation. By seeing Ātman verily, through listening, thinking over and assimilation, my dear, all this becomes known" (Br 2-4-5). So has Yājñavalkya enumerated the means of self-realization to his wife Maitreyī. Ācārya Śāṅkara explains this passage as follows: "First one has to listen to teaching about Him by the teacher as well as the Śāstra. Then one has to think over the teaching by reasoning. Then one has to contemplate upon the Reality. For thus it is that He is seen when these disciplines of listening, reasoning and contemplation are all accomplished. When these are all harmonized, then and then only, the true vision of the One Brahman is achieved and not otherwise, by mere listening" (Br Bh. 2-4-5).

By 'mere listening' in the above Bhāshya, is meant listening which is not in harmony with thinking and contemplation. Any and every kind of interpretation does not constitute real listening. One must listen to the instruction of a teacher familiar with Āgama (the traditional method of efficacious teaching). And then one must reflect upon what has been listened to, and harmonize the teaching with reasoning, so as to clear all doubts and difficulties about it. Much more valuable than either of these is nididhyāsana (contemplation), for it is the final means of corroborating the teaching by one's own experience. It is also known as vijñāna (special knowledge, assimilation). It is note-worthy that in the above quotation, vijñāna is given as a synonym for nididhyāsana. And in the Chāndōgya, it has been taught "He is to be sought out, He is to be known". 'Seeking' there is but listening and thinking over here referred to; for there can be no other way of actually seeking out one's own self. And" 'vijijñāsitavyah' there means that one should know Ātman in a special way, that is to know Him through one's own intuition" (Ch.Bh.8-7-1).

44. Listening, thinking over and contemplation, all the three are the means to attain immediate knowledge of Ātman; when we talk of Brahmajñāna or Atmajñāna,

the word jñāna, does not signify either the act or the means of knowing. Knowledge involved in the word jijñāsa (wish to know or enquiry) is the resultant knowledge or final intuition, Jñapti. "The object of desire denoted by the desiderative suffix (the ending in the word jijñāsa) is the knowledge resulting in avagati (final intuitive consciousness), for desire aims at a result. It is Brahman that is desired to be intuited by jñāna the means of final knowledge. And it is the intuitive knowledge of Brahman which is the highest goal of man, because it destroys, once for all, Avidyā and other evils which are the seed of saṃsāra" (Su.Bh. 1-1-1). "Reflection and contemplation are both meant for the intuitive knowledge" (Su.Bh. 1-1-4). Now this intuitive knowledge is exactly what is meant by seeing Ātman. And so there remains nothing to be done after seeing Ātman. Everything becomes known when the Ātman is thus seen, for there is nothing else independent of Ātman. All action, means of action, and ends are due to Avidyā (misconception), just as the snake in the rope is the result of a misconception of the rope. Hence the Śruti says "Everything becomes known (when Ātman is seen)" (Bṛ Bh.2-4-5).

45. Listening (study of the teaching), thinking over and contemplation are the means for the intuitive vision of Ātman. "Since listening and the other means are to culminate in the vision, they must bear fruit in this very life in the same way as enjoined acts such as pounding paddy are to end in the appearance of rice-grains" (Su.Bh. 4-1-1). Hence it follows that listening and other courses of discipline are to be pursued till the vision of Ātman ensues. "But in the case of those who are endowed with an adroit mind unhindered by ignorance, doubt, or misconception, the futility of repetition of these disciplines must certainly be admitted, since they would be able to intuit the meaning of the text 'That thou art' even when it is taught to them but once" (Su.Bh. 4-1-2). Such aspirants are qualified in the highest sense for the teaching of Vedānta.

46. Upāsanā (meditation) and Nididhyāsana (contemplation) are both terms denoting preparatory species of discipline. "Upāsanā and nididhyāsana are means of mental acts involving a repeated process" (Su.Bh. 4-1-1). Only, nididhyāsana is a particular species of upāsanā having a result to be experienced in this very life. "As for the upāsanās which are meant for perfect knowledge, the limit of their application is of course quite determined since they are to end in a visible effect just as acts like pounding of the paddy. For it cannot be insisted that some additional effort is necessary even after the effect, to wit, right vision of Ātman, is achieved" (Su.Bh. 4-1-12); not so in the case of the other upāsanās, for their practice has to be continued for life, since the effect is to be experienced only after departure from the body, and depends on the last thought at the moment of dying.

47. The terms upāsanā and Vēdana, may mean either meditation or knowledge according to context. For instance in the passage "He who devotes himself (upāste) individually to them he does not know (veda); for (the Self) will be incomplete when taken singly out of the whole. Therefore one should take to it (upāsīta)

as Ātman, for all these become one here” (Bṛ 1-4-7). In this text both the terms upāsanā and vēdana are knowledge of Ātman, whereas the self-same words are used in the sense of meditation (upāsanā) in this Śruti:

“One should meditate (upāsīta) upon mind as Brahman, whoever knows (veda) it thus he shines and warms up with name and fame, and spiritual splendour” (Ch.3- 18-1, 3). Now meditation is an act, while knowledge is not that. “An action is that which is enjoined without any regard to the nature of an existent thing, and which depends upon the exercise of a person’s will Although meditation or flow of thought is a modification of the mind, yet it is possible for a person either to do or not to do, or even to do it in a wrong way, since it quite depends on the will of the person meditating. Knowledge, on the other hand, is to be effected by some Pramāṇa, and a Pramāṇa has to conform to the nature of its object as it is. Knowledge therefore is not some-thing which can be done, left undone or done in the wrong way at will, for it exclusively depends on an existent thing and not any Vedic injunction nor on a person’s will” (Su.Bh. 1-1-4). The knowledge of Brahman as one’s own Self, is in fact that consciousness (jñapti) which has been already referred to (in para 44) as ‘avagati’ (intuition). “Consciousness (jnapti) is identical with Ātman and not some thing different therefrom. Hence it is eternal. The modifications of the mind as an Upādhi, which passing through the organs of hearing, sight &c. assume the forms of objects like sound, arise at their very inception only as objects of and pervaded by the consciousness which is Ātman. It is for this reason that they are semblances of Ātman- Consciousness commonly called by the name of knowledge, are imagined by people lacking in discrimination to be properties modifying Ātman Himself” (Tai. Bh. 2-1). It is from this common-sense viewpoint that we can talk of knowledge as ‘arising’ in conformity with the nature of its object. The knowledge of Brahman arising from Vedānta teaching means necessarily a mental modification and as such it cannot objectify Ātman. Yet it is called Atma-jñāna because it reflects the Ātman, who is of the nature of consciousness and it is also in this sense that it is contrasted with meditation as dependent on its object and not on any injunction or a person’s will.

Nididhyāsana no doubt is mental too, and it is also a kind of steady flow of thought enjoined by the Śruti just as any other upāsanā is. But the former is a mental process of focussing one’s closest attention in order to realize the nature of its object. “Come, sit down, I shall explain it to you. You had better try to assimilate it by close attention (nididhyāsva)” (Bṛ 2-4-4). In this passage Yājñavalkya in using the word nididhyāsva evidently exhorts Maitreyī to concentrate her mind upon what he says so that she might understand the thing without any doubt or difficulty.

48. In the commentary of Śāṅkarācārya the term ‘Yōga’ is sometimes seen to be used as a variant for both upāsanā and nididhyāsana. “The white (śukla) and other paths to liberation which the Yōgins (devotees) speak of, are not paths to

real freedom, for they relate to worldly life only. They merely lead to the worlds of Brahma and other gods, since reference is made in that context to departing through particular parts of the body in such terms as “The Ātman departs either through the eye or through the head, or through any other opening in the body’ (Bṛ 4-4- 2)” (Bṛ Bh. 4-4-9). In this context, evidently, the yōgins referred to are upasakas, “Now will be taught the resultant fruit of yōga, the realization of the identity of one’s Self with Brahman, leading to the complete cessation of all mundane suffering” (GBh. 6-29). The yōga mentioned here is nididhyāsana or concentrated contemplation. In his commentary on a particular verse in the Gītā, Śaṅkara remarks that ‘dhyāna is thinking on the nature of the Self and yōga is exclusive concentration on the Self’ (GBh. 18- 52). There also the yōga referred to is ‘nididhyāsana’, And in the Sūtra-Bhāshya, “Now, as for this samādhi which is taught in the Vedāntas, which aims at the realization of the Ātman of the Upanishads ... “ (Su.Bh. 2-3-39), the samādhi to which reference is made is nididhyāsana likewise. Samādhi literally means concentration upon the Self. “Moreover, yōgins visualize this Ātman, the unmanifest, devoid of all plurality, during the time of Samrādhana, and Samrādhana means the practice of devotion, flow of thought and focussed attention” (Su.Bh. 3-2-24). In this passage too, taken from the Sūtra-Bhāshya, by yōgins are meant those who conduct nididhyāsana; and samrādhana is the process of practising this kind of contemplation. Again in the Śruti “The wise one having realized this Deva (Ātman) through the Adhyātma-yōga overcomes both elation and grief” (Ka, 1-2-12). Śaṅkara explains ‘Adhyātma- yōga’ to be “the concentration of the mind which has been withdrawn from the sense-objects” referring again to this nididhyāsana. And the manō-nigraha (control of the mind) which Gauḍapāda refers to (GK. 3-40) as resulting in fearlessness and realization of Ātman, is nothing but nididhyāsana. If we take note of the fact that in all such cases nididhyāsana is invariably taken to be the means of realization of Ātman, it will be evident that it is not the ‘yōga’ practice as taught by Patañjali that is meant. This should be sufficient to dispel the false notion that nididhyāsana should result in ‘Nirvikalpa Samādhi’ (trance bereft of all thought constructions) before knowledge of Ātman dawns. When the realization of Ātman is achieved through nididhyāsana the mind is transformed into no-mind (amanōbhava) or Ātman” (GK. 3-31, 32). It does not result in mere ‘suppression of the modifications of the mind (cittavṛttinirōdha)’ as taught by Patañjali.

49. The word ‘samādhi’ has been variously interpreted by Śaṅkara to suit the particular contexts in which it occurs. “To those who are attached to enjoyment and power, and whose mind is enticed by the flower of speech relating to particular rites, the thought of resolve is never formed in their samādhi” (G. 2-44). Here the Ācārya explains samādhi as the mind in which everything is deposited for the enjoyment of the person concerned. In the verse (G .2-53) ‘When thy mind now perplexed by various Śrutis stays steadily on the samādhi, then wilt thou attain yōga’, he takes samādhi to mean the Ātman, since the mind becomes

stable when staying on the 'Ātman'. And in the ślōka "What is the description, O Kesava, of the steady-minded one who has taken his stand in samādhi" (G.2-54), the Ācārya interprets 'samādhisthasya' as of one who has got discrimination acquired through a balanced mind, or in other words, of one who has realized Ātman as distinguished from all not-self. Again in commenting on the sentence "Now listen to wisdom concerning the yōga" (G. 2-39), the Ācārya says "wisdom regarding the Karma-yōga or performance of works, and in the yōga of samādhi" meaning nididhyāsana otherwise called Dhyāna-yōga by the term samādhi. He has nowhere stated that samādhi, Savikalpa or Nirvikalpa, (trance with or without thought-constructions), is the result of nididhyāsana. As for the Śruti, it expressly declares that nididhyāsana is a direct means to intuitive vision of Ātman.

From the Book Vision of Ātman

SECTION NINE: RETROSPECT AND CONCLUSION- Yājñavalkya's Teachings

68. We have arrived at the close of the Maitreyī Brāhmaṇa, There is only one more Kaṇḍika to be discussed. It is therefore time for summing up the teaching of Yājñavalkya So we shall enumerate briefly the results of these teachings according to Śāṅkara free from the admixture of later accretions.

1) No one can hope to purchase immortality with all the wealth one can possibly acquire in this world.

(2) Everything-in the universe that one loves, is dear for the sake of Ātman, one's own self. So Ātman is the dearest of all.

(3) The Ātman alone is worth seeing through hearing about, reflecting upon and contemplating upon. When He is thus seen, everything becomes known.

[This does not mean that one's individual self has to be known; for, it is already known through. the teaching of the revelation dealing with the ritual portion of the Veda. One who has studied the Vedas and performed the religious works enjoined therein, knows very well that one's self answering to the notion of 'I', is distinct from the aggregate of the body and the sense-organs. Every believer in his own religion, believes in such a self perhaps. Yājñavalkya however, refers to the Witnessing Self of each one of us.]

Knowing this Self is quite unlike the objectification of any empirical phenomenon by means of a concept. As Śāṅkara puts it in his Upadeśa-Sāhasri, it is the highest kind of intuition vouchsafed to man :-

चैतन्यभास्यताहमस्तादर्थ्यं च तदस्य यत्।

इदमंशप्रहाणे न परः सोऽनुभवो भवेत् ॥ उप. ५-५

"Since the ego is revealed by Consciousness, and it is itself dependent

13. Śravaṇa Manana Nidhidhyāsana

on It, by destroying this objective factor that highest intuition of the Self would accrue." U.S. 5-5.

(4) The teaching that Ātman being known everything becomes known, should not mislead one to suppose that something else exists side by side with Ātman. There is absolutely nothing else. Ātman is all that is.

Śaṅkara's interpretation of the teaching of the Śruti texts that Ātman is to be known, is that the Natural Avidyā which separates one from one's real Self, has got to be wiped off by Vidyā. The common man who naturally superimposes the body and the senses upon the real Ātman, transfers by mistake the properties of the not-Self to the Self, and vice versa. So long as he is under the influence of this nightmare, he conceives the genuine Ātman as something to be known, and presupposing this Avidyā for the purpose of teaching, the Śrutis teach that Ātman is to be known and immortality attained by means of that knowledge.

(5) Śravaṇa according to Śaṅkara, is only listening to and trying to understand the teaching of the Śrutis and of the teacher about the real nature of Ātman. Neither the Śruti nor the teacher can command the seeker to understand Ātman; nor can they point out or objectify Ātman by describing him as such and such. This is true even in the case of the knowledge of empirical things.

ज्ञेयाभिमुखस्यापि ज्ञानं कदाचिज्जायते, कदाचिन्न जायते; तस्मात् तं प्रति ज्ञानविषय एव दर्शयितव्यो
ज्ञापयितुकामेन। तस्मिन्दर्शिते स्वयमेव यथाविषयं यथाप्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते। न च प्रमाणान्तरेण
अन्यथाप्रसिद्धेऽर्थे अन्यथाज्ञानं नियुक्तस्याप्युपपद्यते। यदि पुनर्नियुक्तोऽहमिति अन्यथा ज्ञानं कुर्यात्, न तु
तत् ज्ञानम्, किं तर्हि, मानसी सा क्रिया। स्वयमेव चेदन्यथोत्पद्येत, भ्रान्तिरेव स्यात्।

सू.भा.३-२-२१

"Even when one has directed his attention towards the object to be known, its knowledge dawns. sometimes, and sometimes not. Therefore, one who wishes to impart knowledge to another, has only to direct his attention towards the object of knowledge, and when that is done, knowledge appears of itself in conformity with the nature of the object and the means of knowledge. Even if one is urged (by the Śruti), knowledge of a thing cannot arise in contradiction of what its nature has been ascertained to be through some other valid means of knowledge. If, however, one should think it to be otherwise than what it actually is, on the score of his being directed (by the Śruti) to do so, that can be no knowledge but only a mental act (of meditation). If the knowledge to the contrary should arise of its own accord, it would be only an illusion." Su.Bh. 3-2-21.

In the case of Brahman, of course, Śravaṇa removes the intercepting misconception, and nothing further is needed to produce the knowledge of the self-shining Ātman.

(6) Manana is the use of reason based upon partial intuitions as adduced by

the Śruti itself or by the preceptor, or reasoning by the seeker himself in harmony with the Vedic reasoning. This reasoning may be of the nature of noting the continuity or persistence of Ātman and Variability or evanescent nature of the not-self, or reflection upon the relation of Ātman to the phenomena during creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world (Su.Bh. 2-1-6). Manana has nothing to do with syllogistic reasoning or dry speculation.

(7) Nididhyāsana (also known by other names such as Adhyātma and Adhyātma Yōga), is a special kind of concentrated contemplation upon Ātman which culminates in the merging of the mind in, and the direct intuition of the Universal Ātman. It has nothing to do with creative imagination (ordinarily known by the name of Upāsana, or the Pātañjala Yōga (intended for the suppression of the modifications of the mind, as a prelude to Samādhi or dissociation of the Ātman from the mind).

(8) Bādarāyaṇa refers (VS. 3-2-24) to a state called Samrādhana or worshipful mood in which the devotee sees even the transcendental Ātman. This has nothing to do with the Pātañjala Samādhi. The word used by the author of the Vedānta Sūtra, means the practice of devotion, deep meditation, and concentrated contemplation and other kindred mental acts of spiritual discipline.

There is another Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa (समाध्यभावच्च) [Samādhyābhāvācca], which is meant for giving a reason for holding that the individual self is an agent of action. Śāṅkara explains the meaning of the Sūtra by a statement that the prima-facie view is that even according to the Upanishads the Jīva must be considered to be an agent, as otherwise the Samādhi enjoined in the Śrutis would become purposeless. Here according to the author of the Bhāshya, the word Samādhi is a variant for Samādhānam (staying the mind on Ātman) by means of Śravaṇa, Manana and other means. It goes without saying that there is absolutely no inkling of the Pātañjala Yōga in this Sūtra, though some recent Vedāntins have been misled by the word Samādhi.

One important corollary, however, emerges out of the Bhāshya on this Sūtra. Since all the means of knowledge indicated by the words Drasṭavyah (to be seen), Śrōtavyah (to be listened to), Mantavyah (to be reflected upon), Nididhyāsitavyah. (to be contemplated upon), have been explained here as implying Samādhi (staying the mind exclusively on Ātman), the meaning of all these, may be subsumed under the act of being attentive. This is the same as what is denoted by the word Praṇidhānam in the following sentence from the Bhāshya :

लोकेऽपि -- इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णयेति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु प्रणिधानमात्रं कुरु इत्युच्यते, न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुरु इति। सू.भा.३-२-२१

“Even in common usage in directions like ‘Look at this’, ‘Listen to this’, one is directed to give a concentrated attention to the particular fact, and not to perform the act of knowing itself” Su.Bh. 3-2-21.

(9) Śravaṇa alone is quite sufficient for the achievement of the intuition of

Ātman in the case of competent enquirers who are able to grasp the exact signification of the terms involved in the proposition 'That thou art'. But in the case of those that are not able to intuit the identity of Brahman and the self on the very first listening, repetition of Śravaṇa and Manana may be necessary to remove the different misconceptions concerning Ātman (SB. 4-1-2).

This repetition of the combined practice of Śravaṇa and Manana, however, should not be taken to be the same as Nididhyāsana as some have misconceived it.

(10) While Śrutis recommending Śravaṇa, Manana and Nididhyāsana, do use verbs and participles that seem to imply injunctions, these means do not admit of being enjoined, and as we find no context in the Śruti in which any particular person undertook to perform these functions in response to an injunction, we need not take any notice of the serious contention of some recent Vedāntins who suppose that Bādarāyaṇa's Shārīraka Mīmāṃsā was undertaken to determine the person qualified, the subject-matter and the result accruing to one who undergoes these items of discipline. These seeming injunctions are simply meant, as Śankara says, to direct the attention of the seeker inwards:-

द्रष्टव्यादिशब्दा अपि परविद्याधिकारपठिताः तत्त्वाभिमुखीकरणप्रधानाः, न तत्त्वावबोधविधिप्रधाना ।
सू.भा.३-२-२१

Qualifications Necessary for Enquiry

69. It will be remembered that only the three direct means to vision (Śravaṇa, Manana and Nididhyāsana), have been mentioned and discussed here. The four indispensable qualifications including Nityānitya-Viveka and Vairāgya, are of course implied in the character of Maitreyī. The introductory narrative also implies that even Women, even though not qualified to perform Vedic rituals, may attain knowledge of the true Ātman under a competent preceptor's guidance, provided they are otherwise qualified.

70. Is there anything else remaining to be known or else done after the Ātman has been intuited? Yājñavalkya has answered this question in the most unequivocal language :-

स एष नेति नेत्यात्माऽगृह्यो न हि गृह्यतेऽशीर्यो न हि शीर्यतेऽसङ्गो न हि सज्यतेऽसितो न व्यथते
न रिष्यति विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयादित्युक्तानुशासनासि मैत्रेयि एतावदरे खल्वमृतत्वं इति होक्त्वा
याज्ञवल्क्यो विजहार ॥ बृ.४-५-१५

"This is the Ātman described as 'not this, not this'. He is ungraspable, for, He is never grasped; undecaying, for, He never decays; unattached, for, He is never attached; unfettered, for He never feels fear, and is never injured. With what, my dear, could one know the knower? O Maitreyī, you have been given the teaching. Only so much, my dear, is immortality. So saying, Yājñavalkya departed (to homelessness)." Br 4-5-15.

After knowing Ātman the Absolute, there remains nothing more to be done to attain immortality; for, to know that Ātman as Pure consciousness the Abso-

lute, is to be the Absolute.

From Misconceptions about Śāṅkara

THE IMMEDIATE MEANS TO KNOWLEDGE

66. We may now pass on to consider the nature and function of śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana taught as means to Darśana Vision of Ātman by Yājñavalkya to his spouse Maitreyi as found in the - Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. We need to digress here to discuss the vexed question of whether or not these have been enjoined. While there has been a notable conflict between two sub-commentaries of Śāṅkara regarding this matter, Śāṅkara himself has expressly proclaimed that the text containing participles, implying Injunction are only seemingly such. (विधिच्छायानि वचनानि) Their real aim is to turn the seeker back from the natural tendency to go outwards towards the external objects on the part of the aggregate of the body and the senses, and to urge one to set up a stream of thoughts towards the Ātman within.

तमात्यन्तिकपुरुषार्थवाञ्छिनं स्वाभाविकात्कार्यकरणसंघातप्रवृत्तिगोचराद्विमुखीकृत्य प्रत्यगात्मस्रोतस्तया प्रवर्तयन्ति ॥ (सू.भा. १-१-४)

But, then, there is another Sūtra in Śāṅkara's Bhāshya thereon, which uses the word 'Samādhi' which has misled some to succumb to the view that a compromise with the Yōga system of Patañjali is also recommended here by Bādarāyana according to Śāṅkara, The wording of the Sūtra is 'समाध्यभावाच्च' (सू.भा. २-३-३९). And because there would be no samādhi (if the individual self were not an agent' - VS.2-3-39). The Sūtra, literally taken, could of course mean that Samādhi is necessary for the Vedāntic knowledge of Ātman. But Śāṅkara's commentary leaves no doubt as to what is actually meant:-

योऽप्ययमौपनिषदात्मप्रतिपत्तिप्रयोजनः समाधिरुपदिष्टो वेदान्तेषु--- 'आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः (बृ. २-४-५) 'सोऽन्वेष्टव्यः स विजिज्ञासितव्यः' (छां. ८-७-१) 'ओमित्येवं ध्यायथ आत्मानम्' (मुं. २-२-६) इत्येवंलक्षणः, सोऽप्यसत्यात्मनः कर्तृत्वे नोपपद्येत ।

In this excerpt, there is the unequivocal statement of Śāṅkara that all these texts recommend samādhi (contemplation) needed for intuiting the Ātman taught by the Upanishads. The very first of the texts quoted here, contains Yājñavalkya's recommendation of śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana as the means for the vision of Ātman. We have no inkling anywhere of the eight steps of Pātañjala- Yōga in this or in any one of the texts cited here.

ARE PĀṆḌITYA AND OTHER MEANS THE SAME AS ŚRAVAṆA ETC.?

67. As impermissible as this equation of śravaṇa etc. with the steps of Pātañjala-Yōga, is the identification of Pāṇḍitya, bālyā, and mauna taught in another text with śravaṇa etc. That text in full reads as follows:

तस्माद् ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत् । बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिः । अमौनं च मौनं च निर्विद्याथ ब्राह्मणः । (३-५-१)

‘Therefore a Brāhmaṇa should try to stay in boyhood after having exhausted learning (paṇḍitya) and having exhausted boyhood and learning, he should be a muni; and having exhausted Mauna (contemplation) and non-mauna, he would be a (real) Brāhmaṇa.’ Br 3-5-1.

On the face of it the text refers to one who has already known Brahman and has nothing to do with śravaṇa and other means, as a cursory reading of Śaṅkara’s Bhāshya on VS. 3-4-47 would make it clear. The reader may look at the commentary on the text itself, and assure himself, if that be necessary at all, that the context is quite different from the one in which Yājñavalkya’s exhortation to his wife occurs.

IS A COMBINED PRACTICE OF ALL THE THREE MEANS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY ?

68. One more misconception about Śravaṇa and we shall close this topic. Are all the three means of knowledge beginning with śravaṇa, obligatory for all seekers of jñāna ? Two sub-commentaries answer the question in the affirmative. All the three are necessary for attaining jñāna, knowledge of Ātman, according to both of these interpreters. But as to which of these three is the principal and immediate means, there is a dissension between the two schools, nididhyāsana being most necessary according to one sub-commentator while śravaṇa is the only means to which the other two are subservient, according to another. Śaṅkara, however, differs from both of these views and unambiguously declares as follows :

(१) मनननिदिध्यासनयोरपि श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वात् ।

This is in reply to a contemporary commentator on the Sūtras, who supposed that the injunction of manana and nididhyāsana implies that śravaṇa alone is unable to produce jñāna. Śaṅkara says that both the subsequent recommendations of means are only for direct intuition just like śravaṇa, and so he implies that they are needed for those who are unable to attain jñāna by the single means of śravaṇa.

This is made crystal-clear elsewhere by him:-

येषां पुनः निपुणमतीनां न अज्ञानसंशयविपर्ययलक्षणः पदार्थविषयः प्रतिबन्धोऽस्ति, ते शक्नुवन्ति सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थम् अनुभवितुमिति, तान्प्रति आवृत्त्यानर्थक्यमिष्टमेव ॥ सू.भा. ४-१-२

Yet the sub-commentator who is biased in favour of nididhyāsana (or meditation) as the immediate indispensable means, ventures to interpret even this express statement to mean -

सकृदुक्तमेवेति । श्रुत्वा मत्वा क्षणमवधाय प्राग्भवीयाभ्यासजातसंस्कारात् इत्यर्थः ॥ वा.भा. पा. ९३३

Any reader who has even an elementary knowledge of Sanskrit, can see for himself that ‘सकृदुक्तमेव तत्त्वमसिवाक्यार्थम् अनुभूय’ (having intuited the Entity taught in the proposition ‘That thou art’ only once) cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be taken to mean ‘श्रुत्वा मत्वा क्षणमवधाय’ (having listened to, reflected upon, and carefully concentrating upon it for a moment). This glossator, of course, believes in contin-

ued practice of nididhyāsana, as absolutely necessary before the dawn of what he calls the Sakshātkāra (realization) of Ātman.

ŚĀṅKARA'S VERDICT AS REGARDS THE MEANS OF KNOWLEDGE

69. We should not close this section dealing with the consideration of the means to the knowledge of Brahman and Final Release, without reproducing one compact statement of Śāṅkara. The reader will do well to ponder over the meaning of this verdict of that Ācārya and to remind himself of Śāṅkara' s final conclusion in the matter, whenever he is confronted with any conflict of views on the part of Śāṅkarites or with adverse critics owing allegiance to other schools.

तस्माद्विद्यासंयुक्तं नित्यम् अग्निहोत्रादि विद्याविहीनं च उभयमपि मुमुक्षुणा मोक्षप्रयोजनोद्देशेन इह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे च प्राग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः कृतं यत्, तद्यथासामर्थ्यं ब्रह्माधिगमप्रतिबन्धकारणोपात्तदुरितक्षयहेतुत्वद्वारेण ब्रह्माधिगमकारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यमानं श्रवणमननश्रद्धातात्पर्याद्यन्तरङ्गकारणापेक्षं ब्रह्मविद्यया सह एककार्यं भवतीति स्थितम्।।सू.भा. ४-१-१८

“Therefore, this is the final conclusion : Obligatory Karma such as Agnihōtra whether combined with Vidyā (meditation), or not combined with Vidyā, practised either in this or a previous birth, by anyone longing for release before the dawn of knowledge, with a view to reach the goal of release, becomes in proportion to its efficacy, the cause of the destruction of accumulated sins which obstruct the knowledge of Brahman, and through indirectly co-operating with the proximate aids such as śravaṇa, Manana, faith and intent devotion culminates in bringing about the one effect namely Brahma-Vidyā leading to release.” Su.Bh. 4-1-18, 537.



14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.

From the Book Essays on Vedānta.

13. APPLICATION OF THE METHOD (Bondage and Release)

122. Vedānta as non-dualism advocating the Absolute Reality, the Ātman alone, can evidently admit of no distinction of the fall of the soul and release or attainment of the Highest Good after practising religious acts of discipline entitling to attain salvation. Yet the Upanishads do speak of release and practice of meditation or other means to attain freedom. How is this anomaly to be explained?

123. Advaitins of Śāṅkara's tradition, say that the Upanishads contain different teachings addressed to different levels of the spiritual mind. These levels are conceded only from the empirical stand-point. From the transcendental view, however, this distinction of bondage and release is overpassed. Is this distinction of vyavahāra and paramārtha a revolution brought about by Śāṅkara's tradition? In order to be able to answer this question, we have first of all to cull different texts from different Upanishads which speak of Release and Vyavahāra or empirical behaviour consisting of thought, speech and action.

The following are a few texts which contain words directly derived from the root muc (to set free):

(१) तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाभिपन्नं ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः ॥ श्वे. ६-१३

“Knowing that cause (of the universe) attained by Sāṅkhya and Yōga, one is freed from all bonds.” Sve. 6-13.

(२) अव्यक्तात् परः पुरुषो व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च ।

यं ज्ञात्वा मुच्यते जन्तुरमृतत्वं च गच्छति ॥ का. ६-८

“Beyond Avyakta (potential form of the universe), however, is the ‘Supreme Purusha’ all-pervading and without the liṅga (conditioning associate such as the mind), knowing whom the creature (Jīva) is freed and attains his immortal nature.” Ka. 6-8.

(३) वेदान्तविज्ञानसुनिश्चितार्थाः संन्यासयोगाद् यतयः शुद्धसत्त्वाः ।

ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे ॥ मुं. ३-२-६

“Those who have fully ascertained what is taught in the Vedāntas (Upanishads), by means of direct knowledge, who, by their endeavour, have purified their mind by the Yōga of renunciation, they, at the final time of death, become completely immortal in the Brahman worlds and are freed from all bonds.” Mu.3-2-6.

124. It is obvious that the freedom obtained through knowledge, can only mean freedom from ignorance of Reality; for knowledge is not something that cuts actual fetters asunder. That is why the Upanishads frequently speak of release from ignorance, or untying its knots.

तस्मै मृदितकषायाय तमसः पारं दर्शयति भगवान् सनत्कुमारः ॥

“To that Nārada, who has washed off the impurity of the mind, the revered Sanatkumara (now) shows the other shore of the darkness (of ignorance).” Cha.7-26-2.

त्वं हि नः पिता योऽस्माकंमविद्यायाः परं पारं तारयसि ॥ प्र. ६-८

“Thou art, indeed, our (real) father; for thou hast taken us across avidyā to the other shore.” Pr.6-8

पुरुष एवेदं विश्वं कर्म तपो ब्रह्म परामृतम् ।

एतद्यो वेद निहितं गुहायां सोऽविद्याग्रन्थिं विकिरतीह सोम्य ॥ मुं. २-१-१०

“All this is really the Purusha, Karma, the tapas (of knowledge), the highest immortal entity. He who knows this as placed in the cave of the heart, my friend, unties the knot of avidyā.” Mu.2-1-10.

125. Release (Mōksha) therefore, is release from ignorance and its effects such as desires, fear, grief, delusion, mental defects, weakness of the heart, old age, death and all other ills of mundane life:-

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः ।

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥ का. ६-१४

“When all the desires taking shelter in this Jīva’s heart are shattered, then mortal man becomes immortal, and attains Brahman here.” Kā.6-14.

यथा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः .

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्ब्रह्मनुशासनम् ॥ का. ६-१४

“When all the knots of the heart are cut asunder, then this mortal -Jīva becomes immortal. This is all the teaching (of Vedāntas).” Ka.6-15.

14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.

आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्। न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति ॥ तै. २-९

“Knowing the bliss of Brahman, one is afraid of nothing.” Tai.2-9.

अभयं वै जनक प्राप्तोऽसि’ ॥ बृ.४-२-४

“Fearlessness, indeed, hast thou attained Janaka !” Br 4-2-4.

तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ ई. ७

“There, what delusion, what grief, to one who has realized Oneness (of all).” Isa.7.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः।

क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे ॥ मुं. २-२-८

“The knot of the heart is untied, all doubts are cleared, this (Jiva’s) karmas are all destroyed, when that (Brahmātman) who is both the high and the low, is seen.” Mu.2-2-8.

आत्मना विन्दते वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दतेऽमृतम् ॥ के. २-४

“Through Ātman one attains vigour, through knowledge immortality,” Ke.2-4.

126. The individual self being bound and limited only by ignorance, a person attains his nature as Brahman and becomes the All so soon as he gains knowledge. This is from the Adhyārōpa standpoint utilized for the purpose of teaching; for everyone has been always Brahman, and therefore there is neither bondage nor release for anyone at all. This is the apavāda (rescission) which Śrutis make use of to teach the eternal truth:

(१) स यो ह वै तत् परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति नास्याब्रह्मवित्कुले भवति।
तरति शोकं तरति पाप्मानं गुहाग्रन्थिभ्यो विमुक्तोऽमृतो भवति ॥ मुं ३-२-९

“Whoever, indeed, knows that Highest Brahman, becomes that very Brahman. No one who does not know Brahman, is born in his line. He crosses grief, crosses sin, and, freed from the knots of the heart, he becomes immortal.” Mu.3-2-9.

(२) ब्रह्म वा इदं अग्र आसीत्। तदात्मानं एवावेत्। अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति। तस्मात्तत्सर्वं अभवत्। तद्यो यो देवानां प्रत्यबुध्यत स एव तदभवत् तथर्षीनां तथा मनुष्याणां। तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वाग्मदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्चेति। तदिदं अप्येतर्हि य एवं वेदाहं ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति तस्य ह न देवाश्च नाभूत्या ईशते। आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति। बृ. १-४-१०

“Thus was Brahman alone in the beginning. It knew itself thus ‘I am Brahman’; and as a consequence of that knowledge, it became everything. There, whoever among the gods know it, he alone became that All. So it was in the case of’Rshis, and so in the case of men. It was seeing this, that

Vāmadeva discovered the mantra ‘I have become Manu, and Surya’ And even now whoever knows this in the form ‘I am Brahman’ he becomes all this. Even the gods are not able to prevent him from becoming such, for he has become their very self.” Br1-4-10.

(३) ब्रह्म दाशा ब्रह्म दासा ब्रह्मैवेमे कित्वाः ॥ ब्रह्मसूक्ते

“Brahman are the fishermen; Brahman, the slaves and Brahman alone verily, are these gamblers.” —Brahmasūkta of the Atharva Veda.

127. It is from the highest Śāstraic standpoint that Gauḍapāda and Śāṅkara declare with one voice that there is none of the conventions of injunctions, Pramāṇas (means of knowledge), acts of discipline, bondage or release when one has realized that all is Brahman or Ātman :

(१) न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिर्न बद्धो न च साधकः ।

न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्त इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ गौ.का. २-३२

“There is neither dissolution nor origination (of the universe), neither a soul in bondage nor one practising the acts of discipline for release; neither one desirous of release nor anyone who has attained release at all. This is the Highest Truth.” GK. 2-32.

(२) तत्त्वमाध्यात्मिकं दृष्ट्वा तत्त्वं दृष्ट्वा तु बाह्यतः

तत्त्वीभूतस्तदारामस्तत्त्वादप्रच्युतो भवेत् ॥ गौ का. २-३८

“Having known the world within to be Reality itself, having known the world without to be Reality itself, and having become one with Reality and taking delight in It alone, one should never swerve from Reality.” GK. 2-38.

तस्मात् ‘अहं ब्रह्मास्मि’ इत्येतदवसाना एव सर्वे विधयः, सर्वाणि चेताराणि प्रमाणानि। न हि अहेयानुपादेयाद्वैतात्मावगतौ निर्विषयाण्यप्रमातृकाणि च प्रमाणानि भवितुमर्हन्ति।

“Therefore it is only until the intuition ‘I am Brahman’ dawns that all injunctions and all other Pramāṇas (valid means of knowledge) prevail. For when Ātman neither to be shunned nor to be taken up, has been intuited, Pramāṇas cannot continue to be, since thereafter they would have neither objects of knowledge, nor knowers desiderating the help of the means,” Su.Bh. 1-1-4.

अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितकार्यकरणोपाधिनिमित्तोऽयं शारीरान्तर्यामिणोर्भेदव्यपदेशः, न पारमार्थिकः। एको हि प्रत्यगात्मा भवति, न द्वौ प्रत्यगात्मानौ संभवतः। एकस्यैव तु भेदव्यवहार उपाधिकृतः, यथा ‘घटाकाशो महाकाश’ इति। तत च ज्ञातृज्ञेयादिभेदश्रुतयः प्रत्यक्षादीनि च प्रमाणानि संसारानुभवो विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रं चेति सर्वमेतदुपपद्यते। तथा च श्रुतिः ‘यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति’ (बृ. ४-५-१५) इत्यविद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं दर्शयति। ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत्तत्केन कं पश्येत्’ (बृ. ४-५-१५) इति विद्याविषये सर्वं व्यवहारं वारयति ॥

14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.

“This distinction between the embodied soul and the inner controller is due to the conditioning associate of the body and senses presented by avidyā, and not real. For there can be only one inmost Ātman, and there cannot be two inmost selves. The same Ātman is treated as though there were distinction in Him, just as we speak of a pot-ether and the universal ether. And from this (view-point), Śruti teaching the distinction of the knower, the known etc., valid; means of knowledge such as perception, experience of saṁsāra, the Śāstra of injunction, prohibition and all that becomes possible. Accordingly the Śruti points to all conventional procedure in the region of ignorance when it says ‘Where there is duality as it were, there one sees another.’ (Br, 4-5- 15), and wards off all (conventions of human) procedure in the sphere of knowledge when it says, ‘Where, however, to this knower, all becomes Ātman alone, there, what could one see and with what? (Br 4-5-15)” Su.Bh. 1:-2-20

पूर्वासिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि ‘त्रिष्वपि कालेष्वकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीम्, नापि भविष्यत्काले’ इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति। एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते। अन्यथा हि अनादिकालप्रवृत्तानां कर्मणां क्षयाभावे मोक्षाभावः स्यात्। न च देशकालनिमित्तापेक्षो मोक्षः कर्मफलवत् भवितुमर्हति। अनित्यत्वप्रसङ्गात्, परोक्षत्वानुपपत्तेश्च ज्ञानफलस्य। सू.भा. ४-१-१३

“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 divisions of time. I was never a doer or experiencer even before this, nor am I such now, nor shall I be such even in the future time. ‘It is only thus that release would be possible; for otherwise, there would be no release at all since karmas which have continued to function from time without a beginning, could not be exhausted, nor can release be an event depending upon some place, time or cause like the fruit of karmas; for in that case, it would be impermanent. This is so for another reason, to wit, that the result of knowledge (of Ātman) cannot be reasonably remote.” Su.Bh.4-1-13.

तमेतमविद्याख्यमात्मानात्मनोरितरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारा लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः। सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेधमोक्षपराणि। कथं पुनरविद्यावद्विषयाणि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि चेति ? उच्यते। देहेन्द्रियादिष्वहंममाभिमानरहितस्य प्रमातृत्वानुपपत्तौ प्रमाणप्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेः।

“On the presupposition of this mutual superimposition of the Self (Ātman) and not-self, called avidyā, all the conventions of Pramāṇa (means of knowledge) and Prameya (object of knowledge) - both seeular and Vedic - start, as also all Śāstras treating of injunctions and prohibitions and of release.

[That is to say, all human procedure presupposes avidyā]

(Question :-) But how are (we to know that) the means of knowledge such

as perception, and the Śāstras, are intended only for the ignorant?

(Answer) To this, we reply :- Inasmuch as a person who does not regard the body and senses etc- as himself and his own, cannot be a cognizer, the means of knowledge cannot function in his case. Adhyāsa Bh.

न हीन्द्रियाण्यनुपादाय प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः संभवति । न चाधिष्ठानमन्तरेणेन्द्रियाणां व्यवहारः संभवति । न चानध्यस्तात्मभावेन देहेन कश्चिद्ब्रह्माप्रियते । न चैतस्मिन् सर्वस्मिन्नसति असंगस्यात्मनः प्रमातृत्वमुपपद्यते । न च प्रमातृत्वमन्तरेण प्रमाणप्रवृत्तिरस्ति । तस्मादविद्यावद्विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणि च ॥

(To explain.-) The convention of perception and other Pramāṇas etc., is not possible without the senses; and the senses cannot function without the body as their basis; and no one could be active without identifying oneself with the body. Nor could there be cognizership in Ātman unattached to anything, without presuming all this. And without cognizership there can be no functioning of the means of knowledge. Therefore, means of knowledge such as perception, as also the Śāstras, are only for the ignorant.” Adh. Bh.

[Everyone who imagines himself to be a knower, presumes that he is the body on which the senses depend. But really, his real nature as Ātman is unrelated to the body or the senses which he calls ‘me’ and ‘mine’.]

नेयं श्रुतिरचेतनस्य सत्त्वस्य भोक्तृत्वं वक्ष्यामीति प्रवृत्ता; किं तर्हि चेतनस्य क्षेत्रज्ञस्याभोक्तृत्वं ब्रह्मस्वभावतां च वक्ष्यामीति । तदर्थं सुखदुःकादिविक्रियावति सत्त्वे भोक्तृत्वमध्यारोपयति । इदं हि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञयोरितरेतरस्वभावाविवेककृतं कल्प्यते । परमार्थतस्तु नान्यतरस्यापि संभवति, अचेतनत्वात्सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियत्वाच्च क्षेत्रज्ञस्य । अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्वभावत्वाच्च सत्त्वस्य सुतरां न संभवति । तथा च श्रुतिः ‘यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात् तत्रान्योऽन्यत्पश्येत्’ इत्यादिना स्वप्नदृष्टहस्त्यादिव्यवहारवदविद्याविषय एव कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहारं दर्शयति; ‘यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कं पश्येत्’ इत्यादिना च विवेकिनः कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहाराभावं दर्शयति ॥

“This (Paingī) Śruti does not aim at attributing experiencing nature to the insentient mind, but only intends to declare that the sentient kshetrajña (individual self) is not (really) an experiencer, but is of the nature of Brahman. To that end, it superimposes experiencing nature on the mind which is subject to pleasure and other changeful moods.”

[This is an instance of deliberate superimposition of some characteristic to negate some other superimposed characteristic of Ātman.]

“For this nature of being active and experiencing, is a fictitious invention due to non-discrimination of the respective nature of the mind and the Self. Really, however, it cannot conceivably pertain to either of these, for the mind is insentient and the Self is changeless. It is altogether inconceivable in the case of the mind, since it is of the nature of an appearance presented

14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.

by avidyā, Accordingly, the Śruti beginning with 'Where, indeed, there is duality, as it were, there one would see something other' shows how all such conventions as of an agent of action, belong to the sphere of ignorance and are similar to one's procedure with regard to an elephant etc. seen in a dream. And it shows the absence of all procedure such as of an agent etc. in the case of a man of discrimination, by the statement beginning with 'Where, to this one, all has become Ātman, there, what could one see and with what' (Bṛ 4-5-15)." Su.Bh. 1-2-12,

[Here Śaṅkara says in so many words that human procedure is shown to be restricted to the sphere of ignorance only, and this is taught to be so by the Śruti by the method of adhyāropāvāda.]

128. It is by the method of deliberate superimposition, therefore, that all ills of mundane life, are attributed by Vedāntins to the not-selves to negate what is usually conceived to be a property of the self in empirical life. As a matter of fact, the so-called individual self, has always been free from all saṁsāric defects. Here is a Sanskrit verse ascribed to Śaṅkara, which is sung by hundreds of Indian devotees of Vedānta every day, putting this method in a nutshell:

नाहं देहो जन्ममृत्यू कुतो मे । नाहं प्राणः क्षुत्पिपासे कुतो मे ।

नाहं चित्तं शोकमोहौ कुतो मे । नाहं कर्ता बन्धमोक्षौ कुतो मे ॥

"I am not this body; whence could birth and death come to me? I am not the life-force; whence could hunger and thirst come to me? I am not the mind; whence could grief and delusion come to me? Nor am I the ego; whence could bondage and release possibly come to me?"

From the Book Misconceptions about Śaṅkara:

Misconception about disembodiedness:

31. The reader of Śaṅkara's Bhāshya will recall how Śaṅkara makes use of this dictum of the superimposition of the body and Ātman again and again, to show how Final Release from the evils of mundane life is only to recognise one's eternal bodilessness. Thus in the commentary of the fourth Sūtra, after describing the whole gamut of life possible for individual selves, he comes to the conclusion that Śrutis and Smṛtis aided by reason, show that the gradation of pleasure and pain felt by creatures is all the result of embodiedness due to Avidyā and other defects. He quotes the Chāndōgya Śruti which says that being beset with pleasure and pain is inevitable for an embodied being, and that the pleasure and pain can never touch one who is bodiless, thus leading to the conclusion that Final Release or bodilessness is no effect of Dharma or religious duty which can only give its result to an embodied being. To an objection that bodilessness might itself be the effect of Dharma or Religious duty, he replies "No, for it is the intrinsic nature of one's Ātman."

Again in the commentary on the same Sūtra (1.1.4), he writes:

शरीरे पतितेऽशरीरत्वं स्यात्, न जीवत इति चेत्, न। सशरीरत्वस्य मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तत्वात्।

“(Objection:) Bodilessness can come only after the falling off of the body and not to one, living.”

“(Reply:) No; for embodiedness is due to a misconception.”

And after showing at length how embodiedness is only due to a false identification with the unreal body, he concludes:

तस्मान्मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात्सशरीरत्वस्य, सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषोऽशरीरत्वम्।

“Therefore, embodiedness being only due to a false notion, it is to be concluded that bodilessness is the nature of a wise one even while living.”
Su.Bha.1.1.4.

In the face of this unequivocal declaration supported by intuition and reason, some of the sub-commentators have ventured to proclaim that, according to Śāṅkara, Videha Mukti (Release after death) is the only release in the primary sense and that Jīvanmukti (freedom while the knower of Brahman is alive), can be only secondary release, since he has the body to sustain which a little portion or residue of Avidyā continues to be till the fructifying karmas are quite exhausted! This is probably because they have been unable to assess a statement of Śāṅkara’s found elsewhere in the Bhāshya:

एवं धर्माधर्मयोर्बन्धहेत्वोः विद्यासामर्थ्यादश्लेषविनाशसिद्धेः। अवश्यंभाविनी विदुषः शरीरपाते मुक्तिरित्यवधारयति ॥

“(The particle ‘tu’ in this form is intended) to emphasise that in as much as virtue and sin, which are the cause of bondage, having been shown respectively not to taint Ātman (in the case of virtuous act), and to be destroyed (in the case of sin), by virtue of Brahma-vidyā, release must necessarily ensue to the knower after his body has fallen.Su.Bha.4.1.14.

Failing to see the convention of the eschatological mukti is only a concession to the vyāvahāric view that man has a body, the vyākhyāna schools have succumbed to the belief that release is really an event in time to be attained after exhausting all karmas.

From The Upanishadic Approach to Reality: Chapter 7, Section 11.

FINAL RELEASE

There is no ambiguity whatever with regard to Final Release, either in the Śruti or in the Bhāshya. Śāṅkara quotes three texts and writes:-

(१) इति चैवमाद्याः श्रुतयो मोक्षप्रतिबन्धनिवृत्तिमात्रमेव आत्मज्ञानस्य फलं दर्शयन्ति ॥ सू. भा. १-१-४.

“These and other Śruti teach that the effect of Atmajñāna, is only the

removal of (nescience) the obstacle to Release." Su.Bh. 1-1-4.

[Release which is already there, manifests itself as soon as ignorance is removed. Knowledge does not create Release.]

(२) इदं तु पारमार्थिकं कूटस्थनित्यम्, व्योमवत् सर्वव्यापि, सर्वविक्रियारहितम्, नित्यतृप्तम्, निरवयवम्, स्वयञ्जयोतिःस्वभावम्; यत्र धर्माधर्मे सह कार्येण कालत्रयं च नोपावर्तते। तदेतद् अशरीरत्वं मोक्षाख्यम्॥ सू. भा. १-१-४.

"This, however, is really real, unchangingly eternal, all-pervading like the ether, devoid of all modifications, ever-content, without parts, self-effulgent by nature. This is that unembodiedness called Release, wherein good and bad deeds together with their effects and time, consisting of the three periods of time, never flourish." Su.Bh. 1-1-4.

(३) अपि च विद्यासाधनं स्ववीर्यविशेषात् स्वफल एव विद्यायां कञ्चिदतिशयमासञ्जयेत् न विद्याफले मुक्तौ। तद्धि असाध्यं नित्यसिद्धस्वभावमेव विद्यया अधिगम्यत इत्यसकृदवोचाम। न च तस्या-मप्युक्तर्षनिकर्षात्मकोऽतिशयः उपपद्यते, निकृष्टाया विद्यात्वाभावात्। उत्कृष्टैव हि विद्या भवति। तस्मात् तस्यां चिराचिरोत्पत्तिरूपोऽतिशयो भवन् भवेत्, न तु मुक्तौ कश्चिदतिशयसंभवोऽस्ति।। सू.भा. ३-४-५२, पा. ४५९.

Here Śaṅkara expressly declares that neither in the knowledge of Brahman, nor in the Final Release, can there be gradations. Strictly speaking, Mukti or Release is already there, for it is of the very nature of Brahman, which is ever-existing. And the knowledge of Brahman, being of the very stuff of intuition, is absolutely changeless being beyond time and no effect of any religious deed performed.

Nevertheless, followers of the sub-commentary schools have imagined gradations in the knowers of Brahman - Brahmavid (knower), Brahmavidvara (better knower), Brahmavidvarīya (still better knower), and Brahmavidvarishṭha (the best of knowers)!

As for Mukti (Freedom), it is obvious that according to Śaṅkara, knowledge reveals Mukti instantly. Empirically speaking, however, he says that misconception even after sublation, may continue to appear like the knowledge of the double moon occurring to some one owing to cataract:-

बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कञ्चित्कालम् अनुवर्तत एव।। सू. भा. ४-१-१४.

Unable to distinguish the two stand-points of view, empirical and transcendental, the Post-Śaṅkara Vedāntins have built up various theories in this respect.

(१) कारणविगमेऽपि कार्यशेषानुवृत्तिः संस्कारात् ; अतो लब्धवृत्तिकर्मसंस्कारात्, तद्विपाकसंस्काराद् वा विदुषोऽपि शरीरस्थितिः।। ब्र. सि.पा. १३२.

Here the living-free knower of Brahman is said to continue to bear his body, because of the initial velocity of fructified karma - according to Maṇḍana. Being a realistic Vedāntin, he could not appreciate Śaṅkara's discussion of 'the continuance of the misconception' though sublated by correct knowledge.

(२) अज्ञानलेशोऽस्त्येव विदुषोऽपि कश्चित्, कञ्चित् कालं शरीरस्थितेरिष्टत्वात् ॥ इ. सि., पा. ७४.

The author of *Ishta-Siddhi* believes not merely in Samskāra, but also a little bit of it!

अविद्यालेशो वा कर्मलेशवत् संस्कारशब्देनाभिलष्येत इति निरवद्यम् ॥ पं.वि. पा.१०६.

The author of the *Vivaraṇa* admits Samskāra or, as an alternative, a bit of Avidyā!

How the undefinable avidyā-śakti happens to be a real material cause of something and how it persists affecting even a free knower, is really passing strange.

On the whole, the Post-Śāṅkara advaitins may be said to lean towards the doctrine of BhartṛPrapañcha, who held that Mōksha was of two kinds, one being realization of Brahmic nature during this life, and the other merging in Brahman after the fall of the body. In any case, they have completely ignored Śāṅkara's teaching that Mōksha is self-established, and has only to be intuited by the wisdom of the secondless Ātman.

From the Book Vedānta Prakriyā Pratyabhijñā (Introduction, Section 7, subsection 4 on Maṇḍana)

In discussing the immediate effect of Brahmajñāna, Maṇḍana remarks that the knower would attain release immediately after he shuffles off the mortal coil. This departure from the body would be sooner or later according to the rigour of one's karma to be exhausted. According to this philosopher there are two alternatives which we may predicate of a person who lives on for some time after he has acquired the knowledge of Brahman. Either he is practicing the meditation needful for complete realisation, which becomes perfected at the time of death, or else, he is really a perfect soul whose dealing in life-even while they appear to be just like those of the ignorant-have this point of difference that the wise one is not obsessed with the idea of their reality (Br. Si. 131-132).

This pathetically realistic description of one who has realised the truth, betrays a woeful disregard of the two standpoints of view which a student of Upanishads has constantly to bear in mind. For, from the transcendental point of view, there is no body, mind or senses limiting any one, since all distinctions are nought, the only reality being Brahman, or Ātman. From the empirical point of view, the jñāni is only one among other egos, while he is a miracle in the eyes of seekers of knowledge. The experience of the sthitaprajña described in the Gītā, can never be exactly defined in empirical terms. From the transcendental point of view, there is no question of the jñāni leaving behind him the body or an independent objective world, for it never existed for him. The idea that he deals with other egos and that the world goes on even after his departure, is true enough empirically, but it can never affect Reality as it is.

The account given here of Maṇḍana's School will be enough to show the difference between the traditional method of Vedānta exhibited by Śāṅkara and the method or methods employed by Post-Śāṅkaras. For, Maṇḍana's method may

14. The Nature Of Liberation And The Liberated One.

be taken as typical of all. Profession of the authority of Scriptures and quoting them with interpretation so as to suit one's own dogmatic views is the uniform line adopted throughout. For fear of prolixity, I refer the reader to the Sanskrit original for details.



Appendix:

Bhāshya Vākyas related to the topics

भाष्यवाक्यानि विषयसंबद्धानि

Appendix

Bhāshya Vākyas related to the topics भाष्यवाक्यानि विषयसंबद्धानि

01. अध्यारोपापवादस्वरूपं

१. दर्शयति च श्रुतिः पररूपप्रतिषेधेनैव ब्रह्म - निर्विशेषत्वात् - 'अथात आदेशो नेति नेति' 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि' 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' इत्येवमाद्या। बाष्कलिना च बाध्वः पृष्टः सन् अवचनेनैव ब्रह्म प्रोवाचेति शूयते- 'स होवाचाधीहि भो इति स तूष्णीं बभूव तं ह द्वितीये तृतीये वा वचन उवाच ब्रूमः खलु त्वं तु न विजानासि। उपशान्तोऽयमात्मा' इति। तथा स्मृतिष्वपि परप्रतिषेधेनैवोपदिश्यते- 'ज्ञेयं यत्तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि यज्ज्ञात्वामृतमश्नुते। अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते' इत्येवमाद्यासु। तथा विश्वरूपधरो नारायणो नारदमुवाचेति स्मर्यते - 'माया ह्येषा मया सृष्टा यन्मां पश्यसि नारद। सर्वभूतगुणैर्युक्तं नैवं मां ज्ञातुमर्हसि' इति ॥ ब्र.सू.भा. ३.२.१७

२. अथवा 'नेति नेति' इति वीप्सायाम्।। वीप्सायां तु सत्यां समस्तस्य विषयजातस्य प्रतिषेधनात् अविषयः प्रत्यगात्मा ब्रह्म इति जिज्ञासा निवर्तते। ब्र. सू. भा. ३.२.२३

३. वेदाः अवेदाः इति वचनात् इष्यत एव अस्माभिः श्रुतेरप्यभावः प्रभोदे। ब्र. सू. भा. ४.१.३

४. उपाधिकृतम् मिथ्यारूपमपि अस्तित्वाधिगमाय ज्ञेयधर्मवत् परिकल्प्य उच्यते "सर्वतःपणिपादं" इत्यादि। तथा हि संप्रदायविदां वचनं "अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते" इति। गी. भा. १३.१३

५. अपवादो नाम यत्र कस्मिञ्चित् वस्तुनि पूर्वनिविष्टायां मिथ्याबुद्धौ निश्चितायां पश्चात् उपजायमाना यथार्थबुद्धिः पूर्वनिविष्टायाः मिथ्याबुद्धेः निर्वर्तिका भवति। यथा देहेन्द्रियसंघाते आत्मबुद्धिः आत्मन्येव आत्मबुद्ध्या पश्चाद्भाविन्या 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यनया निवर्त्यते। यथावा दिग्भ्रान्तिबुद्धिः दिग्ग्याथाम्यबुद्ध्या निवर्तते। ब्र. सू. भा. ३.३.९

६. तथा अध्यारोपितनामरूपकर्मद्वारेण ब्रह्म निर्दिश्यते 'विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म', 'विज्ञानघन एव', 'ब्रह्म', 'आत्मा' इत्येवमादिशब्दैः। बृ. भा. २.३.६

02. परमार्थदृष्टिव्यवहारदृष्टिभेदः

- १) अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते। (सू. भा. २-१-२७)
- २) सर्ववादिभिः अविद्याकृतव्यवहारभ्युपगमात्। परमार्थानभ्युपगमाच्च ॥ (मां का. भा ३-५)
- ३) तदर्थं सुखदुःकादिविक्रियावति सत्त्वे भोक्तृत्वमध्यारोपयति। इदं हि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वं च सत्त्वक्षेत्रज्ञ योरितरेतरस्वभावाविवेककृतं कल्प्यते। परमार्थतस्तु नान्यतरस्यापि संभवति, अचेतनत्वात् सत्त्वस्य, अविक्रियत्वाच्च क्षेत्रज्ञस्य। अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितस्वभावत्वाच्च सत्त्वस्य सुतरां न संभवति। तथा च श्रुतिः 'यत्र वा अन्यदिव स्यात्तत्रान्योऽन्यत्पश्येत्' इत्यादिना स्वप्नदृष्टहस्त्यादिव्यवहारवदविद्याविषय एव कर्तृत्वादिव्यवहारं दर्शयति। (१-२-१२)
- ४) तस्मात् प्राग्ब्रह्मात्मताप्रबोधात् उपपन्नः सर्वो लौकिको वैदिकश्च व्यवहारः। (सू. भा २-१-१४)
- ५) स च स्वात्मभूतानेव घटाकाशस्थानीयान् अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितनामरूपकृतकार्यकरणसंघातानुरोधिना जीवाख्यान् विज्ञानात्मनः प्रति ईष्टे व्यवहारविषये। (सू. भा. २-१-१४)
- ६) यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या परमात्मतत्त्वाच्छ्रुत्यनुसारिभिरन्यत्वेन निरूप्यमाणे नामरूपे मृदादिविकारवद्वस्त्वन्तरे तत्त्वतो न स्तः सलिलफेनघटादिविकारवदेव तदा तदपेक्ष्यऽएकमेवाद्वितीयऽनेह नानास्ति किञ्चने त्यदिपरमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते। यदा तु स्वाभाविक्याविद्यया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनस्वरूपवदेव स्वेन रूपेण वर्तमानं केनचिदस्पृष्टस्वभावमपि सन्नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधायते नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव च भवति स्वाभाविकी तदा सर्वोऽयं वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वव्यवहारः ॥ (बृ. भा. ३-५-१)
- ७) विज्ञानं चेतनम्, अविज्ञानं तद्रहितम् अचेतनम्, पाषाणादि। सत्यं च व्यवहारविषयम्, अधिकारात्। न परमार्थसत्यम्। एकमेव हि परमार्थसत्यं ब्रह्म। इह पुनर्व्यवहार विषयम् आपेक्षिकं सत्यम्, मृगतृष्णिकाद्यनृतापेक्षया उदकादि सत्यम् उच्यते। (तै. भा २-६)

03. विद्याविद्ययोः स्वरूपं, अविद्यायाः निवृत्तिप्रकाराः

- १) तामसोहि प्रत्ययः आवरणात्मिकत्वादविद्या विपरीतग्राहकः, संशयोपस्थापको वा, अग्रहणत्मको वा। विवेकप्रकाशाभावे तदाभावात्। तामसे च आवरणात्मके तिमिरादिदोषे सति अग्रहणादेरविद्ययात्रयस्योपलब्धेः। गी. भा. १३.२
- २) मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य अहमिदम् ममेदम् इति नैसर्गिकोयम् लोकव्यवहारः। ब्र. सू. अ. भा.
- ३) तमेतम् एवम् लक्षणम् अध्यासम् पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते। ब्र. सू. अ. भा.
- ४) तमेतम् अविद्याख्यम् आत्मानात्मनेरितरेतराध्यासम् पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः लौकिका वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः। ब्र. सू. अ. भा.

Appendix

५) एवमयम् अनादिरन्तो नैसर्गिकोध्यासः मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्ताः ।
ब्र. सू. अ. भा.

६) विद्योत्पत्तौ अविद्यायाः हि अस्तत्वात् तदाश्रये अविद्यानुपपत्तेः । न हि अग्निरुष्णः प्रकाशश्च इति
विज्ञानोत्पत्तौ यस्मिन् आश्रये तदुत्पन्नम्, तस्मिन्नेवाश्रये शीतोऽग्निरप्रकाशो वा इत्यविद्याया उत्पत्तिः, नापि
संशयः अज्ञानं वा । (ई.भा-१८)

७) यदि ज्ञानाभावः. यदि संशयज्ञानं यदि विपरीतज्ञानं वा उच्यते सर्वं हि ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्यते । बृ. भा.
३.३.१

८) क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोर्विषयविषयिणोः भिन्नस्वभावयोः इतरेतरतद्धर्माद्ध्यासलक्षणः संयोगः क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञ-
स्वरूपविवेकाभावनिबन्धनः । गी. भा. १३.२६

९) सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य आत्मभूते इव अविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये
संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्य ईश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिः इति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते । ब्र. सू.
भा. २.१.१४

१०) तद्विवेकेन च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यां आहुः । ब्र. सू. अ. भा.

११) प्रतिषिद्धसर्वविशेषस्यापि ब्रह्मणः सर्वशक्तियोगः संभवति इत्येतदपि अविद्याकल्पितरूपभेदोपन्यासे
नोक्तमेव । ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.३१

१२) विद्याविद्ययोः तद्धर्मत्वम् इति चेत् । न । प्रत्यक्षत्वात् । विवेकाविवेकौ रूपादिवत् प्रत्यक्षौ उपलभ्येते
अन्तःकरणस्थौ । न हि रूपस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य सतो द्रष्टृधर्मत्वम् । अविद्या च स्वानुभवेन रूप्यते 'मूढोहम्,
अविविक्तं मम विज्ञानम्' इति । तथा विद्याविवेकोनुभूयते । उपदिशन्ति च अन्येभ्य आत्मनो विद्यां
बुधाः । तथा च न्ये अवधारयन्ति । तस्मात् नामरूपपक्षस्यैव विद्याविद्ये । नामरूपे च नात्मधर्मौ ।
'नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद् ब्रह्म' (छां. ८-१४-१) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् । ते च पुनर्नामरूपे सवितरि
अहोरात्रे इव कल्पिते न परमार्थतो विद्यमाने ॥ (तै.भा २-८)

१३) यथालोके.....तद्विषयाज्ञानतिरोभावश्च (बृ. भा. १-४-१०)

१४) अत इदमविद्यायाः सत्त्वमुक्तं भवति ।

सर्वात्मानं सन्तमसर्वात्मत्वेन ग्राहयति ।

आत्मनोऽन्यद्धस्त्वरमविद्यमानं प्रत्युपस्थापयति ।

आत्मानमसर्वमापादयति । (बृ.भा-४-३-२०)

१५) अविद्यादिदोषनिवृत्तिफलावसानत्वात् विद्यायाः । य एवाविद्यादिदोषनिवृत्तिफलकृत्प्रत्यय आद्योऽन्त्यः
सन्ततोऽसन्ततो वा स एव विद्येत्यभ्युपगमात्त्र चोद्यस्यावतारगन्धोऽप्यस्ति (बृ-भा १-४-१०)

१६) विद्यायां हि सत्याम् उदिते सवितं शार्वरमिव तमः प्रणाशमुपगच्छत्यविद्या ॥ (गी.भा २-६९)

१७) न हि क्वचित्साक्षाद्ब्रह्मस्तुधर्मस्यापोद्गी दृष्टा कर्त्री वा विद्या । अविद्यायास्तु सर्वत्रैव निवर्तिका दृश्यते ।
तथेहाप्यब्रह्मत्वमसर्वत्वं च अविद्याकृतमेव निवर्त्यतां ब्रह्मविद्यया । बृ. भा. १.४.१०

04. प्रातिभासिकवस्तुविचारः

- १) प्रत्येत्येव हि केवलं न तु तत्र रजतमस्ति। (सू.भा ४-१-५)
- २) स्मृतिरूपः परत्र पूर्वदृष्टावभासः ॥ (सू भा. अव)

05. मायास्वरूपम्

१) अविद्यात्मिका हि सा बीजशक्तिः आव्यक्तशब्दनिर्देश्या परमेश्वराश्रया मायामयी महासुप्तिः, यस्यां स्वरूपप्रतिबोधरहिताः शेरते संसारिणो जीवाः। तदेतदव्यक्तं क्वचिदाकाशशब्दनिर्दिष्टम् ‘एतस्मिन्नु खल्वक्षरे गार्ग्याकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्च’(३-८-११) इति श्रुतेः। क्वचिदक्षरशब्दोदितम् ‘अक्षरात् परतः परः’ (मुं २-१-२) इति श्रुतेः; क्वचिन् मायेति सूचितम् ‘मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान् मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्’ इति मन्त्रवर्णात्; अव्यक्ता हि सा माया, तत्त्वान्यत्वनिरूपणस्याशक्यत्वात् (सू. भा १-४-३)

२) ‘तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः’ इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वरूपात् सर्वज्ञात् सर्वशक्तेरीश्वराज्जगज्जनिस्थितिप्रलयाः, नाचेतनात् प्रधानादन्यस्माद्वा इत्येषोऽर्थः प्रतिज्ञातः “जन्माद्यस्य यतः” इति; सा प्रतिज्ञा तदवस्थैव, न तद्विरुद्धोऽर्थः पुनरिहोच्यते। कथं नोच्यते, अत्यन्तमात्मन एकत्वमद्वितीयत्वं च ब्रुवता ? श्रुणु यथा नोच्यते--- सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्यात्मभूते इवाविद्याकल्पिते नामरूपे तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीये संसारप्रपञ्चबीजभूते सर्वज्ञस्येश्वरस्य माया, शक्तिः, प्रकृतिरिति च श्रुतिस्मृत्योरभिलष्येते। ताभ्यामन्यः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरः, ‘आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद् ब्रह्म’ इति श्रुतेः, ‘नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि’ ‘सर्वाणि रूपाणि विचित्य धीरो नामानि कृत्वाभिवदन्यदास्ते’ ‘एकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति’ इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्य च। (सू.भा. २-१-१४)

३) अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते। (सू. भा. २-१-२७)

४) तस्मात् आत्मैकत्वप्रतिपत्त्यर्था कल्पिता सृष्टिः अभूतैव प्राणसंवादवत्। “इन्द्रो मायाभिः” (बृ. २-५-१९) इति अभूतार्थप्रतिपादकेन मायाशब्देन व्यपदेशात्। ननु प्रज्ञानवचनो मायाशब्दः। सत्यम्। इन्द्रियप्रज्ञाया अविद्यामयत्वेन मायात्वाभ्युपगमात् अदोषः। मायाभिः इन्द्रियप्रज्ञाभिः अविद्यारूपाभिः इत्यर्थः। “अजायमानो बहुधा विजायते” (तै.आ. ३-१३) इति श्रुतेः। (मां ३-२४)

५) इन्द्रः परमेश्वरः मायाभिः प्रज्ञाभिः नामरूपभूतकृतमिथ्याभिमानैर्वा न तु परमार्थतः पुरुरूपो बहुरूपः ईयते गम्यते एकरूप एव प्रज्ञानघनः सन् अविद्याप्रज्ञाभिः। (बृ.भा. २-५-१९)

६) एक एव परमेश्वरः अविद्यया, मायया..... अस्ति। (सू.भा १-३-१९)

७) अस्ति चायमपरो दृष्टान्तः “यथा स्वयं प्रसारितया मायया मायावी त्रिष्वपि कालेषु न संस्पृश्यते, अवस्तुत्वात्, एवं परमात्मापि संसारमायया न संस्पृश्यते” (सू भा २-१-९)

८) माया इति अविद्यमानस्य आख्या। (मां का ४-५८)

९) मया सर्वतः दृशिमात्रस्वरूपेण अविक्रियात्मना अध्यक्षेण मम माया त्रिगुणात्मिका अविद्यालक्षणा प्रसूतिः सूयते उत्पादयति सचराचरं जगत्। (गी.भा ९-१०)

06. शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्

१) अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, न; अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य। न हि सास्त्रं इदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति, किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.४

२) अपि च अन्त्यमिदं प्रमाणं आत्मैकत्वस्य प्रतिपादकं नातःपरं किञ्चिदाकाङ्क्ष्यमस्ति। ...। सति हि अन्यस्मिन्नवशिष्यमाणे अर्थे आकाङ्क्षा स्यात्, नत्वात्मैकत्वव्यतिरेकेणावशिष्यमाणोऽन्योऽर्थोऽस्ति य आकाङ्क्षेत। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१४

३) न चेत्यमवगतिर्नोपपद्यत इति शक्यं वदितुम्। 'तद्धास्य विजज्ञौ' इत्यादि श्रुतिभ्यः। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१४

४) कर्मफले हि स्वर्गादौ अनुभवानारूढे स्यादाशङ्का भवेद्वा न वा इति। अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलं 'यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म' (बृ. ३.४.१) इति श्रुतेः, 'तत्त्वमसि' (छा. ६.८.७) इति च सिद्धवदुपदेशात्। ब्र. सू. भा. ३.३.३२

५) आत्मविज्ञानस्य फलपर्यन्तत्वात् न तद्विषयस्य शास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्यं शक्यं प्रत्याख्यातुम्। न चानुमानगम्यं शास्त्रप्रामाण्यम्। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.४

६) प्रमातृत्वं ह्यात्मनो निवर्तयत्यन्त्यं प्रमाणम्। निवर्तयदेव चाप्रमाणीभवति स्वप्नकालप्रमाणमिव प्रबोधे। गी. भा. २.६९

७) वेदस्य हि निरपेक्षं स्वार्थं प्रामाण्यं रवेरिव रूपविषये। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१

८) न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्। किं तु श्रुत्यादय अनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवमिह प्रमाणम्। अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.२

९) रूपाद्यभावाद्धि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षगोचरः। लिंगाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनां ॥ (सू.भा २-१-७)

१०) 'तं त्वौपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि' (बृ. ३-९-२६) इति च औपनिषदत्वविशेषणं पुरुषस्य उपनिषत्सु प्राधान्येन प्रकाशमानत्वे उपपद्यते। (सू.भा १-१-४)

११) शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणम् अतधर्माध्यारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रामाण्यम् आत्मनः प्रतिपद्यते, न तु अज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन। (गी.भा २-१८)

१२) तस्मात् वेदप्रामाण्यस्य अव्यभिचारात् तादर्थ्यं सति वाक्यस्य तथात्वं स्यात्। न तु पुरुषमतिकौशलात्। न हि पुरुषमतिकौशलात् सविता रूपं न प्रकाशयति। तथा वेदवाक्यान्यपि नान्यार्थानि भवन्ति। (बृ. ३-३-१)

- १३) वाक्यार्थज्ञानसमकाले एव तु पर्यवसितो भवति। केवलशब्दप्रकाशितार्थज्ञानमात्रनिष्ठाव्यतिरिक्ताभावात्। (मुं . भा १-१-६)
- १४) न हि विधिशतेनापि तमःप्रकाशयोरेकत्र सद्भावः शक्यते कर्तुम्, किमुत लिङ्गैः केवलैरिति। (मुं. भा अव)
- १५) न हि वचनं वस्तुनः सामर्थ्यजनकम्। ज्ञापकं हि शास्त्रं न कारकं इति स्थितिः ॥ (बृ भा १-४-१०)
- १६) यथोक्तम् ऋग्वेदादि शास्त्रं योनिः कारणं प्रमाणम् अस्य ब्रह्मणः यथावत्स्वरूपाधिगमे। शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्म अधिगम्यते इत्यभिप्रायः (सू.भा १-१-३)
- १७) न हि इदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनम् आगममन्तरेण उत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम् (सू.भा २-१-११)
- १८) तथा प्रतिपुरुषं परिसमाप्तं शास्त्रम् इति न शास्त्रविरोधगन्धोऽपि अस्ति। (बृ.भा ५-१-१)
- १९) शब्दमूलं च ब्रह्म शब्दप्रमाणकं न इन्द्रियादिप्रमाणकम्। (सू.भा २-१-२७)

07. अनुभवस्वरूपविचारः

- १) न धर्मजिज्ञासायां इवश्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायाम्, किंतु श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयश्च यथासंभवम् इह प्रमाणम्। अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तुविषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य। कर्तव्ये हि विषये नानुभवापेक्षा अस्ति इति श्रुत्यादीनामेव प्रामाण्यं स्यात्।(सू.भा १-२)
- २) विलक्षणत्वाधिकरस्य पीठिका भागः
दृष्टसाम्येन अदृष्टं अर्थं समर्थयन्ती युक्तिः अनुभवस्य संनिवृष्यते। विप्रकृष्यते तु श्रुतिः ऐतिह्यमात्रेण स्वार्थाभिधानात्। अनुभवावसानं च ब्रह्मविज्ञानम् अविद्यायाः निवर्तकं मोक्षसाधनं च दृष्टफलतया इष्यते। (सू.भा २-१-३)
- ३) एष व्यावृत्तसर्वसंसारधर्मकोऽनुभवात्मको ब्रह्मसंज्ञकस्तत्पदार्थः वेदान्ताभियुक्तानां प्रसिद्धः (४-१-२)
- ४) तस्मात्सर्वदुःखविनिर्मुक्तचैतन्यात्वकोऽहमित्येष आत्मानुभवः (४-१-२)
- ५) अनुभवारूढं तु ज्ञानफलम् “यत् साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् ब्रह्म” (बृ. ३-४-१)। (३-३-३२)
- ६) पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि, नेतः पूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वा अहमासम्, नेदानीं नापि भविष्यत्काले इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति। (सू.भा. ४-१-१३)
- ७) तस्मात् यदपाये देहे दर्शनं न भवति, यद्भावे च भवति, तद्दर्शनादिक्रियाकर्तृ न देहः इत्यवगम्यते। (बृ . भा ४-३-६)

08. अन्वयव्यतिरेकलक्षणम्, तर्कस्वरूपम्

१) स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोरुभयोरितरेतरव्यभिचारात् आत्मनोऽनन्वागतत्वम्, संप्रसादे च प्रपञ्चपरित्यागेन सदात्मना संपत्तेर्निष्प्रपञ्चसदात्मकत्वम्, प्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्मप्रभवत्वात् कार्यकारणानन्वत्वन्यायेन ब्रह्माव्यतिरेकः -इत्येवंजातीयकः (२-१-१४)

२) यदपि श्रवणव्यतिरेकेण मननं विदधच्छब्द एव तर्कमप्यादर्थव्यं दर्शयतीत्युक्तम्, नानेन मिषेण शुष्कतर्कस्यात्रात्मलाभः संभवति; श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव ह्यत्र तर्कोऽनुभवाङ्गत्वेनाऽऽश्रीयते (२-१-६)

३) रूपाद्यभावाच्च नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः; लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम्;

आगमात्रसमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत् (सू.भा २-१-७)

४) अनुमानमपि वेदान्तवाक्याविरोधि प्रमाणं भवत्, न निवार्यते, श्रुत्यैव च सहायत्वेन तर्कस्याप्यभ्युपेतत्वात्। तथा हि--- 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' इति श्रुतिः 'पण्डितो मेधावी गन्धारानेवोपसंपद् येतैवमेवेहाचार्यावान् पुरुषो वेद' इति च पुरुषबुद्धिसाहाय्यमात्मनो दर्शयति। (सू. भा १-१-२)

५) निरागमाः पुरुषोत्प्रेक्षामात्रनिबन्धनास्तर्का अप्रतिष्ठिता भवन्ति, उत्प्रेक्षाया निरङ्कुशत्वात्; तथा हि--- कैश्चिदभियुक्तैर्यत्नेनोत्प्रेक्षितास्तर्का अभियुक्ततरैरन्यैराभास्यमाना दृश्यन्ते; तैरप्युत्प्रेक्षिताः सन्तः ततोऽन्यैराभास्यन्त इति न प्रतिष्ठितत्वं तर्काणां शक्यमाश्रयितुम्। पुरुषमतिवैरूप्यात्। अथ कस्यचित् प्रसिद्धमाहात्म्यस्य कपिलस्य अन्यस्य वा संमतस्तर्कः प्रतिष्ठित इत्याश्रीयेत- एवमप्यप्रतिष्ठितत्वमेव, प्रसिद्धमाहात्म्याभिमतानामपि तीर्थकराणां कपिलकणभुक्प्रभृतीनां परस्परविप्रीतपत्तिदर्शनात्। अथोच्येत, अन्यथा वयमनुमास्यामहे, यथा नाप्रतिष्ठादोषो भविष्यति; न हि प्रतिष्ठितस्तर्क एव नास्तीति शक्यते वक्तुम्; एतदपि हि तर्काणाम् अप्रतिष्ठितत्वं तर्केणैव प्रतिष्ठाप्यते, केषांचित् तर्काणामप्रतिष्ठितत्वदर्शनेन अन्येषामपि तज्जातीयकानां तर्काणाम् अप्रतिष्ठितत्वकल्पनात्; सर्वतर्काप्रतिष्ठायां च लोकव्यवहारोच्छेदप्रसङ्गः ; अतीतवर्तमानाध्वसाम्येन ह्यनागतेऽप्यध्वनि सुखदुःखप्राप्तिपरिहाराय प्रवर्तमानो लोको दृश्यते; श्रुत्यर्थविप्रतिपत्तौ च अर्थाभासनिराकरणेन सम्यगर्थनिर्धारणं तर्केणैव वाक्यवृत्तिनिरूपणरूपेण क्रियते; मनुरपि चैवमेव मन्यते 'प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च शास्त्रं च विविधागमम्। त्रयं सुविदितं कार्यं धर्मशुद्धिमभीप्सता' इति। 'आर्षं धर्मोपदेशं च वेदशास्त्राविरोधिना। यस्तर्केणानुसंधत्ते च धर्मं वेद नेतरः' इति च ब्रुवन्; अयमेव च तर्कस्यालंकारः, यत् अप्रतिष्ठितत्वं नाम; एवं हि सावद्यतर्कपरित्यागेन निरवद्यस्तर्कः प्रतिपत्तव्यो भवति; न हि पूर्वजो मूढ आसीदित्यात्मनापि मूढेन भवितव्यमिति किंचिदस्ति प्रमाणम्; तस्मान्न तर्काप्रतिष्ठानं दोष इति चेत्। एवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः। यद्यपि क्वचिद्विषये तर्कस्य प्रतिष्ठितत्वमुपलक्ष्यते, तथापि प्रकृते तावद्विषये प्रसज्यत एवाप्रतिष्ठितत्वदोषात् अनिर्माक्षस्तर्कस्य; न हीदमतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनं आगममन्तरेणोत् प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम्। (सू.भा २-१-११)

६) श्रुत्यनुगृहीत एव हि अत्र तर्कः अनुभवाङ्गत्वेन आश्रीयते (सू.भा २-१-६)

७) अपि च सम्यग्ज्ञानान् मोक्षः अपि च सम्यग्ज्ञानान्मोक्ष इति सर्वेषां मोक्षवादिनामभ्युपगमः; तच्च सम्यग्ज्ञानमेकरूपम्, वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात्; एकरूपेण ह्यवस्थितो योऽर्थः स परमार्थः; लोके तद्विषयं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानमित्युच्यते -यथाग्निरुष्ण इति; तत्रैवं सति सम्यग्ज्ञाने पुरुषाणां विप्रतिपत्तिरनुपपन्ना; तर्कज्ञानानां त्वन्योन्यविरोधात् प्रसिद्धा विप्रतिपत्तिः; यद्धि केनचित्तार्किकेण इदमेव सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति

प्रतिष्ठापितम्, तदपरेण व्युत्थाप्यते; तेनापि प्रतिष्ठापितं ततोऽपरेण व्युत्थाप्यत इति च प्रसिद्धं लोके; कथमेकरूपानवस्थितविषयं तर्कप्रभवं सम्यग्ज्ञानं भवेत्; न च प्रधानवादी तर्कविदामुत्तम इति सर्वैस्तार्किकैः परिगृहीतः, येन तदीयं मतं सम्यग्ज्ञानमिति प्रतिपद्येमहि; न च शक्यन्तेऽतीतानागतवर्तमानास्तार्किका एकस्मिन्देशे काले च समाहर्तुम्, येन तन्मतिरेकरूपैकार्थविषया सम्यङ्मतिरिति स्यात्; वेदस्य तु नित्यत्वे विज्ञानोत्पत्तिहेतुत्वे च सति व्यवस्थितार्थविषयत्वोपपत्तेः, तज्जनितस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यक्त्वमतीतानागतवर्तमानैः सर्वैरपि तार्किकैः अपन्होतुं शक्यम्। (सू.भा २-१-११)

८) एतेन सर्वाणि तर्कस्मरणानि प्रतिवक्तव्यानि। तान्यपि तर्कोपपत्तिभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानायोपकुर्वन्तीति चेत्, उपकुर्वन्तु नाम। तत्त्वज्ञानं तु वेदान्तवाक्येभ्य एव भवति ॥ (सू.भा २-१-३)

९) तार्किको ह्यनागमज्ञः स्वबुद्धिपरिकल्पितं यत्किञ्चिदेव कल्पयति। अत एव च येयमागमप्रभूता मतिः अन्येनैव आगमाभिज्ञेनाचार्येणैव तार्किकात्, प्रोक्ता सती सुज्ञानाय भवति (कठ. १-२-९)

१०) वाक्यार्थविचारणाध्यवसाननिर्वृत्ता हि ब्रह्मावगतिः, नानुमानादिप्रमाणान्तरनिर्वृत्ता। (सू.भा १-१-२)

११) न हि मनोविकल्पनायाः रज्जुसर्पादिलक्षणायाः रज्ज्वां प्रलयः उत्पत्तिर्वा। न च मनसि रज्जुसर्पस्य उत्पत्तिः प्रलयो वा। न च उभयतो वा। (मां का. २-३२)

09. सुषुप्तात्मविचारः

१) सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति; परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति वेदान्तमर्यादा। (सू.भा १-४-१८)

२) यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादौ अपि सत्यां स्वाभाविक्याम् अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्यानपोदितवात् पूर्ववत् पुनः प्रबोधे विभागो भवति। (सू.भा २-१-९)

३) मनःप्रचारोपाधिविशेषसंबन्धादिन्द्रियार्थान् गृह्णन् तद्विशेषापन्नो जीवो जागर्ति; तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनःशब्दवाच्यो भवति; स उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायाम् उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इवेति 'स्वं ह्यपीतो भवति ॥ (सू.भा १-१-९)

४) अपि च न कदाचित् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्य अनपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते ॥ (सू.भा ३-२-७)

५) इदानीं योऽसौ सर्वात्मभावो मोक्षो विद्याफलं क्रियाकारकफलशून्यम्, स प्रत्यक्षतो निर्दिश्यते यत्र अविद्याकामकर्माणि न सन्ति। (बृ.भा ४-३-२२)

६) अत्र च विनिर्मुक्तं प्रत्यक्षतः इति।

७) सुषुप्ते पुनः संप्रसन्नः असंगो भवतीति असंगतापि दृश्यते। (बृ.भा ४-३-१९)

८) अविद्यया भयं मन्यते इति ह्युक्तम्। तत्कार्यद्वारेण कारणप्रतिषेधोऽयम्; अभयं रूपमित्याविद्यावर्जितमित्येतत्। अविद्यावर्जितम् इत्येतत् ॥ (बृ.भा ४-३-२१)

९) स यद्यात्मा अत्र अविनष्टः स्वेनैव रूपेण वर्तते, कस्मादयम्-अहमस्मीत्यात्मानं वा, बहिर्वा-इमानि

भूतानीति, जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरिव न जानाति? -इत्यत्रोच्यते; शृण्वान्नाज्ञानहेतुम्- एकत्वमेव अज्ञानहेतुः ॥
(बृ.मा ४-३-२१)

१०) ब्रह्मैव तु एकम् अनपायि सुषुप्तिस्थानम् (सू.मा ३-२-७)

10. अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणम् (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)

१) ज्ञाने च लौकिकादिविषये ज्ञेये च लौकिकादित्रिविधे- पूर्वं लौकिकं स्थूलं, तदभावेन पश्चाच्छुद्धलौकिकं, तदभावेन लोकोत्तरं इत्येवं क्रमेण स्थानत्रयाभावेन परमार्थसत्ये तुर्येऽद्वयेऽजेऽभये विदिते, स्वयमेवात्मस्वरूपमेव। मा. का. मा. ४.८९

२) त्रयाणां विश्वादीनां पूर्वपूर्वप्रविलापनेन तुरीयस्य प्रतिपत्तिरिति करणसाधनः पादशब्दः। ...। तुरीयस्य तु पद्यत इति कर्मसाधनः पादशब्दः। मा.का.मा.१.२

३) प्रसिद्धेनैव भेदानां ग्राह्यत्वेन हेतुना समत्वेन स्वप्नजागरितस्थानयोः एकत्वं आहुः विवेकिनः। मा.का. मा. २.५

४) सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पत्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात्। एवं च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमोऽद्वैतसिद्धिः। सर्वभूतस्थश्चाऽऽत्मा एको दृष्टः स्यात्। सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि। ... अन्यथा स्वदेहपरिच्छिन्न एव प्रत्यगात्मा साङ्ख्यादिभिरिव दृष्टः स्यात्। तथा च अद्वैतमिति श्रुतिकृतो विशेषो न स्यात्। मा. मा. मं. ३

५) संप्रसादितशब्दो जीवो जागरितव्यवहारे देहेन्द्रियपञ्जराध्यक्षो भूत्वा, तद्वासनानिर्मितां च स्वप्नान्नाडीचरोऽनुभूय, श्रान्तः शरणं प्रेप्सुरुभयरूपादपि शरीराभिमानात्समुत्थाय, सुषुप्तावस्थायां परञ्ज्योतिराकाशशब्दितं परंब्रह्मोपसंपद्य विशेषविज्ञानवत्त्वं च परित्यज्य स्वेनरूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते। ब्र. सू.मा.१.३.२०

६) जीवप्रसवबीजात्मकं अपरित्यज्यैव प्राणशब्दत्वं सतः, सच्छब्दवाच्यता च। यदि हि निर्बीजरूपं विवक्षितं ब्रह्म अभविष्यत् 'नेति नेति', 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते', 'अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितात्' इत्यवक्ष्यत्। मा. का. मा. १.२

७) अविद्याकामकर्मभिः संसारहेतुभिः संयुक्त एव स्वप्न इति न स्वमपीतो भवति सुषुप्त एव स्वं देवतारूपं जीवत्वविनिर्मुक्तं दर्शयिष्यामीत्याह। छा.मा.६.८.१

८) अत्रचैतत्प्रकृतं - 'अविद्याकामकर्मविनिर्मुक्तमेव तद्रूपं यत्सुषुप्ते आत्मनो गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षतः इति। बृ. मा. ४.३.२२

९) ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुप्तिस्थानमित्येत् प्रतिपादयामः। तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति जीवस्य ब्रह्मतत्वावधारणं स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहारविमुक्तत्वावधारणं च। तस्मादात्मा एव सुप्तिस्थानम्। ब्र. सू. मा. ३.२.७

१०) उपपद्यते च ईदृश एव संबन्धो न अन्यादृशः(सू मा ३-२-३५)

११) सुषुप्तिकाले च परेण ब्रह्मणा जीव एकतां गच्छति; परस्माच्च ब्रह्मणः प्राणादिकं जगज्जायत इति

वेदान्तमर्यादा। (सू भा १-४-१८-)

१२) यत्रैतत् पुरुषः भवति (छां ६-८-१)==== यत्र यस्मिन् काले एतन्नाम भवति पुरुषस्य स्वप्स्यतः। प्रसिद्धं हि लोके स्वपितीति। गौणं चेदं नामेत्याह। यदा स्वपितीत्युच्यते पुरुषः तदा तस्मिन् काले सता सच्छब्दवाच्यया प्रकृतया देवतया संपन्नो भवति संगत एकीभूतो भवति। मनसि प्रविष्टं मनआदिसंसर्गकृतं जीवरूपं परित्यज्य स्वं सद्वृत्तं यत् परमार्थसत्यम् अपीतो अपिगतो भवति। अतस्तस्मात् स्वपिति इत्येनमाचक्षते लौकिकाः। स्वम् आत्मानं हि यस्मात् अपीतो भवति।

१३) अपि च न कदाचित् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्य अनपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते। (सू भा ३-२-७)

१४) अत्रोच्यते। न स्वप्नादिप्रत्ययवत् (सू भा २-२-२९)

१५) स उपाधिद्वय उपरमे..... (सू.भा १-१-९)

१६) यथा च स्वप्नदृगेकः स्वप्नदर्शनमायया न संस्पृश्यते, प्रबोधसंप्रसादयोरनन्वागतत्वात्, एवमवस्थात्रयसाक्षी एकोऽव्यभिचारी, अवस्थात्रयेण व्यभिचारिणा न संस्पृश्यते। मायामात्रं ह्येतत्, यत्परमात्मनोऽवस्थात्रयात्मना अवभासनम्, रज्ज्वा इव सर्पादिभावेन इति। (सू.भा २-१-९)

१७) अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन (सू.भा. २-१-२७)

11. कार्यकारणप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणं (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)

१) अस्य जगतः नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य मनसाप्यचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य जन्मस्थितिभंगम् यतः सर्वज्ञात् सर्वशक्तेः कारणाद्भवति तद् ब्रह्म।
ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.२

२) कार्यमाकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत् कारणं परं ब्रह्म। तस्मात् कारणात् परमार्थतः अनन्यत्वं व्यतिरेकेणाभावः कार्यस्यावगम्यते। कुतः? आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१४

३) न चेयं परिणामश्रुतिः परिणामप्रतिपादनार्था तत्प्रतिपत्तौ फलानवगमात्। 'स एष नेति नेतीत्यात्मा' इत्युपक्रम्य 'अभयं वै जनकं प्राप्तोसि' (बृ. ४.२.४) इति। तस्मादस्मत्पक्षे न कश्चिदपि दोषप्रसङ्गोऽस्ति। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.२७

४) पारिशेष्यात् सदेकमेववस्तु अविद्यया उत्पत्तिविनाशादिधर्मैः नटवत् अनेकधा विकल्प्यते। गी. भा. १८.४८

५) मूलकारणमेव आअन्त्यात् कार्यात् तेन तेन कार्याकारेण नटवत् सर्वव्यवहारास्पदं प्रतिपद्यते। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१८

६) सतो विद्यमानस्य वस्तुनः रज्ज्वादेः सर्पादिवत् मायया जन्म युज्यते। न तु तत्त्वतो यथा तथा अग्राह्यस्यापि सत एव नात्मनः रज्जुसर्पवत् जगद्रूपेण मायया जन्म युज्यते। मा.का.भा. ३.२७

७)। माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि। मैवम्। सा च माया न विद्यते। माया इति अविद्यमानस्य आख्या

इत्यभिप्रायः। मा. का. भा. ४.५८

१) न तु अयं विभागः न त्वयं विभागः परमार्थतोऽस्ति, यस्मात् तयोः कार्यकारणयोरनन्यत्वम् अवगम्यते। कार्यं आकाशादिकं बहुप्रपञ्चं जगत्, कारणं परं ब्रह्म; तस्मात् कारणात् परमार्थतोऽनन्यत्वं व्यतिरेकेण अभावः कार्यस्यावगम्यते। कुतः? आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः। आरम्भणशब्दस्तावदेकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानं प्रतिज्ञाय दृष्टान्तापेक्षायामुच्यते 'यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' इति; एतदुक्तं भवति एकेन मृत्पिण्डेन परमार्थतो मृदात्मना विज्ञातेन सर्वं मृन्मयं घटशरावोदञ्चनादिकं मृदात्मकत्वाविशेषाद्विज्ञातं भवेत्; यतो वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयम् वाचैव केवलमस्तीत्यारभ्यते विकारः घटः शराव उदञ्चनं चेति; न तु वस्तुवृत्तेन विकारो नाम कश्चित् अस्ति (सू.भा. २-१-१४)

१०) इतश्च कारणत् अनन्यत्वं कार्यस्य, यत्कारणं भाव एव कारणस्य कार्यमुपलभ्यते, नाभावे; तद्यथा--सत्यां मृदि घट उपलभ्यते, सत्सु च तन्तुषु पटः; न च नियमेनान्यभावे अन्यस्य उपलब्धिर्दृष्टा(सू. भा. २-१-१५)

११) प्रकृतिः च उपादानकारणं च ब्रह्माभ्युपगन्तव्यम्, निमित्तकारणं च; न केवलं निमित्तकारणमेव ; कस्मात्? प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्। एवं हि प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तौ श्रौतौ नोपुरुध्येते। प्रतिज्ञा तावत्- 'उत तमादेशमप्राक्ष्यो येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम्' इति; तत्र चैकेन विज्ञातेन सर्वमन्यदविज्ञातमपि विज्ञातं भवतीति प्रतीयते; तच्चोपादानकारणविज्ञाने सर्वविज्ञानं संभवति, उपादानकारणाव्यतिरेकात् कार्यस्य; निमित्तकारणाव्यतिरेकस्तु कार्यस्य नास्ति, लोके तक्ष्णः प्रासादव्यतिरेकदर्शनात्। दृष्टान्तोऽपि 'यथा सोम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' इत्युपादानकारणगोचर एवाभ्यायते (सू.भा-१-४-२३)

१२) अविद्याकल्पितेन च नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन तत्त्वान्यत्वाभ्यामनिर्वचनीयेन ब्रह्म परिणामादिसर्वव्यवहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; पारमार्थिकेन च रूपेण सर्वव्यवहारातीतमपरिणतमवतिष्ठते ॥ (सू.भा-२-१-२७)

१३) परमार्थतस्तु न कस्यचित् केनचिदपि कार्यकारणभावः कस्यचित् इत्येव भावः(मां.का ४-४०)

12. पञ्चकोशप्रक्रियायाः निरूपणम् (अध्यारोपापवादक्रमेण)

१) अन्नमयादिभ्यः आनन्दमयान्तेभ्यः आत्मभ्यः अभ्यन्तरतमं ब्रह्म विद्यया प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन दिदर्शयिषु शास्त्रं अविद्याकृतपञ्चकोशापनयनेन अनेकतुषकोद्रवितुषीकरणेनैव तदन्तर्गततण्डुलान् प्रस्तौति। तै. भा. २.२

२) अतश्च न अन्नमयेनैव परिच्छिन्नेन आत्मना आत्मवन्तः प्राणिनः, किं तर्हि तदन्तर्गतेन प्राणमयेनापि साधारणेनैव सर्वपिण्डव्यापिना आत्मवन्तो मनुष्यादयः। एवं मनोमयादिभिः पूर्वपूर्वव्यापिभिः उत्तरोत्तरैः सूक्ष्मैः आनन्दमयान्तैः आकाशादिभूतारब्धैः अविद्याकृतैः आत्मवन्तः सर्वे प्राणिनः। तथा स्वाभाविकेनापि आकाशादिकारणेन नित्येन अविकृतेन सत्यज्ञानान्तलक्षणेन पञ्चकोशातिगेन सर्वात्मना आत्मवन्तह। स हि परमार्थत आत्मा सर्वेषाम् इत्येदपि अर्थात् उक्तं भवति। (तै.भा २-३)

३) यद्यपि अन्नमयादिभ्य इव आनन्दमयात् 'अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा' इति न श्रूयते, तथापि नानन्दमयस्य ब्रह्मत्वम्।।

४) तस्मात् न प्राप्तिः सङ्क्रमणं, नापि अन्नमयादीनामन्यतमकर्तृकम्। पारिशेष्यात् अन्नमयाद्यानन्द-मयान्तात्मव्यतिरिक्तकर्तृकं

५) ननु आनन्दमयस्य (सू.भा. १-१-१९)

६) अपि च आनन्दमयस्य (सू.भा. १-१-१०)

13. द्रष्टृदृश्यविचारः

१) यदि दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा यदि वा घटस्य द्रष्टा सर्वथापि द्रष्टैव। द्रष्टव्ये एव तु भवान् विशेषमाह दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा इति। द्रष्टा तु यदि दृष्टेः यदि वा घटस्य द्रष्टा द्रष्टैव।

न। विशेषोपपत्तेः। अस्त्यत्र विशेषः। यो दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा स दृष्टिश्चेद् भवति नित्यमेव पश्यति दृष्टिम्, न कदाचिदपि दृष्टिर्न दृश्यते द्रष्टा। तत्र द्रष्टुर्दृष्ट्या नित्यया भवितव्यम्। अनित्या चेत् द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिः तत्र दृश्या या दृष्टिः सा कदाचित् न दृश्येतापि। यथा अनित्यया दृष्ट्या घटादिवस्तु। न च तद्वत् दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा कदाचिदपि न पश्यति दृष्टिम्। किं द्वे दृष्टी द्रष्टुर्नित्या अदृश्या, अन्या अनित्या दृश्येति ? बाढम्। प्रसिद्धा तावत् अनित्या दृष्टिः अन्धानन्धत्व दर्शनात्। नित्यैव चेत् सर्वोऽनन्ध एव स्यात्। द्रष्टुस्तु नित्या दृष्टिः। “न हि द्रष्टुर्दृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते” (४-३-२३) इति श्रुतेः। अनुमानाच्च। अन्धस्यापि घटाद्याभासविषया स्वप्ने दृष्टिरूप लभ्यते। सा तर्हि इतरदृष्टिनाशे न नश्यति। सा द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिः। तथा अविपरिलुप्तया नित्यया दृष्ट्या स्वरूपभूतया स्वयंज्योतिः समाख्यया इतराम् अनित्यां दृष्टिं स्वप्नबुद्धान्तयोर्वासना प्रत्ययरूपां नित्यमेव पश्यन् दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति। एवं च सति दृष्टिरेव स्वरूपमस्य अग्न्यौष्ण्यवत्, न काणादानामिव दृष्टिव्यतिरिक्तोऽन्यश्चेतनो द्रष्टा अन्यश्चेतनो द्रष्टा (बृ.भा. १-४-१०)

२) दृष्टिरिति द्विविधा भवति, लौकिकी पारमार्थिकी च। तत्र लौकिकी चक्षुःसंयुक्ता अन्तःकरणवृत्तिः। सा क्रियत इति जायते विनश्यति च। या तु आत्मनो दृष्टिः अग्न्युष्ण प्रकाशादिवत् सा च द्रष्टुः स्वरूपत्वात् न जायते न विनश्यति च सा क्रियमाणया उपाधिभूतया संसृष्टेव इति व्यपदिश्यते द्रष्टेति। भेदवच्च द्रष्टा दृष्टिः इति च॥ (बृ.भा ३-४-२)

३) यदस्य जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः चक्षुराद्यनेकोपाधिद्वारं चैतन्यात्मज्योतिःस्वाभाव्यम् उपलक्षितं दृष्ट्याद्यभिधेयव्यवहारापन्नम् सुषुप्ते उपाधिभेदव्यापारनिवृत्तौ अनुद्भास्यमानत्वात् अनुपलक्ष्यमाणस्वभावमपि उपाधिभेदेन भिन्नमिव यथाप्राप्तानुवादेनैव विद्यमानवदुच्यते। तत्र दृष्ट्यादिधर्मभेदकल्पना विवक्षितार्थानभिज्ञतया। सैन्धवघनवत् प्रज्ञानैकरसघनश्रुतिविरोधाच्च। “विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म” (३-९-२८), “सत्यं ज्ञानम्” (तै. २-१), “प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म” (ऐ.५-३) - इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यश्च ॥ (बृ.भा ४-३-३०)

४) “यो वेद स आत्मा ” इति प्रकाशस्वरूपः इति गम्यते। (छां भा ८-१२-५)

14. श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासन स्वरूपम्

१) तस्मात् आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यो दर्शनार्हः दर्शन विषयम् आपादयितव्यः। श्रोतव्यः, पूर्वम् आचार्यतः आगम तश्च। पश्चात् मन्तव्यः, तर्कतः। ततो निदिध्यासितव्यः, निश्चयेन ध्यातव्यः। एवं हि असौ दृष्टो भवति श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनसाधनैर्निर्वर्तितैः। यदा एकत्वम् एतान्युपगतानि तदा सम्यग्दर्शनं ब्रह्मैकत्वविषयं प्रसीदति नान्यथा श्रवणमात्रेण। (बृ मा २-४-५)

२) पूर्वम् आचार्यागमाभ्यां श्रुते, पुनस्तर्केण उपपत्त्या मते विचारिते। श्रवणं तु आगममात्रेण, मते उपपत्त्या। पश्चात् विज्ञाते एवमेतत् नान्यथा इति निर्धारिते ॥ (बृ मा ४-५-७)

३) यत्पुनरुक्तं श्रवणात् पराचीनयोर्मनननिदिध्यासनयोर्दर्शनाद्विधिशेषत्वं ब्रह्मणः, न स्वरूपपर्यवसायित्वमिति, तन्न; श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वान्मनननिदिध्यासनयोः। यदि ह्यवगतं ब्रह्मान्यत्र विनियुज्येत, भवेत्तदा विधिशेषत्वम्; न तु तदस्ति, मनननिदिध्यासनयोरपि श्रवणवदवगत्यर्थत्वात्। (सू. मा १-१-४)

४) दर्शनपर्यवसानानि हि

श्रवणादीन्यावर्त्यमानानि दृष्टार्थानि भवन्ति। यथा अवघातादीनि तण्डुलादिनिष्पत्तिपर्यवसानानि हि, तद्वत् ॥ (सू. मा ४-१-१)

५) द्रष्टव्यादिशब्दा अपि परविद्याधिकारपठिताः तत्त्वाभिमुखीकरणप्रधानाः, न तत्त्वावबोधविधिप्रधाना भवन्ति; लोकेऽपि 'इदं पश्य, इदमाकर्णय' इति च एवंजातीयकेषु निर्देशेषु प्रणिधानमात्रं कुरु इत्युच्यते, न साक्षाज्ज्ञानमेव कुरु इति। ज्ञेयाभिमुखस्यापि ज्ञानं कदाचिज्जायते, कदाचिन्न जायते; तस्मात् तं प्रति ज्ञानविषय एव दर्शयितव्यां ज्ञापयितुकामेन। तस्मिन्दर्शिते स्वयमेव यथाविषयं यथाप्रमाणं च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते ॥ (सू. मा ३-२-२१)

६) अन्वेष्टव्यो विजिज्ञासितव्यः इति चैष नियमविधिरेव नापूर्वविधिः। एवम् अन्वेष्टव्यो विजिज्ञासितव्य इत्यर्थः। दृष्टार्थत्वादन्येषणविजिज्ञासनयोः ॥ (छां ८-७-१)

७) जागरितेऽपि यद्दर्शनं तदपि स्वप्नं मन्यते श्रुतिः। (बृ. मा ४-३-१९)

15. मोक्षस्वरूपम् मुक्तलक्षणं

१. मुक्तवस्था हि सर्वं वेदान्तेषु एकरूपेव अवधार्यते। ब्रह्मैव हि मुक्त्यवस्था। न च ब्रह्मणः अनेकाकारयोगोऽस्ति। ब्र. सू. मा. ३.४.५२

२. अत्र इहैव प्रदीपनिर्वाणवत् सर्वबन्धोपशमनात् ब्रह्म समश्नुते। ब्रह्मैव भवति इत्यर्थः। क. मा. २.३.१४

३. ... किंतु विद्वान् स इहैव ब्रह्म यद्यपि देहवानिव लक्ष्यते स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति। ... तस्मात् इहैव ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति, न शरीरपातोत्तरकालम्। न हि विदुषः मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तिः जीवतोऽन्यो भावः ... भावान्तरापत्तौ हि मोक्षस्य विवक्षितोऽर्थः आत्मैकत्वाख्यः स बाधितो भवेत्। बृ. मा. ४.४.६

४. न हि 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यस्य वाक्यस्य अर्थः 'तत्त्वं मृतो भविष्यसि' इत्येवं परिणेतुं शक्यः। ब्र. सू. मा. ३.३.३२

५. अतोऽविद्याकल्पितसंसारित्वनिवर्तनेन नित्यमुक्तात्मस्वरूपसमर्पणान्न मोक्षस्यानित्यत्वदोशः। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.४
६. तस्मात् मिथ्याप्रत्ययनिमित्तत्वात् सशरीरत्वस्य सिद्धं जीवतोऽपि विदुषः अशरीरत्वम्। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.४
७. पूर्वसिद्धकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वविपरीतं हि त्रिष्वपि कालेषु अकर्तृत्वाभोक्तृत्वस्वरूपं ब्रह्माहमस्मि नेतःपूर्वमपि कर्ता भोक्ता वाहमासं, नेदानीं, नापि भविष्यत्काले इति ब्रह्मविदवगच्छति। एवमेव च मोक्ष उपपद्यते। ब्र. सू. भा. ४.१.१३
८. अकर्त्रात्मबोधोऽपि हि मिथ्याज्ञानबाधनेन कर्माण्युच्छिनत्ति। बाधितमपि तु मिथ्याज्ञानं द्विचन्द्रज्ञानवत् संस्कारवशात् कञ्चित्कालमनुवर्तते एव। ... कथं हि एकस्य स्वहृदयप्रत्ययं ब्रह्मभावनं देहधारणं च अन्येन प्रतिक्षेप्तुं शक्येत। श्रुतिस्मृतिषु च स्थितप्रज्ञलक्षणनिर्देशेन एतदेव निरुच्यते।। ब्र.सू.भा.४.१.१५
९. दर्शयति च 'यत्र त्वस्य सर्वमात्मैवाभूत् तत्केन कम् पश्येत्' (बृ. ४.५.१५) इत्यादिना ब्रह्मात्मदर्शिनंप्रति समस्तस्य क्रियाकारकफललक्षणस्य व्यवहारस्य अभावम्। ब्र. सू. भा. २.१.१४
१०. नावगतब्रह्मभावस्य यथापूर्वं संसारित्वं शक्यं दर्शयितुम्। वेदप्रमाणजनितब्रह्मात्मभावविरोधात्। ब्र. सू. भा. १.१.४
११. गुणानेतान् यथोक्तान् अतीत्य जीवन्नेवातिक्रम्य मायोपाधिभूतान् त्रीन् देही देहसमुद्भवान् देहोत्पत्तिबीजभूतान् जन्मजरादुःखैः ... जीवन्नेव विमुक्तः सन् विद्वानमृतमश्नुते। गी. भा. १४.२०
१२. सम्यग्दर्शननिष्ठानां सन्यासिनां सद्योमुक्तिरुक्ता। गी. भा. ५.२७
१३. न च प्रतिषिद्धसेवाप्राप्तिः एकत्वप्रत्ययोत्पत्तेः प्रागेव प्रतिषिद्धत्वात्। न हि रात्रे कूपे कण्वके वा पतितः उदिते सवितरि पतति तस्मिन्नेव। छा.भा.२.२३.१
१४. विद्वान्स्तु पुनर्विद्यया अविद्यायां निवृत्तायां शक्नोत्येवाशेषतः कर्म परित्यक्तुं, अध्यारोपितस्य शेषानुपपत्तेः। न हि तैमिरिकदृष्ट्या अध्यारोपितस्य द्विचन्द्रादेः तिमिरापगमे शेषोऽवतिष्ठते। एवं च सतीदं वचनमुपपन्नं 'सर्वकर्माणि मनसा' (गी. ५.१३) इत्यादि, 'स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरः', (गी. १८.४५), 'स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः' (गी. १८.४६), इति च। गी. भा. १८.४८



अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालये प्रकाशिताः संस्कृतग्रन्थाः

अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयप्रकाशितेषु उपनिषद्शांकरभाष्येषु विशेषोऽयं यत् (१) 'विषयानुसारेण प्रविभक्तग्रन्थशरीरत्वम्' (२) तत्तद्विभाग प्रतिपाद्यविषय सूचकशिरोलेख-निवेशः, (३) पाठान्तरनिर्देशभाष्यान्तर संवादादिस्थलसूचनापूर्वकं हितमिताधृष्टिष्णदानम्, (४) विचार प्रचोदिका पीठिका, (५) उपनिषन्मूलस्य स्थूलाक्षरैः भाष्यस्य मध्यगात्राक्षरैः, उपनिषत्सारादि परिशिष्टभागस्य च सामान्य सूक्ष्माक्षरैः - इति चैवं विविधगात्रस्फुटाक्षरै-रङ्कनं च इति। सुन्दर अक्षरैः शुक्लमसृणपत्रे मुद्रापितानामप्येषां पुस्तकानां गात्राकारानु गुण्येन परिमित मूल्येनैव वितरणे प्रयत्नः कृतः। सर्वत्र टिप्पणं व्याख्यानादिकं च नूतनतया श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिरनुगृहीतम् ॥

१. ईशावास्योपनिषत् - (पु. ५६) २०/-
सभाष्यटिप्पणयुता। उपनिषदो माध्यन्दिनपाठः जिज्ञासूपयोगि मन्त्रानुक्रमणिका शब्दसूच्यादिसमेता विचारप्रचोदक-पीठिकायुता च ॥

२. केनोपनिषत् (पु. १३१) २०/-
ईशावास्यभाष्यवदेव सर्वपरिकरोपेतम्। परिशिष्टे सार्थभाष्यस्थमुख्यशब्द-वर्णानुक्रमेण दत्ताः। अत्र भाष्यहृदयविसंवादि-टीकाभिप्रायाः समालोचिताः। पदवाक्य-भाष्ययोश्चैकककर्तृकत्वमसंभावितमिति सविमर्श पीठिकायामुपपादितं च ॥

३. काठकोपनिषद्भाष्यम् (पु. १८९) २५/-
केनभाष्यवत् सर्वपरिकरोपेतम्।

४. मुण्डकोपनिषद्भाष्यम् (पु. १५२) २०/-
कठभाष्यवत् सर्वपरिकरोपेतम्। पीठिकायां न केवलं भाष्यविषयविवेचनम्, किं तु भाष्यतट्टीकाकारयोः मतभेद-विमर्शनं च कृतमत्र ॥

५. माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः (पु. ६१८) ३००/-
श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिरनुगृहीतायाम् अन्वर्थाभिधानायामस्यां व्याख्यायां माण्डूक्योपनिषदि गर्भीकृतानि नैकानि रहस्यानि श्रीगौडपादसंमतवेदान्तप्रक्रियानुसारेण तथा विवृतानि यथा मोक्षमाणानां जिज्ञासूनामस्याः श्रवणमननाभ्यां छिद्येरन् सर्वसंशयाः भिद्येत च हृदयग्रन्थिरात्मसत्यानुबोधेन। श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादभाष्य वाक्यार्थश्च प्रतिपदं प्रस्थानत्रय-भाष्यान्तरवाक्यान्तरसंगानेन मतान्तरदोषाविष्करणपूर्वकं तथा व्याकृतो यथा विशुद्ध-संप्रदायध्वना गतिर्निर्विघ्ना भवेत् पाठकानाम्। विशिष्य च अलातशान्तिप्रकरणे प्राचीनग्रन्थतत्त्वशोधकोत्थापितमतान्तरसंक्रान्तिशङ्कानिरसन-पूर्वकं श्रीगौडपादसंमता वेदान्तप्रक्रिया प्रदर्शिता, पूर्वतनप्रकरण त्रय प्रकियया एकवाक्यतां गमिता च। आङ्ग्लभाषामय्या गैर्वाणवाणीमय्या च भूमिकया श्रीगौडपादसंमतप्रक्रियाया असाधारणं स्वरूपं माहायानिकप्रक्रिया वैलक्षण्यस्फुटी- करणपूर्वकं हृदयंगमं कृतम् ॥

६. तैत्तिरीयोपनिषच्छ्रीक्षावल्लीभाष्यम् (पु. ९६) २०/-
टिप्पण्यादि सर्वपरिकरोपेतं मुण्डकभाष्यवत् ॥

७. तैत्तिरीयोपनिषत् : आनन्दवल्ली भृगुवल्ली च (पु. ४४७) ५०/-
सभाष्या-श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीनिर्मित'भाष्यार्थविमर्शिनी' व्याख्या-सहिता। व्याख्यायां भाष्याक्षरानुक्रमेणैव विषयोपपादनं कृतम्। भाष्ये अर्वाचीन-मतान्तरप्रविष्टवेदान्तिभिरुत्थाप्यमानशङ्कानां निरसनपूर्वकं विशुद्धशङ्कर-प्रक्रियाया श्रैष्ठ्यं च सम्यगाविष्कृतम्। पुस्तकस्यान्ते अनुवाकसूची, उपनिषत्खण्डसूची, अर्थनिर्देशपूर्वकं भाष्यस्थ-मुख्यशब्दानां सूची, विमर्शिनीगतमुख्यविषयसूची च - इत्येता वर्णानुक्रमसूच्यो निवेशिताः। आङ्ग्लगैर्वाणभूमिकयोः भाष्यगता मुख्यविषयाः सप्रपञ्चं परिशीलिताः - इति सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरं परिष्करणमिदम् ॥

८. सुगमा (पु. १३४) २०/-

अध्यासभाष्यव्याख्या । श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिर्विनिर्मिता । प्रचलित व्याख्यानानां भिन्नभिन्नप्रस्थानावलम्बनत्वात् शुद्धं शाङ्करदर्शनं कीदृशम्, कथं च त् अविवादम्, अविरोद्धं च स्यादिति संशयानानां मनःसमाधानाय प्रस्थानत्रयभाष्यैककण्ठ्यम् आदर्शयन्ती सार्वत्रिकानुभवानुसारिवेदान्तप्रक्रिया-प्रख्यापनी इयं व्याख्या ॥

९. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (पु. १३८)

२५/-

जिज्ञासाधिकरणभाष्यस्य नूतनेयं व्याख्या श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्र सरस्वतीसंयमिभिः प्रणीता । सार्वत्रिकानुभवानुसारि शाङ्करं प्रस्थानं स्वासाधारणधर्मविशिष्टं व्याख्यान-रातप्रस्थानान्तरकलङ्करहितं दरीकृतभाष्यान्तरदुराक्रमं च परिशुद्धरूपेणाविष्कृतमत्र ॥

१०. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (पु. १६४)

३०/-

जन्माद्यधिकरणभाष्यव्याख्या सच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीविरचिता । यथैव जिज्ञासाधि-करणव्याख्यायां ब्रह्मज्ञानसतत्त्वनिर्धारणं कृतम्, एवमेवात्र जगज्जन्मादिकारणसतत्त्वनिर्धारणं कृतम् सर्ववेदान्तादृताम् अध्यारोपापवादप्रक्रियामनुसृत्य । परिशिष्टे च जिज्ञासाधिकरण भाष्यव्याख्यायामिव सूत्रार्थसंबद्धाः केचन विषयाः भगवत्पादसंमतां वेदान्तप्रक्रियां निर्दिधारयिषूणाम् उपकाराय विचारिताः ॥

११. सूत्रभाष्यार्थतत्त्वविवेचनी (तृतीयो भागः) (पु. ३३९)

४०/-

शास्त्रयोनित्वाधिकरण-समन्वयाधिकरणभाष्ययोर्व्याख्या । पूर्ववदेव शुद्ध-शाङ्करप्रक्रियाप्रकाशिनी । परिशिष्टचिन्तायां शास्त्रप्रामाण्यसतत्त्वविमर्शः, श्रवणादीनां स्वरूपकृत्यादिगता चिन्ता इत्याद्याः विषयाः संकलिताः ।

१२. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (१-२) : (पु. ४३)

१०/-

वेदान्तसिद्धान्तनिर्णयः, शाङ्करसंप्रदायनिर्णयश्च - इति किरणद्वयात्मकः प्रथमो भागः ।

१३. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (३-४-५) : (पु. ५३)

१५/-

अस्मिन् द्वितीये भागे शाङ्करवेदान्तमर्यादा, शाङ्करवेदान्त प्रक्रियास्वरूपम्, अध्यारोपापवादविशेषाश्च - इत्येते विषयाः प्रतिपादिताः ।

१४. शुद्धशाङ्करप्रक्रियाभास्करः (६-७) : (पु. ५४)

१५/-

अस्मिन् तृतीये भागे - शाङ्करप्रस्थानस्य प्रस्थानान्तरेभ्यो वैलक्षण्यं स्फुटितम्, शाङ्कराद्वैतस्य बौद्धमतसाम्यशङ्का च परिहृता ।

१५. गीताशास्त्रार्थविवेकः (पु. २१६)

३०/-

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीसंयमिभिरनुगृहीतोऽयं ग्रन्थः । अल्पकायेनाप्यनेन प्रकरणेन सुचिन्तितेन, श्रीशाङ्करभगवत्पाद भाष्यादृत एव वेदान्तार्थो गीताचार्यानुगृहीत इति, स एव चानुसृतः परमपुरुषार्थदायी इति च जिज्ञासवो निःसंशयं विजानीयुः । अत्र प्रप्रथमं साङ्ख्य-योग-कर्म-ध्यान-ज्ञानादिपदार्थानां विवेकः कृतः । तदनु च कर्मयोग-ध्यानयोग-भक्तियोग-ज्ञानयोगानां परस्परसंबन्धो निरूपितः । परिशिष्टे च भागे साङ्ख्ययोगदर्शनाभ्यां गीतादर्शनस्य सालक्षण्यवैलक्षण्ये विवेचिते येन स्पष्टं विज्ञायेत सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धान्त एव परिशुद्धः स्वीकृतोऽत्र शास्त्रे इति ॥

१६. ब्रह्मविद्यारहस्यविवृतिः (पु. १५०)

२०/-

सगुणनिर्गुणब्रह्मविद्याविवेकेन जिज्ञासूनां निरायासप्रवेशः ब्रह्मणि यथा लभ्येत तथा श्रीचरणैः छान्दोग्योपनिषदोऽष्टमोऽध्यायः अत्र व्याख्यातः ।

१७. नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धिः ('क्लेशापहारिणी' व्याख्या सहिता)(६०४)

२००/-

व्याख्यानकर्तारः श्रीसुरेश्वराचार्यैः प्रमाणीकृतोपदेशसाहस्रीतः वार्तिकद्वयतश्च श्लोकान् समुद्धृत्य वार्तिकप्रस्थानवि शुद्धसंप्रदायमाविरकार्षुः । सत्वरं जिज्ञासुभिर-वलोकनीया व्याख्येयम् ।

१८. वेदांतप्रक्रियाप्रत्यभिज्ञा (पु. ८२२) Under Print

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिर्विनिर्मितोऽयं स्वतन्त्रो निबन्धः। तत्रास्मिन् प्रथमे सम्पुटे सर्वत्र वेदान्तेषु अध्यारोपापवादन्यायाश्रया एकैव प्रक्रिया प्राधान्येन परिगृहीतास्ति वेदान्ताभियुक्तैरित्येतद्वर्शितमत्र। अस्याः प्रक्रियाया अनादरादेव हेतोः सर्वेऽपि वावदूकाः वेदान्तोपदिष्टमात्मैकत्वमनुभवारूढमापादयितुं नाशक्नुवन्नित्येतच्च निदर्शितम् अतिप्राचीनकालादारभ्य सर्वज्ञात्ममुनिसमयपर्यन्तवृत्तवेदान्त विचारेतिहास-सङ्क्षेपोपस्थापनेन ॥ विस्तृतांग्लभाषामयभूमिकया संस्कृतभाषामयभूमिकया च समलङ्कृतः, प्रधानविषयानुक्रमणिकासहितश्च।

१९. वेदान्तबालबोधिनी (पु. ६०)

१०/-

भगवत्पादविरचित प्रातःस्मरणस्तोत्रस्य प्रश्नोत्तररूपं व्याख्यानम्। भाष्यकारोक्तीनां सरणिमेवानुसृत्य वेदान्तसिद्धान्तोऽत्र जिज्ञासूनां हृदयंगमितः।

२०. वेदान्तडिण्डिमः (पु. ७६)

२०/-

सुप्रसिद्धमिदं प्रकरणं भावबोधिण्याख्या व्याख्या सहितम्। व्याख्यायां ललितया शैल्या श्रुतिप्रमाणवचनोदाहरणपूर्वकं श्लोकार्थो विवृतः। युक्त्या समुपबृंहितश्च।

२१. विशुद्धवेदान्तसारः (१९६८) : (पु. १०४)

१५/-

अत्र जिज्ञासुजनचित्तभूमिकाविशेषानुसारेण अनुभवप्रधानदृष्ट्या इन्द्रियप्रधान-दृष्ट्या चेति वेदान्तोपदेशस्त्रेधा विभज्य प्रदर्शितः।

२२. विशुद्धवेदान्तपरिभाषा (पु. १४६)

२०/-

ब्रह्म, जगत्, जीव इति पदार्थत्रयस्य सतत्त्वम्, जगद्ब्रह्मणोः जीवब्रह्मणोश्च संबन्धश्च साम्प्रदायिकपरिभाषा-जातमवलम्ब्य अत्र निरूपितः।

२३. शाङ्करं वेदान्तमीमांसाभाष्यम् (स्वयंव्याख्यातम्) (पु. १२१)

२०/-

२४. वेदान्तविद्वद्गोष्ठी (पु. १६४)

२५/-

शाङ्करभाष्यतद्व्यख्यानप्रस्थानयोर्वैलक्षण्यमधिकृत्य एकादश विद्वत्प्रकाणा-डानामभिप्रायाः अत्र दत्ताः। विद्वदभिप्रायसंग्राहिका आंग्ल भूमिकाविभूषितश्च।

२५. पञ्चपादिकाप्रस्थानम् (पु. २०५)

३०/-

अत्र पञ्चपादिकाप्रस्थानं भाष्यप्रस्थानेन तुलितमस्ति; येनावलोकितेनेदं निश्चीयेत यत् सर्वथापि प्रस्थानान्तरमेवावलम्बितं पञ्चपादिकाकारैः, भाष्याक्षराणि तत्र तत्रान्यथायोजनेन स्वाभ्युपगत प्रमेयपराणीव वाक्यानि नीतानि चेति।

२६. श्रीशाङ्करहृदयम् (मूलाविद्यानिरास) (पु. २५७)

१५०/-

श्रीसच्चिदानन्देन्द्रसरस्वतीभिः पूर्वाश्रमे विनिर्मितं प्रकरणमिदं पूज्यपादानां श्रीशाङ्करभगवत्पादानां वेदान्तप्रक्रियारहस्यभेदकानां गभीराशयं विवृणोति। सर्वत्र चात्र प्रमाणवाक्यानुदाहृतानि परःशतम् श्रीमद्भाष्यकृतां तत्साक्षादन्तेवासिनां श्रीसुरेश्वराचार्याणां सुप्रसिद्धमाण्डूक्यकारिकाकृतां श्रीगौडपादाचार्याणां च। अनुशाङ्करवेदान्तिभिः संप्रदायविरोधेन नूतनतया अभ्युहितस्य औपनिषदप्रक्रिया मलिनीकरणमूलस्य मूलाविद्यावादस्य समूलोत्पाटनरूपोऽयं निबन्धः सम्यग्दर्शन-लालसजनग्राहिशुष्कतर्कपिशाचोच्चाटने महामन्त्ररूपो विजयते ॥

२७. पारमहंस्यमीमांसा (पु. १६०)

२५/-

संन्यासाश्रमः कथं शास्त्रेण विहितः, संन्यासस्य प्रकाराः, यतीनां नित्यानि अनुष्ठेयानि, संन्यासिना मुख्यो ध्येयः, प्रणवचिन्तनस्य प्रकाराः - इत्यादयो विषयाः - शाङ्करभाष्यं प्रमाणीकृत्य श्रुतिस्मृतिसङ्गतिपूर्वकं निरूपिता अस्मिन् प्रबन्धे। पारमहंस्यस्य वैशिष्ट्यं सम्यक् दर्शितमत्र ॥

२८. भक्तिचन्द्रिका - नारदभक्तिसूत्राणं व्याख्या (पु. २२२)

५०/-

नारद प्रणीतानां भक्तिसूत्राणां व्याख्यारूपोऽयं ग्रन्थः ॥शाङ्करसूत्र भाष्यशैली-मनुकरोति इयं नूतना व्याख्या। भक्तिविषये

संभावितानां सम्भाव्यमानानां सर्वेषां प्रश्नानाम् आक्षेपाणां च परिहारोऽत्र दर्शितः । भावुकैः रसिकैः अवश्यं अवलोकनीयोऽयं ग्रन्थः । कन्नडमूलग्रन्थ रचयितारः-श्री स्वामिनः, संस्कृतानु-वादकः-विद्वान् वेङ्कटेशशर्मा, होसहल्ली ।

२९. भामती (रचयिता विट्ठल शास्त्रिगलु) (पु. १४४)

१०/-

“भामतीसमालोचनम्” भामत्याः श्री शाङ्करभाष्यस्य च अनुगुणाननुगुण-प्रदर्शकोऽयं ग्रन्थः । सर्वेषामपि पुस्तकानां प्रापणव्ययस्तु पृथगेव

प्रापणस्थानम् :

- १) अध्यात्मप्रकाशकार्यालयः, होलेनरसीपुरम्, हासन - ५७३ २११,
दू : ०८१७५-२७३८२०
- २) बेंगलोर, दू : ०८०-२६७६५५४८

Books Authored by Sri S.S. Swamiji

S.No.	Name of the Book	Pages	Price Rs.
1	Narada's Aphorisms On Bhakti <i>(The book will serve as a valuable guide to those who wish to tread the path of Bhakti)</i>	32	10/-
2	Minor Works Of Sri Sankarachaarya <i>(Contains 16 most popular minor works of Sankara)</i>	68	15/-
3	Sankara's Clarifications Of Certain Vedantic Concepts <i>(Some more deep seated misconceptions among students and scholars of Vedanta are clarified in this valuable text)</i>	96	25/-
4	How To Recognise The Method Of Vedanta <i>(Introduction to Sanskrit Text, "Vedanta Prakriya Prathyabijna of Vedantic thought upto the time of Sarvajnatma Muni)</i>	128	30/-
5	Avasthatraya Or The Unique Method Of Vedanta <i>(Method of three states of Consciousness, which our real Self transcends. A valuable introduction to the study of Vedanta as a pure philosophy)</i>	20	10/-
6	Salient Features Of Sankara Vedanta <i>(Presents matter and method of genuine Sankara Vedanta in a small compass)</i>	136	25/-
7	Misconceptions About Sankara Vedanta <i>(All criticisms on Vedanta are convincingly solved using the genuine traditional methodology of Sankara Vedanta)</i>	120	25/-
8	Vision Of Atman	130	20/-

	<i>(The different aspects of three means of Intuitive knowledge, to wit, Sravana, Manana and Nididhyasana are explained)</i>		
9	Intuition Of Reality	114	20/-
	<i>(The Vedantic Knowledge is not mere subtle intellectualism but is intuition of Reality, arising through Divine Grace)</i>		
10	Upanishadic Approach To Reality	79	20/-
	<i>(The Unique Method of teaching Vedanta adopted by Shri Gaudapada, Sankara & Sureshwara)</i>		
11	Science Of Being	108	25/-
	<i>(Deals with Chapter VI of Chandogya Upanishads. Presents in a nut-shell the true nature of the Science of Being)</i>		
12	Essays On Vedanta	185	50/-
	<i>(Contains essential tenets of the Upanishads and the method of approach adopted in them)</i>		
13	Shudda-Saankaraa-Prakriya-Bhaaskara	200	50/-
	<i>(Sheds Light on the Vedantic method according to Sankara determining the real doctrine of Upanishads)</i>		
14	Sankara's Sutra Bhashya	121	20/-
	<i>(Illustrates to an earnest seeker of Truth, how Sankara Bhashyas are self-explanatory, and do not require guidance of commentators)</i>		
15	Introduction To Vedanta Texts	232	40/-
	<i>(Compilation of Introductions from English & Sanskrit works of S.S. Swamiji)</i>		
16	Isavasyopanishad (Sankara Bhashya)	70	20/-
17	Vedanta Or The Science Of Reality	551	120/-
	<i>(Book Written by Sri K.A. Krishnaswamy Iyer) (Deals with the immediate realisation of Brahman by Intuitive reflection on the witness of the three states of consciousness)</i>		
17A	Collected Works Of K.A. Krishnaswamy Iyer	330	80/-
	<i>(Contains lectures & articles contributed to various periodicals on different occasions as well as unpublished writings of the author of the "Vedanta or Science of Reality")</i>		

Books authored by Sri D.B. Gangolli
[Satchidananda Vaakjyothi series 18-25]

18	The Relevance Of Vedanta In This Modern Age Of Civilization <i>(Translation of "Vedantavuu Adhunika Jiivanavuu" - Xerox)</i>	70	20/-
19	A Broad Outline Of Vedanta <i>(Translation of "Sankara Mahaa Manana")</i>	24	10/-
20	Reality Beyond All Empirical Dealings <i>(Translation of "Sarva Vyavaharateetavada Paramartha")</i>	40	10/-
21	Deliberation On The Ultimate Reality <i>(Translation of "Anubhava Paryantavada Atma Vichara")</i>	84	12/-
22	Brahmavidya Or Knowledge Of The Ultimate Reality <i>(Translation of "Brahma Vidya")</i>	52	10/-
23	The Quintessence Of Pristine Pure Vedanta <i>(Translation of "Parishuddha Vedanta Sara")</i>	42	10/-
24	The Philosophical Science Of Vedanta <i>("Translation of Adhyatma Vidye")</i>	44	12/-
25	Vedanta : The Only Consummate Spiritual Science <i>(Translation of "Paripurna Darshana")</i>	44	12/-
26	The Unique Teachings Of Sankara <i>(Discussion on Adhyasa Bhashya)</i>	67	10/-
27	The Scientific Approach Of Advaita Vedanta <i>(Uses the modern audio-visual method with 14 diagrams to depict the fundamentals of Advaita Vedanta)</i>	120	30/-
28	Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji (Life Sketch)	56	15/-
29	The Magic Jewel Of Intuition <i>(Translation of Paramartha Chintamani. This Magnum Opus explains the subtle and secret teachings of Mandukya Upanishad using Avasthatraya Prakriye)</i>	560	100/-
30	The Essential Adi Shankara <i>(Translation of "Sankara Vedanta Sara", excellent reference book and a constant guide for a genuine student of Vedanta)</i>	240	75/-
31	Essential Gaudapada	432	400/-

	<i>(Translation of Gaudapada Hridaya ; Explanation of Karikaas)</i>	
32	Intuitive Approach To Sankara Vedanta	200 40/-
	<i>(Translation of Vedantārtha - Sara - Sangraha. Secrets of Adhyasa, Adhyasa, Adhyaropa - Apavada Nyaya revealed)</i>	
33	The Basic Tenets Of Sankara Vedanta	200 30/-
	<i>(Translation of Sankara Vedantada Moolatatwagalu)</i>	
34	The Pristine Pure Advaita Philosophy Of Adi Sankara	136 25/-
	<i>(Translation of Sankara Siddhanta : Explains pure Sankara Siddhanta and exposes the wrong interpretation of Vyakhyanakaras)</i>	
35	Advaita Pancharatnam	80 10/-
	<i>(Commentary of Five Verses composed by Adi Sankara on Advaita Vedanta)</i>	
36	The Method Of Vedanta (Dr. J. Alston)	N o 150/- Stock
37	Essential Sureswara And Satchidananda	150/-