

Collected Books & Articles on VEDĀNTA



**Brahmajna Kavi, Vedānta Chatura
Sri Devarao Kulkarni**



Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya
Holenarasipura - 573211

Collected Books & Articles on
VEDĀNTA

by

Brahmajna Kavi, Vedānta Chatura
Sri Devarao Kulkarni

Sl. No. 271
Catalog Sl.No. 43

Published by

ADHYATMA PRAKASHA KARYALĀYA

Holenarasipura - 573211,

Hassan District, Karnataka State, INDIA

Tel : +91 8175 273820 Mobile : +919535790641

www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

email : secretary@adhyatmaprakasha.org

coordinator_apk@yahoo.com

Bengaluru Branch

No. 68 (New No. 6), 6th Main Road, 2nd Block,

Thyagarajanagara, Bengaluru - 560 070

Tel : +91 80 26765548 Mobile : +919606691002

email : shankara.bhaskara@gmail.com

2024

COLLECTED BOOKS & ARTICLES ON VEDANTA-

Written by Sri Devarao Kulkarni

Published by Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, Holenarasipura-573211,
Hassan District, Karnataka State, INDIA.

Phone: +91 8175 273820

website : www.adhyatmaprakasha.org

e-mail : secretary@adhyatmaprakasha.org
coordinator_apk@yahoo.com

First Print 2024 - In one Volume

Copies 500

Price Rs. 400/-

Paper 80 gsm NS Maplitho

Copies available at :

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

Holenarasipura - 573211

Hassan District, Karnataka State, INDIA

Tel : +91 8175 273820 Mobile : +919535790641

Bengaluru Branch :

Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya

No. 68 (New No. 6), 6th Main Road, 2nd Block,

Thyagarajanagara, Bengaluru - 560 070

Karnataka State, INDIA

e-mail: shankara.bhaskara@gmail.com

+91 80 26765548 Mobile : +919606691002

Printed by

Sri Rama Printers

47, BKM Complex, Suprajanagara,

Chunchaghatta Main Road,

Bengaluru - 560 062, Cell : +91 9845346197

Publisher's Note

Sri Devarao Kulkarni is one of the prominent disciples of Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji. He completed a comprehensive study of Shankara Vedanta commentaries under the Swamiji's guidance. Through the Swamiji's teachings, he recognized that Vedanta is not merely a subject for propagation, but a wealth of experiential realization. Understanding that divine grace is necessary for philosophical insight, he personally advanced on the path of intense spiritual practice. Through his practice, he clearly grasped the richness of the commentaries.

Just as Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji made profound philosophical concepts easily accessible to people of all backgrounds, Sri Devarao Kulkarni also uniquely served both his guru and society through Vedanta discourses, devotional storytelling, folk ballads, and literary works. His books have been published in both Kannada and English.

1. Guide-Lines to Shankara Vedanta
2. Adhyatma Yoga
3. Avasthaatraya Viveka
4. Teaching of Brahman through the attributions of Avidya and Maya
5. Prospectus for Teaching GENUINE VEDANTA
6. Articles on Vedanta

All the above mentioned books except sl.no.6 were originally published separately in different contexts and places. We are now publishing them together as a single volume titled "Collected Books & Articles on Vedanta by Brahmajna Kavi Sri Devarao Kulkarni" for the convenience of readers.

For this book publication, the following devotees have generously contributed: 1. A close disciple (name not revealed)--Rs.75,000; 2. Prabhakar, Rs. 5,000; 3. M. V. Sridhar, Rs.10,000; 4. Vijayamurthy, Rs.10,000; 5. Usha SatyaNarayana, Rs.5,000; 6. Vanitha, Avadhani 4,000.

Sri R.B. Gopinath, Bengaluru, a direct disciple of Sri Devarao Kulkarni has done the proof reading. Ved. Brah. Sri Lakshmisha Bhat has done the proof reading of Sanskrit quotations. Vid. Smt. Mrudula Ravi and Late. Smt. Manjula have immensely helped in proof reading and corrections. our sincere thanks to all of them.

We hope that this book will be welcomed by students of Vedanta.

5-08-2024
Bangalore

Publisher

CONTENTS

Collected Books & Articles on Vedanta

- | | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Guide-Lines to Shankara Vedanta | 1 - 120 |
| 2. | Adhyatma Yoga | 121 - 182 |
| 3. | Avasthaatraya Viveka | 183 - 272 |
| 4. | Teaching of Brahman through the
Attributions of Avidya and Maya | 273 - 352 |
| 5. | Prospectus for Teaching
Genuine Vedanta | 353 - 374 |
| 6. | Articles of Devarao Kulkarni on
Vedanta | 375 - 497 |
-

अद्वैतवादमुकुरः किल शङ्करस्य
गाढं कदर्थरजसा तमसानुलिप्तः ।
तस्यैव भाष्यमवलम्ब्य मया कृतोऽस्मिन्
कममलापनयनेऽस्य महान् प्रयत्नः ॥

Guide-Lines to
SHAṆKARA VEDĀNTA

Pages 1 - 120

About the Book

In this book the author makes it clear that Shaṅkara-Vedānta has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by the sub-commentators on Shri Shaṅkara's Bhāshyas. Accordingly the seekers are confused and confounded by many distortions, misinterpretations and misleading versions of Shaṅkara's original Bhāshyas.

The Author has gathered some definite ideas regarding the methodology of teaching this pristine pure Shaṅkara-Vedānta.

According to this methodology an aspirant should know at first the fundamentals of Shaṅkara-Vedānta, which work as a key to open the treasury to Shaṅkara Vedānta. Without a thorough understanding of these fundamental principles, the aspirant will not be able to follow or to grasp the subtle teachings of the Parasthānatraya Bhāshyas.

At the outset it may be mentioned that these fundamentals (= basic rules of interpretation) are mainly five in number:

- i. Relying on the intuitive experiences of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life.
- ii. Realising the Witnessing principle of life which is beyond ego.
- iii. The methodology of deliberate Superimposition and subsequent Rescission.
- iv. The distinction of the empirical standpoint and transcendental standpoint.
- v. Understanding the differences between the Sadhanas of Vastutantra and Kartṛtantra.

-AUM-

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays it is very essential to know Āchārya Shāṅkara's teachings in its true perspective according to his *Prasthānatraya Bhāshyas*, because Shāṅkara-Vedānta has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by the sub-commentators on Shri Shāṅkara's Bhāshyas. Accordingly the seekers are confused and confounded by many distortions, misinterpretations and misleading versions of Shāṅkara's original Bhāshyas. To comprehend the fullest import of the teachings of Shāṅkara, we have to take the traditional works of *Gaudapāda's Kārikā* on *Māṇḍūkya Upanishad*, *Upadesha Sāhasrī*, an independent work of Shri Shāṅkara and *Sureshvara's Vārtikas* on Taittiriya and Bṛhadāranyaka Bhāshyas of Shri Shāṅkara and his independent work called *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. All these contain the idea of pristine pure Vedānta in unequivocal voice. Teachings based on these works are not easily available to the aspirants of Shāṅkara-Vedānta. To remove this scarcity, *Shri Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji of Karnataka State*, has made a sustained effort to show the genuine teachings through his writings. The first book is published in Kannada viz. "Shāṅkara Vedānta Sāra". In the introduction to this book Swāmiji has declared that "never before in any part of the world a book of this type which contain subjectwise classification of the sentences of the Bhāshya and

traditional books referred to above has been published". In this direction he has published hundreds of books in three languages viz. Kannada, Sanskrit and English.

Fortunately for me I came across Shri Swāmiji and studied most of his books and followed his guidances for nearly twenty years (1954-55 to 1974-75). I have also propagated this teaching in some parts of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra and also to some foreign aspirants. By this experience of 25 years of teachings and discussion with various kinds of people I have gathered some definite ideas regarding the methodology of teaching this pristine pure Shaṅkara-Vedānta.

According to this methodology an aspirant should know at first the *fundamentals of Shaṅkara-Vedānta*, which work as a key to open the treasury to Shaṅkara Vedānta. Without a thorough understanding of these fundamental principles, the aspirant will not be able to follow or to grasp the subtle teachings of the Parasthānatraya Bhāshyas.

At the outset it may be mentioned that these fundamentals (= basic rules of interpretation) are mainly five in number:

- i. Relying on the intuitive experiences of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life (सार्वत्रिक पूर्ण अनुभव)

- ii. Realising the Witnessing principle of life which is beyond ego (साक्षी दर्शन)
- iii. The methodology of deliberate Superimposition and subsequent Rescission (अध्यारोप-अपवादन्याय)—the Vedantic devices adopted in the Upanishads for the purpose of teaching the nature of Absolute Reality.
- iv. The distinction of the empirical standpoint and transcendental standpoint, i.e. Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti and Paramārtha Dṛṣhti (व्यावहारिक दृष्टि-परमार्थिक दृष्टि)
- v. Understanding the differences between the Sādhana of Vastutantra and Kartṛtantra (वस्तुतन्त्र-कर्तृतन्त्र विवेक) i.e. knowledge depending on ontological facts (वस्तुतन्त्र) as against action depending upon human will or effort (कर्तृतन्त्र or पुरुषतन्त्र)

These five are the vital principles to know Śaṅkara Vedānta. Strictly speaking these are the foundations on which the edifice of Śaṅkara-Vedānta is built. Unless and until the seeker can discern these fundamentals, it will be very difficult for him to reconcile the seemingly contradictory statements of Bhāṣyas. There have arisen divergent views (misconceptions) not only among the followers of adverse school (like Mādhva, Rāmānuja etc.) but also among those that owe their allegiance to Śaṅkara's tradition itself (like Bhāmatikāra, Vivaraṇācārya etc.). These differences of opinion are, due mostly to either disregarding these basic rules of

interpretations or overlooking the needful importance to these five fundamentals mentioned above. According to Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji's teachings based on Shaṅkara Bhāshyas, if we try to understand the various standpoints adopted for the purpose of teachings, then all our misconceptions and doubts will get removed. For this purpose I propose to explain here these five fundamentals briefly, as interpreted by the Revered Swāmiji of Holenarsipur, only to understand the subject-matter of Shaṅkara-Vedānta in its true perspective.

Shri Swāmiji, my Gurudev, has explained these five fundamentals in his various works. I propose to put them in one book-form. These fundamentals have been culled out from the various works of Shri Swāmiji, so they are not new inventions of my own. I am indeed greatly indebted to my Guruji for this.

After going through this book very carefully an aspirant will realize that he is in a position to study the Shaṅkara Bhāshyas. Apart from this, he will be able to realize that the teachings of Āchārya Shaṅkara are consistent with life and experience and these form definite means to get peace and tranquility in this very life. Hence this book is appropriately titled '*Guide-lines to Shaṅkara Vedānta*'. Without the guidance of the Upanishads as taught by a Guru, who is well-versed in the traditional method of instruction (श्रोत्रिय) and who has realized or intuited the ultimate Reality (ब्रह्मनिष्ठ), the nature

of Reality cannot be easily comprehended. For this purpose I have discussed the full significances of ten important suggestions (guidances) of Shri Swāmiji as mentioned in his book. “Misconceptions about Shaṅkara” in the Appendix.

The credit for writing this book should go to Shri *R.B. Gopinath, Bangalore* and Shri *Manas Kumar Sanyal, Calcutta*. Both are ardent students of Shaṅkara-Vedānta and keen followers of the teachings of Shri Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swāmiji. May the Almighty and Shri Sadguru bless them in all the aspects of life.

Bangalore

29th September 1990

- DEVARAO KULKARNI

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	9
2. Universal Acceptance and comprehensive Vision of Life	15
3. Cognising the Witnessing Principle of Life	36
4. The Unique Methodology of Vedānta: Adhyārōpa & Apavāda	65
5. Empirical View & Transcendental View	90
6. Kartrutantra and Vastutanatra Sadhanas	105
7. Conclusion	119

Guide - Lines to SHAṆKARA VEDĀNTA

CHAPTER – 1

The first Fundamental:

Relying on the intuitive experiences of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life.

L SPECIFIC FEATURE OF VEDĀNTAS (UPANISHADS)

According to Shri Shaṅkara, though the Upānisāhds are indivisible part of Vedas, the teaching contained in the Upanishads is quite unlike the other types of teachings like rituals (Karmas), meditations (Upāsānās), taught in Vedas. Hence the deliberations on Brahman, i.e. *Brahma-Jijnāsā* has been taught separately from the deliberations on Dharma, i.e. *Dharma-Jijnāsā* which mainly teach us the rituals and meditations. To perform rituals etc. one should observe varnas, Āshramas, Age, Condition etc., So it is not applicable commonly to all. This Dharma Jijnāsā runs on the common belief that "I am so and so, I am a doer of actions, I am happy, I am miserable" etc., accepting agentship and enjoyership. This part of the text of Veda is authoritative in its own field. This is accepted by Shankara as it has been accepted by other Mimāṃsakas as he is himself a follower of *Sanātana Vaidika Dharma*. But his main contention is that apart from this Dharma-Jijnāsā there is *Brahma-*

Jijnāsā, i.e. deliberation on Brahman which is also taught by Veda in the last portion thereof which are called Aranyakas (Upanishads). This Brahma-Jijnāsā is based on Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. Though this is the fact, these two forms of Jijnāsās are not rival to each other, because Brahma-Jijnāsā nourishes the Dharma-Jijnāsā in one aspect and the Dharma-Jijnāsā will lead to Brahma-Jijnāsā in another aspect.

Thus they are complementary to each other. Hence Shaṅkara declares in Bṛha. Bhāṣya -2/4/10 thus :

“The Veda is absolutely valid with regard to its subject-matter. Therefore those who aspire after the well being must accept the verdict of the Vedas on knowledge or on rites, as it is.”¹

It was also shown by Shaṅkara how the conflict with the injunctions about the rites and duties is to be resolved by a reference to the distinction between the enlightened and unenlightened men.(S. Bh-1/3/19)

According to Shaṅkara, the Dharma-Jijnāsā, i.e. the deliberation on religious matters has taken for granted the common belief of the agentship and enjoyership. It has not set out to determine the true nature of the Self. So it is authoritative in its field only. For this purpose Shaṅkara declares in his Adhāyasa Bhāṣya:

¹ “वेदस्य हि निरपेक्षं स्वार्थं प्रामाण्यं, तस्माद् यत्तेनोक्तं तत्तथैव प्रतिपत्तव्यम्
आत्मनः श्रेय इच्छद्भिः - ज्ञानं वा कमे वा ॥”

“It is a fact that a man performing religious duties or Karma does not attain the exquisite fruits of scriptural duties unless he has acquired a knowledge through belief in the Shāstras that his essential nature of Ātman is separate from his body, senses etc., Still a knowledge of the absolute Reality that is the Self, is not a pre-requisite for such a man who is ignorant of his true nature, for the knowledge of Reality has no relevance here, and it is opposed to agentship of action in as much as the nature of Ātman (as taught in Vedānta) is beyond hunger and thirst, free from such differentiation as Brahmin caste, Kshatriya caste etc. and is not subject to birth and death (Bṛi-3/5/1 and 3/4/6). And the scriptures, which are operative before the dawn of the real knowledge of the Self cannot transgress the limits of their dependence on people groping in nescience”.

So it is evident that the scriptural texts belonging to the Karma-Kānda is meant for those ignorant people who do not know the essential nature of Ātman. And in the ultimate Reality of Ātman, there are really no castes, no relationships with body, sense organs, mind, intellect etc., and no categories of the nature of action, means of action and fruits of action at all. So Śaṅkara distinguishes the Brahma-Jijnāsā from Dharma-Jijnāsā. For this reason when he comments on the first Shāriraka Sūtra, he discusses as to what the word ‘अथ’, i.e.

'afterwords' denotes. Here we have to observe that it is not the meaning of this word that after completing Dharma-Jignāsā alone, one will be fit for Brahma-Jignāsā. But before or after the Dharma-Jignāsā he who has got the pre-requisite qualities such as (i) discrimination between eternal and non-eternal (नित्यानित्यवस्तुविवेकः); (ii) dispassion for the enjoyment of the fruits of work here and here after (इहामुत्रार्थफलभोगविरागः) (iii) perfection of such practices as control of mind, control of senses and organs etc., (शमदमादिसाधनसम्पत्); and (iv) an intense desire for liberation (मुमुक्षुत्वञ्च) can undertake, a deliberation on the Upanishadic texts for getting a direct knowledge of Brahman. So these are the inevitably required qualities to deal with Brahma-Jignāsā. These are called as Sādhana Chatustaya Sampatti.

One important difference between these two types of deliberations on *Dharma* and *Brahman* is shown in Sūtra Bhāshya -1/1/2.

“न धर्मजिज्ञासायामिव श्रुत्यादय एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्मजिज्ञासायां, किन्तु श्रुत्यादयः अनुभवादयाश्च यथासम्भवमिह प्रमाणाम् अनुभवावसानत्वात् भूतवस्तु विषयत्वाच्च ब्रह्मविज्ञानस्य” ॥

In this sentence Shaṅkara emphatically declares that the deliberation on Brahman should and must culminate in one's own intuitive experience. So here the *Vedāntic Anubhava* (Vedāntic intuition) is also a Pramāṇa, but not merely the Shruti alone just as it is in the case of Dharma-Jignāsā. In the case of religious duty, the utterances of the

Shrutis etc., would be the only means of knowledge, because no direct experience is needed in support. But the knowledge of Self, which relates to an already existing entity, culminates in experience. Hence it is evident here, that the Brahma-Jijnāsā starts on the firm ground of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. Hence this is the first fundamental of Shaṅkara Vedānta—relying on common experience and taking the full view of life. As an elaboration we shall explain the significance of common experience or universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life in the following pages.

II. UNIVERSAL ACCEPTANCE OR COMMON EXPERIENCE:

To determine the reality we have to rely on the firm ground of common experience meaning the experiences which are common to all irrespective of caste, creed, gender, age, stage of life (Āshrama), time, place etc., For example, the knowledge about fire that it is hot, the knowledge about ice that it is cold or direct perception just as we see external things through our eyes (the acquisition of knowledge through a contact of the eye with some objects) etc., These types of common experiences never change their nature. Shaṅkara thus says in Briha Bhāshya -2/1/15:

- (i) “For, a thing can never change its nature, just as fire invariably burns and illumines straw, tender grass

etc., that come in contact with it. If it does not, we cannot assert that fire burns or illumines" (Briha Bh-2/1/15)

Shankara has hence declared in his Brahma Sūtra Bhāshya -2/2/11 thus :

- (ii) "तच्च सम्याग् ज्ञानम् एकरूपं वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात् एकरूपेण हि अवस्थित यः अर्थः सः परमार्थः । लोके तद्विषयं ज्ञानं सम्यग्ज्ञानम् इति उच्यते, यथा अग्निः उष्णः इति" ॥

"And that true enlightenment has no diversity, since it must conform to an existent fact (वस्तुतन्त्रत्वात्)। That content of knowledge is said to be the most real since it ever remains the same and in the world, the knowledge of that kind is said to be right knowledge as for instance, the knowledge about fire that it is hot."

Here Shankara gives the example that the fire is hot —this denotes the universal experience (common experience भूयोदर्शन). For this purpose he often uses such words—"दृश्यते" "अदर्शनात्" "दृष्टत्वात्" "अदृष्टत्वात्" etc., in his Bhāshyas.

- (iii) "In all the bodies, liquids such as secretions, blood etc., are *seen* (दृश्यते) to present in abundance."

[S. Bh -3/1/2]

- (iv) "For the organs cannot either go or stay any where unless they have a material support, since this is contrary to *experience*, it is not *noticed* (अदर्शनात्) in any living creature."

[S. Bh -3/1/3]

- (v) “Accordingly it is a matter of *common experience* (लोके अनुभवः) that the nacre appears as silver and a single moon appears as two.” [-Adhyāsa Bhāṣhya]

So to determine the reality we have to rely on the common experience, i.e. a truth can be called as such only if it is acceptable and verifiable by every one at all times. Shaṅkara emphatically declares in Gītā Bhāṣhya (18/16) that, “even a hundred Shruti texts cannot be considered to be valid if they pronounce fire to be cold or non-luminous,¹. In Brha. Bhāṣhya (2/1/20) also he says : “You cannot prove that fire is cold or that the sun does not give heat, even by citing a hundred examples, for the facts would already be known to be otherwise through another means of knowledge.”

To determine the transcendental reality Shaṅkara has followed the footsteps of the utterances of the Shrutis which denote and culminate in the universal acceptance (i.e. common to all persons) and comprehensive tribasic vision of life (i.e. which follows the experiences of the three states of waking, dream and deepsleep). So the truth should be based on this firm ground and not on the experience of an individual soul. Shaṅkara himself never said that it is his own experience. He says, everything should be proved by direct universal intuition and reasoning based on such intuition as far as possible. The

¹. नहि श्रुतिशतमपि शीतोऽग्निप्रकाशोवा इति बुवत् प्रमाण्यमुपैति ॥

(गी.भा. १८-६६)

truth should not be based merely on the utterances (study of teachings) of any great Soul or Omniscient being or Prophet or Philosopher or the thinker, nor does it depend on the implicit faith alone in the mere utterances of Scriptures. Truth, however, is one and what is against common experience must be rejected, whoever says it even if he be the Lotus-born (Brahma). Strictly speaking the Advaita Siddhānta is not creation of Shaṅkara but it is universal truth based on common experience. The transcendental Reality is called as Brahman or Ātman in the Upanishads and in Gītā. It is declared in these Shāstras that this Reality is the Self of all. For examples:

“एको देवःसर्वभूतेषु गूढः” (Shvetashvatara -6/11)

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा” (Katha – 2/2/29, 19, 11)

क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां बिद्धे सर्वक्षेत्रेषु” (Geetha – 13/2)

“ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृदयदेशे..तिष्ठति” (Geetha – 18/61)

“समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु” (Geetha – 9/29) etc.

By this we can understand that the transcendental Reality which is taught in the Upanishads and in Gītā is the Self of all. So it should be cognized on the basis of common experience alone and not on the individual mystic experiences which have been gained by some practices like Yōga, Samādhi etc. These types of individual mystic experience are there but they are not useful to determine transcendental Reality which is called PARAMĀRTHAHA. Shri Shaṅkara has clarified

that pure Consciousness which is the Witnessing Self can be cognized and experienced as it is our own true Self which can neither be denied or accepted. It is transcendental, but can be experienced intuitively. Shaṅkara gives supreme importance to universal experiences (but not on individual experience) in determining the validity of the statement of Scriptures.

So it is proved here that to know the significance of Shaṅkara-Vedānta we should rely on the universal acceptance or the common experience. This is called Sārvatrika Anubhava (सार्वत्रिकानुभव). Now we shall deal with the comprehensive vision of life, i.e. Pūrṇa Anubhava (पूर्णानुभव)

III. POORNAANUBHAVA OR COMPREHENSIVE VISION OF LIFE:

A. Partial view of life according to the physical science and all other systems of Philosophy except Vedānta,

The common experience of the worldly life is divided in to two parts, i.e. the subject and the object. The external world is the object and the perceiver of this, is the subject. All empirical experiences consist of the subject-object relationship. On this supposition all other sciences, first want to discover the truth regarding the objects. In this process also every sciences e.g. Physics, Chemistry, Engineering etc., takes a part and

partial view of the objective world. From this standpoint there are so many subject-matters which are variously divided and every science deals with a particular subject-matter. Apart from this the Psychology also deals with the subject which consists of analyzing the mind of other persons and creatures which are objects for their own mind. According to this there are so many varieties such as human psychology, child psychology etc. Sometimes they take the subjective mind of their own and they infer regarding the objective mind on the basement of the behavior of other persons, creatures etc. So the material science and the psychiatry which are very important these days, have not got or relied on the comprehensive vision regarding the universe. For example, even in the case of a person who has studied whole of the solar system which is the universe, one will come to the conclusion that in view of there being so many solar systems in this vast universe it will be impossible to know everything in this universe. From this standpoint all sciences are dealing with a part of the universe and not the universe as a whole with comprehensive aspect. This is the position of the material sciences.

The above sciences deal with the objects which are regulated by time, space and causation. Hence the sciences which are dealing with the part of the universe are bound by these factors and they have no capacity to extricate themselves from these regulations.

B. VEDANTIC VIEW REGARDING THE UNIVERSE:

In Vedānta the whole phenomenon of the universe is divided into three planes:

- i) The Divine plane:- *Ādhidaivika Prapancha*
- ii) The Material plane:- *Ādhibhautika Prapancha*
- iii) The corporeal plane:- *Ādhyātmika Prapancha*

The first is the divine plane which means (from the Sanskrit root-Div. To shine) the sun, the moon, the stars, planets etc., which are millions and billions in number; the divine worlds according to the religious beliefs such as heavenly worlds upto Brahma-Lōka—including all these, the Vedānta takes in one group as divine plane or *Ādhidaivika Prapancha*.

The material plane means the world which we see—the conglomeration of the five elements—Ether, Air, Fire, Water and the Earth; all types of bodies of all creatures, all the things which we see and all types of scientific machines etc., which are already invented and to be invented in future such as computers, robots etc.,—all these are to be taken in this plane, i.e. the material plane or *Ādhibhautika Prapancha*.

The corporeal plane is concerned with the subject, while the above said two planes are coming in the category of the objects or the objective world. In this corporeal plane: the body, vital force, organs of action

and sense organs, mind, intellect and feelings of sorrow and pleasure etc., including the “Me-notion” are included. This group is called as Corporeal plane or *Ādhyātmika Prapancha*, because all these are assembled together just like any machinery, like a watch assembled with dial, springs etc. This group is called in Vedānta as *Kārya-Kāraṇa Sanghāta* (Gi-13/70). This is the technical term of Vedānta which denotes the corporeal plane. All these form the third group.

Besides these three planes, we have to take the infinite idea of time, space and causation. The time-space factor appear in our daily life as if they are real and beginningless and endless and hence infinite. The question will be absurd that, “in which time does the time factor appear? In which place the idea of space is there?” Because without the concept of time or space there will be no kind of dealings such as thinking, talking and acting. For this purpose philosophers who started thinking regarding the truth of time and space which are metaphysics have come to different conclusions in this matter:

- a) Some say that the distance between two things is called as ‘space’ and the intervening period between two events is called as ‘time’.
- b) Others say that the above view is not correct because to count the things 1, 2, 3, etc., the space is required as the substratum. So also in the case of events, without the substratum of time, there will be no counting of series of events.

- c) Others hold the view that the notion of time and space are there where there is the mind and hence these are the apriori notions of the mind.
- d) Others say that time, space and causation—all these are relative to each other. There is no absolute time, space or causation. Neither time nor space has any existence of its own; each exists or seems to exist only in constant relation to and association with other. So, all the dealings are coming under the relativity alone. There may be an absolute truth, it may be God. (= A Great Geometer) also. This final conclusion is drawn by Einstein. Here we have to remember that “bereft of time factor, there will be no causation”, because ‘cause’ means that which exists inevitably before the effect (Kārya Niyata PūrvaVṛttihi Kāranam). This is the judgement of Nyāya-Shāstra (Indian science of reasoning). So, the idea of causation cannot be considered apart from the time factor.

The Vedāntic view of the Universe comprehends all the infinite idea of time, space, causation etc., with all the multiplicity of the universe including the “Mention” and is considered as a single unit of the appearance of the universe. This whole unit of the universe appears in the waking state. Shri Shaṅkara explains the nature of the universe itself in a comprehensive way in his S-Bh-1/1/2 as follows:

“... this universe that is manifested through name and form, that is associated with diverse agents and experiencers, that provides the support for actions and results having well-regulated space, time and causation, and that defies all thoughts about the real nature of its creation.”

This is the Vedāntic view of comprehensive vision of the phenomenon of the universe.

C. Method of observing the life as a whole:

The physical sciences seek the aid of instruments, gadgets and appliances to establish their truths, and even so they can never reach any finality because they thrive only in one state—the waking state, discarding the universal experiences of two other states of life i.e. dream-state and deep sleep-state. This is evidently a partial view of life and the truths arrived at thereby are also only partial. But Vedānta takes into consideration the whole life in all its manifested and unmanifested forms, i.e. the Vedānta takes the human experiences of all the three states viz., Waking, Dream and Deep sleep to arrive at its conclusions. So Vedāntic conclusions which are based on intuitive experiences, become irrefutable and valid for all times. No other system of philosophy except Vedānta bases its enquiry on a comprehensive tri-basic view of life and on the principle of universal acceptance.

Where there is an appearance of the waking state, the state contains the whole of the above said unit

(mentioned in the previous article No. III B). When the waking state disappears, there is no appearance of the above said dualistic universe. For example, in deep sleep there is no appearance of the waking state. Where there is the appearance of the dream, in that state also another kind of the unit of universe appears just as it is described in the case of waking state. But when dream state disappears the whole unit of that universe also disappears.

So in Vedānta, the comprehensive vision of appearance and disappearance of the dualistic world is taken together. These two are described as *manifested* and *unmanifested* forms of the universe. These are technical terms used in Vedānta as Vyakta (व्यक्त) and Avyakta (अव्यक्त) in Gītā-8/18; Sat (सत्) and Asat (असत्) in Gītā – 13/12; Kshara (क्षर) and Akashara (अक्षर) in Gītā–15/16; Vidita (विदित) and Avidita (अविदित) in Kena-Upanishad – 1/4, Mūrta (मूर्त) and Amūrta (अमूर्त) in Bṛha-Upanishad -2/3/1; Sambhūti (सम्भूति) and Asambhūti (असम्भूति) in Ishāvāsyōpanishad–12 etc. Here Shaṅkara says the meaning of these as Vyākṛta (व्याकृत) and Avyākṛta (अव्याकृत) in Sūtra Bhāṣhya – 2/1/27.

The revered Swāmiji of Holenarsipur has given this practical and all embracing outlook of comprehensive vision of life while explaining Tribasic method of Vedāntā, i.e. AVASTHĀTRAYA based on Shaṅkara Bhāṣhya Māndūkya-Mantra–5 in his "Māndūkya Rahasya Vivṛithi". Here he explains the whole range of life which is divided

into parts : That is DarshanaVṛitti (-the states of waking and dream where one sees something else) and AdarshanaVṛitti (- the states of deep sleep and trance wherein one sees nothing) ('दर्शनादर्शन वृत्तयोः तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधलक्षणस्य स्वापस्य तुल्यत्वात् - Mān.Bh-5). In Upanishads and in Gītā the same method is taken as shown above. Taking these both sides of life (= the whole of life in all its manifested and unmanifested forms) and determining the truth is an important thing in Vedānta. All types of experiences just as common man's experiences, mystic experiences of Yōgis, Upāsakas and so on, are all included in the Vyakta or Darshana Vṛtti. And in deep sleep, when there is no appearance of the dualistic world, it is said from the standpoint of waking state that it (= dualistic world) exists in the unmanifested seed-form, meaning that it disappears for the time being etc. This experience is common to all and is called Avyakta or Adarshana Vṛitti. It is an undeniable fact that there is no third category of experience besides the two states—DarshanaVṛitti and Adarshana Vṛitti.¹ This is comprehensive vision of life. This is common to all and so it is universal acceptance. This is the method of observing the life as a whole and the universal acceptance. This type of analysis is not based on any individual experience. The individual experiences which are gained through efforts are bound to time, space and causation

¹ The three states are the objects of knowledge for, there cannot be anything knowable besides these three states. G.K.Bh.4/88

factors but one's own being which is the substratum of the Darshana and Adarshana Vrittis is clearly beyond the dualistic condition such as space, time etc. The locus or substratum of all these various illusory phenomenon of manifested and unmanifested forms is certainly the pure consciousness—the Ātman alone which is really real. On this firm ground of one's own Being (= the Witnessing principle of life) is Shaṅkara-Vedānta built. Those who have overlooked the principle of Tri-basic view are unable to understand Shaṅkara properly.

Thus after observing this comprehensive view of life, one can easily cognize his own Being which is the substratum of these two, appearance and disappearance of the universe. This Being is the real nature of the Self. So Sri Shaṅkara describes this comprehensive view of life in Māndūkya Bhāṣya – 3, thus:

“सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात्”
meaning “in as much as the intention is to show that the entire phenomenal universe and the world of Gods, together with this gross cosmic Self, contribute to the constitution of the four aspects of Ātman.”

D. Correct meaning of the term Sārvatrika Pūrṇa Anubhava (सार्वत्रिकपूर्ण अनुभव):

Commonly in Shaṅkara Vedānta, to realize the true nature of the Self, a common belief was prevailing and it is that we have to get some individual mystic experience like Samādhi, etc. On this belief the aspirants were

trying to understand Shaṅkara's teachings. Till Shri Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji dawned on the horizon of Vedānta, there was no usage of this first fundamental, i.e. universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. The word "सार्वत्रिक पूर्ण अनुभव" denotes the above said criterion. The readers are referred to English introduction to Māndūkya Rahasya Vivṛtti by Swāmiji—Anubhavasya Prāmukhyam—the predominance of Anubhava. Here he has given the correct meaning of the term "Anubhava". The word "Anubhava" is not used in Vedānta in the sense of perceptions, feeling or emotion or newly acquired mystic experiences through the practices of Japa, meditation or practice of Pātanjala Yōga which are called mystic experiences, which are concerned with the individuals and which also vary from one individual to another. But that which is common to all, by which the waking, dream and deep sleep states are directly intuited and which reminds the experience of the dream and deep sleep directly to the waking intellect and that which gives room to differentiate the waking state from other two states and which is not relying on the functions of the sense organs or the mind etc., and which is itself the true nature of consciousness of one's own, that Witnessing Self itself is called as Sākshi Anubhava or Intuition in Vedānta.

This clarity regarding the word Anubhava representing the true Shaṅkara Prakriyā has not been told by any Vedantin except by Shri Swāmiji of Holenarsipur in the

hoary history of Vedānta. So this is a revelation in the field of Shaṅkara-Vedānta brought about by Shri Swāmiji. By this, Vedānta has been rescued from the belief that the Advaita Vedānta also is a cult just like Dvaita, Vishishtadvaita etc. Swāmiji has thus showed that this is the universal truth which could be understood by any one if one has got the capacity of understanding.

IV. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS REGARDING THE FIRST FUNDAMENTAL :

Thus the comprehensive vision of life and universal acceptance is the first fundamental of Shaṅkara-Vedānta. In Shruti and Smṛtis the transcendental reality, i.e. the real nature of the Self is described as the Self of all. So here we have to take the common experience of all. For example:

In Upanishads –

एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः — Shvetashvatara – 6/11

एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढो आत्मा — Katha 1/3/12

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा — Katha 2/2/9, 10, 11 etc.

And in Geeta :

‘समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु’ — Geeta -9/29

समं सर्वेषु भूतेषु तिष्ठन्तं परमेश्वरम्’ — Geeta -13/27

‘अहमात्मा गुडाकेश सर्वभूताशयस्थितः’ — Geeta -10/20

ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशे तिष्ठति” — Geeta - 18/61

‘क्षेत्रज्ञं चापि मां विद्धि सर्वक्षेत्रेषु’ — Geeta 13/2 etc.

In this way the comprehensive vision of life which is explained above is another important thing in Shankara Vedānta.

This is hinted by the following Mantra :

POORNAMADAHA POORNAMIDAM —

Br̥ha — 5/1/1

(पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात् पूर्णमुदच्यते ।

पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥)

Here it is hinted that by the word “Idam” (इदं) the appearance and disappearance of the universe is to be taken as a whole. This is the comprehensive vision regarding the world. By the word “Adaha” (अदः) it is denoted that one’s own true nature of being which is the substratum of the appearance and disappearance of the universe, i.e. the Brahman or the real nature of the Self. And then one should observe the pervasiveness of this Self in the appearance of the whole universe (पूर्णात् पूर्णमुदच्यते). By this, when the universe is falsified, then this falsification is called as Pūrnasya Pūrnāmādāya (पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय). Shankara writes here as TIRASKRITYA (तिरस्कृत्य), i.e. by negating the universe which is only an attribution due to ignorance, by Brahma-Vidyā. After negating, the infinite Brahman alone remains (पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते).

So here the life in its reality is the pure Being and the substratum of the appearance of the universe which is the infinite and the universe which is the appearance of the pure being (from the standpoint of ignorance), are also taken as a whole. Apart from these two—the pure Being as substratum and the appearance of the universe due to ignorance, there is no third type of experience in our life. Hence this is the correct view of comprehensive vision of life. No other science except Vedānta has got this type of the comprehensive vision of life. All other sciences have relied on the biased opinion of waking state alone and taking the individuality as our true nature. But in Vedānta, the microcosm (व्यष्टि अहंकार – the individual Jeeva)—and the macrocosm (समष्टि अहंकार – the cosmic Self, i.e., The Hiranyagarbha) are taken together as one unit (which are of adventitious and ephemeral nature) along with the substratum which is our true nature. Hence this view is a method of seeing the life as a whole. This is the first fundamental of Shāṅkara-Vedānta. If an aspirant understands this, it will be easy for him to know all other teachings of Shāṅkara Vedānta.

Now we have to discuss on the second fundamental principle, i.e. *Cognising the Witnessing Principle of life* which would be very easy after knowing the above first fundamental of Shāṅkara-Vedānta. We shall see this in subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER—2

The 2nd Fundamental:

Cognising the Witnessing Principle of Life which is the substratum of Vyakta and Avayakta

1. NATURE OF WITNESSING SELF:

Shri Shri Satichidānanendra Saraswati Swāmiji has declared that until and unless one cognizes that the Witnessing principle, which is his true nature and which is called as the Witness or *Anubhava Swarūpa* or *Sākshi Anubhava*, which is quiet separate from the two types of experiences such as;

- i) *Pratyaya Anubhava*—the perception which comes with the contact of other objects through sense organs, and
- ii) *Vedana Anubhava*—the emotions or feelings or mental conceptions which occur bereft of the functions of sense organs only in the mind just as anger, happiness, devotion, jealousy etc., including the mystic experiences of Yōga philosophy.

It is impossible to recognize that there is our true nature which is called as *Anubhava Swarūpa* and in which all types of experiences culminate and which is the

witness of all modifications of Anthahkarana including the 'Me-notion' and hence it is difficult to penetrate the secrets of Shaṅkara-Vedānta. Echoing this view, Shri Shaṅkara has declared in his Sūtra-Bhāṣya – 1/1/4 that,

Objection: Ātman being the object of the 'Me-notion', it is not reasonable to say that he is known only from the Upanishads.

Reply: Not so, for we have refuted this position by saying that this Ātman is the *Witness of that Ego*.

(To explain): "Leaving aside the (erroneous) knowledge of the Self as the agent (of actions) as contained in the idea of "I", the real Self—which is the witness of the idea of "I" which exists in all creatures, which is without any difference of degrees, and which is one, unchanging, eternal and all pervasive consciousness —(such a Self) is not known as the Self of all by anyone in the section of the Vedas dealing with virtuous deeds, or in the scriptures of the logicians."

This is the bed-rock of the huge building of Shaṅkara-Vedānta. So at first an aspirant should cognize this Witness as one's own Self through the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru. After cognizing this, he will be able to take a stand in this true nature and then he will be fit to understand the secrets of the teachings of Shaṅkara Vedānta. This is the most important principle in Shaṅkara Vedānta.

Commonly in the empirical dealings when one wants to know something, he does so with his instruments such as mind, intellect and sense organs. With the aid of these instruments one gains the knowledge of the external phenomena. This position is called as the knowership or Pramātṛ (प्रमातृ). This Pramātṛ is described in the above Bhāṣhya-sentence as Aham Pratyaya Kartṛ (अहं प्रत्ययकर्तृ) meaning, knower, doer, enjoyer etc., and all these are included in one word, i.e. the 'Me-notion' or the 'sense of I'. This type of procedure is enough to know the other objects as well as the psychological plane. But in Vedānta, it is a very difficult and subtle task as one has to cease his identification with mind-intellect-sense organs through discrimination according to the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru. So here an introvert mind is necessarily required.

When an aspirant turns inward up to the Witnessing principle of life, which is beyond the 'Me-notion', at that time he remains as the Witness and he can objectify his own 'Me-notion' or 'Ego'. This *remaining* as the Witnessing Principle is called here as *cognizing* the Witnessing Principle of life. Here 'cognising' means quite unlike the cognizing of the other objects. Here it is just remaining as the Self. To stay in one's own nature is called by Shaṅkara as "निष्क्रियात्मस्वरूपावस्थानम्" - Gi-Bh-3/30 and 18/49; स्वात्मानुभवनिश्चयरूपेण अवस्थानम् - Gi.Bh-18/54.

In this connection, one should not misunderstand that the 'remaining as the Self' means we shall attain a state like *Nirvikalpa Samādhi* etc., where there are no dealings. That is why Shaṅkara has warned in S.Bh-2/1/14, thus :

"This also follows from the teaching that the embodied soul, is Brahman is essence in the passage, "that is the That Thou art, Shyetaketo". This identity of the embodied soul, that is taught, is a self-established truth and it is not to be accomplished through some extraneous effort.

“स्वयं प्रसिद्धं हि एतत् शारीरस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वम् उपदिश्यते, न यत्नान्तरप्रसाध्यम्” ।

From this it follows that like the idea of the rope removing the ideas of snake etc. (superimposed on it), the acceptance of the unity of the individual Self with Brahman, as declared in the scriptures, results in the removal of the idea of an individual soul bound up with the body, that is a creation of beginningless ignorance. When this false notion that embodied soul is the real Self is removed, all those activities become sublated which are based on that assumptions, which are created by ignorance, and for supplying a rationale for which a separate diversified part is imagined in Brahman. It is further shown by the Upanishad, with the help of such passages as, "But when to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self then what should one

see and through what?" (Bṛha-2/4/13) etc., that in the case of one who has realized Brahman as the Self, all empirical dealings cease that are concerned with action, instruments and results. It cannot be said that this negation of dealings (in the Self) is confined to a certain state (during liberation only), for the identity of the Self and Brahman stated in, 'That Thou art' is not contingent on any particular state'.

So here, the determination or the discerning factor on the firm ground of one's own intuitional experience, is the main criterion.

II DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INTELLECTUAL EXPERIENCE AND INTUITIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Now we have to understand as to what is the intuitional experience, because to cognize or to take a stand in the Witnessing Principle of life, the intuitional experience (साक्षी अनुभव) is the only means and not the intellectual process of thinking (प्रमात् अनुभव). So in Vedānta when we say discrimination or Vichāra (विचार) etc., it is not the thinking process of the intellect as being an Ego, but the introvert process of relying on the intuitional experience of life, and only here one will realize one's own intuitional Self which is separate from the intellect or the mind. Even though the mind is required to follow the intuitional experience, here, it turns inwardly unlike its habitual flow towards the outer objects through the sense organs. That is why Shaṅkara says:

“—The mind that is purified by the instructions of the scriptures and the teacher, and control of body and sense organs etc., become the instrument for realizing the Self”. (Gi-Bh-2/21)

So at first the aspirant should discriminate the intuitional experience from the intellectual process of thinking. The *discriminating process* is given below :

How do we know that there is ‘Me-notion’? How do we know that ‘I dreamt’ or ‘I slept happily?’ How do we know that ‘I am awake now’? Commonly all are puzzled and think that they know these things through their mind. But strictly speaking, the mind has no capacity to objectify the “Me-notion”, because one generally says, “My mind is wandering here and there’ etc. So, the ‘Me-notion’ is the user of the mind. The mind which concerns to the waking state has no capacity to extricate itself from this state and pass on to the other states such as dream or sleep. Suppose the waking mind really goes to the dream, then it would have said that “I have come here temporarily from the waking state etc.,” just as a man says when he travels temporarily to other places from where he originally belongs to. But in our experience we do not find such a happening in the dream state. And in deep sleep there is no trace of mind at all. This is in the experience of all. If it is there it would not be called as deep sleep. So, the presence or the absence of the mind is understood through one’s own nature of Witnessing Principle of life and it is expressed through

the mind and the intellect taking the grab of 'Me-notion'. Due to lack of this deep discrimination all wrongly think that 'we know everything through mind or intellect'. Hence through the teachings of the Guru and the Shāstra, we have to discriminate the intuitional experience (बोधिजप्रत्यय) from the intellectual process of thinking (बौद्धप्रत्यय).

In the above said manner when we say 'I dreamt' or 'I slept happily'—these experience are called as intuitional experiences in Vedānta. The word Intuition (अनुभव) has got different meanings according to dictionary but here in Vedānta the meaning of this word is: '*Tuition*' (= *Bōdha* or knowledge) which comes from '*in*' (= inside) to the intellect, so it is called as *Intuitional experience*. To get these experiences there is no need of any of the activities or functions of the sense organs or the mind. It comes directly from the inner bosom which is our true nature. So our nature which is absolute nature of consciousness directly reminds the experiences of dream and deep sleep to the waking mind. So in Vedāntic terminology it is called as *Sākshi Anubhava* (साक्षी अनुभव). This Sākshi-Anubhava is quite separate from Anubhavas which have been described above as perceptions, conceptions etc.

When we are in the range of perceptions or emotions (conceptions), inevitably we have taken the identification with our mind and sense organs. But when we turn our observations towards this intuitional experience, at that

time we lose our identification with our mind or the Antahkarana and automatically we remain in our true nature and objectify the Antahkarana by our true nature. *This is the difference between the ordinary thinking process of the mind and the discriminating process of Vedānta.* For this purpose it is said that Viveka or Vichāra does not mean the ordinary process of thinking of the intellect. To take a stand in one's own true nature of the Witnessing Principle of life, this type of discrimination is the only means and through this means only the cognition of the Witnessing Principle of life, meaning getting *Sākshi-Anubhava* is possible. From this standpoint when one follows the Vedāntic teachings one will easily grasp and realize at last the non-dual absolute Self as the whole and sole reality.

III. THE WITNESS AS DISTINCT FROM ACTIVE EGO.

Process of Discrimination

At first an aspirant should know that there are two types of 'I'. One is the acting "I" ('Me-notion' in empirical life) and the other, the real 'I' (Sākshi or Witness of all). In empirical dealings also these two types of "I" are prevailing—just as an actor takes part in the drama as the king or an emperor and on the stage he acts just like a king having all the adjuncts such as dress etc. At that time, he says 'I am an emperor' and performs all the actions related to the part. This is the acting 'I'. But

what he really is—a man in the world—that his being is the real ‘I’. Having the adjuncts of a dress of a king when he comes later from behind the curtain, even though he is still in that dress of the king, he deals with other persons from the standpoint of his true nature as a man. At that time his adjuncts are not important but his true nature is the predominant factor.

Similarly, commonly when we say ‘I am so and so’, ‘I am a doer of actions’, ‘I am happy or miserable’ etc, then this is the acting ‘I’ which has taken the part of individual soul in the stage of waking and dream. This individuality is called as ‘Me-notion’, ‘Pramātr’ (प्रमातृ) ‘Aham Pratyaya Vishaya Kartṛ’ (अहं प्रत्ययविषयकर्तृ) and ‘enjoyer’, (भोक्ता) etc., in the empirical life. This individuality appears as if it is real due to adjuncts like mind, intellect, sense organs, body etc. which are only false appearances and of adventitious and ephemeral nature, restricted to a particular state—either waking or dream, and are conjured up by ignorance. Where these adjuncts disappear like in the state of deep sleep etc., there remains the real ‘I’ (Sākshi or Witnessing Consciousness) as it is, in its true nature. This is clearly said in Chāndōgya –Upanishad – 6/9/3 thus : “All individuals remain in their true nature in deep sleep”. This true nature is not at all affected by the appearance of individuality which appears due to adjuncts. At that time also, it continues to exist as it was before.

Shankara declares this thing in his Sūtra Bhāṣya -3/2/7

‘अपि च न कदाचित् ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात् । स्वप्नजागतिरतयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपात्तित्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्वक्ष्यते । सति संपन्नस्तावदेकत्वात् विजानातीति युक्तम् ॥’

“Besides, there is no time when Jiva has not become one with Brahman, for one’s intrinsic nature cannot be alienated. Only in view of the seeming foreign aspect which he assumes in dream and waking owing to contact of conditioning associates, it is proposed to say that he attains his own form on the dissolution of that foreign aspect. It is but reasonable that the Jiva merged in Pure Being (Brahman) is not conscious because of (absolute) unity.”

And the same thing he confirms in S.Bh -1/1/9 thus:

“The individual soul keeps awake so long as it is under the influence of the characteristics of those objects of sense-perception which it apprehends as a result of its contact with the conditioning factors constituted by the diverse manifestations of the mind. It assumes the name of the mind while seeing dreams under the influence of the latent impressions of the experiences of the waking state. And when these two conditioning factors disappear in the state of the deep sleep, it appears to be merged, as it were, in the Self, (स्वात्मनि प्रलीन इव) owing to the absence of particularization created

by limiting adjuncts, and hence it is said to have become merged in its own Self."

In these two Bhāshya quotations we have to observe the words *Pararūpāpattimiva*, meaning He appears as if He has become an individual Jiva which is not his true nature but only a garbed one. Similarly in the second quotation the word *Pralina Iva* (प्रलीन इव), meaning the individual soul appears to be merged, as it were, in its own Self, owing to the absence of limiting adjuncts. Strictly speaking there is no emerging or merging with one's own true nature for him. But due to disappearance of the adjuncts in deep sleep it is described as "as if he has merged in his true nature". So one's own true nature is the Witness of the 'Me-notion'. This true nature need not be gained newly by some efforts or through some experiences of states like Samādhi etc., where there is no kind of dealings.

This truth is declared by Shaṅkara in S.Bh-2/1/14 in *SVAYAM PRASIDDHAMHI ETAT ... NIBANDHANA-TVAAT*. The gist of this Bhāshya-quotation is: Being Brahman is very nature for all if it is recognized through the teachings of Shāstra and Guru that the previous wrong notion that "I am an individual" is a false appearance and at the same time all types of dealings will also get cancelled or falsified which are based on the pivot of individuality. The Shruti says that after knowing the real nature of the Self there remains nothing regarding any dealings. This is not restricted to any particular state

where there are no dealings because, being Brahman is one's true nature and hence it is not restricted to a particular state. So, this true nature of the Witnessing Principle of life is to be cognized through discrimination (Viveka) alone. So to cognize the Witnessing Principle, the discrimination or Viveka is the only means. Shankara says this time and again in his Sūtra Bhāṣya. For example:-

—‘Before the dawn of discriminating knowledge, the individual soul's nature of consciousness remains mixed up as it were, with the body, senses, mind, intellect, sense objects and sorrow, happiness etc., but the same individual is said to have its real nature when the discriminating knowledge dawns from the Upanishads. Therefore the individual soul continuing in the state of its unmanifested nature, owing to the absence of discriminating knowledge, is said to have its real nature manifested when discriminating knowledge dawns.’ (S.Bh-1-3-19)

Therefore the result of the discriminatory knowledge (विवेकज्ञान) is the attainment of its real nature, its realization of its nature as the absolute Self. The function of Antahkarana which take place at the time of discrimination is as follows. According to the teachings of Vedānta and Āchārya when the aspirant turns inwardly, then

- i) The Antahkarana stops to see the outer things through the sense organs (i.e. the Antahkarana starts ignoring the external objects).

- ii) It gives up the thinking regarding the outer things through the mind.
- iii) It rejects imagining or inferring the matters through the intellect.
- iv) It gives up the idea of “I am so and so” “I am a doer of actions” ‘I am happy.’ ‘I am miserable’ etc.,—the feelings which will arise by taking the identification with the ego.
- v) Lastly he completely turns his attention towards Witnessing Principle of the ego through the discrimination and concentration.

At that time the aspirant himself remains as the Witness. And the Antahkarana which has followed this nature, also starts to appear in the form of the Witnessing Principle as it is completely pervaded and directly illuminated by the self just like the mirage that is illuminated and pervaded by the sunshine. Thus the seeker arrives at the final intuition of Ātman after abolishing all the superimpositions.

IV MISCONCEPTIONS REGARDING THE WITNESS AS MANY AND ONE ACCORDING TO SUB-COMMENTARIES :

The doctrine of Post-Shaṅkara’s, who hold that perception is of two kinds, to wit, Jeeva Saakshi and Ishvara-Saakhi, is totally opposed to Shruti and reason based on intuition as well as to the Bhāshyas.

Some misconceptions regarding this nature of Witnessing Principle of life are still prevalent. For example, the Witness (Sākshi) of the ego is separate in each individual soul. And hence Jiva-Sākshi (जीवसाक्षी) are many: the Witness for Ishvara, i.e., Ishvara Sākshi (ईश्वरसाक्षी) is one i.e., Brahman. The Brahman is like Mahākāsha (महाकाश) and the Witness which are many are like Ghatakāshas (घटाकाश), etc. These types of misconceptions are there due to not-knowing the true nature of the Witness according to the teachings of Bhāshya and also due to non-cognition of Anubhava and relying only on the intellectual inference. So it is essential to know or to cognize that the Witnessing Principle of life is the predominant thing.

According to Shaṅkara's teachings, we have to cognize the nature of the Witness as it is. While explaining the Pūrāṇa Anubhava (Chapter-1), it is said that the whole phenomenon of the universe including all multiplicity of the souls and the world with the concept of infinite time, space, causation etc., is Upādhi (उपाधि) for Pratyagātman (प्रत्यगात्मा). The Bhāshya-Vākya has been referred earlier which is said in Māṇḍūkya Mantra-3 Bhāshya, thus, 'सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । एवं च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः' ॥ Here Shaṅkara says that the Witnessing Principle of life is the substratum of the universe and hence it is not an individual one. For example, when we realize that the Witness is beyond the ego then it is evident that it is

transcendental reality of this multiplicity, because the multiplicity of the universe appears only when there is the appearance of the ego. So, in this process of discrimination we have to take macrocosm with microcosm. If this view is missed, then our thinking process will lead us to the doctrine of Kapila Sāṅkhya who has accepted the multiplicity of the Selves. This thing has also been explained by Shankara in the Bhāṣya portion quoted above. So it is wrong to assume that there are many Witnesses.

Holding the view that there are many Witnesses is itself an illogical statement. The many entities to whom this multiplicity has appeared—that subject is the only entity fit to be called as Witness, and those which have appeared to this Witness becomes the witnessed because they are objects. The Vedānta is a subjective science and not an objective one. To accept the many entities inevitably we have to accept the existence of the time-space factors. These factors are only in the realm of the ego. When we say that Witnessing Principle of life is beyond ego and it is the Witness of the ego, then naturally it is beyond the concepts of time-space etc. It being so, how can there be many Witnesses? For this reason the doctrine of one and the same Witnessing Ātman as the universal Self of all beings has been proclaimed in the Shruti:

“एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः

सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा।

कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः

साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च" ॥

(Shvetāshvatara-6/11)

—“*One* and the *same* shining one (*Deva*), is hidden in all beings, the omnipresent, the *inmost Self* of all beings, the overlord of all acts, presiding over all beings, the *Witnessing consciousness*, one, and without attributes.”

We have explained this thing while explaining the Sarvatrika Anubhava, the universal acceptance of the Vedantic teaching. Hence the belief that there are many Witnesses—one for each individual—is a wrong notion and contrary to the Shruti and the reasons which are based on intuitional experiences and to the Bhāshya. The multiplicity appears either in waking or in the dream and in deep sleep there is no multiplicity. This presence and absence of multiplicity is known or objectified through one's own Being which is the Witnessing Principle of Life. It being so, how is it possible to say that ‘that Principle is many’?

Like this, holding the view that there is Ishvara-Sākshi (ईश्वरसाक्षी) is also equally absurd. In Māndūkya Mantra-6, the Self who remains in deep sleep and in whom both the states merge and emerge from him, that Self is described as Ishvara (एष सर्वेश्वरः) and so also in Brh̥dāranyaka—4/4/22, the same Ātman who is the Witnessing Principle of life is described as “एष भूताधिपतिः, एष भूतपालः” etc. By this we can easily understand

that the *Self itself is called as Ishvara*. In Sūtra Bhāṣhya—2/3/41, Shaṅkara identifies this Witness with Ishvara. He writes thus :

“अविद्यावस्थायां कार्यकरणसंघाताविवेकदर्शिनः जीवस्य अविद्यातिमिरान्धस्य सतः परस्मात् आत्मनः कर्माध्यक्षात् सर्वभूताधिवासात् साक्षिणः चेतयितुः ईश्वरात् तदनुज्ञया कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्व लक्षणस्य संसारास्य सिद्धिः ॥”

—In this sentence Shaṅkara has described that the Supreme Self who presides over all activities and resides in all beings and who is the Witness of all is the Supreme Lord. So the Witness himself is the Ishvara and here all the description of the Shvetāshvatara Mantra (6/11) is taken. By this Shaṅkara emphatically says that the *Witnessing Principle itself is Ishvara* which means that the Sākshi and Ishvara are synonymous terms.

From the standpoint of reason also saying that there is Sākshi for Ishvara is incongruous. Because, if there is a Sākshi for Ishvara then this Ishvara comes into the category of the Witnessed (साक्ष्य). That which is the Sākshi alone is fit to be called Ishvara and not the witnessed ones, because witnessed ones also are merely objects to the witness. Shaṅkara has explained this in Mādūkya Mantra—6:

“एष हि स्वरूपावस्थः सर्वेश्वरः साधिदैविकस्य सर्वस्य ईश्वरः ईशिता; नैतस्मात् जात्यन्तरभूतोऽन्येषामिव” ।

The significance of this sentence is that the true nature of the Self of everyone is himself Ishvara, but Ishvara is not other than the Self as the logicians hold the

view. According to the logician Ishvara is separate from the individual Selves.

When we look from the standpoint of comprehensive vision of life there can be only two parts—one is the Self which is one's being and everything else will come into the category of non-selves and this includes the "Ego-sense" or "Me-notion".

The not-self is of an adventitious and ephemeral nature and hence it is a false appearance due to ignorance and the Self is the only reality. If we hold the view that the Ishvara is different from this Self, then he comes into the category of not-self. Then there will be no Ishvaratva (ईश्वरत्व) for him.

Hence the Witnessing Principle of life itself is called as Ishvara from the standpoint of appearance and disappearance of the universe, as the Self is the substratum of the universe. For this reason Shankara calls the Self as TAT—(तत्) pdada in S. Bh-4/1/2—

“एष व्यावृत्त सर्वसंसारधर्मको अनुभवात्मको”— “This object called Brahman, which is denoted by the word ‘TAT’ which is free from all mundane attributes and which is by nature Consciousness, is well intuited (known) to the people who are adepts in Upanishads”.

In this description that which is of the nature of consciousness, whose nature is called as “Anubhava”

(see Upadeshasāhasri—12/8¹) is called as “TAT” pada meaning Ishvara. Hence the Witnessing Principle itself is Ishvara from the standpoint of the appearance and disappearance of the universe which is conjured up by Avidyā. Hence it is wrong to hold the view that there is Ishvara Sākshi (ईश्वर-साक्षी) which contradicts the Shruti, reason and Bhāshya.

The nature of the Witnessing Principle is non-dual one, meaning ever devoid of all types that exist in dualistic world. Hence it is described as *Prapanchō-pashama* (प्रपञ्चोपशम) in Shruti (Mān-7). But for the purpose of teaching, the witnesshood is attributed on the non-dual Self from the standpoint of “Me-notion”. Strictly speaking, there are no two entities such as Sākshi, the Witness and Ahampratyaya, the Pramātṛ. Through the adjuncts like Antahkarana, body etc., which are conjured up by ignorance, the same Witnessing Principle appears as if he has taken the garb of “Pramātṛ or Ahampratyaya”. When these adjuncts are falsified through discrimination, meaning the non-dual nature of the Self alone remains,

१ विज्ञातेर्यस्तु विज्ञाता स त्वमित्युच्यते यतः ।

स स्यादनुभवस्तस्य ततोऽन्योऽनुभवो मृषा ॥”

(Upadeshasāhasri – 12/8)

—“It is the knower (Bṛha-3/4/2) of knowledge that is referred to by the word ‘Thou’ in the Shruti (Ch-6/8/7). The understanding of the term ‘Thou’ in this sense is correct. The other sense (i.e., the self with intellect etc.,” superimposed on it, i.e. “Me-notion”) different from it is due to superimposition.”

at this stage of Self-realization of the Pramāṭṛ or Ahampratyaya himself remains as the Witness. This is said in the 2nd Ślōka of “Brahmavid Gāthā”. (= traditional saying) quoted by Śaṅkara at the end of S.Bh -1/1/4:

“अन्वेष्टव्यात्मविज्ञानात् प्राक्प्रमातृत्वमात्मनः ।
अन्विष्टः स्यात् प्रमातृव पाप्मदोषादिवर्जितः ॥”

—“Before the realization of Ātman to be sought out, the Ātman is a Pramāṭṛ (= knowing agent). When the search has been finished, the Pramāṭṛ himself would become the one Supreme Witnessing Self free from all evils of good and bad and the like.”

So, the witnesshood is attributed for the purpose of teaching the non-dual Self from the standpoint of ego just like the Ishvarahood is attributed on the same Witness from the standpoint of the universe.

V. WITNES IS SELF-ESTABLISHED REALITY:

According to Nyāya-Shāstra, the nature of the Self should be determined through Pramānas, but in Vedānta the Pramāṭṛ (= Ego sense) who is the user of Pramānas like mīnd, intellect, sense organs etc., is himself a Self-established entity in all dealings. So Pramāṭṛ is not proved through Pramānas where as the existence of Pramānas and correctness is to be proved by the Pramāṭṛ. To know the Prameyās (प्रमेय) or the objects, Pramānas are required, but not for determining the nature of the Self, even as Pramāṭṛ. Shri Śaṅkara says in S. Bh. 2/3/7:

“न ह्यात्मा आत्मनः प्रमाणमपेक्ष्य सिद्ध्यति । तस्य हि प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि अप्रसिद्धप्रमेयसिद्धये उपादीयन्ते” ॥

—“Ātman Himself is not established with the aid of any right means; for His sake the perceptive means etc., are utilized in order to ascertain the objects which are not known.”

In Gītā Bhāṣhya—2/18:

“सिद्धे हि आत्मनि प्रमातरि प्रमित्सोः प्रमाणान्वेषणा भवति । न हि पूर्वमित्थम् अहमिति आत्मानं प्रमाय पश्चात् प्रमेयपरिच्छेदाय प्रवर्तते । न हि आत्मा नाम कस्यचिदप्रसिद्धो भवति” ।

“Only when the Self stands predetermined as the knower, there is a search for a means of knowledge by the knower. Indeed, it is not that one first determines oneself as ‘I am such’ or ‘I am not such’ through the instruments of knowledge and then takes up the task for determining an object of knowledge. For what is called as ‘Self’ does not remain unknown to any one.”

In this connection one thing that should be remembered is that in most of the editions the reading is “आत्मानं अप्रमाय”, which is wrong-one. The correct reading is “आत्मानं प्रमाय”. The meaning here is “no one wants to determine one-self whether ‘I am’ or ‘not’ etc., through Pramānas before going to know the outer objects. So it is *ĀTMĀNAM PRAMĀYA* (this is the correct reading).

In the empirical view when the Pramātṛ himself is Self-established there is no necessity to say that the

nature of the Self, who is the Witness of the Pramātṛ should be known by Pramānas. For this reason Śaṅkara has said here is chronological order the words SIDDHE HI ĀTMANI (सिद्धे हि आत्मनि—this denotes the true nature of the Self who is the Witness) PRAMĀTARI (प्रमातरि—this denotes that the same true nature appears as if he has taken the garb of Pramātṛ or Ego through the adjuncts like mind, intellect, sense organs etc.) By this it is proved that the true nature of the Self being a Witness comes first and then the same Self appears as Pramātṛ (as per chronology). So the Witness is the Self-established one who is of the nature of pure consciousness (अनुभवात्मक) as already said as per S.Bh-4/1/2 and no Pramānas (instruments of knowledge) are necessary to prove It. Hence there is no necessary to take view points of Nyaya Shāstra and Tarka Shāstra which rely on Pramānas to prove any thing, in Vedānta. The Self is Aprameya (अप्रमेय)

(i) Bṛha-4/4/20: 'एतदप्रमयम् ध्रुवम्' ॥

(ii) Gītā – 2/18: 'अनाशिनोऽप्रमेयस्य' ॥

It is true that in Vedānta also it is accepted that the Shāstra is the Pramāna to know the Self and the Upapatti (उपपत्ति), i.e. Tarka is necessary to perform Manana. Though this is the thing, Shāstra is Pramāna here only to negate the not-self and to rescue the aspirant from the wrong identification with not-selves. But Shāstra never tells that Brahman is an objectifiable one. On the other hand, it declares that the Brahman is not objectifiable by any means, i.e., It can neither be perceived by means

of the senses nor can It be conceived by means of the mind or intellect. It is your Self and remains as the Eternal Witness. Hence from standpoint of removing the wrong notion regarding Brahman only, the Shāstra is called as Pramāna. Further it may be noted that after following teaching of Shāstra the dealings like Pramāna, Prameya Pramātr etc., cease to exist.

Thus the view-point of Vedānta that the Shāstra is the means to know the Self is only to negate the not-self alone, but not to objectify the Self. The reader is referred to the following Bhāshya quotations regarding this :

—“But the Scripture is the final authority (Pramāna) by way of merely negating superimposition of qualities that do not belong to the Self, it attains authoritativeness with regard to the Self, but not by virtue of making some unknown thing known”.—
(Gi-Bh-2/18)

- (ii) “Opponent: If Brahman be not an object of knowledge, It cannot logically be presented by the scriptures as stated in B.S. -1/1/3.

Vedāntin : Not so, for the scriptures aim at the removal of the differences fancied through ignorance. Not that the scriptures seek to establish Brahman as an entity referable objectively by the world ‘this’ (i.e. Brahman is not presentable positively by saying, ‘This is so’.)

What do they do then?

By presenting Brahman as not an object on account

of It's being the inmost Self of the knower, they remove the differences of the 'known', the 'knower', and the 'knowledge' that are fancied through ignorance (अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादितेदमपनयति) (S.Bh-1/1/4)

So, here Shāstra is Pramāna from the point of superimposition, which is quite unlike the other Pramānas. So also Lakshana (लक्षण) of the Self or Brahman is described in 'जन्माद्यस्य यतः' (B.S.-1-1-2) and "सत्यं ज्ञानं अनन्तं ब्रह्म" (Taittiriya -2/1) etc., are also called as Lakshanas from this standpoint alone, because the nature of the Self is Alakshanam (अलक्षणम् Mān—7. "व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च" Katha—2/3/8 etc.) The dialectic system which is used in Manana (मनन) is the *Shrauta Tarka* (श्रौततर्क) itself, which is relying on the intuitional experiences but not the gymnastics of the intellect. So this dialectic system also has taken its shelter in Anubhava, i.e. intuitional experience, Shri Shaṅkara has clearly stated the nature of such Shrauta Tarka in S. Bh-2/1/6.

VI. SOME IMPORTANT SENTENCES REGARDING THE NATURE OF WITNESSING CONSCIOUSNESS:

The following sentences are very useful to take a stand in one's own true nature of the Witnessing Principle of life through Viveka. This process is called Anusandhāna (आत्मानुसन्धान). A few sentences are shown here as examples.

- i) a) “तया अविपरिलुप्तया दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति” ॥

(Bṛha-Bh-1/4/1)

—The seer has two kinds of vision, one eternal and the other transitory. Through that unfailing eternal vision, the Self always sees the other transitory vision in the dream and waking states, as idea and perception respectively and becomes the seer of sight.

- b) “स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं चोभौ येनानुपश्यति ।

महान्तं विभुं आत्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति’ ॥

(Ka-2/1/4)

—“The wise one having ascertained that great and all pervading Ātman through whom one sees the contents of both dream and waking, does not grieve.”

In these two sentences one’s own nature which is the Witnessing Principle of life which illumines the appearance and disappearance of the waking and dream states, is shown.

- ii) “सर्वप्रत्ययदर्शी... सम्यग् दर्शनमित्यर्थः” ॥

(Kena-2/4)

“The Self, that encompasses all ideas (acquired through the intellect) as Its objects, is known in relation to all these ideas. Being the Witness of all cognitions and by nature nothing but the power of consciousness, the Self is indicated by the cognitions themselves in the midst of cognition, as non-

different from them. There is no other door to Its awareness. Therefore when Brahman is known as the innermost Self (i.e. Witness) of cognitions, then It is known, that is to say, then there is Its complete realization."

Here there are three points to be observed. (a) The nature of Self is the Witness for all Vṛttis including the "Me-notion". (b) Vṛttis are many but the illumining Self is only one. (c) The Vṛttis including "Me-notion" are pervaded by the nature of consciousness of life. So these Vṛttis are like the waves in the ocean of consciousness. Observing this, when the pervasiveness of the consciousness is discerned in the Vṛttis, then that nature of consciousness is Pratyaya Pratyagātma (प्रत्ययप्रत्यगात्मा). The same thing is shown in the following Gītā-Bhāṣya also. ..

iii) "दृशिकर्मत्वापत्तिनिमित्ता.... अवगति अवसानैव ॥"

(Gi.Bh-9/10)

—"All the activities of the world in the form, 'I eat this; I see; I hear this; I experience this happiness I suffer this sorrow; I shall do this for that purpose; I shall do this for this purpose; I shall know this etc.,' indeed arise owing to their being the objects of consciousness, they verily exist in consciousness and culminate in consciousness."

The significance of this sentence is that the word *Avagati* (अवगति) denotes the true nature of the Self and

all types of Vṛttis or notions or ideas appear in this nature of pure Consciousness and merge in the Consciousness alone, just like waves in an ocean.

- iv) 'एवं अहंप्रत्ययिनम् अशेषस्वप्नप्रचारसाक्षिणि प्रत्यगात्मनि अयस्य तं च प्रत्यगात्मानं सर्वसक्षिणं तद्विपर्ययेण अन्तःकरणादिषु अध्यस्यति'

(Adhyasa Bhāṣhya)

—"In the same way, one first superimposes the idea of ego, i.e. "Me-notion", on the Self, the Witness of all the manifestations of that ego; then by an opposite process, one superimposes on the internal organ (Antahkarana etc.) that Self which is opposed to the not-self and which is witness of everything."

Here Shaṅkara has used the direct word Sākshi (साक्षी), the Witness and has shown that it is different from Aham-Pratyaya (अहंप्रत्यय). This sentence resembles

"न हि अहंप्रत्ययविषयकर्तृ व्यतिरेकेण तत्साक्षी सर्वभूतस्थः समः, एकः, कूटस्थनित्यः पुरुषः विधिकण्डे तर्कसमये वा केनचिदधिगतः सर्वस्यात्मा" ॥

(S.Bh. 1-1-4)

which has been described as *the bed-rock of Shaṅkara's Bhāṣhyas* because this is the basic principle on which the whole of Shaṅkara's teaching is based. This has already been stated and interpreted at the beginning of this chapter.

- v) Gi. Bh -13/22

"भोक्ता अग्न्युष्णवत् भोक्ता आत्मा इत्युच्यते ॥" "परमात्मा देहादीनां ... विलक्षण आत्मेति परमात्मा" ।

The significances of these two sentences are as follows:-

(a) The nature of the Witness is the nature of pure consciousness. The Pratyayas or the notions such as pleasure, pain, delusion etc., which pertain to Antahkarana, are illumined by this Sākshi and pervaded by that Sākshi.

(b) Due to wrong identification one assumes that 'I am the body' and takes identification with the sense organs, mind, intellect etc. These are inner-selves from the stand point of the body. Strictly speaking all these are not fit to be called as "I" because other than this true nature, all will become fit to be called as "*mine*" but never this true nature. Therefore it is said here that this is Parama Ātma (= the transcendental Self), meaning it never becomes other than one's Self, such a body etc. So here also the Witnessing Principle—the Witness of all objects—beginning from the body and ending with the intellect—which are imagined through ignorance—is shown.

(vi) Gi. Bh -2/21

“थथा बद्धयाद्याहतस्य शब्दाद्यर्थस्य अविक्रिय एव सन् बुद्धिवृत्त्या विवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्यया उपलब्धा आत्मा कल्प्यते एवमेवात्मानात्म-विवेकविज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या असत्यरूपयैव परमार्थतोऽविक्रिय एवात्मा विद्वान् उच्यते” ॥

—Here that the modifications of the Antahkarana such as ignorance or wrong notions regarding the nature of the Self which is common and the right knowledge regarding the true nature of the Self which is generated

by the discrimination through the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru are shown. Both are the modifications of the Antahkarana. But the true nature of the Self is the *Witness* of these modifications. This is pointed out here.

CONCLUDING REMARKS:

All the above quoted sentences are the means to take one's stand in one's own true nature of the Witnessing Principle of life. In Prasthānatraya Bhāshyas there are so many sentences written by Shri Shaṅkara out of mercy to show the path of discrimination which will lead unto one's own true nature. This is a very *important principle* among all the five because when an aspirant starts direct Sādhana's like Shravana, Manana and Nidhidhyāsana, in all these Sādhana's he has to take a stand in his true nature and from that standpoint he has to listen to the Vedāntic teachings and has to reflect on their meaning and import and has to contemplate on them for corroborating the teachings by one's own experience. If this grip is missed then all the Vedānta will become only intellectual gymnastics, i.e. it loses the very Shaṅkara's point '*Anubhava Avasānatvāt*' (अनुभवावसानत्वात्), that means that the deliberation will never culminate in one's own Anubhava.

CHAPTER-3

The 3rd Fundamental:

The Unique Methodology of Vedānta: Adhyārōpa and Apavāda

1. Why this methodology of Adhyārōpa and Apavāda alone is employed exclusively in Vedānta :

The traditional teaching of Vedānta has got the above said only methodology to teach Brahman, the ultimate Reality. The Brahman is the very Self (i.e. Swarūpa) of the aspirant. So it is not an understandable, or objectifiable or realizable thing to be gained newly by efforts. In this strict sense knowing the Brahman, realizing the Brahman etc., are impossible because it is not a separate thing from the very Self of the seeker. Hence, here no effort is required to know the Brahman, but the effort is required only to cease or to remove the false identifications with the not-selves. This is clearly said by Shaṅkara in Gītā Bhāṣya – 18/50, thus :

—“Therefore, we have only to eliminate what is falsely ascribed to Brahman by Avidyā; we have to make no more effort to acquire a knowledge of Brahman as He is quite Self-evident.... Hence, effort is not needed for knowledge, but only for the removal of the thinking what is not the Self as the Self.”

In these two sentences Śhaṅkara clearly says that there is no need to stress for knowing the Ātman or Brahman because the Ātman himself appears in the form of the universe due to ignorance. So, one should negate or discard the appearance of the universe, that is to say, one has to cease to have the wrong identification with the non-selves—from ego to body and the corresponding world that are superimposed on Ātman through ignorance.

To illustrate by an example:

When the elephant, king, chariot and so on, made of sugar are shown to the children, they see the various forms and they insist on having a particular form. But here the truth is that only sugar appears in all these forms. To the buyer and the seller there are really no forms, i.e. no interest in the form but only in the sugar because they discard the appearance of the forms and cognize that the sugar is the reality. To teach this reality of sugar to the child the only way is to discard the appearance of the form and no necessity of telling or commanding the child that he has to understand that this is sugar. If he negates the forms naturally the sugar alone remains there. Similarly, in the case of teaching the nature of Brahman also it is taught only to negate or rescind the false appearances superimposed on It due to ignorance, for Brahman is devoid of all specific features and as such, can never be described in positive terms. The scripture and the teacher only tell the student what Ātman is not. They follow the methodology of Superimposition and Rescission for pointing out the Reality.

So, the method used here is deliberate *Superimposition* (अध्यारोप) and subsequent *Rescission* (अपवाद).

II. Nature of Methodology:

Reference to the method by some ancient Vedāntins in Śaṅkara Bhāṣhyas.

Before negating the false appearance, the Śāstras and the Guru accept the existence of the superimposed things tentatively as if they are really related to the truth though they are, in fact, false appearances. After teaching gradually, the truth is pointed out and the aspirant himself remains as the final truth of Brahman Itself and automatically he realizes the falsehood of the attributed things which was taught previously. This is said clearly by Śaṅkara in Gi—Bh—13/13 and introduction, to 13/14:

Here Bhagavad Gītā states that, Ātman is neither called 'being' nor 'non-being' (ब्रह्म न सत् तत् न असत् उच्यते). This statement makes the seeker think that Ātman either is non-existence (शून्य) or is insentient (जड). In order to dispel this misconception, Ātman is said to pervade all living beings and function through their hands, feet etc., by assuming these as qualities of the knowable Ātman, just to convince the seeker of Its existence. Because of the *superimposition* of the organs like hands, feet etc., which are adjuncts, lest there be the misconception that the Ātman has sensory and other organs and that It really has such activity as moving etc. The Gītā at the very next

stages *rescinds* this misconception by saying that Ātman is devoid of all limiting adjuncts and It is Nirguna (निर्गुण) (in Gītā—13/14). Here Shankara declares that, “this is the traditional method of Vedānta—those who have known the tradition say that the Self who is ever devoid of all kinds of attributes or mundane qualities is taught through the method of superimposition and recission.”¹ An illustration is given below:

The teacher teaching geography at first tells the pupils that the sun rises in the east in the morning, comes up above our head at noon and sets in the west in the evening, and so the sun has got rising the setting capabilities. And from December to June the sun goes from south to north and from June to December, the sun goes southwards, and sometimes the eclipses take place on the sun etc. The pupils nod and understand as such. After that the teacher says the truth that (in higher classes of course) the sun has really no such transition. Due to the movement of the earth, all these dealings are attributed on the sun. And when the moon comes between the earth and the sun, then we say that there is solar eclipse, but strictly speaking the sun has no such eclipsing effect.

Here, in this illustration, accepting the attributes such as sun rises and sun sets etc., is called *Adhyaropa*, superimposition, deliberate superimpositions. To show

¹ ‘तथा हि सम्प्रदायविदां वचनम् ‘अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्चयते’

the real nature of the sun the teacher should negate all types of dealings which had been attributed on the sun previously for the purpose of teaching. When the children understand the negation of the dealings by taking the standpoint of the position of the sun instead of taking the standpoint of the position of earth, automatically they will give up the wrong notions regarding the sun even when the dealings such as rising, setting etc., appear to be there in daily life. Mr. Gaelieleo who discovered that the earth is moving, he himself was talking in terms of morning and evening even though there cannot be such dealings with regard to the sun. The same is the case with the Brahman.

In his Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣhya (4/4/25) also Śaṅkara has set forth the nature of this method, thus:

“It is to bring home this purport (viz. He who knows It, the self as such as the fearless Brahman, certainly becomes the fearless Brahman) that the ideas of projection, maintenance, dissolution etc., as well as those of actions and its factors and results are *superimposed on the Self*. Again, by their *negation*—by the elimination of the superimposed attributes through a process of “Not this, not this” the truth has been known”.

(for further references to this method in Śaṅkara’s work see section vii of this chapter).

With a view to turning the attention of the enquirer towards the Brahman, the ultimate Reality, the Scriptural texts use the method of superimposition. Due to misconception regarding the Reality, one by nature, attributes certain features on the Reality which, in fact, are non-existent. To remove this innate misconception the scriptural texts deliberately attribute certain other superior features which are in due course rescinded. At this stage, the Transcendental Reality alone subsists and this is called as the cognition of the Reality in Vedānta. At that time the seeker himself takes a stand in his own intuitional experience of his true nature. This is the nature of this methodology.

Gaudapāda, the grand-preceptor of Shankara, also has resorted to this device of superimposition (अध्यारोप) from the empirical standpoint as a means and its final negation (अपवाद) when the intuition of the Absolute unborn, non-duality is achieved :

— “As the Shruti passage, ‘This is the final instruction. It is not this, not this’, on account of the incomprehensibility of Ātman, *negates* all dualistic ideas *superimposed* upon Ātman (as the means for the attainment of Ātman), therefore the birthless, non-dual Ātman alone exists and not the duality.”

(GK – 3/26)

III. The Meaning of the word Rescission:

Shankara has clearly stated the meaning of the word Apavāda or rescission in S. Bh-3/3/9.

“APAVĀDO NĀMA .. YATHĀRTHA BUDHYĀ NIVARTATE”

The meaning of this sentence is “Apavāda or rescission occurs when a subsequent true idea of an object, happens to sublate the earlier unreal idea regarding it. For instance, the idea of selfhood persisting with regard to the assemblage of the body and the senses is removed by the subsequent idea being born out of the teaching, “That thou art”. The word Apavāda in Sanskrit commonly has got the meaning allegation. But here it is used in the sense APAVĀDA meaning denying or ablation or abrogation or negation or discarding etc., what is said before. This word is used here in this sense only.

When the not-selves have been negated through the teaching which is based on the firm ground of one’s own intuitional experience the seeker realises the falsehood of the not-selves and he remains himself as the Self. So the realization of the Self is not stressed but the realization of the falsehood of the not-selves is the main thrust. Hence, “deliberate superimposition and subsequent negation” is the only method that is possible and adopted in the Upanishads.

IV. Kalpita Samvruti alone should be taken in this methodology, but not the Lōka-samvruti:

In this method only we have to go with the deliberate attributions made by the Shāstra for the purpose of teaching the Brahman, that is to say that the Kalpita *Samvr̥ti*.¹ (= deliberate ascription) alone should be taken here, but not the *Lōka-Samvr̥ti*² or Paratantra *Samvr̥ti*, i.e. the ordinary human procedure due to Avidyā or Adhyāsa, because the former (कल्पितसंवृति) is purely a conventional device employed by the Shāstra or the preceptor only for enlightening the intellect of the seeker so that he can realize the Truth. This is said by Shaṅkara :

“The empirical knowledge in respect of scriptures, teacher and taught is illusory and imagined only as a means to the realization of the ultimate Reality.”

(GK. BH – 4/73)

Except this method there is no other way to teach the Brahman as it is not an object. It being so the enlightened people also at first accept the attributions and after denoting the truth the attributions automatically get falsified. So the negation of the attributions is the only way to teach the Brahman.

¹ *Kalpita-Samvr̥ti* means the procedure adopted by the Shāstra or the preceptor as a device for teaching the means of knowing the truth (GK. Bh—4/73).

² *Lōka Samvr̥ti* means ‘Vyavahāra’, the experiences of the empirical world which are caused by metaphysical ignorance (G.K. BH-4/57).

But when the Brahman is taught to be meditated with some names and forms, then the positive attributions are predominant. But when we have to know the nature of the Brahman as it is, then the only method used is Superimposition and Rescission (negation). It is a general rule that to get the Jñāna or realisation of Brahman and to meditate (i.e. to do the Upāsana of Brahman) for fruits to be enjoyed in this life or for joys to be experienced in the other world—in both cases attributions are to be taken, but there is a great difference between these two. In the process of realization of Brahman through *Viveka* (discrimination) the aspirants should give up the Upādhis (attributions) and take his stand in Brahman (i.e. the attributes are ultimately rejected in the case of knowable Brahman). While in the case of Upāsana or meditations of the Brahman that are prescribed in the Shāstras, the Upāsaka has to keep the Upādhis and with the Upādhis only (i.e. without rejecting the attributes) he has to meditate.¹ The meditations that are prescribed for realization is based on the deliberate attribution of names and forms and at the same places Brahman is described as the cause of the universe and this also comes under the category of the above said methodology. This is clearly shown by the Swāmiji of Holenarsipur in his Kannada book ‘Shaṅkara Vedānta Sāra’ and also in his Sanskrit books, ‘Suddha Shaṅkara Prakriyā Bhaskara and

¹ “एकङ्कपि ब्रह्म अपेक्षितोपाधिसम्बन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसम्बन्धश्च उपास्त्वैनं ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेषु उपदिश्यते ॥”
(S. Bh—1/1/12)

Vedānta Prakriya Pratyabhijñā'. The gist of the same is furnished in the next section.

V. TEACHING OF BRAHMAN BY MEANS OF SUPER IMPOSITION IS ONLY FOR NEGATING WHAT IT IS NOT CORRECTLY:

The general line of this methodology adopted in Vedāntic writing and its significance are clearly shown by Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji in his books mentioned above. In these books he has set forth some different varieties of superimposition indicating that some particular superimpositions are intended to negate some other particular features. For example.

1) By superimposing 'attainability' (प्राप्यत्व) on Brahman "ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्"—The knower of Brahman attains the Highest—Tai-2/1 (although It is eternally attained because of Its all pervading and also because of its being the very Self of every one), the Shruti negates that it is *attainable by any means other than knowledge*.

2) By attributing 'knowability' (ज्ञेयत्व) on Brahman, the Shruti negates the *knowability of objects other than the Brahman*. For example in the text. एतज्ज्ञेयं नित्यमेवात्मसंस्थम्”
Shve-1/12

3) Through the attributions of the 'knowership' (ज्ञातृत्व) on the Self, the previous attribution (i.e. *knowability*) is removed, as in the text : “एष हि द्रष्टा,... बोद्धा, कर्ता, विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः”—Prashna—4/9; “विज्ञातारमरे केन विजानीयात्”—By what means, my dear, can the knower be known?—Br̥ha—2/4/14.

4) By attributing the '*Ātmanhood*' (आत्मत्व), the *knowership* is removed, as in the text; "आत्मेत्येवोपासीत"—The self alone is to be meditated upon—Bṛha-1/4/7.

5) By attributing the "*Witnesshood* (साक्षित्व) of the ego, the *Selfhood* is removed i.e. the *individuality* is removed, as in the text, साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्गुणश्च" The witnessing consciousness is one and without attributes—Shve-7/11.

6) By certain other texts the very essential nature of Ātman is pointed out as in the text 'स एषः नेत नेति आत्मा'—He is *neti neti*, not such not such—Bṛha—3/9/26, in order to negate all specific attributes including *Witnesshood* of the ego. The unborn Ātman shines forth of Its own accord.

7) Again, by attributing that the Self is Brahman, i.e. attributing '*Brahmanhood*' (ब्रह्मत्व) on the individual Self, the *finiteness* (परिच्छिन्नत्व or अल्पत्व) is removed. For example in the text, 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म सर्वानुभू'—Bṛha—2/5/19, Māndūkya—2.

8) By attributing the '*Selfhood*' on Brahman, the *indirectness* (परोक्षत्व) of the Self is removed. For example in the text 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि'—Bṛha-1/4/10; 'यत् साक्षादपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः —Brahman that is immediate and direct—the Self that is within all—Bṛha-3/4/1.

9) By attributing that the Brahman is *knowable only through the Vēdantic sentences or teachings* (वाक्यगम्यत्व), the Shruti has removed the idea that the Self can be *known through Pramānas such as perception* (प्रत्यक्ष), *inference* (अनुमान) etc. For example in the text, "तं त्वौपनिषदं

पुरुषं पृच्छामि”—I ask you of that Being who is to be known only from the Upanishads—Bṛha—3/9/26.

10) The attribution of ‘मनोगम्यत्व’ i.e. Brahman is *ascertainable by the mind*, is sometimes taught to indicate that it is *not known through sensuous knowledge*. For example in the text, ‘मनसैवानुद्दृष्टव्यम्;’—Through the mind alone It is to be realized—Bṛha—4/4/19.

11) Again, by asserting that the nature of the Self is *beyond the sphere of speech and thought* the very idea of the Brahman as an object (*Vishayatva- विषयत्व*) is removed. As for instance in the case of texts like this: ‘यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह’—Failing to reach that Brahman, words turn back along with the mind—Tai—2/9.

12) By attributing that the Brahman is the cause of the universe (*Jagatkāranatva—जगत्कारणत्व*) the idea that the Brahman is the product (*Kāryatva - कार्यत्व*) of any thing is negated, as in the text: “तस्माद् वा एतस्मादात्मनः आकाशः संभूतः”—From that Brahman, which is the Self, was produced space—Tai—2/1.

13) After that, by asserting that the effect, i.e. the appearance of the world is only a *Vikalpa* (विकल्प), i.e. concocted by ignorance, the *causehood* of Brahman is also negated by the Shrutis saying “अथात आदेशो नेति नेति”—Now therefore the description of Brahman: Not this not this,—Bṛha-2/3/6; “तदेतत् ब्रह्म अपूर्वमनपरमन्तरमबाह्यम्” “That Brahman is without prior or posterior, without interior or exterior”—Bṛha—2/5/19.

14) By attributing the '*generalhood*' (Sāmānyatva - सामान्यत्व) on Brahman, the *particulars* (Visheshaha) are negated. For examples in the texts, “यथा दुन्दुभेर्हन्यमानस्य ... शब्दोगृहीतः” —when a drum is beaten, one cannot distinguish its various particular notes, but they are included in the general note of the drum or in the general sound produced by different kinds of strokes (Similarly nothing particular is perceived in the waking and dream states apart from the (general) Pure consciousness)—Bṛha—2/4/7 (See also Bṛha—2/4/8 and 9)

15) Asserting that the Self is of untainted nature ('*Asangatva*' - असङ्गत्व), the previous *generalhood* is removed. As for instance in the text like; “असङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः” —The Self is untainted by these two states (waking and dream)—Bṛha—4/3/15.

16) By attributing the '*mundanehood*' (संसारित्व) on the Self, the *insentient* nature (जडत्व) of the Self is negated. For example, in the text “आत्मनस्तु कामाय सर्वं प्रियं भवति” But for one's own sake that it is loved—Bṛha—2/4/5.

17) By attributing the nature of the Self as being the subject of meditation (*Upāsyatva*—“उपास्यत्व”) the previous nature *i.e.* *mundanehood* is negated. For example, “एतत् वै सत्यकाम परं चापरं च ब्रह्म यदोकारमभिध्यायीत” —O Satyakāma, this very Brahman, that is known as the inferior and superior, is but this AUM which is to be *meditated*.—(Prashna-5/2).

18) By attributing the” *Witnesshood of the three states*” (अवस्थात्रय-साक्षित्व) on the Self, the Shruti removes the wrong idea that the Self is circumscribed by the body, i.e. *Parichinnatva—Bhrānti* (परिच्छिन्नत्व-भ्रान्ति) is rescinded. As for instance in the texts like this :

“स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं चोभौ येनानुपश्यति ।

महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥”

“The wise one having ascertained that Great and all pervading Ātman through whom one sees the contents of both dream and Waking, does not grieve.” [Ka -2/1/4]

19) By attributing that the Self is the fourth, i.e. *Turiyatva* (तुरीयत्व), the Witnesshood of the three states is also negated. For example in the text :

“नान्तः प्रज्ञं न बहिष्प्रज्ञं ... न प्रज्ञानघनं ... एकात्मप्रत्ययसार... चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा ।”—Turiya is not that which is conscious of the internal subjective world (here it is indicated that it is not Taijasa), not that which is consciousness of the external objective world (here it is denied that Turiya is Vaiswānara), not of Consciousness amassed throughout (here it is denied that it is a condition of deep sleep), having the notion of the self only as a means of knowing Him. This is what is known as Fourth (Turiya).” Mā-7.

20) By attributing the ‘*aspiranthood*’ (साधकत्व) on the Self the Shāstra negates the wrong notion that the Ātman is *Nityasamsāri* (नित्यसंसारि) meaning Ātman is ever suffering from the mundane qualities. For example in the text, “तस्मादेवं विच्छान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वा आत्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति,

सर्वमात्मानं पश्यति ।”— “Therefore he who Knows it as such becomes calm, self-controlled, withdrawn into himself, enduring and concentrated and sees the self in his own Self (body); he sees all as the Self.” Bṛha—4/4/23

21) By asserting that the nature of the Self is ever devoid of all types of mundane qualities (नित्यमुक्तत्व अध्यारोप), the Shāstra negates the Sādhakahood attributed previously. As for instance in texts like “प्रपञ्चोपाशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतम्” (Mā-7)—“By describing Turiya as negation of all phenomena”, the attributes which characterize the three states, viz., waking etc. are negated. Hence it is ever Peaceful, all Bliss and it is non-dual i.e. devoid of illusory ideas of distinction of Sādhyā, Sādhaka and Sādhana.

In short, the very soul of this methodology consists in superimposing some particular attribute or character, as pertaining to Brahman with a view to negate or discard another gross misconception concerning Brahman and then abrogating the previous superimposed character by yet another superior superimposition, ultimately leading to the realization of the true nature of the Self by abolishing all attributions.

VI. Different ways of the usage of the Attributions:

Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji has shown another type of usage of the attribution in his Kannada book, “ShaṅkaraVedānta Sāra” as well as in his Sanskrit book “Shuddha Sankara Prakriyā Bhāskara”.

In the above portion it is shown that to remove a particular misunderstanding the Shāstra has used a particular attribution on the Self, but here it is shown that we may use a particular attribution to remove various misunderstandings. Vedantins have used in this way the attribution already. To illustrate by an example:

“The Ātman is the only reality to be known”—this attribution of ‘*knowability*’ on Ātman commonly denotes that other than the Ātman nothing else deserves to be called as knowable. Besides this we can determine the following points on this single attribution of knowability on Brahman.

i) The cause for the false appearance of the not-self, (i.e. duality) is the ignorance alone regarding the real nature of the Self.

ii) If one knows the real nature of the Self, it automatically follows that he has known all the not-selves (i.e. one becomes omniscient by the knowledge of Brahman). This is clearly stated in Mundaka – 1/1/3 – “Which having been known all this becomes known.”

iii) If one cognizes the real nature of this Self, for him the ignorance gets destroyed or falsified completely.

iv) If one cognises the nature of the Self, after that there would not remain the distinctions such as the knower, the means of knowledge and the knowable etc.

So, here by one attribution we have shown the five points (including the first) of negations of misunderstandings.

Similarly it is taught that Brahman is beyond both mind and speech not only to negate the Vishayatva (विषयत्व) of It, but also to reveal that Ātman is known exclusively through *intuition* distinct from both mind and speech as may be seen from the texts like,

- i) “वेदान्तविज्ञानं सुनिश्चितार्थाः”—Those who have quite correctly ascertained the truth by means of *intuition* arising from Vedānta. (Mundaka—3/2/6)
- ii) “आनन्दं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् न विभेति कुतश्चन”—One who has *intuited* that Bliss of Brahman, is not afraid of anything. (Tai-2/9)
- iii) “तद् ह विजज्ञौ”—That Reality of the Self, he (Shvetaketu) *intuited* from Uddālaka. (Ch—6/16/3)
- iv) “स विजिज्ञासितव्यः”—One should know Him (Ātman) through one's own *intuition* (Ch—8/7/1)
- v) “प्रोक्ताऽन्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ”—Ka-1/2/9 —It is easily *intuited* my dearest boy, when taught by a traditional Vedantin.

Again, “*attainability*” is imputed to Brahman not merely to negate that it is attainable by some means other than knowledge, but also it 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 (Hiranyagarbha) whose attainability is taught in Shrutis like “He attains Swarājyam”. (Tai-1/6)

Similarly Brahman alone is taken as a cause of the world, not only to negate its Kāryatva (कार्यत्व) but also to discard the idea that Paramānu (परमाणु) Pradhāna (प्रधान) or Jeeva (जीव) or Māyāshakti (मायाशक्ति) or Māyāvishishta Brahman or Māyā pratibimba Brahman etc. is the cause of the world.

Hence it is proved that the methods which are used in Vedānta to teach the true nature of Brahman such as (i) Avasthātraya Viveka¹ ii) Kārya-Kāraṇa Prakriyā,² iii) Sāmānya-Vishesha³ (the universal and the particular) Prakriyā, iv) Pancha-Kōsha Viveka⁴, v) Anvaya-Vyatireka Prakriyā⁵, vi) Dṛg-Dṛshya Viveka⁶ etc, are only parts of 'Adhyārōpa Apavāda' which is the only methodology of Vedānta.

¹ 1) In Avasthātraya-Viveka, the existence of the three states are temporarily accepted belonging to the Self (this is Adhyārōpa of अवस्थात्रयत्व)

2) In Kārya-Kāraṇa Prakriyā, Brahman is taken to be the cause of the world (this is Adhyārōpa of जगत्कारणत्व)

3) In Sāmānya-Vishesha Prakriyā, Brahman is regarded as genus, i.e. the concept of the universal is applied to Brahman. (this is Adhyārōpa of सामान्यत्व)

4) In Panchakōsha Viveka, the pervasiveness and the nature of being the inmost of all is temporarily ascribed to the Self (This is Adhyārōpa of सर्वव्यापित्व)

5) In Anvaya-Vyatireka, the continuity or persistence of Ātman as a residual factor is assumed (this is Adhyārōpa of अन्वयत्व)

6) In Dṛg-Dṛshya Viveka, Ātman is presented as the knower of all (this is Adhyārōpa of द्रष्टृत्व or ज्ञातृत्व).

If this secret is known, then one will get rid of the idea that there is anything else apart from the Self. Because, due to natural ignorance one has misunderstood the non-dual Self as not-self, i.e. as the world, individuality etc. Strictly speaking there is no world or individuality. And the ordainership (*Ishvaratva*) of Brahman which is attributed from standpoint of these two is also a kind of Adhyāropa. If one does not get to know the secret of this methodology he will mistake that “as there is the Self, so also the not-self is also there”. To remove this wrong idea the methodology of teaching the Brahman can be only through “Not this not this.” This is the only method used for the purpose of teaching Brahman.

This Adhyāropa – Apavāda Nyāya can also be utilized in another way as shown by Swāmiji in his books, “Essays on Vedānta”. That is the use of words expressing objects to indicate the Absolute by negating opposite significance. For instance in the sentences: “सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म” — Tai-2/1 ‘विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म’ — Br—3/9/28. Here some empirical epithets are applied to the absolute in the metaphysical sense. The words ‘Reality’, ‘Consciousness’ ‘Infinity’ and ‘Bliss’ suggest Brahman here by negating what is ‘unreal’, ‘unconsciousness’ ‘finite’ and ‘sorrowful’ respectively. Besides this, we can determine the following points on this attribution:

- i) Brahman is of the nature of “Infinite Reality, Consciousness and Bliss.”

- ii) As it is the Ātman of the Self of each one of us, we can conclude that our real Self is Brahman of this nature.
- iii) Our finite individual self, which is sometimes consciousness, sometimes unconsciousness, is not meant here.

Thus Shāstra has denoted indirectly the definition of Brahman through denying the common meanings of these words *Satya*, *Jñāna*, etc., and turns one's attention towards one's own true nature of the Self, i.e. Brahman whose nature is beyond the words and concepts.

viii) A few references from the Bhāshyas about the importance of the Adhyārōpa-Apavāda method:

Shankara gives some illustrations regarding this methodology in his Br. Bh-4/4/25 "YATHAA EKA PRABHRITI-TATVOPASAMHARAHA KRITAH."—"Just as, in order to explain the nature of numbers from one up to a hundred thousand billions, a man superimposes them on certain lines (digits), calling one of them, one; another ten, another hundred, yet another thousand and so on and in so doing he only expounds the nature of numbers but he never says that numbers are the lines.¹

¹. This shows that Shankara definitely knew 'decimal notations'. Here he has explained the method arithmetically. But this can be explained algebraically also. Just as in algebra in the equation, $x^2 + 10x = 11$, in order to evaluate the value of x , we have to add the figure 25 (twenty five) on both sides:

Or, just as, in order to teach the alphabet, he has recourse to a combination of leaf (serving for paper), ink, lines etc., and through them explains the nature of the letters, but he never says that the letters are the leaf, ink, lines etc. Similarly in this exposition the one entity 'Brahman, has been inculcated through various means, such as the projection (of the universe). Again, to eliminate the differences created by those hypothetical means, the truth has been summed up as 'not this, not this'.

The same illustration is quoted in S.Bh-2/1/14, 'TATHAA AKAARAADI.....AKSHARA-PRATI-PATTEHE"—i.e., from the false perception of the presence letters in some lines (drawn on paper) the true letters like 'a' etc., are grasped.

In Taittiriya Bhāshya also he declares this method in 2/8, 'TASMAAT SATYAM JNAANAMANANTHAM.....

$$x^2+10x+25 = 11+25$$

$$\text{or, } (x+5)^2 = 36 = 6^2$$

$$\text{or, } x+5=6$$

$$\text{Therefore } x = 6 - 5 = 1.$$

Similarly in Vedānta-Shāstra also in order to realize the real nature of Ātman or Brahman, some characteristics of not-self are deliberately "added" to (i.e. superimposed on) It for the purpose of teaching. Had the algebraical method been prevalent at the time of Shāṅkara, then he definitely would have given this type of example.

VIKALPA UPAPADYATE’—“Hence it is with a view to realizing the Self, which has been defined above in the text ‘Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinity’ (Tai 2/1/1) that becoming many, entering into creation, acquisition of bliss, fearlessness, attainment etc., have been *attributed* to Brahman, conceived of as the basis of all empirical dealings, but with regard to the really transcendental Brahman, beyond all conditions, there can be *no such ascriptions*.”

Shankara says that this (Adhyārōpa-Apavāda Nyāya) is the only method of Vedānta and no other method to remind the true nature of seeker as Brahman which is devoid of all types of adjuncts. For this the reader is referred to Bṛha. Bhāṣya: 2/3/6 “ATO NA NIRDESHTUMITI NIRDESHAHA”, meaning “Brahman cannot be described as ‘It is such and such’ as we can describe a cow by saying, ‘there moves a white cow with horns’. Brahman is described by means of name, form and action *superimposed* on It in such positive terms as ‘*knowledge*’, ‘*Bliss*’, ‘*Pure consciousness*’, ‘*Brahman*’, ‘*Ātman*’ etc. When, however, we wish to describe Its true nature, free from all differences due to limiting adjuncts, then it is an utter impossibility. Then there is only one way left, viz., to describe It as ‘not this’, ‘not this’ by *eliminating* all possible specifications of It that have been known”.

Hence the usual procedure of Shruti in teaching the subtle Ātman, is to point out something grosser as the Ātman and then negating it to lead the seeker to the real

Ātman. This can be illustrated thus (see S. Bh-1/1/8) : A man going to point out the tiny *Arundhuti star* first shows a big star very near to it indirectly as Arundhuti itself for the time being and then he negates (discards) it and shows subsequently the real primary Arundhuti. The other stars are called by the name Arundhuti just to lead the seeker's eye towards the actual Arundhuti. Similarly the same method of deliberate imputation of characteristics and its subsequent negation has been referred to in Vedānta, saying 'This is not the Self, this is not the Self.'

VIII. Misunderstandings regarding the methodology and conclusive remarks regarding the 3rd fundamental:

Unable to comprehend this methodology of Vedānta (—The 3rd fundamental of Śaṅkara Vedānta) the modern Vedantins like Rāmānuja, Mādhva etc., have missed the track of the teachings of Vedānta. And mainly they have no idea regarding the comprehensive vision of life and indispassionate thinking.

In Advaita Vedānta also, after Sureshvarā Āchārya, when the sub-commentators twisted the sentences of Bhāṣhya according to their own respective ideas, they have also missed the track of tradition. Because in traditional way the word Adhyārōpa denotes that thing which is a false appearance concocted by natural (Naisargika) ignorance, i.e. Adhyāsa. When these people have started arguing that there is a material cause

(called Mūlāvidyā) for this Adhyāsa, then this material cause is naturally not a concocted one by Avidyā (— metaphysical ignorance) and then it will be impossible to be removed by the knowledge.

But according to Shaṅkara the nature of knowledge is the capacity to remove Avidyā (=misconception regarding the real nature of the Self) and showing the falsehood of the attributed thing. By this, it illumines the truth as it is and it has no capacity to destroy something which is existing one and to produce newly something. Shaṅkara has said this clearly in his Bṛha. Bh-1/4/10 : NAHI KASHCHIT VASTU.....

A free translation of this portion would be as follows: “This knowledge has never been observed whether directly to remove some characteristic of a thing or to create one, but everywhere it is seen to remove ignorance. Similarly here also let the idea of not being Brahman and not being all that is due to ignorance, be removed by the knowledge of Brahman, but it can neither create not put a stop to a real entity”.

Thus it is clear that these people have missed the true track of Vedānta-Sampradāya. If we know the secret of this third fundamental of Vedānta (= Adhyārōpa-Apavāda Nyāya), then we will never be out of track with the teachings of the Upanishad.

Hence this third secret of Shaṅkara Vedānta is to be known by the earnest students of Vedānta. One can easily

recognize his own true nature of the Witnessing principle of life by following the process of discrimination which starts on the firm ground of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. To take a firm stand there this methodology of *superimposition and rescission* is the only way.

The superimpositions put forth from the empirical standpoint of view, which are prescribed by the Shāstra are called as *Kalpita Samvṛti*. Samvṛti means Vyavahāra, Shāstra intends to push the seeker into the core of his life unto the Witnessing principle of life which is the ultimate truth. When the seeker remains as true Witnessing principle of life then he transcends all the empirical bondages which are in the realm of metaphysical ignorance. Though the Shāstra is in the realm of empirical dealings, as it is in the form of words, it takes the seeker unto end of the empirical dealings just as the boat takes the passengers to the other bank of the river. After crossing the river when he puts his leg on the bank then there is no problem of water. Similarly when the seeker remains as the Witnessing principle of life then he transcends all the empirical dealings. This is the effect of the above said method. So, now we have to know the difference between the two standpoints, viz., the empirical viewpoint and the transcendental view point—the Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti and the Paramārtha Dṛṣhti, which we shall deal with in the next chapter.

CHAPTER – 4

The 4th Fundamental:

Two different standpoints – Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti (the Empirical standpoint) and Paramārtha Dṛṣhti (the Transcendental standpoint)

1. Basis for Dividing the two standpoints :

Some people raise the objection that Shaṅkara has made two different standpoints in his Bhāṣhya and what he wants to accept he says that it is from the transcendental standpoint and that is really real. And whatever he does not want to accept, he dismisses with the observation that it is said with the empirical viewpoint. (These are called as *Paramārtha Dṛṣhti* and *Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti* in Sanskrit). And it is very difficult to understand as to what exactly Āchārya says regarding the final truth.

This objection is raised due to non-apprehension regarding the comprehensive vision of life which is the very first fundamental principle. If we know the secret of the very first fundamental, then we can very easily grasp the teaching of the two standpoints.

(i)

According to the comprehensive vision of life, our life is divided into two parts—one is the dualistic appearance and the other, non-dual Absolute Being. This is an universally accepted thing. The dualistic dealing which is divided into two parts such as subject and object appears whenever waking or dream occurs—where there is this type of appearance there are dealings such as thinking, speaking and doing. These three—*thought*, *speech* and *deed* are called as Vyavahāra. Whenever we say Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti all types of thoughts, words and deeds come under the category of Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti, i.e. empirical viewpoint of dealings. He who has synchronized one's thought, word and deed, meaning he who speaks as he thinks and acts as he speaks, is called as crooked one. So the word Vyavahāra compromised all types of thought, speech and deed. All our present life is based on this empirical viewpoint. The worldly dealings, religious dealings etc., all come under this category. The Vedānta Shāstra deals with this type of dealing as from the empirical viewpoint or Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti.

All these there (viz. thoughts, speech and deeds), according to Vedānta, are in the realm of ignorance or nescience only and hence do not pertain to the transcendental reality, which is beyond the ken of these three. So then Vyāvahārika view is same as the view of ignorance (*Avidyā-Dṛṣhti*), the Pāramārthika view is same as the view of knowledge (*Vidyā-Dṛṣhti*). According to

Vedānta Shāstra, our own being is there beyond this range of empirical dealings—where there are no thoughts, no speech, no deeds but our own being is there and it is on its own merit, self-established and beyond all the concepts and words.

(ii)

In common life, whenever the word denotes something, the mind follows the word and gets the concept of that things, as for example, if we say an elephant, by hearing this word, immediately our mind gets the concept of an elephant. Sometimes the things which have not been seen in this world, these types of things also can be imagined by the mind according to the direction of the words, as for example, when we say that *Airāvata* (God Indra's elephant) is there in the heaven, then one asks what is that *Airāvata*? When explained that it is a kind of elephant whose colour is white and which has got seven trunks, even though no one has seen such an animal in this world, our mind can imagine this "Airāvata" and if a man is an artist he can depict the same in a pictorial form. So the mind follows the words. In a tractor, there are two front wheels which are of small size and two big wheels at the back. The front wheels have the steering and they show the path and the big wheels follow. Similarly words show the path and the mind then follows it.

All the empirical dealings are fully covered by these two instruments—that is, the *words and concepts*. Hence

our mind is simply a bundle of concepts which have been created through the words. All this range of words and concepts are called as empirical dealings—*Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti*.

But according to Vedānta, our own being, which is beyond words and concepts, is there. Whenever the Shruti wants to denote this transcendental reality it says: “YATO VĀCHO NIVARTANTE APRĀPYA MANASĀ SAHA”(- Tai-2/9), i.e. failing to reach which (Ātman), words turn back along with the mind. Hence our own being which transcends all types of dealings, i.e. thought, speech and deed, that very being is called as “Transcendental reality”—*Paramārtha Satya* by comprising with the present empirical aspect of life.

(iii)

If we observe according to universal acceptance, the deep sleep where there is no appearance of either waking or dream, our own being remains there which is beyond the concepts and words and that it is to be intuited by the seeker with the help of the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru. This Being which transcends all types of words and concepts is not to be confused as essenceless, void or nothingness meaning it is not Shūnya as declared by Nihilists. It is one's own true Being which is beyond the word and idea of Being. As this Being is the substratum for the appearance and disappearance of the empirical dealings, so this transcendental Being is a really real one and the empirical dealings are apparently real. For

example, either in waking or in dream all types of dealings are seen as real until either state exists. When these two states disappear and mutually cancel the appearance of the other, then the Being which is the transcendental reality, remains unaffected. So this Being is really real and these two states are apparently real in their realm of appearance.

Taking these two aspects of life, Shankara has divided these two standpoints. Those who have no idea regarding these basic principles and who have relied only on the empirical view point, (only these people) raise such objections mentioned at the beginning of this chapter.

(iv)

The distinction of the empirical and transcendental viewpoints are not an imagination of Shankara but they are there as facts of life. We give here-in some examples:

a) In our daily life also there are two view points – one is transcendental and the other empirical. While playing the *chess-game*, they spread the pawns and call them as king, minister, elephant, horse, camel, soldiers etc. There are certain rules and regulations regarding moving of these pawns. Both the parties must follow the rules while playing. After the game is over, when all the pawns are put into a box, then the transcendental view point of all these being wood or plastic automatically follows. And from this view point there is nothing like king, minister etc., but while playing the chess one should not rely on

the standpoint that they are wood. One cannot move the pawns as one likes, because when he is in the plane of the game he should follow the rules of the game. So the playing is with the empirical view and there are differentiations like king etc. Understanding that all these are mere pieces of wood (or plastic) is the transcendental view point.

b) In Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad-2/4/7, 8 and 9, the *Sāmānya—Viśeṣha Prakriyā* (the methodology of general and particular) is shown. According to this, the general principle is the transcendental reality and the particulars which are imagined on the reality, only belong to the empirical reality. For example, West Bengal, Bihar Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka etc., the States are there from the empirical viewpoint alone, but India (which includes all these states) is from the transcendental viewpoint.

c) In the previous chapter, while discussing the methodology of Vedānta we have cited the illustration : 'The sun rises in the east in the morning, is overhead at noon and sets in the west in the evening, by taking the standpoint of the position of the earth'. This is "empirical view". However the truth of the matter is that the sun has really no such transaction i.e. it neither rises nor sets from the stand point of the position of the sun. This is the "transcendental view".

Hence in our daily life also we rely on these two standpoints in every aspect of life. Therefore these are the facts of life and not the imaginations.

(v)

Thus, it is only a matter of looking at the same thing from two different points of view—one from the *common-sense view* or the Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti and the other, from the *Vedāntic view* or the Paramārtha Dṛṣhti. Śaṅkara has clearly stated that the Shāstra accepts Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti for teaching the truth. For example, “the different modifications of the sea such as the waves, the bubbles, the foam, the ripples etc., are accepted as different according to empirical view as they do not lose their individuality in relation to one another, but they are non-different from sea-water, is the transcendental view. Just as the waves and bubbles etc., are not different from water, the world and the mind are not different from the Self. Although this distinction can well exist as observed in common experience, but in reality this difference does not exist, since a non-difference between the Brahman and the universe including the “Me-notion” is recognized” (S.Bh-2/1/13).

The Shāstra and the teacher employ both these standpoints when they attempt to enlighten the seekers of Truth.

II. ŚAṆKARA RECOGNIZES THE TWO VIEWPOINTS OF REALITY:

(Some quotations from Bhāshyas)

We have said that Pure Being is transcendental reality meaning really real and the dualistic world is empirically real, an apparent reality, just as the cinema and the arc lamp—the former apparently real and the latter, really real. Shaṅkara never mixes these two standpoints and he differentiates these two standpoints and gives proper place for all the empirical dealings. The readers are referred to following sentences of the Bhāshya:

(i)

**“YADA TU PARAMARTHA DRISHTYĀ TENA NA
KASCHIT-VIRODHĀH” (Bṛha—Bh—3/5/1)**

“But when name and form are tested from the standpoint of the highest truth in the light of the above Shruti texts, as to whether they are different from the Supreme Self or not, they cease to be separate entities, like the foam of water or like the modifications (of clay), such as a jar. It is then that such passages as, ‘one only without a second’ and ‘there is no difference whatsoever in It’, have scope from the standpoint of the Supreme Self as referring to the highest realization. But when, on account of our metaphysical ignorance, the reality of Brahman, although remaining as it is, naturally untouched by any thing—like the reality of the rope, the mother of pearl and the sky—is not discriminated from such limiting adjuncts as the body and organs, which are created by name and form and our natural vision of those adjuncts remains, then this phenomenal existence

consisting of the things different from Brahman has full play. This unreal phenomenal existence created by differentiation is indeed a fact for those who do not believe in the things as different from Brahman as well as for those who do believe. But the believers of the highest truth, while discussing, in accordance with the Shrutis, the actual existence or non-existence of things apart from Brahman, conclude that Brahman alone is the one without a second, beyond all finite relations. So there is no contradiction between the two—*Vyavahāra and Paramārtha Views*.”

(ii)

In Gitā-Bhāṣya-18/17, ĪĀchārya says in the same way in reply to a question.

“NANU HATVĀPI .. UBHAYAM UPAPADYATE EVA”.

“Objection: ‘Is it not at contradictory to say – even by killing he does not kill?’ You may say that this is eulogy of Jnāna. Even then it is quite contradictory.

Reply: This is not at all a defect, for this becomes logical from the standpoint of *empirical view and transcendental view*. (Explanation;) By adopting the empirical standpoint which consists in thinking ‘I am the body and I am a killer’ by identifying the body with the Self (i.e. relying on this *Laukika Vyavahāra Dr̥ṣhti*) it is said here HATVĀPI (—even by killing). And by taking the transcendental viewpoint of the true nature of the

Self (i.e. relying on *Paramārtha Dṛṣhti*) it is said here NA HANTI NANIBODHYATE (—that he does not kill any body nor he will be bound by that action). So both the statements are congruous *from the standpoint of different views.*”

(iii)

Empirical view, Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti, Laukika Dṛṣhti, Avidyā Dṛṣhti i.e. natural viewpoint—all these are synonymous terms in Śaṅkara-Vedānta. Vaidika Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti, also comes under the category of empirical view point. Similarly, transcendental view, Paramārtha Dṛṣhti Āchārya Dṛṣhti, Vidya Dṛṣhti i.e. Vedantic viewpoint—all these are synonymous terms. For this we can study the following sentences of the Bhāshyas: ...

“EVAM AVIDYĀKRITA NĀMA RŪPA ŪPĀDHI SARVAJNATVĀDI VYAVAHĀRAHA UPAPADYATE”
S.Bh – 2/1/14

“Thus (Brahman) conditioned by the limiting adjuncts—name and form—created by nescience, becomes Ishavara, just as space limited as it were, by jars, pots etc., and within the domain of the empirical existence (i.e. in the sphere of common sense view). He rules it over the selves which identify themselves with the individual intellects and are called Jivās and which though identical with Himself, conform like the spaces in pots etc., to the aggregates of the bodies and senses created by name and form that are projected by

nescience. Thus God's rulership, Omniscience and Omnipotence are contingent on the limiting adjuncts conjured up by nescience, but from the standpoint of really real, however, there is no distinction of 'the ruler, and the ruled' or 'Omniscient' and 'limited knowledge' at all with regard to the Self shining in Its own nature, after the removal of all limiting adjuncts through illumination.

(iv)

The same is said in Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya – 2/1/22, “API CHA YADĀ..NATU PARAMĀRTHATO ASTI ITI ASAKRITAVOCHĀMA”.

“Moreover, when the idea of non-difference is generated by such declaration of identity as ‘That thou art’; then the transmigratory nature of the individual Jeeva is removed as also the creatorship—of Brahman; for all dualistic dealings brought about by ignorance, get sublated by right knowledge. Then in that state where can creation come from and from where the defects like non-accomplishment of beneficial result? We have stated more than once that the mundane existence characterized by the non-accomplishment of beneficial results etc., is an error arising from the non-recognition of the difference (from the soul) of the limiting adjunct constituted by the assemblage of body and senses which are a creation of name and form conjured up by ignorance.”

III Usage of this distinction of two standpoints:

Veda or Shāstra prescribes two types Sādhana, (i) rituals and meditations (Karma and Upāsana), and (ii) cognizing the real nature of the Self as nondual, absolute and falsification of the phenomenon of the universe. This is called as *Jñāna*. When Shāstra speaks regarding the first type of Sādhana, it relies on the *empirical standpoint* and while teaching the second type, it takes the *transcendental view-point*. Even though when the Shāstra teaches the second type of Sādhana, then also it deliberately attributes some qualities or forms (i.e. *Upādhis*) on Brahman for the purpose of teaching. This type of attribution also comes under the category of empirical dealings, but it is called as *Kalpita Samvṛti*. When the Shāstra wants to denote the true nature of the Self, then there is no other way than the negation of the attributes: So the string of negations such as 'NĀNTAH PRAJNAM ... (Mā-7), NETI NETI (Bṛha) etc., are the only way to teach the Brahman. The reader may refer the text regarding the secret of this technique in "Māndūkya Rahasya Vivṛti" (Commentary on 3/26 Kārikā).

For eminent students who are eligible to cognize the true nature of the Self and are able to take a stand there, the Shāstra teaches from the transcendental standpoint. Before that, the Shāstra uses some attributes as a means to teach the transcendental reality. But for those

who are unable to cognize the real nature of the Self, the Shāstra relies on pure empirical stand-point and initiates the Sādhanaś like Karma Yōga, Upāsanāś, Jijnāśā Bhakti, complete surrendering to the Lord (Prapatti) etc. The Āchāryas like Rāmānuja, Madhva, Shri Kṛṣṇa Chaitanya etc., hold that the whole range of the Shāstra is in empirical state only. That is to say doing something according to Shāstra and achieving something after sometime (Kālāntara) or in other worlds (Lōkāntara). Shaṅkara also accepts these ideas denoted by the Shāstra such as going to Brahma-lōka and so on in his Bhāshyas. He does not condemn the Shāstra which teaches rituals, meditations and their results etc. But he says that all these are in the realm of ignorance, i.e. Vaidika Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti. So strictly speaking Shaṅkara won't oppose or condemn the principles like surrendering to the Lord, practising meditations, performing rituals etc., which have been accepted by other Āchāryas also. But other Āchāryas do not have vision of Shaṅkara which has specially shown—the transcendental reality on the firm ground of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life.

Some people think that Shaṅkara has recognized two types of Vedānta, from these two different standpoints. But one should not misunderstand that, there are really two types of Vedānta—one for *Vyavahāra* and the other for *Paramārtha*. Because *Vyavahāra* is natural for all. Finding out, the truth according Vedānta, is quite separate from this *Vyavahāra*. Take the illustrations of diamond,

graphite, coal (or coke). No one wants to sell or buy these things at the same rate. According to Vyavahāra, the value of diamond is too much comparing to coal and graphite. Again these substances cannot be used in our daily life for the same purposes. For example, diamond is used as gem and for cutting glasses, graphite is used as an electrode (as it is a good conductor of electric current) and coal or coke is used as fuel. But finding out the reality of these substances is quite different from ordinary dealings of business. If we find the truth of these three experimentally, carbon is only real. Diamond, graphite, coal (or coke), charcoal—all these are allotropic modifications (Rūpa-Bheda) of the same element-carbon. So also in Vedānta, from the stand-point of empirical view, the Laukika Vyavahāra and Vaidika Vyavahāra and ethics, moral values etc., are all there in our daily life. This is *Vyavahāra*. We should take it as it is, when we want to deal with the world. But we should not apply the oneness of Brahman in these spheres (i.e. in these Vyavahāras). Since, according to Vedānta, all these Vyavahāras are in the realm of ignorance or nescience only and hence do not pertain to the Transcendental reality which is beyond thoughts, speech and deeds.

Another important point is to be remembered. The students of Śaṅkara Vedānta should not try to deliver lectures on Śaṅkara Vedānta by quoting some Upanishadic doctrines and Śaṅkara Bhāṣyas and using mere logic etc.,

to prove Advaita doctrine. Instead of this, the seeker himself has to testify the utterances with his own intuitional experience if it is the teaching of the transcendental reality and if it is an empirical subject, then he has to use proper *Pramānas*, i.e. *means* of right knowledge (S.Bh-2/2/28). So one must know both the standpoint of the "*empirical view point*" and the "*transcendental view point*" and he has to use the intuitional experience for the latter, while the means of right knowledge to the former.

Shāṅkara-Vedānta proves the superiority of the Advaita knowledge over other views as it does not contradict the scriptural statements regarding creation and ritualistic Karmās and Upāsanās. In fact, Shāṅkara's Vedānta comprehends all other visions, assimilates, gives support and transcends. So, an aspirant must and should know these two standpoints if he wants to know the secrets of Shāṅkara-Vedānta. Then there will be no confusion regarding the teaching of the Shāstra.

The Sāadhanās which have been prescribed from the *empirical stand-point* come under the category of Kartṛ Tantra and the teachings from the *transcendental view point* come under the category of Vastu Tantra. This will be dealt with as the fifth principle of Shāṅkara Vedānta in the next chapter.

CHAPTER-V

The 5th Fundamental:

Difference between Kartrutantra and Vastutantra Sāadhanās

1. NATURE OF KARTRUTANTRA AND VASTU TANTRA JNĀNA

It is an important fundamental teaching of Shaṅkara Vedānta that Shri Shaṅkara divides Sāadhanās prescribed in Vedas into two groups for two different types of aspirants. The first is *Kartṛtantra* Prakriyā and the second one, *Vastutantra* Prakriyā.

The term “Kartṛ” means the doer or an agent, and the term “Tantra” means that action which depends on the will of the doer. So Kartṛ tantra means actions (or deeds), feelings which are to be performed either physically or mentally and which depends on the will and effort of the doer or the agent. It is usually seen in our life in all types of actions. There are three alternatives before an agent of action viz, he may do, may not do or may perform the action in a different way altogether. Shaṅkara gives illustrations for this kind of Sāadhanās either in the empirical or under religious duties, which depend on the will or wish of the doer. For example,

—“Besides, an act to be performed depends entirely on the will of the person doing it, worldly or Vedic activities may or may not be undertaken, or they may be

dealt with otherwise; as for instance, a man can walk, ride, proceed otherwise or need not move at all. Similarly (there are passages): 'In the sacrifice (with Sōma juice) called *Atirātra*, the vessel containing the Sōma juice called *Shōdashi* is taken up' and 'In the *Atirātra* sacrifice the *Shōdashi* is not taken up'. (Tai S. VI—VI—2.4). (In the *Agnihōtra* sacrifice) 'the oblation is offered after sunrise and oblation is offered before sunrise'. These injunctions and prohibitions are meaningful here (in the context of rites) as also are the alternatives, general rules and exceptions."

[S.Bh—1/1/2]

So it is evident that *Dharma Jijnāsā* is *Kartṛ Tantra*. In the case of religious duty, direct statement of the text and the like would be the only means of knowledge, because no experience is needed in support.

And in the continuation of the above portion of S.Bh—1/1/2, Shaṅkara explains the nature of *Vastu Tantra Jñāna*. Here "Vastu" means ontological fact of existence and "Vastu Tantra" means the knowledge which arises according to the fact and which does not depend upon the will or wish of the knower. Always the knowledge is generated as per fact, as it depends solely on the nature of the object to be known and not on the will or wish of the knower. Hence it (the knowledge so generated) is called as *Vastu Tantra*. Hence the *Vastu Tantra* knowledge has no alternatives, i.e. knowledge is not something to be done, not done or done otherwise. For

the realization of Brahman no effort is needed other than the removal of ignorance. And this removal of ignorance is not an act, a *Karma*, but an ontological truth implied in the highest experience.

The purport of the Vedāntic teaching viz., the unity of Ātman is such a Vastutantra knowledge. When the Upanishads say that “only by knowing Him one transcends the mortality, there is no other way”—Shve. 3/8. etc., it is evident that through Jñāna only one gets salvation and there is no other means to get it. In our life and experience, Jñāna, knowledge is only Vastutantra. So this knowledge of the Self also must and should be of the same category.

Shāṅkara says, “Karma and Upāsanaś (rituals and meditations) and the results or fruits of them are inevitably gained after a period of time either in this world or in the higher worlds. But the nature of enquiry in to the Supreme Self is quite different, for it is dependent on *intuitive experience* (Anubhava) and the result accrues immediately at the end of the enquiry” (S.Bh-1/1/4). So it is evident that Brahmajijnāsā is Vastu Tantra Prakriyā.

II AN OBJECTION:

Samuchchaya of Jñāna and Karma is necessary for a result, knowledge alone cannot yield a result:

Since Dharma Jijnāsā is Kartṛ Tantra and Brahmajijnāsā is *Vastu Tantra*, so Shāṅkara won't accept the *Samuchchaya*

of Jñāna-Karma or Jñāna-Upāsana etc. Because he relied on the fact of life. Not knowing this secret all are objecting that this view of Shankara i.e. only Jñāna, is enough, is wrong. They hold the view that in our empirical dealings or in religious duties (rites) no knowledge of a thing alone is fruitful. When the knowledge issues forth into the action then only the fruit will be achieved. So the knowledge must be subordinate to the action, either physical or mental. There is no experience as such that by mere knowledge something is achieved. For example one has passed a medical examination such as M.B.B.S. By merely getting the graduation and having the knowledge of medicine and the nature of disease he cannot cure a disease and hence he does not get the money. He has to treat the patients professionally, i.e. he has to properly apply the medicine to the patients after correct diagnosis and has to show good results and only then he will be able to cure the disease and get the money. So also in the case of a lawyer, etc. In material science there are two categories—one is theory and the other, practical. Those who have got the practical knowledge in addition to the theoretical knowledge, are only fit persons. If there is no practical knowledge, but is only theoretical, that types of knowledge is futile. In the dealings such as rites, meditations etc., according to the Veda, or practising Yōga Sādhanaś also have got these two types of theoretical and practical knowledges. When the practical is important thing, then the knowledge must be subordinate to the action.

Relying on this view point, all other Āchāryas like, Rāmānuja, Madhva etc., have taken the stand that the *Jñāna must be subordinate to the action*, either physical or mental. Then only the result may be achieved at some other time or in other worlds according to the utterance of the Vedas. Hence they recommend a combination of Knowledge and Action (*Jñāna-Karma Samuchachaya*) for liberation.

III. Reply: Mere knowledge of a thing can produce a result:

The above objection seems very strong on the face of it. But Shankara replies for this giving an illustration in his Sūtra Bhāshya—1/1/4, showing that even mere knowledge of a thing can produce a result –

“Although, it was argued that a reference to any object as such, without its being connected with an injunction about the work, will be useless like the statements—‘the earth has seven islands.’ etc., that argument is demolished on the evidence of the usefulness of such statements of facts as, ‘This is a rope and not a snake’ ”.

So, in our daily life also there is the utility of mere knowledge.

We can take here another experience to show that only knowledge can rescue from bondage. Suppose a man dreams. During the dream time he assumes that the dream state is the real world. If he is attacked by a tiger

or caught by robbers etc., he fears assuming that, that thing is actually taking place. When he awakens, he gets the correct knowledge that he was sleeping safely in his room. By the dawn of this knowledge alone he will be free from the fear that occurred during the dream. There is nothing to be done to destroy the cause of the fear except the right knowledge of the real position, i.e. only the awareness that he gets on waking up is sufficient to falsify that dream experience. So here also the knowledge of the reality alone has given the result of salvation or liberation. So, it is wrong to hold the view that the mere knowledge alone cannot yield the result. For this reason Śhaṅkara says in S.Bh-1/1/4.—‘The mere reminder of one’s being the non-migratory Self by saying that you are not this Samsāri-Jeeva, that thou art etc., would be fruitful by wiping of the delusory notion that one is an individual Self suffering from the ills of mundane life.

IV. Difference between the knowledge regarding the outer things and the knowledge of the true nature of the self.

Commonly when we say that the knowledge, either regarding the outer things or regarding the real nature of the Self—both are same in one aspect—that both are Vastu Tantra and generate in the Antahkarana and in both cases the Antahkarana Vṛttis are pervaded by the pure consciousness. But there is a vast difference between the knowledge regarding the outer things of empirical life and that of rituals, meditations etc., according to the Shāstra

and the knowledge of the true nature of the Self. Because, referring to the knowable objects, the Vṛttitva remains there and the aspirant takes his stand in his "Me-notion" (Ego-sense), but in the case of Self-knowledge the Vrittiva will be falsified and the aspirant takes his stand in his true nature of the Self at the time of listening the meaning of the Vedānta texts and there remains nothing else to be done in deference to the injunction about seeing Ātman.

Without knowing this great difference between the two types of knowledge, all others are raising objections to the Shaṅkara's view point. But Shaṅkara himself has clarified this difference in his Bhāṣhya to Mundaka Upanishad in—1/1/5, i.e. in his introduction to Mantra 1/1/6 thus:

"In connection with the subject matter of injunctions are to be found certain acts which are like the Agnihōtra (sacrifice) to be performed subsequent to the understanding of the text, through a combination of numerous accessories, for example, the agent etc. Unlike this, nothing remains to be performed here within the domain of the higher knowledge but all actions cease simultaneously with the comprehension of the meaning of the sentences in as much as nothing remains to be done apart from continuance in the mere knowledge revealed by the words."

Here Shaṅkara declares that at the time of listening to the meaning of Vedāntic sentences, he takes his stand in his true nature.

According to these statements when the Self-Knowledge dawns simultaneously all types of dualistic appearance including Antahkarana will get falsified and the non-dual Self alone remains and nothing else apart from the Self. For this purpose we have told once before that the realization of the Self means realization of the falsification of the not-selves alone and not objectifying the Self. Not knowing this great difference all objections are raised on the Shaṅkara's statements. Falsifying all the dualistic appearance and remaining as the non-dual Brahman alone is called as Mōksha. This is said by Shaṅkara in B.S.—Bh-1/1/4, "BRAHMA BHĀVASCHA MOKSHA".

V. Some misconceptions due to not knowing this difference between Kartṛ Tantra and Vastu Tantra Prakriyas.

The knowledge of Brahman is Vastu Tantra and not Kartṛ Tantra. For it is the Self-luminous and Self-established Witness (Sākshi), the very Self of us all. Jñāna, as Shaṅkara conceived it is not knowledge which has to be acquired by human efforts, but an ontological fact of existence. From this standpoint this discrimination i.e. Viveka which is taught at the time of Shravana and Manana or Nididhyāsana—all these types of direct means of Self-knowledge come under the category of Vastu Tantra Prakriyā; while all types Ritualistic Karmas and Upāsanaś, Karmayōga, Upāsana with Jijnāsā, Bhakti, or

practising the adjuvant means like Amāṇitva etc. (Gi-13/7-11), Buddhi Vishuddhatva etc. (Gi—18/51-54) are all concerned with the category of Kartṛ Tantra Prakriyā. These two types of Sādhanaś are dealt with in Shaṅkara's Bhāṣhyas. Persons unable to realize the discrimination of Vastu Tantra and Kartṛ Tantra forms of knowledge imagine that the Vedāntic text only yields indirect knowledge and hence all misconceptions like :

- (i) Repetition of Ātma Jñāna or Mahāvākyas (*Prasankhyāna*)
- (ii) Combination of Jñāna and Upāsana, or Jñāna-Karma, i.e., Rituals (*Jñāna-Karma Samuchchaya*) for getting liberation.
- (iii) Getting *Sākshātkāra* by a Kartṛ Tantra Bhāvanā (meditation on the qualityless Brahman)
- (iv) Destruction of Vāsanās (*Vāsanākshaya*) even after the dawn of knowledge by repeated meditation.
- (v) Dissolving the universe into Brahman by meditation (*Prapancha Pravilaya Vāda*).
- (vi) Suppression of the modifications of mind by the practice of Pātanjala Yōga (*Chittanirōdha* or *Manōnashā*), etc.,

have arisen in their minds and they have propounded some of these theories in the garb of explanation to Shaṅkara Bhāṣhyas. They think that the practices of these

functions are necessary to gain the confirmation of knowledge, because these people have understood that after knowing all these theories we have to practice some exercises to achieve concrete or tangible results in time. They naturally distinguish between the theory and the practice as is evident in our daily life. But we have reiterated previously that, that which is done and achieved afresh is non-eternal and is invariably time-bound. This is forgotten by these people and this in itself becomes a disqualification for them. That which is restricted by time, space and that which is not-self can be achieved by practice after having known it theoretically. But in the case of the Self, who is the very core of one's Being and whose nature is immediate and direct there is no possibility whatsoever of distinctions like theory and practice. In his *Prasthānatraya Bhāṣhyā*s Śaṅkara has referred all these types of arguments time and again. Brahman is Self-evident inmost Self and no description, definition or proof of its existence is needed. Here the only effort needed is to cease one's natural tendency of identifying himself with not-selves from the ego to the body and nothing more for making it known. In this regard, Śaṅkara states in *Gītā Bhāṣhya*—8/50 which is mentioned earlier by us.

VI. A Crucial Analysis:

Whether Jñāna is mental activity like Upāsana or not: Some people assume that getting knowledge also is a type of mental action because it requires some efforts.

So why should we not say that just as meditations and Upāsanās are mental activities so also the Jñāna is a kind of mental activity? Śaṅkara has taken up this issue in Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya—1/1/4, and analyses the subtlety of the difference between “*action*” and “*knowledge*”.

(Objection): Is not knowledge a kind of mental action? (Reply): Not so, because there is a difference. An action is in evidence where the injunction about it occurs independently of the nature of the thing concerned and where it is subjected to the activities of the human mind, as for instance in such sentences as ‘when the priest (called Hōtā) is about to utter the Mantra “*Vaushat*” he shall meditate mentally on the deity for whom the ablation is taken up by the Adhvaryu – Ai Br 2/8/1; ‘one should mentally meditate on the deity identified with evening’ (ibid). Though meditation, i.e. thinking, is a mental action, yet it can be done, not done, or done otherwise by a man, for it is a voluntary action depending on the will and effort of a man. But knowledge arises from its valid means (e.g. perception, inference etc); and the valid means apprehend the thing just as they are. Hence knowledge is not something to be done, not done or done otherwise, for it is entirely determined by the nature of the things and neither by injunctions of Śāstras nor by the will of a man. Hence though knowledge is also a mental modification, (it has a difference). For instance, the thinking of a man or a woman as fire in, “O, Gautama, a man is surely a fire”

(Ch-5/7/1), “O, Gautama, a woman is surely a fire”, (Ch-5/8/1) is certainly an action, since it arises from injunction alone and it is dependent on man. But the idea of fire with regard to familiar fire is neither dependent on injunctions nor on man. What is it then? Ans : Since it is determined by a thing coming within the range of perception, it is surely knowledge and no action. Thus also it is to be understood in the case of all objects coming within the range of valid means of knowledge. That being so the realization of the unity of Brahman and the Self (that can never be sublated) is also a kind of knowledge and it is not determined by injunction.”

[—S.Bh—1/1/4]

In the above paragraph Shaṅkara has shown that the knowledge is not a mental action, just as meditation. So it won't require any injunction. Awareness of an object or a fact cannot be ordered or changed by our will. This is the sum and substance of the above portion. Shaṅkara elsewhere clearly shows this thing in S.Bh—3/2/21 “As for expressions like ‘The Self is to be seen’ (Brh—2/4/5) which are met with in the context of the supreme knowledge they are meant mainly for attracting one's mind towards the Reality, but do not aim mainly at enjoining any injunction about the knowledge of the Reality”

In the same Sūtra Bhāṣya itself later he declares—
“Knowledge arises, however, from its valid means (like perception etc.) and it conforms to its object, just as it

is. It can neither be produced by a hundred injunctions not debarred by a hundred prohibitions. For it is not a matter of personal option, it being dependent on the object itself”.

In all these sentences Shaṅkara has shown that the knowledge of the Self comes under the category of *Vastutantra* and not *Kartṭantra* or *Purushatantra*. And also that it does not come under the category of *Upāsanās*. This is told in *Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣhya*—1/1/4.

In this context Shaṅkara says that there are four types of meditations or feelings prescribed by *Shāstra* :

- i) Sampad Upāsanā ii) Adhyāsā Upāsanā iii) Vishishta Kriyā yōga (also called as Samvarga Upāsanā and iv) Samskāra Upāsanā.

These four categories belong to ritualistic Karmas and meditations and hence they are *Kartṭ Tantra Upāsanās*. But the knowledge of the Self which culminates in one's own intuitional experience and generates firm conviction regarding the true nature of the Self is *Vastutantra*. It means that as the real nature of the Self is there, the knowledge regarding that real nature generates as it is, that is, according to the fact. Hence Shaṅkara has said in the last sentence of the above quoted paragraph that “Hence the knowledge of Brahman is not dependent on human action.”

Questions: On what does it depend? Answer :it is dependent on the thing Itself, as in the case of the

knowledge of a thing got through such valid means as direct perception”.

Hence the direct perception of Brahman is an ontological fact (*Vastutantra*) which is independent of human effort (*Purusha Tantra*). Self-awareness or awareness of Brahman dawns in our mind spontaneously and effortlessly at the very moment of our attentively listening to the teachings of the Shāstras and the Āchārya.

VII. Benefit of knowing this difference

When the Sāadhanās such as Karma Yōga, Upāsanās or observing the virtues like humility, modesty, non-violence etc., (Amānitwadigunas, Bhagavad Gītā, 13th chapter verses 7 to 11) and purification of mind etc. (*Buddhivishuddhatwādi Gunas*, Bhagavad Gītā 18th chapter, verses—52 to 54) etc., are taught, these are to be done with effort and are to be observed in daily life. So these are called Accessory means Paramparā Sāadhanā (परम्परा साधन) and Adjuvant means Sahakāri Sāadhanā (सहकारी साधन). But when the direct means of the Self-knowledge such as *Shravana*, *Manana* and *Nididhyāsana* are taught, at that time the Sādhaka has to observe inwardly as to whether the facts told by the Shāstra and the Guru are according to his experience or not and he himself has to cognize according to the facts of life using intuitional experience. At this time gradually he loses his identification with the body, the senses, the mind or the intellect and automatically he ceases to be an “Ego-sense” and remains himself as the Witnessing principle

of life. After this, he will not have any kind of duties to be performed because the very doership which is the 'ego' itself is falsified. So the Sādhana of Viveka or Vichāra is not a Kartṛ Tantra Sādhana but it is Vastu Tantra alone. To reach this standpoint i.e. the witnessing principle of life, all types of Kartṛ Tantra Sādhana are helpful from outside.

While performing these Kartṛ Tantra Sādhana one should take identification with his ego (Antahkarana). While when he starts to discriminate according to Vastu Tantra Sādhana, inevitably he loses the identification with Antahkarana. So one should know this secret of the *fifth fundamental of Shaṅkara Vedānta* to remove all types of misunderstandings regarding the nature and place of Sādhana according to Shaṅkara.

CONCLUSION

Now, here in this book "*Guidelines to Shaṅkara Vedānta*" the five fundamentals of Shaṅkara Vedānta are shown in brief. According to Shri Shri Satchidānandendra Saraswathi Swāmiji these are very important to the secret of the teachings of Prasthāna Traya Bhāṣya just as the Panchaprāṇas or five vital forces are to the life. So an aspirant should know these five—i) Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life, ii) cognizing the witnessing principle of life, iii) The methodology of Vedānta, i.e. superimposition and rescission, (IV) Difference between transcendental standpoint and

empirical standpoint and v) The difference between the Kartṛ Tantra and the Vastu Tantra Sādhanaś. Without knowing these *basic principles* most of the followers of Shaṅkara have confused the teachings of Shaṅkara.

Basically the seekers should remember that there is a vast difference and contradiction between the Bhāṣhya and the commentators who came after Sureshvarāchārya. These sub-commentators also use the words like Adhyārōpa and Apavāda, Vyavahāra Dṛṣhti and Paramārtha Dṛṣhti etc., but they have twisted the Bhāṣhya according to their own ideas which basically contradict the ideas which are expounded in the Shaṅkara Bhāṣhyās. For this reason these five fundamentals have been shown here according to the teachings of Bhāṣhyas that have referred to the universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. Remembering these principles if one studies the Prathānatraya Bhāṣhyās with the help of a competent teacher, wherever it is possible, then the aspirant can clearly understand the genuine teachings of Shaṅkara and he will get the benefit of getting released from the bondage of Samsāra.

May Shri Shaṅkara who is the Self of all, i.e. Brahman bless the seekers of Truth to go in the right path and achieve the goal.

AUM TAT SAT

ADHYATMA YOGA

Pages 121 - 182

About the Book

This book, brings out the unique feature and secret of Adhyatma Yoga, which is Vastu Tantra (that is, the cognition of a thing as it is and not dependent on the will or wish of the cogniser) and not Kartru Tantra (that is, a meditation or anything else done according to the will or wish of the performer). Naturally, this Adhyatma Yoga does not belong to the category of doing something and achieving the result afresh. On the other hand, it is cognition of the real nature of the Self through a peculiar and unique process of concentrated observation in keeping with the directives of the Shrutis or the Upanishads.

There are hundreds of spiritual institutions or missions in our country and abroad which prescribe various processes of meditation to the aspirants. By and large, these teachers of meditation fall into two groups viz, those who advocate gaining mystic experiences and getting into a trance etc., through the means of meditation and those who teach meditations through which one has to achieve the experience of the Self just as any other experiences like feelings, emotions etc.; in the objective world. Both these groups, however, advocate the Kartru Tantra meditations, that is, something to be done and achieved afresh by the performer, and evidently this result will be time-bound and hence non-eternal.

This book, brings out the unique feature and secret of Adhyatma Yoga also known as Dhyana Yoga, Manonigraha Yoga, Samadhi Yoga, and Nidhidhyasana. This is Vastu tantra i.e. the cognition of a thing as it is and not dependent on the will or wish of the cogniser. This Adhyatma Yoga does not belong to the category of doing something and achieving the result afresh.

Publishers Note to the Second Print

Publications of the books on Vedanta is a major activity of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, founded by **Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swami**. Swamiji's translations of Prasthanatraya Bhashyas and a number of his original books in Sanskrit, Kannada and English languages are well known all over the world for their authentic interpretation of Shankara. The Karyalaya has also published books written by the disciples and followers of the Swamiji for the same reason.

The second print of the present book is being published because of their popularity among the readers of Vedanta and since the copies of the previous print are no more available. The author Sri Devarao Kulkarni was one of the prominent disciples of the Swamiji. He is well known to the readers not only as the author of this book, but as the author of the book in Kannada "Shaankara Vedanta Saurabha", which is quite comprehensive in its coverage of topics on Vedanta and extensive in the details. We hope and pray that the readers welcome this second print of **Adhyatma Yoga** and derive benefit by reading it.

The Karyalaya acknowledges with sincere thanks the services rendered by all those followers of Swamiji in bringing out the second print. Our thanks are also due to the type setter as well as the printer for a work nicely executed.

Date 25/10/2016

Publishers

Preface

The present book, Adhyatma Yoga, deals with the immediate means to Self knowledge, namely, shravana, manana and nididhyasana. The author Sri Devarao Kulkarni was an eminent desciple of Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swami who was the foremost authority on Shaankara Vedanta during the twentieth century. The author has stated that he was inspired by the teaching and writings of Sri Swamiji and wrote the present book closely following them. The English knowing readers of the book must be indebted to the author for having written on a topic that is of great importance in Vedanta. I thank the authorities of the Karyalaya for giving me this opportunity of writing a preface to this book and render a small service for a cause that was very dear to the Swamiji.

In the first chapter, the author has explained the meaning of Adhyatma and the contexts in which they are used. In Vedanta the word Adhyatma predominantly denotes the science of the Self or Atmavijnanasastra.

The essence of the teaching of all Upanishads is this : "All this is Brahman; This Self is Brahman" **Ma.Up.1**. The meaning is that Brahman is the Reality underlying the phenomenal universe. According to Shankara, 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 Brahman.

The common man, without knowing the nature of his own Self, naturally superimposes the body, mind and senses upon the real Self, transfers by mistake the properties of the not-self to the Self and vice versa. It is this superimposition, *adhyasa*, which is due to a misconception, that Shankara calls as ignorance, *avidyaa*. So long as man is under the influence of this ignorance, he appears to undergo a transmigratory life with all its suffering.

The Self is self-established. This means that it cannot be and need not be established by any means of knowledge. Since the superimposition of the not - self is due to a misconception, the ignorant seeker needs only to be told that he is seeking his own Self. Shankara says: a mere reminder that one is really a 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**. A preceptor, who is established as Self, teaches the seeker the purport of the Upanishads and reminds him of his true nature. It is in this sense that *shravana* which is listening to the preceptor and grasping the teaching, is called an immediate means to Self knowledge.

If the mere reminder that one is really the non - transmigratory Self does not cause an individual's

ignorance to be wiped off and thus establish him as his real Self, then the reason would be the natural propensity of man to look outwards, always seeking the sense objects. Withdrawing from the sense objects and focusing on the indwelling Self is what needs to be achieved. Performance of one's obligatory duties, cultivation of devotion, bhakti, and upaasana helps one to attain the purity of mind (cittashuddhi) and equip him with the four basic qualifications (**saadhana chatustaya sampatti -Su.Bha. 1.1.1**) and an inward focused mind that render him eminently eligible for shravana.

When one has not grasped the teaching on hearing it, then manana, reflection on the teachings on the nature of Self becomes necessary. This reflection is by Vedantic reasoning and not by dry logic. "Enquiry into Brahman demands primarily the consideration of the teaching, the vedantic text, and as subservient to it, reasoning not in discord with it" - **Su. Bha.1.1.1**. Reflection on the teaching by Vedantic reasoning must be repeated until one is free from all doubts and misconceptions about the teaching.

Nididhyasana, spiritual concentration or intense contemplation also is a means of Self knowledge, and is meant for corroborating the teachings grasped by shravana and manana. Qualified aspirants who have not intuited the Self either by shravana alone or by repeated practice of shravana and manana have an alternative in Nididhyasana. The process of spiritual concentration

is explained as Adhyatmayoga in Kathopanishad. **Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji** has clarified in his books that Dhyana yoga of Bhagavadgita and manonigraha of Gaudapada Karika are only different nomenclatures for the Adhyatmayoga or nididhyasana.

The author of the present book has explained adhyatmayoga, shravana and manana in a detailed manner. He has argued how only Vedantic reasoning may be helpful to the seeker and not dry logic. Being more practical and helpful to the aspirants he has elucidated several points that are important and must be borne in mind during the practice of Adhyatmayoga and also many pit falls and obstacles that they may face during sadhana. He has emphasized that nididhyasana is different from meditation, upasana. He has brought out all these points mainly from the Bhashyas of Shankara, Gaudapada Karikas and the writings of **Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swami**.

I conclude this preface offering prayers to the Swamiji. May he bless all the readers of this valuable book by the revered author.

17.09.2016

Dr K S Ramanatha Sharma
Former Professor and Principal,
ksramanatha@yahoo.com

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	129
2.	Adhyatma	134
3.	Adhyatma Yoga	142
4.	Misconceptions	154
5.	Appendix	163
	- Shravana (Listening)	163
	- Manana (Reflection)	169
6.	Conclusion	181

ADHYATMA YOGA

INTRODUCTION

The book "**Adhyatma Yoga**" was published in Kannada in 1963 for the first time as my maiden attempt in writing on Vedantic topics according to the Prasthānatraya Bhāshyas. I was so much fascinated by the discourses of Śrī Śrī Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji as well as his writings on this topic of "**Adhyatma Yoga**" that I was inspired to publish a book, bringing out the unique feature and secret of this **Adhyatma Yoga**, namely, that this **Adhyatma Yoga** or **Dhyana Yoga** is **Vastu Tantra** (that is, the cognition of a thing as it is and not dependent on the will or wish of the cogniser) and not **Kartru Tantra** (that is, a meditation or anything else done according to the will or wish of the performer). Naturally, this **Adhyatma Yoga** does not belong to the category of doing something and achieving the result afresh. On the other hand, it is cognition of the-real nature of the Self through a peculiar and unique process of concentrated observation in keeping with the directives of the **Shrutis** or the **Upanishads**.

There are hundreds of spiritual institutions or missions in our country and abroad which prescribe various processes of meditation to the aspirants. By and

large, these teachers of meditation fall into two groups viz, those who advocate gaining mystic experiences and getting into a trance etc., through the means of meditation and those who teach meditations through which one has to achieve the experience of the Self just as any other experiences like feelings, emotions etc., in the objective world. Both these groups, however, advocate the **Kartru Tantra** meditations, that is, something to be done and achieved afresh by the performer, and evidently this result will be time-bound and hence non-eternal. The subject dealt with here viz., **Adhyatma Yoga**, also known as **Dhyana Yoga**, **Manonigraha Yoga**, **Samadhi Yoga** and **Nididhyasana**, is treated these days as a **Kartru Tantra Sadhana**.

But in the Śhaṅkara Bhāshya throughout, this **Adhyatma Yoga** or **Dhyana Yoga** is treated as a **Vastu Tantra Sadhana**. What are the reasons for this deviation or departure from the Bhāshya interpretation? This important question is answered convincingly in Sri Swāmiji's monumental and revolutionary works like "Mandukya Rahasya Vivruti", "Gītā Shāstraartha Vivekaha", "Pancha paadika Prasthaanam" & "Vedānta Prakriya Pratyabhijñā" etc., in Sanskrit and in his English books like "Misconceptions about Shankara", "Intuition of Reality", "Some Clarifications about Certain Vedantic Concepts" and "How to Recognise the Method of Vedānta" etc., as also in his several Kannada books.

The commentators on Shankara Bhāshyas after Sureshwara Acharya like the Panchapaadika, Vivarana and Bhaamati etc., have misinterpreted this “**Adhyatma Yoga**”, connecting it with the process of **Patanjali Yoga** with its eight limbs. Though in Shankara Bhāshyas the first five among these eight limbs are accepted as beneficial to **Adhyatma Yoga**, the other three, namely, **Dharana**, **Dhyana** and **Samadhi** are rejected totally. I have clearly elucidated the exact meaning and import of the words, “**Dharana**”, “**Dhyana**” and “**Samadhi**”, which are used in Bhashyas in various contexts. Shankara has emphatically declared that Patanjala school is one teaching distinctly dualistic doctrines. He says in his Sūtra Bhāshya 2-1-3: “But the followers of **Sankhya** and **Yoga** are dualists and they do not perceive the unity of the Self”. Whereas, Bhaamati says : “**Shravana** (listening) and **Manana** (reflecting) are to be treated as “**Dharana**”, meaning, one should fix his mind on the Self. The word “**Nididhyasana**” is equal to “**Dhyana**” of **Patanjala Yoga**, in which one should keep the flow of his mind continuously on the Self without any interruptions. The word “**Darshana**” denotes the realisation or **Saakshaatkara**, meaning, the **Sadhaka** enters into **Samadhi** or trance through a one-pointed thought flow in which ultimately the mind itself ceases to exist”. These types of interpretations are taken as authoritative for centuries now and all are confused in determining the true nature

of **Adhyatma Yoga**, and the basic or central truth of the nature of the Self was totally lost to the world. The essential truth of it all is:

1. The Self can never become an object for the process of "**Samyama**", that is, the combination of **Dharana**, **Dhyana** and **Samadhi** according to **Patanjala Yoga**.

2. The **Vritti** or concept of **Saakshaatkara** is not an essential factor to cognise or intuit the real nature of the Self, whose nature is direct and immediate to the cogniser, because the concept of **Saakshaatkara** belongs to the meditator and hence it is **Kartru Tantra**. It is true that in various **Kartru Tantra Upasanas** dealt within the Upanishads, **Saakshaatkara** or visualisation or realisation is to be achieved or attained afresh.

3. Whereas, the nature of **Nididhyasana** or **Adhyatma Yoga** is **Vastu Tantra**. As the nature of the Self is immediate and direct, there is no necessity of **Vritti** like **Saakshaatkara** in order to prove or determine the nature of the Self.

These three main reasons are adduced by our Swamiji in his books for this misinterpretation.

A foreign disciple wanted to know the exact meanings of the words "**Adhyatma**" and "**Adhyatma Yoga**" and this treatise about both the words was prepared for his sake. Previously in the books in Kannada and Telugu only the "**Adhyatma Yoga**" was

dealt with, but here along with **“Adhyatma Yoga”** the chapter on **“Adhyatma”** is included; besides, an appendix, in which the relevant topics of **Shravana** and **Manana** are treated in detail, is added at the end for the benefit of the aspirants.

I am happy that this edition is published by the Bangalore Branch of the Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya and is being distributed free to the public on the unique auspicious occasion of the birth centenary celebrations of my Guru, Śrī Śrī Satchidānandendra Saraswati Swāmiji. The copyrights of this edition as well as the Kannada edition of **“Adhyatma Yoga”** belong to the Śrī Shantananda Vinayakaswamy Devalaya and Sri Dattaguru Shankara Vedanta Nilaya Trust of Yelahanka. I am glad that the Trust authorities have agreed to dedicate this English edition to the memory of our revered Swamiji.

I have to offer my thanks to the donors (who wish to remain anonymous) of this English edition for their kind help in its publication and free distribution to the public on this occasion. I am also thankful to my friend and ardent disciple of my Guru, Sri D.B. Gangolli, who helped me in preparing the manuscript of this edition. I pray to the Almighty and our revered Guruji to bless everyone who has helped in the publication of this edition.

Devarao Kulkarni

“ADHYATMA”

1) First, we should know the meaning of the word “Adhyatma”. **Adhi + Atma = Adhyatma**. The word **Atma** denotes one’s own Self. And the thing or the entity which is identified with one’s own nature, that thing is called **Adhyatma**. For example, the body, the vital force, the organs of action, the sense organs, the mind, the intellect and the ego, (including perceptions, feelings) all these are together called as the corporeal plane. From the body to the ego all these things or entities are corporated (assembled) together into one whole. And every creature identifies itself with this conglomeration such as “I am so & so”.

2) Sometimes man identifies himself with outer things also and feels “I am a rich or a poor man” etc. But the identification with entities ranging from the body to the ego is a predominant factor, while the identification with outer things is secondary, because one conceives his own nature or he himself to be the body and the rest as “mine”. Sometimes he thinks that these entities from the body to the ego as “mine”. This kind of behaviour takes place according to one’s dealings in this life. For example, when one says “I am fair, long, short, strong etc., then he takes

identification with his body. And when he says 'my body has become weak', then he objectifies his body. And unknowingly he takes a stand in his true nature which is different and apart from his body. The outer objects deserve to be addressed or felt as "this is mine", but it is impossible for one to take identification with the outer things and conceive as "I", i.e. as his own Self. However, the entities from the body to the ego deserve to be taken identification with by any one as "I am". So this corporeal plane i.e from the body to the ego, is called as "Adhyatmika Prapancha".

3) The Science, of which the subject matter is the investigation of the real nature of the Self, is called as "**Adhyatma Shastra**" meaning the Science which authoritatively and predominantly deals with the nature of the Self is called as "Adhyatma".

4) From this standpoint, anatomy and physiology are the earliest or the first group of sciences involved in starting the enquiry about the body, which is identified by all creatures as "I am". After these the sciences about the various organs of speech and the sense organs are the second group. Thereafter psychology, the science which investigates the various functions of the mind and their consequences etc., is utilised. This is the third group. So also the intellect (**Buddhi** or **Vijnana**) and its aspects like momentary functioning etc., are investigated in Buddhism. This is the fourth group. At last, the Upanishads determine

the real nature of the Self, which transcends the 'I sense' or the ego, on the firm ground of universal (intuitional) experience and by means of investigating it with a comprehensive vision of life. Here the investigations about the Self culminate in the final intuition and there will be no residue of the duality such as the investigator, the investigated and the investigation.

5) So the teachings of the Upanishads about the true nature of the Self is the only Science of **Adhyatma** in the real sense, and not the other four groups mentioned above. Hence "**Adhyatma**" means the Science which investigates predominantly and authoritatively the true nature of the Self.

6) In some places in the Upanishads the process of meditation is prescribed for the benefit of the students who are incapable of cognising the true nature of their own Self. In these contexts also some types of meditations related to the corporeal plane are prescribed by the scriptures. For example, "the mind is certainly infinite, and the "**Viswe Devas**" (kind of deities) are infinite. Through this meditation one wins an infinite world" (**Bri III.1.9**) "**The Mind is Brahman**" (**Ch.III.18.1**) etc. Like this the outer things also are prescribed to be meditated upon and those things are related to the divine plane or material plane, for example, "The instruction is : "the Sun is **Brahman**" (**Ch.III-21-1**); "Air is certainly the place of merger".

“The vital force is certainly the place of merger”
(Ch IV-3-1 to 4).

To distinguish the meditations on things of the divine plane, and to lay stress on the things related to the corporeal plane, the Shruti starts to say that “Then is the instruction through analogy in the context of the (individual) Self : This known fact, that the mind seems to go to it (Brahman) and the fact that it (Brahman) is repeatedly remembered through the mind; as also thought (that the mind has with regard to Brahman)”, (Ken, 4-5). Here the Mantra states now the instructions about the meditation of “**Adhyatma**”. To distinguish from the things of the material and the divine planes, the scripture uses the expression, “now the meditation upon **Adhyatma**”, meaning, the meditation on the things like mind etc., with the feeling of relationship of **Brahman** or the real nature of the Self.

Hence it is to be determined that either in the case of cognition of the real nature of the Self or in the case of the meditations, the inner entities which are related to the corporeal plane are called as “**Adhyatmika Prapancha**”. But when we refer predominantly to “**the Science of Adhyatma**” or “**Adhyatma**”, then it denotes invariably the science which determines the true nature of the Self, **HENCE THE WORD “ADHYATMA” DENOTES THE SCIENCE REGARDING THE SELF.**

7) The word **“Adhyatma”** is used usually to mean “spiritual”. This word denotes the soul which is the spirit or which lives in the body and after death departs from the body. The science which deals with this soul or spirit is called as **“the spiritual science or Adhyatma Shastra”**, but here also the source of all kinds of spirits or energies is the true nature of the Self, who is beyond the ego or I-sense. So the real spiritual science means investigating the real nature of the Self alone. This Ultimate Truth is revealed in the Upanishads only and there is no other science except this Upanishadic literature which reveals the true nature of the Self as it is on the firm ground of universal acceptance of experience (i.e, intuition) and the comprehensive scrutiny of life.

8) Hence the spiritual science or the **Adhyatma Shastra** is a peculiar science which is very subjective and reaches the very core of life. The system of subjective teachings is available mainly in the ten principal Upanishads and in Sri Shankara's **“Prasthanatraya Bhashyas”**. Before concluding this subject, we will give an excerpt from the Sutra Bhashya :

“Question : (Opponent) It is not proved that the Self is known from the Upanishads alone in as much as it is contained in the idea of **“I”**.

“Answer :- (Vedantin) Not so, for this has been refuted by saying that the Self is the Witness of that

idea. Leaving aside the (erroneous) knowledge of the Self as the agent (of actions) as contained in the idea of "I", the (real) Self, who is the Witness of the idea of "I" which exists in all creatures who is without any difference of degrees, and who is one, unchanging, eternal, and all-pervasive Consciousness, (such a Self) is not known as the Self of all by any one in the section of the Vedas dealing with virtuous deeds, or in the scriptures of the logicians. Hence this Self cannot be denied by any one, nor can it be taken as forming a part of any injunction. And, because it is the Self of all, it is beyond all rejection and acceptance". (S.B. 1-1-4).

9) The results of meditations like "transcendental meditation" of "Mahesh Yogi" or the occult practices of "Raja Yoga" etc., and all such practices which accrue in due course, like miracles of **Shakti Patha** (transferring power from one person to another person) etc., are called as spiritual benefits. To some extent, these are very useful in our life and are very attractive also. But from the standpoint of the real science of "**Adhyatma**" these are non-eternal things. The general rule is: "That which is done and achieved is non-eternal". So, when the aspirant wants the Eternal Truth, which is beyond the triple concepts of time, then invariably he has to surrender himself to the teachings of the Upanishads regarding the true nature of the Self, who is the innermost Being or the very core of life.

10) Unless and until we transcend the realm of duality i.e., the body, the mind, the intellect, the ego and the outer world along with the concepts of infinite time, space, causation etc., it is not possible to reach the Eternal Truth. So the real aspirant should know this Truth and he has to turn away from all these non-eternal results which are materialistic, mystic or terrestrial. He has to fix his attention on the cognition of the true nature of the Self. Then only he can get the complete salvation from the bondage of **Samsara**. This truth is stated in "Kathopanishad". The boy, Nachiketa, asks the following question to Yamadharma, who is the deity of Death: "(Nachiketa said) If I am fit and you too, sir, are pleased with me, then tell (me) of that thing which you see as different from virtue, different from vice, different from cause and effect, and different from the past and the future". (Katha 1-2-14).

And it is a very important thing that it is possible to get easily this firm establishment in the true nature of the Self, which is eternal, by listening to the exposition by a Guru of Self-knowledge. The Guru is one who is well-established in his true nature of the Self. This is also said in the above Upanishad in 1-2-8 and 1-2-9. See the commentary of Shankara on these stanzas of Katha Upanishad. Hence it is very difficult to attain the highest goal of **Adhyatma** for the common man without the help of the teachings of the

Upanishads and the Guru. If he has the proper idea of renunciation i.e., about the non-eternal nature of all achievements and has complete faith in God or the Lord, then he will have the proper Guru and he will very easily cognise his true nature as the Self, who is eternal and non-dual. This is the final benefit of the **Adhyatma Shastra**.

* * * * *

“ADHYATMA YOGA”

1) We have already discussed about the word “Adhyatma”. Now we shall know the meaning of “Adhyatma Yoga”. Usually the word “Yoga” denotes “Patanjali Yoga”, “Rajayoga” etc., But according to Prasthanathraya Bhashyas, the “Yoga” is quite different. In the Vedanta Shastra, Shankara has accepted the first five limbs of Patanjali Yoga i.e. “Yama” (controlling the sense organs), “Niyama” (controlling the organs of actions), “Asana” (method of sitting comfortably for a long time), “Pranayama” (regulation of breath for obtaining the tranquillity of the mind) and “Pratyahara” (withdrawing the mind from hankering after the enjoyment of outer objects). These five limbs of Patanjali Yoga are indispensable for the students of Vedanta also, especially for a student of “Adhyatma Yoga”. To develop these qualities, Karma Yoga and Upasanas are helpful for the common man. This is also corroborated in the Bhagavad Gita, which says that Karma Yoga leads to “Dhyana Yoga”, Dhyana Yoga leads to “Jnana” through Bhakti Yoga. Here the Dhyana Yoga itself is Adhyatma Yoga.

2) According to Patanjali, there are eight limbs or steps in “Yoga”. The first five have already been

described. The remaining are **"Dharana"**, **"Dhyana"** and **"Samadhi"**. But these three are not accepted in the Vedanta Shastra. There are words like **"Dharana"**, **"Dhyana"**, found in Prasthanathraya Bhāshyas. For example, in the ninth chapter of the Bhagavad Gītā, it is stated : "In the eighth discourse it has been declared that the Yoga of concentration or **Dharana**". Also in the Taittiriya Upanishad 1-11-4, besides such practices as concentration, meditation etc., the words **"Dhyana"** and **"Dharana"** used in the context have the same meaning as they have in Patanjali Yoga. These are only the "concentrated meditation" on **"Om-kara"** or on any form of the Lord as prescribed in the Vedas. Shankara has opined in the Sūtra Bhāshya that **Patanjali Yoga** is a dualistic school. This is because the **Patanjali Yogins** contend that there is multiplicity of the Self, and accept reality of the primordial matter of the universe (i.e **Prakriti**) and the existence of the Lord besides the above two. But in Vedanta, it is determined that the only non-dual Brahman appears as all these owing to ignorance. This is also stated in **Sūtra Bhāshya 2-1-4** as: "But the followers of **Sankhya** and **Yoga** are dualists and they do not perceive the unity of the Self." Thus, the words like **"Yoga"** or **"Sankhya"** used in Vedanta (For example, in Bhagavad Gītā, they are not related to **Patanjali Yoga** or **Kapila Sankhya**, but they denote a process of discrimination and concentration,

according to the teachings of Vedanta, which rely on universal (intuitional) experience and a comprehensive vision of life.

3) It must be made clear that **"Adhyatma Yoga"** is not related whatsoever to **Patanjali Yoga**. We shall now discuss the meaning of **Adhyatma Yoga**, according to the Upanishads. The words, **"Adhyatma Yoga"**, are described in Kathopanishad (1-2-12) as developing concentration of the mind on the Self and thereby it is meditation. Shankara has stated in his Bhāshya that "Concentration of the mind on the Self after withdrawing it from the outer objects is **Adhyatma Yoga**", The process of this Yoga has been delineated in the Kathopanishad in 1-3-13. This has also been clearly explained in **Sūtra Bhāshya 1-4-1**. It is as follows : "The discriminating man should merge the organ of speech into the mind; He should then merge that mind into the cognizing self ; he should merge the cognizing self into the Mahan Atma (great soul) ; he should merge the great soul into the peaceful Self". (1-3-13). The idea implied is this: "He should merge the organ of speech into the mind", means that he should give up all the external activities of the organs of speech etc., and continue to act only through the mind ; and, because the mind also has a tendency to think of objects, he should discover the defect in thinking of the pros and the cons, and then he should hold the mind confined steadfastly in the intellect that has the faculty of determination and is

referred to by the term cognizing Self. That intellect, again, he should withdraw into the great soul, the experiencer, or into the acute intellect, sharpened through meditation. The great soul is, however, to be established by him in the peaceful Self, in the **Supreme Purusha** under consideration, that is to say, in the highest Goal".

Thus, the **Adhyatma Yoga** is not like the other meditations, which are of the nature of "**Kartru Tantra**" (meaning, that which depends on the will and wish of the doer), but it is "**Vastu Tantra**" (meaning, observing the facts as they are by concentrating the mind on them to cognise them in their true perspective).

4) This **Adhyatma Yoga** is called as "**Nididhyasana**" and in the sixth chapter of the Gita this **Nididhyasana** is described as "**Dhyana Yoga**". The complete sixth chapter of the Bhagavad Gita reveals the process of this **Dhyana Yoga** with its accessories. In this very Bhagavad Gītā in the following contexts also this **Dhyana Yoga** or **Adhyatma Yoga** is prescribed : 13-24, 18-52. The same **Adhyatma Yoga** is also called as "**Manonigraha Yoga**" by Gaudapada in his **Mandukya Karikas** from 3-41 to 3-48. So in all these places the practice of **Adhyatma Yoga**, its accessories, the obstacles during the practice and the removal of the obstacles are described.

5) To practice this **Adhyatma Yoga** (**Nididhyasana**, **Dhyana Yoga**, or **Manonigraha**

Yoga), an aspirant, at first, should get “**Atmaprathyaya**” (meaning, the firm conviction about the real nature of the Self) by listening to the process of discrimination taught by the **Guru** and the **Shashtra** and he must know the process of **Manana** i.e., method of reflection on the firm ground of intuition and adopting the reasons according to the teachings of the **Guru** and the **Shashtra**. After this to take a stand in his true nature of the Self and cognise the pervasiveness of the Self in all the dualistic phenomena, he has to practise this **Nididhyasana** or **Adhyatma Yoga**. The actual process of **Nididhyasana** is as follows :

A) The essence of the totality of experience of the outer world is the five kinds of sensations only i.e sound, touch, form or colour, taste and smell. Except for and apart from these five sensations, there is no world as such. To prove the existence of this external world our sense organs are the only criteria. Bereft of these five-fold sensations got through the sense organs, there is no proof whatsoever available for the existence of the world. So the sense organs are “the Self” of the external world.

Here the significant features of the Self are : 1) residing inside, 2) pervading the outer thing, 3) being independent, 4) being subtle. For these four significant features see *Katha -upanishad* 1-3-10 and **Bhagavad Gītā** 3-42. The significant features of the not-self are quite unlike the Self. For example, 1) appearing outside,

2) being pervaded by the Self, 3) being dependent on the Self, 4) being gross. According to these criteria one should determine the nature of the Self, considering the whole gamut or range of things from the outside world to the innermost Self. In this process the first step is sublating the outer world by means of the sense organs, meaning, one cognises that only through the vibrations or sensations of the sense organs, one comes to experience the outer world and that there is no outer world as such apart from these sensations of the sense organs. Once having determined this, he is not drawn towards the outer world or he will not be attracted by the objects of the outer world. The result of this firm conviction is called as sublating the outer world by means of the sense organs.

B) After this one should investigate the source of the sense organs. Then he comes to the conclusion that the mind is the Self of the sense organs. Here also residing inside, pervading outer things etc., are the four common features. All the above-stated methods should be applied to the mind and the sense organs or the outer things. So here the **Sadhaka** gets a firm conviction that the mind alone appears as the sense organs and the outer world with the concepts of infinite time, space, causation, etc., This is called as the sublation of the sense organs by means of the mind. Here the **Sadhaka** remains in the form of the mind only. He is an embodiment of the mind, as it were. There is no

independent existence for the world or sense organs apart from the mind.

C) Then he has to proceed inwards towards the intellect. Here the faculty of determining and objectifying the agitation of the mind is called as "intellect" or "**Buddhi**". This intellect is the Self of the mind. By keen observation one should sublimate the mind by means of the intellect, adopting the previous way of reasoning. Here the aspirant remains as the intellect. For him there is no mind or the sense organs or the outer world independently as such, apart from the intellect.

D) Then this **Sadhaka** should discern or divine the stuff of the intellect i.e "I" - sense or "ego". This ego objectifies the intellect in the manner : "My intellect is capable of understanding such and such a thing or is incapable etc." Hence this "I" - sense is the inner stuff of the intellect and also is the enjoyer of pleasure or pain. Meaning, though the pleasure and pain are related to the inner organ, this "I" - sense identifies itself with those feelings of pleasure and pain etc., So it is called as "enjoyer". When this "I" - sense is described from the standpoint of the Microcosm (individual), then it is called as a "**Jeeva**", but when this "I"-sense is described from the standpoint of the Macrocosm, (meaning, the cosmic "I" or the I-sense of all the creatures together or the first "I" - sense in the universe) it is called as "**Hiranyagarbha**",

“Mahan Atma”. This is a peculiar expression of Vedanta or a technical term. To summarise, one should sublimate his intellect by means of his “I” - sense. All the other features should be observed as described above during all these steps or stages. Hence the “I” - sense is the Self of the whole phenomena. Where there is the “I” - sense, invariably it appears with its whole retinue of its respective world. Here it is very essential to remember and intuitively reason out that the ego of the waking and the ego of the dream are not the same. In fact, they have no relationship with each other whatsoever. Each ego projects its own respective world. Where there is no “I” - sense there is no trace of any kind of any world. Therefore we have to take the Macrocosm along with the Microcosm and this is the peculiar method of Vedanta. To get this confirmed, we have to observe life with a comprehensive vision on the basis of the universal acceptance of (intuitional) experience. When the waking ego appears, along with it the whole waking world appears to exist. This is the same case with the dream state. And in deep sleep when these two types of “I” - senses disappear there is no trace whatsoever of any world or duality. Hence it is evident that this “I” - sense is the Self of all the phenomena.

E) At last, the aspirant should objectify his “I” - sense or ego taking a stand in the true nature of his own Self, that is, the Witness of the “I” - sense. To objectify the “I” - sense the only method is through

discrimination, and with deep concentration when one says there is "I" - sense, then automatically he takes his stand in his true nature of the Self, who is the Witness of the ego or "I" - sense. There is no need of any effort to take a stand in the true nature of the Self, because that is one's own nature of Being and always he is That. Due to his wrong identification with not-selves like the ego etc., one misconceives that "I am so and so". By adopting this process of discrimination with a concentrated mind according to this **"Adhyatma Yoga"**, as described here, one ceases his identification with the ego and all the rest. For example, when one discriminates that the "I" - sense appears in the waking state as well as in the dream state (separately) and it disappears completely in deep sleep, then at that time he has ceased his identification with his "I" - sense. But when he wants to express this intuition, at once he takes the form of "I" - sense and uses the "I" - sense and the instruments in its retinue to express. At that time he gets confused and says that "I knew the absence of "I" - sense in deep sleep through my intellect or mind". But the fact is quite different. Hence to take a stand in the true nature of the Self, there is no other way than the process of discrimination. This is explained by Shankara in his commentary on **Sutra Bhashya (1-1-4)**. In the excerpt which we have given at the beginning of this topic, the last phrase is: "The great soul (ego or cosmic "I") is, however, to be established by him in the peaceful Self, in the supreme

Purusha under consideration. That is to say, in the "highest Goal". The meaning of this phrase is explained hereunder.

F) Through the practice of this "**Adhyatma Yoga**" at last one cognises 'that my true nature of Being is beyond the "I" - sense or ego'. When one cognises this Truth, then he remains unto himself as of the nature of the Witness of the ego. Hence "to know the Self is to be the Self and to be the Self is to cease the identification with the not-self". This utterance of Sri Ramanamaharshi is to be remembered by the **Sadhaka** of **Adhyatma Yoga**. Here the **Sadhaka** has traversed inwards, as it were, with a concentrated mind, followed by discrimination, and has arrived at the brink of all duality and at the very core of life. And he himself has remained as the Witness of the ego or as the Pure Self.

After this he has to observe (as he has done during the previous steps) the pervasive nature of the Witness in all the things from the ego to the outer world. So, there is no independent existence of the so-called not-self apart from the true nature of the Self. And there is no possibility of distinguishing the Self and the rest in time or in space, because the concepts of time, space and causation are within the jurisdiction of the "I" - sense only. So the not-self itself is not in time or in space. The very ideas of time, space etc., are included in the not-self. And the true nature of the Self, as He

is beyond the "I" - sense, is not within the jurisdiction of time and space. So it is impossible to say that the Self is the first and not-self is the second. Strictly speaking, the whole phenomena of not-selves is pervaded by the Self only, just as the water pervades the waves in and through or, the clay pervades the pot. Hence there is no not-self as such apart from the real Self. When one does not know the real nature of the Self, then he misconceives the Self as if He is the not-self. This truth is confirmed in the following shruti passage: "Because when there is duality, as it were, then one smells something..... one thinks something, one knows something, (But) when to the knower of **Brahman** everything becomes the Self, then what should one see and through what..... what should one know and through what ?".

For this reason Shankara has declared in the Sutra Bhashya about the causation between **Brahman** (the Self) and the world in the following manner: "As the spaces within pots or jars are non-different from the cosmic space or as water in a mirage is non-different from a (sandy) desert, since they sometimes appear and sometimes vanish away and as such their nature cannot be defined, similarly it is to be understood that this diverse phenomenal world of experiences and things experienced, have no existence apart from Brahman". By this we can conclude that Brahman or the Self is the Reality and the world is a false appearance. By this

process when one cognises the falsification of the whole phenomena of the dualistic world, including the "I" - sense, then he establishes himself naturally in the non-dual (absolute) Self. This is the final result of **Adhyatma Yoga** or **Nididhyasana**.

* * * * *

MISCONCEPTIONS

The aspirant should not entertain the following misconceptions :

1) At the end of this **Adhyatma Yoga** one enters into **Samadhi (Nirvikalpa Samadhi or trance)**:

2) one will get strange, abnormal experiences or hearing of wonderful sounds or seeing of fascinating visions etc.,

3) getting or acquiring **Siddhis** or miraculous powers.

As these are very attractive and tempting powers or experiences, many people expect or anticipate such results, but all these are not at all concerned to this **Adhyatma Yoga**, dealt with here. Because, what is done and achieved afresh is non-eternal and is a time-bound thing, but here in **Adhyatma Yoga** one should cognise his true nature as the Self, who is beyond the concepts of time and space and by this cognition he has to falsify the duality in its entirety and thereby his ego or I-sense. An aspirant should practise this **Adhyatma Yoga** till he gets established naturally in the awareness of the Self without any effort. This is called in Vedanta as **Jñāna Nishtha** and to get this **Jñāna Nishtha** this **Adhyatma Yoga** is a direct means.

The aspirants of this **Adhyatma Yoga** should observe outwardly humility etc., which are prescribed in the **Bhagavad Gītā** 13-7 to 11 and 18-51 to 54 and

he has to try always to discriminate between the ego and the Self, who is its Witness. This is not a process of constant meditation or feeling as "I am the Self" which comes under the purview of **Kartru Tantra Sadhana**. But one should observe keenly the facts of life with a concentrated mind followed by discrimination mentioned above.

Mostly in these days the teachers or Gurus in the spiritual field highly recommend meditation and the methods of meditation prescribed by them are useful to some extent in our daily life, but this **Adhyatma Yoga** is quite unlike those meditations. Here, after cognising the non-dual nature of the Self through the practice of this **Adhyatma Yoga** there will be no question of the triad of the beneficiary, the benefit and the source or the means of the benefit. Please refer to the quotation given above from Brihadaranyaka 2-4-14 viz. "but when to the knower of **Brahman** everything becomes the Self, then what should one see and through what.....?". After listening to this **Adhyatma Yoga** some people take it as a subject matter which has to be grasped by the intellect. These people think that they have correctly understood, but they keep on asking "what next"? These types of questions indicate that they have not yet acquired the necessary qualifications to intuit their own true nature as the Self. Hence they think that these are all intellectual exercises or noetics, because these people have understood that after knowing all these theories

we have to practise some exercises to achieve concrete or tangible results in time. They naturally distinguish between the theory and the practice as is evident in our daily life. But at the beginning itself we have reiterated that, that which is done and achieved afresh is non-eternal and is invariably time-bound. This is forgotten by these people and this in itself becomes a disqualification for them. That which is restricted by time, space and that which is not-self can be achieved by practice after having known it theoretically. But in the case of the Self, who is the very core of one's Being and whose nature is immediate and direct, there is no possibility whatsoever of distinctions like theory and practice. One's own Self is the practical of the practical. Here the only effort needed is to cease one's natural tendency of identifying himself with not-selves from the ego to the body. In this regard, Shankara states in the **Gītā Bhāshya 18-50** : "Therefore, we have only to eliminate what is falsely ascribed to **Brahman** by **Avidya**; we have to make no more effort to acquire a knowledge of **Brahman** as He is quite Self-evident.

Meaning of Certain Important Words According to Shankara's Bhāshyas.

This **Adhyatma Yoga** is described here according to Shankara's Prasthanatraya Bhashyas. In this connection there are many words used in the Bhashyas like "**Yoga**", "**Samadhi**", etc., The meaning of these types of words is different in the

Bhashyas from what meaning has been commonly given to them by others. For this purpose we would like to show here below some meanings given to these words :

1) In the Gītā 2-44 the word "**Samadhi**" is interpreted by Shankara as "**Samadhi** means Buddhi or Antahkarana, in which are gathered together all objects of enjoyment for the Purusha, the individual soul". Here Shankara says that the conviction of a resolute nature of the intellect is called as **Samadhi**, meaning one can determine whether to go towards the worldly enjoyment or towards emancipation and for both, the resolute nature of the intellect is the main cause. Hence **Samadhi** means **Buddhi**.

2) In the Gītā 2-53 the word "**Samadhi**" means the Self. The mind or the intellect gets completely still when one cognises the true nature of the Self by discrimination. Hence the Self is called as **Samadhi**. **Dhi** means the Self. Except cognising the real nature of the Self there is no equipoise of the mind. So in the 54th stanza of this chapter the word "**Samadhistha**", means one who is already established naturally in his true nature as the Self.

3) In the Mandukya Karika 3-37, the word "**Samadhi**" is interpreted by Shankara in two ways, first from the standpoint of the intellect-the firm conviction about the true nature of the Self is obtained by a concentrated or one-pointed mind and so this

awareness of the Self is called as Samadhi. From the standpoint of the Self, in the Self alone the mind gets the equipoise and hence the Self is called as **"Samadhi"**. The word **"Yoga"** is interpreted by Shankara in the following manner : 1) In the Gita 2-53 **"Yoga"** means the awareness of the true nature of the Self as a result of discrimination 2) In the Gita 2-39 the word **"Yoga"** is used in the sense of means to reach **Jñāna (Sankhya)**, meaning the practice of **Karmayoga** is the means to attain **Jñāna**. 3) In the introduction to the fourth Chapter of Bhagavad Gītā the meaning of the word **"Yoga"** is given as follows: "The natural establishment in the true nature of the Self and the consequent result of complete renunciation, and that which will be attained by the means of **Karmayoga**-that kind of **Yoga** was taught in the previous two chapters". Here **Yoga** means natural establishment in the true nature of the Self. 4) Practising the direct means to get the cognition of the true nature of the Self viz. **Shravana** (listening), **Manana** (contemplation) and **Nididhyasana** (**Adhyatma Yoga**). This kind of practice is known as **Sankhya** or **Sankhya Yoga** and before this, practising **Karma Yoga** is called as the path of **Yoga**. In the fifth chapter of Bhagavad Gita these two paths are described. 5) As we have stated before, the various names of **Adhyatma Yoga** are given as **"Dhyana Yoga"** in the sixth chapter of Bhagavad Gita 13-24 and 18-52, **Manonigraha Yoga** of **Mandukya Karika** and all

these are concerned to **Nididhyasana**. 6) In Bhagavad Gītā 9-5 the word "**Yoga**" is described as the divine mystery of the Lord or the Self and is called as "**Yoga**", meaning, the Self, who is the substratum of the whole phenomena of the dualistic world, simultaneously appearing as if He has taken the form of the world and at the same time being devoid of all the dualistic phenomena. This mystery is described here as "**Yoga**".

In all these places mentioned above Shankara has described the word "**Yoga**" according to the true traditions of Vedanta, but he has not taken into consideration the so-called **Samadhis**, **Yogas** etc., which are described in **Raja Yoga**, **Patanjala Yoga**, **Hatha Yoga**, etc., Hence there is no mention whatsoever of **Chakras**, **Nadis**, **Kamalas**, **Kundalini**, miracles etc., in the context of Self-Knowledge. In some places where there are some peculiar types of **Upasanas** mentioned in the Upanishads like **Omkara**, **Ahamgraha**, etc., sometimes the **Nadis** like **Ida**, **Pingala** and **Sushuma** are mentioned, and Shankara has also accepted these terminologies in these chapters on **Upasana** according to Vedic utterances. But in the chapters devoted exclusively to Self-Knowledge or intuition of Reality, there is no mention whatsoever of these words like **Chakras** (centres), **Nadis** (subtle nerves) etc., Before concluding the **Adhyatma Yoga** we have to discuss about the impediments and the method of overcoming

them according to Gaudapada's Karikas and the Bahgavad Gītā.

Sri Gaudapada mentions these obstacles as follows: 1. Vikshepa, 2. Laya, 3. Sakashaaya (Kashaaya) 4. Rasaaswaada.

1) Vikshepa: When a **Sadhaka** starts practising the process of **Adhyatma Yoga**, sometimes the mind wanders about thinking about worldly matters with a hankering for the enjoyment of the pleasure from outer objects. This tendency of agitation in the mind is called as **Vikshepa**. An aspirant should practise to overcome this defect by **Vairagya**, meaning non-attachment or renunciation. This non-attachment is of two kinds. First, one should observe incessantly that everything is full of misery and is non-eternal. By observing these facts while enjoying worldly things, one should desist from hankering. This is half of the renunciation. The Buddhists and protagonists of other schools have taught this kind of renunciation only. But in Vedanta, the complete renunciation is prescribed for the aspirants. The nature of that renunciation is as follows : The aspirant should remember that the whole phenomena of duality is only a false appearance. The reality of this universe is the Self, but one misconceives that very Self as the world. The Self is non-dual, unborn and absolute even at the time of appearing as the universe. So the Reality is always unborn. From the standpoint of this Reality, even now also there is no

world as such. This is called here as “remembering the unborn Truth”. When the **Sadhaka** observes this on the firm ground of a comprehensive vision of life, then only he can get complete renunciation or **Vairagya**.

2) **Laya**: At the time of inquiry, according to the process of **Adhyatma Yoga**, sometimes the intellect becomes dull and merges into deep sleep. This obstacle is caused by inertia (**Tamas**). To overcome this one should make his mind alert and he should try to engage himself in the process of discrimination inwardly, and outwardly he should observe certain disciplines and regulations in life regarding diet, work, rest, sleep, etc., Please refer to **Bhagavad Gita (8-17)**. By observing these regulations outwardly one can conquer this **Tamas**.

3) **Sakashaaya (Kashaaya)**: Sometimes the mind comes to a stand-still. Neither it follows the method of discrimination nor it goes to sleep. This condition of the mind is called as seed form of the **Vikshepa**. Here the mind is ready to go out even when the attention is given up or let for a moment. To conquer this defect, one should make repeated efforts to put it back on the track of discrimination.

4) **Rasaaswaada**: When the mind is absorbed in the process of discrimination, it gets a kind of pleasure of bliss which is the sequel of the concentration on the subject matter. This pleasure or bliss is a hindrance for taking a stand in the true nature of the Self. This is

called **Rasaaswaada**. Here "**Rasa**" means pleasure and "**Aswaada**" means enjoying it. To overcome this hindrance one should rely on an acute process of discrimination, which is as follows: "This pleasure is a reflection of the Self in the mind due to concentration. As I am the Self, I am the witness of this concept of pleasure. As I am the non-dual Self, there is no triple concept like the enjoyment, the enjoyer and the enjoyed. I am of the nature of Bliss, which is evident in deep sleep. This pleasure is a concept which appears and disappears. So it is a false appearance in its true essence". By thinking in this way one can overcome this hindrance (Refer to Gaudapada Karika of Mandukya III-40-46).

All these matters have been summarised in the Bhagavad Gītā classifying these remedies into two groups. One is a constant practice (**Abhyasa**) and the second is renunciation (**Vairagya**). Constant practice is : One should observe outwardly humility, purification of the mind etc., which have been mentioned above (Bhagavad Gītā. 13-7 to 11 and 18-51) and inwardly one has to practise the process of discrimination with a concentrated mind, which has been described above in detail. **Vairagya** is to be practised as given in Gaudapada Karikas, which have been explained already. By observing these two one can conquer all the hindrance for **Adhyatma Yoga**.

APPENDIX

There are three direct means (**Saakshaat Sadhanas**) to Self-Knowledge and they are called as **Shravana** (listening), **Manana** (reflection) and **Nididhyasana** (contemplation), according to Shankara Bhashya (Refer to **Taittiriya Bhashya 1-11-4**). Among these, **Nididhyasana** has been dealt with in detail in "**Adhyatma Yoga**". Here for the benefit of aspirants I wish to discuss about the other two kinds of **Sadhanas**, viz. **Shravana** and **Manana**.

Shravana (listening)

The aspirant or student should listen to the teachings of a competent Guru or preceptor in accordance with the Upanishadic utterances. During the **Shravana** by the pupil he is expected to refer to his own intuitive experiences so as to understand the teachings of Guru properly. In this regard the Guru or the preceptor has to be perforce one who is himself firmly established in his true nature as the Self. Otherwise, the teacher will not be able to drive home the subtle implications of his teachings. Śri Shankara refers to this in his Kathopanishad Bhāshya 1-2-8 and 9. Particularly in the eighth Mantra he has dealt in an elaborate manner with the results as well as the nature of the teaching. Śri Shankara has mentioned four points

in this regard : 1. During the time of listening the student cognises his true nature as the Self which is ever free from mundane life ; 2. He will have no doubts of any kind about non-dual nature of the Self ; 3. There will be no residue of anything to be known ; 4. There will be no question of not knowing or not cognising the nature of the Self. So, the **Acharya** or the teacher must be a competent one and the pupil also must be one who is pure in heart and an introvert.

An Example

The common run of people believe that they are all born in this world at a particular time and place and just like them all the creatures also are born in this world. Every human being believes that "I am also a creature born and brought up in this world and have enjoyed pleasure and pain and eventually I am going to die one day. Before my birth this world was there and after my death also this world will continue to exist eternally." But according to the teachings of Vedanta first the aspirant has to cognise his own Being which is beyond his I-sense or ego. This process is elaborately dealt along with excerpts from Sri Shankara's Bhāshya in the "**Adhyatma Yoga**"-page no. 7-8 Naturally, the student has to take a stand in the true nature of Being or the Self and cognise that the whole waking state appears in his Being and in that state his ego and the

corresponding world with the concepts of infinite time, space and causation appear. During the time of Shravana or listening the student invariably takes a stand in his true nature as the Self or he ceases his identification with his ego. Here the aspirant should notice carefully that taking a stand in his Self and ceasing his identification with his ego mean the same thing and they are not two separate functions. From this standpoint of the Self (or taking a stand in his Being) it will be evident that his former beliefs are all misconceptions. Sri Shankara in his Manduka Bhashya mentions the result of this kind of cognition in the following manner : “..... the intention is to show that the entire phenomenal universe and the world of gods, together with this (gross cosmic) Self, contribute to the constitution of the four parts. If the presentation is made in this way, non-duality stands established on the removal of the entire phenomenal world, and the Self existing in all beings is realised as one, and all beings are seen as existing in the Self”. In this connection, some points are to be remembered:

1. The concept of infinite time and space is included in the waking state. So the state itself is not in time or in space ;
2. The Self, who is the substratum of this whole waking phenomena, is beyond time and space and hence it is incorrect to say that the Self is one and the state is the second;

3. The Self is of pervasive nature and He has pervaded the whole phenomena of the waking state. So it is evident that the nature of the Self is non-dual and absolute, but owing to the ignorance of this true nature of the Self the same Self appears as the waking world;

4. Thus the result mentioned by Śrī Shankara in his above-said excerpt is achieved at the very moment of the student's Shravana or listening to the teacher's exposition and he (the student) can easily see the whole universe in the Self and the Self in the whole universe. Here the aspirant cognises his true nature to be ever free from all mundane miseries. This is an example of Vedantic teaching.

Śrī Śrī Satchidānandendra Saraswathi Swāmiji has declared for the first time that the concepts of time, space and causation are within the state and the true nature of the Self is, without any shadow of doubt, beyond these concepts of time, space and causation. Before the advent of Sri Swamiji on the Vedantic firmament all the so-called Advaita Vedantins believed that in one day the three states of the waking, the dream and the deep sleep take place and the Self continues His existence in all these three states as well as in infinite time (see Panchadashi 1-3 to 7). To get the experience of non-dual nature of the Self one should get into a trance (**Samadhi**) by means of the **Patanjala Yoga** after **Shravana, Manana** and

Nidhidhyasana. By mere discrimination one cannot get the experience of the true nature of the Self (See Panchadashi 1-53 to 61). But our Swāmiji revealed the truth that the Self cannot be experienced by the student but he has to intuit that the Self is not, and can never be, an objectifiable thing, by means of **Viveka** or discrimination only. The word “discrimination” is misunderstood in these days to be an intellectual exercise. It is totally forgotten here that **Viveka** or discrimination means that one should separate his true nature as the Self from his ego or I-sense. So, it is evident from this that the Self is not to be attained in any particular state or condition. This fact has been stressed by Śrī Shankara in his Sūtra Bhāṣya 2-1-14 as follows : “..... for the identity of the Self and Brahman stated in “**That Thou Art**” is not contingent on any particular state”.

So the competent student can attain the final goal of life by **Shravana** or listening alone. This is also stated by Śrī Shankara in the Sūtra Bhāṣya as follows: “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 realise the meaning of “**That Thou Art**” even from the first utterance, so that a repetition in their case is certainly useless”.

When one cognises his true nature as the Self, he gets a firm conviction about his own nature and this

firm conviction is called as **"Atma Pratyaya"**. To engender this **"Atma Pratyaya"** in one's own mind **Shravana** or listening is the only means and its result is the dawn of **"Atma Pratyaya"**. This is explained by Sri Shankara in the following passages of his **Bhāshyas** : Gita 13-34 ; **Mandukya Mantra** No.7 ; **Mundaka** 2-2-9 ; **Mandukya Karika** 3-32. In all these places the result of **Shravana** is described as producing the **"Atma Pratyaya"** in the student's mind. Through this **"Atma Pratyaya"** only one can take his stand in his true nature as the Self and in no other way. However, it should be remembered that here by the **"Atma Pratyaya"** the Self is not objectified, but the dawn of **"Atma Pratyaya"** itself is revealed in the light of the Self. Hence, to know the Self is to be the Self and to be the Self is to cease the identification with the not-selves. Thus the student falsifies the appearance of the dualistic world and remains in his true nature as the non-dual Brahman. Thereafter there is no question of his having any aspiration for anything in time and in space and further there cannot be any possibility of contradiction of this right vision whatsoever. This fact is stressed by Śri Shankara in his **Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāshya** towards the end of 2-3-6. These are the essential features of **"Shravana"**.

* * * * *

Manana (Reflection)

As previously mentioned, the direct means for the Self-Knowledge are described by Śrī Shankara in his Bṛhadāranyaka Bhāṣhya 2-4-5 as follows : “Therefore, the Self, my dear Maitreyi, should be realised, is worthy of realisation, or should be made the object of realisation. It should first be heard of from a teacher and from the scriptures, then reflected upon through reasoning, and then steadfastly meditated upon”. This is a brief account of these three means, and among these three we have already dealt with the first one and the last (i.e. **Shravana** and **Nidhidhyasana** or **Adhyatma Yoga**) For the present, the middle one, namely, **Manana**, has to be dealt with.

Śrī Shankara has pointed out that **Manana** should be done through reasoning. Here the word “reasoning” commonly connotes logic, inferences, conjectures and “**Tarka**”. In the case of the Self-Knowledge, it should be kept in mind, mere logic or pure reasoning according to the Western philosophers or inferences as per Eastern **Tarkikas** is not at all useful to the aspirants. According to Śrī Shankara’s Bhāṣhya, there are three kinds of logic. The first is dry logic, which contradicts the common experiences in practical life. “For if one says A (non-poisonous) **Dundubha** (water snake) is

like a (poisonous) snake (like cobra)," the **Dundubha** does not thereby become poisonous ; or if one says "A snake is like a **Dundubha**," the snake does not thereby become non-poisonous." (**Sūtra Bhāshya 2-2-10**). There are some examples of mere logic as used in algebra, like, if A is equal to B and if B is equal to C, then evidently A is equal to C. These examples of mere logic are based on certain thought processes only, but no one knows for certain what exactly these letters A,B and C denote or stand for or whether they are equal or not etc., Without considering the facts as they are, to join two types of thoughts and to draw a conclusion thereby is the nature of this kind of logic. These two kinds of examples belong to the class of dry logic, called in Sanskrit as **Kutarka**.

The second category of logic is called as **Pramana Tarka** in Sanskrit, meaning the inference based on sense perceptions. For example, if one sees smoke on the top of a mountain he infers that there must be fire. Here the existence of the smoke is established on the strength of the sense perception and the existence of the fire is inferred. This is deduced on the strength of one's previous experience of having seen the smoke emanating from the fire. This kind of logic is useful to some extent in our daily life. The Indian **Tarka Shastra** or system of logic called as "**Praacheena Nyaya**" and "**Naveena Nyaya**" etc., are built up stupendously with their innumerable rules and regulations as well as many maxims. In this field the disputant who relies on

stronger grounds of evidences is capable of vanquishing his rivals. In this system of logic, if the fundamental perception, on which the later inferences have been drawn, is found or proved to be wrong, then the whole range of inferences built on it becomes null and void. For example, when one has apparently seen "smoke" on the top of a mountain and later he has realised that it was not smoke at all but it was only a whirl wind or fog etc., then all his previous inferences stand cancelled. So also if the evidences or maxims are proved to be incorrect then also all his reasonings do not hold water. Sri Shankara points out mainly three defects of logic in general and they are :

1. No finality is ever reached, because a logician may confirm that his is the real truth but in due course of time another more powerful logician may refute it and the latter may stand refuted by another later and so on. And it is impossible to determine the final truth by bringing together in one congregation all the past, the present and the future logicians and decide once for all.

2. There is always the possibility of mutual contradiction among the logicians.

3. There is always the possibility of self contradiction in every logician's contentions. In Sutra Bhashya 2-1-11 Sri Shankara has elaborately dealt with these defects.

The third is called as "**Shrauta Tarka**" or reasoning based on the **Shruti** utterances. This **Tarka** or reasoning is to be taken here in this **Manana** or reflection on the Self. To some extent the **Pramana Tarka** or the reasoning of the second category mentioned above also may be taken in so far as it is not inconsistent with the **Shruti** utterances. But predominantly the aspirant has to rely on **Shrauta Tarka** only. Śrī Shankara has sounded a warning about this : "It was also argued that by enjoining "reflection" over and above "hearing", the (Bṛhadāranyaka) Upanishad shows that logic also is to be honoured. But through such a subterfuge, empty logic cannot find any scope here : for, logic conforming to the Upanishads is alone resorted to here as a subsidiary means helping realisation". (Sūtra Bhāṣhya 2-1-6). The significances of **Shrauta Tarka** are as follows : a) The **Shrauta Tarka** relies on the intuitive experience of one's own real nature as the Self which is based on universal acceptance. b) Taking two partial intuitions and joining them and thereby drawing a conclusion on the firm ground of intuitive experience. c) So this reasoning is beyond the ken of duality, meaning, it is neither concerned to the sense perceptions, the mental conceptions or intellectual inferences nor is it concerned to the thought constructs of time, space and causation etc., It should be evident to a discerning aspirant that there is no scope whatever for any opposition or contradiction to the conclusions drawn

on the basis of this **Shrauta Tarka**. Because, this reasoning is beyond the ken of duality. These types of reasoning are exemplified by Sri Śaṅkara in his above-quoted Bhāshya portion. "And this is of this kind : Since the states of dream and wakefulness contradict each other, the Self is not identified with any of one of them ; since the individual soul dissociates itself from the world in the state of deep sleep to become one with the Self which is Existence, it must be the same as the transcendental Self ; since creation has originated from Brahman, and since the law is that the cause and effect are non-different, creation must be non-different from Brahman ; and so on". (S.B 2-1-6) Here we have to discuss about these three types of reasoning. In the first kind it is said that the waking state and the dream state inevitably cancel each other when each of them appears. The Self, who is the substratum of these two states, is not circumscribed by them. This is the significance of the first reason. Here one should remember that the waking state includes the three planes, namely, the divine, the material and the corporeal, which are described in the body of the book on "**Adhyatma** (Page No. 2 and 3) and the concepts of time, space and causation, as also all the creatures along with the enquirer's me-notion. Thus the total phenomena of the waking state should be taken as a whole. So also the dream state is to be considered. When the aspirant observes this process of discrimination about both the states then naturally he

loses his identification with his ego and takes his stand in his true nature as the Self. Otherwise, these two phenomena of the waking and the dream states cannot be assessed in a comprehensive manner. By this process of discrimination when one discerns that his own nature is untainted by these two states, then he cognises the essence of these two false appearances is the Self alone. In the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad the sage Yagnavalkya has taught this truth to King Janaka, affirming that the nature of the **Self is untainted, self-illuminating and non-dual**. These three conclusions have been drawn from the above reasoning. Here the intuition of the waking state and the dream state have been taken as two partial intuitions and after joining them on the basis of the common denominator of the real nature of the Self and showing their mutual cancellation the conclusion has been drawn about the true nature of the Self in the above - said manner. So, at the end of this reasoning the aspirant is established in his essential nature of non-dual Brahman. To get this result only the Shrauta Tarka is used, and it will be evident to the aspirant that this kind of Shrauta Tarka is beyond the ken of intellect as well as the concepts of time, space and causation. This is the special feature of **Shrauta Tarka** and this kind of **Tarka** is used in **Katha Upanishad 3-1-4**.

In the second kind of reasoning two partial intuitions of the waking state and the deep state are taken and from them the conclusion has been drawn

that the nature of the individual soul is ever free from mundane qualities. From the standpoint of the waking world, every individual feels that "I am enjoying pleasure or suffering misery." This belief is due to the wrong identification with the not-selves, i.e., from the body to the ego. When he cognises that the pleasure or the suffering are illumined by Himself as He is the Witness of these two kinds of concepts, at once he discerns that "I am free from these two". This kind of acute or sharp discrimination is very difficult to be adopted by the common aspirant. A common man, though he might have a gigantic intellect, understands this type of discrimination to be a mere inference, because he has no introvert nature as well as the capacity to cease his identification with his own ego. But one who is a qualified student may understand this truth in its proper perspective and significance. If he finds any difficulty in taking a stand in his true nature as the Self, then the intuition of deep sleep is to be taken as the criterion for his guidance. In deep sleep every human being is clearly free from all mundane sufferings, and he is rid of his own ego. Now the two types of partial intuitions are to be joined here in the following way : In the waking state though a person suffers from the mundane calamities, as he is the Witness of these sufferings He has no taint of them, and in deep sleep He is free from all mundane calamities owing to the absence of the adjuncts like the body, the mind, the intellect and the senses, which are false appearances

included in the waking state. These two intuitions have been joined here and a conclusion is drawn to the effect that the nature of the Self is ever free from the mundane sufferings. This is the significance of the second kind of reasoning. The third kind of reasoning pertains to the Bhāshya statement : "Since creation has originated from Brahman, and since the law is that the cause and effect are non-different, creation must be non-different from Brahman ; and so on ". In this regard, we have to discuss in detail topics like ; 1. According to modern science, around a nucleus minute things like protons, electrons and neutrons revolve and this conglomeration of an atom is the basic unit for all things in the world and hence the creation. To the question where from do the things like the nucleus the protons and the electrons are produced the scientists have no answer and they explain it away by saying that they are there naturally. Then naturally for these things to function the apriori concepts of time and space are required. Then if they are further questioned as to how time and space have come into existence then they dismiss it away saying that these questions are concerned to metaphysics. In other words, they admit that these questions are beyond their sphere. Next let us consider how Western philosophers like Kant and Einstein answer this question about time and space. According to Kant, time and space are mental concepts and without these concepts there is no functioning of the mind or the sense organs. The external objects are

related to time and space and so our sense organs report about them relatively with the concepts of time and space. The mind functions in four ways : 1. Unity of idea ; 2. quality ; 3. quantity ; 4. causation. Hence, we cannot know "the Thing in itself", i.e how the world and the mind are there without these concepts of time and space. And according to Einstein these are all relative things, and he conjectures that apart from this phenomenon of the world which is totally in the relative field there must be "Noumenon" which is absolute, about which he has not drawn any definite conclusions. According to the Eastern philosophers : 1. The **Kapila Sankhyas** say that the primordial matter of the universe, which is called as "**Pradhana**", "**Prakriti**" and "**Avyakta**" (unmanifested seed form of the world) is the cause for this universe. 2. Atoms are the cause for the universe, say the **Vaisheshikas**. 3. **Vaisheshikas**, **Naiyyayikas** and **Patanjali** agree with the point that the Lord or **Īśvara** is required to create the universe from the atoms or from the **Prakriti**. This Lord is quite separate from the world as well as the souls. 4. Many religions say that God has created this universe and he is the sustainer and the destroyer of this universe and that he is quite independent from the souls as well as the universe. 5. The **Buddhistic** view about the universe is that it is only a mental creation like a dream and there is nothing real here. So they assert about the essenceless nature of the universe, the soul and God, and this is called as Nihilism. These are

all brief accounts of the views of the Western and the Eastern philosophers.

Now let us consider the Vedantic view of creation. First one has to decide that the concepts of infinite time, space and causation and all the multiplicity are to be included in the word "creation". Sri Shankara explains this in his Sūtra Bhāshya as follows :..... "this universe that is manifested through name and form, that is associated with diverse agents and experiences, that provides the support for actions and results, having well-regulated space, time and causation, and that defies all thoughts about the real nature of its creation". (S.B 1-1-2). To determine any truth Vedanta relies on a comprehensive view of life and applying this principle to the problem of creation. Vedanta guides the aspirants in the following manner: The entire creation is restricted to the waking state only, and this waking state emerges from the Self, is sustained & dissolved in Him when the waking state disappears. Hence, it is said in Vedanta that the Self or Brahman is the cause of the universe. Here the word "cause" is not used in the ordinary sense. In our daily life the cause is concerned to the past and the effect is concerned to the present. So the causation seen in the world inevitably requires the time factor but when we consider the question of creation then the words like "cause and effect" are to be interpreted in a different way altogether. Hence in Vedantic parlance the word "cause" means the Reality and the word "effect"

means the false appearance. To explain, there is no separate existence for the effect apart from the cause. Moreover, the effect is an imagined thing and hence is only an apparent name & dealing. For example, in the case of a wooden chair the chair has no independent existence apart from the wood which it is made of. The idea of the chair and its dealings are, in the ultimate analysis, imagined on the substance of the wood. So also the relation between the world and Brahman. It is to be understood here that the world or the universe as Brahman is real, but world as such is unreal. This truth is revealed by Sri Shankara in his Sutra Bhashya as follows : "As the spaces within pots or jars are non-different from the cosmic space or as water in a mirage is non-different from a (sandy) desert - since they sometimes appear and sometimes vanish away, and as such their nature cannot be defined, even so it is to be understood that this diverse phenomenal world of experiences, things experienced, and so on, has no existence apart from Brahman". (S.B. 2-1-14). For this purpose Sri Shankara has declared in the third type of reasoning quoted above as : "Since creation has originated from Brahman, and since the law is that the cause and effect are non-different, creation must be non-different from Brahman". This is also confirmed by Sri Shankara in his Brihadaranyaka Bhashya by saying that "In life if a thing cannot be perceived apart from something else, the latter is the essence of that thing. According to the guidance of this **Shrauta**

Tarka, taught or used by Vedanta texts and is based on a comprehensive vision of life, if an aspirant inquires into the cause of the universe he will find at the end of his enquiry that he has automatically falsified the appearance of the universe and at the same time he has intuited the non-dual nature of **Brahman** as his own self. This is the benefit accruing from this kind of **Shrauta Tarka**.

* * * * *

Conclusion

To know the secrets of Vedantic teachings one should necessarily know the following **five fundamentals**:

1. Relying on the intuitive experiences of universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life.

2. The intuition of the Self or the eternal **Witness** of the ego.

3. The method of superimposition and rescission, which is called as **Adhyaropa** and **Apavada**;

4. The difference between **Vastu Tantra** and **Kartru Tantra sadhanas** and their results.

5. The difference between the absolute or transcendental viewpoint and the empirical viewpoint, which are called in Vedanta as **Paramaarthā Drishti** and **Vyavahara Drishti**.

The intuition of the Self or the eternal Witness and the difference between **Kartru Tantra** and **Vastu Tantra** are dealt with briefly in the "**Adhyatma Yoga**" and "**Shravana**" portions herefore. The method of superimposition and rescission is used throughout the vedantic literature, particularly in this **Manana** portion. The discrimination about the states like waking, dream and deep sleep and the

determination about the cause of the universe etc., are based predominantly on this method. For example, the states or creation are things superimposed on the true nature of the Self owing to ignorance, and when the enquiry is completed the aspirant discerns that all these are **Brahman** in their essence. By this conviction when the previous set of wrong notions have been removed then this sublation of the wrong concepts is called as rescission or **Apavada**. At the commencement of the teaching whatever things are accepted to be true for the time being from the standpoint of the superimposition that is called as the empirical viewpoint or the **Vyavahara Drishti**, while at the end of the teaching and enquiry all the previous wrong notions are removed on the strength of the absolute viewpoint and this final negation of all superimpositions taught by the **Shruti** or the Guru in the form of “**Neti, Neti**” or “Not this, not this”, these types of teachings are called as the **Paramartha Drishti** or the absolute viewpoint.

These fundamentals of Vedanta, which were not known to the spiritual world till recently, were revealed by our revered Swāmiji, Śrī Śrī Satchidānandendra Saraswati, the founder of **Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya**, Holenarasipur, Hassan District, Karnataka, as a result of a rigorous and intensive research into Shankara Bhashyas for over 50 years.

* * * * *

AVASTHAATRAYA VIVEKA

Pages 183 — 272

About the Book

To realise one's own nature as 'non-dual Brahman', there are many methods which are usefully applied in *Vedanta*. Though all these methods are included in only one methodology i.e., *Adhyaropa & Apavada*, among all these methods the discrimination of the tribasic view of life which is called as *Avasthaatraya Viveka* is a **Jem** for the aspirants to take a stand in one's own true nature directly and immediately.

Here in this book four different viewpoints of the three states, *waking, dream and deep sleep* in consonance with the utterances of Shankara-Bhashyas and Shruti are explained

Due to want of discrimination we have misunderstood the non-dual Brahman itself as three states. Waking, Dream and Deep sleep are not events occurring in one time-series. For, then they would be experienced as parts of one continuous state. But nobody experiences as such. There is no cause-effect relationship among the states. They are mutually independent. Strictly speaking each of the three states is a full manifestation of Atman or Reality as otherwise, we cannot explain why the states are not experienced in juxta-position of each other or why they are not externally connected by time.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Introduction	187
2. The Uniqueness of Avasthaatraya Viveka	195
3. CHAPTER - I	
Four aspects of waking state	199
4. CHAPTER - II	
Four aspects of dream state	209
5. CHAPTER - III	
Four aspects of deep sleep state	231
6. CHAPTER - IV	
Determining the nature of Turiya	243

Avasthaatraya Viveka

Aum

Introduction

To realise one's own nature as 'non-dual Brahman', there are many methods which are usefully applied in *Vedanta*. Though all these methods are included in only one methodology i.e., *Adhyaropa & Apavada*, among all these methods the discrimination of the tribasic view of life which is called as *Avasthaatraya Viveka* is a **Jem** for the aspirants to take a stand in one's own true nature directly and immediately. **Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji** has stated this as "अवस्थात्रयप्रक्रियायाः असाधारणधर्माः" in the introduction to his Sanskrit work *Mandukya Rahasya Vivriti*. According to Shankara, the whole state including *macrocosm* and *microcosm* should be taken as an adjunct to one's own true nature of being. The art of this taking a stand in one's own being which is the substratum of the appearance and disappearance of the dualistic state should be known through the teachings of Shashtra and Guru only. Once an aspirant has recognised this, he will lose his identification with his individuality and he remains directly as *Turiya* i. e., non-dual Brahman. This is the speciality of this tribasic method of life.

Here in this book four different viewpoints of the three states, *waking, dream and deep sleep* in consonance with the utterances of Shankara-Bhashyas and Shruti are explained in the first three chapters. At first I got an insight into this type of different viewpoints hinted in *Mandukya Rahasya Vivriti* written by my revered Gurudev (as "सुषुप्तात्मनोऽज्ञत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं च दृष्टिभेदात्"). By clarifying these viewpoints the student will get rid of all types

of doubts regarding the nature and the relationship between the *Avasthaas*. And also he will take a stand in his true nature of the Self as *Turiya* which is absolutely free from the taint of *Avasthaas*. To help to take a stand in the ultimate Reality (truth), the previous standpoints regarding the *Avasthaas* are used just as a ladder is used to climb up to the top of a building. This new vision of different standpoints regarding *Avasthaas* will help the aspirants to understand the secrets of the teachings of the Upanishads at various places.

Due to want of discrimination we have misunderstood the non-dual Brahman itself as three states. Waking, Dream and Deep sleep are not events occurring in one time-series. For, then they would be experienced as parts of one continuous state. But nobody experiences as such. There is no cause-effect relationship among the states. They are mutually independent. Strictly speaking each of the three states is a full manifestation of Atman or Reality as otherwise, we cannot explain why the states are not experienced in juxta-position of each other or why they are not externally connected by time. So it is absurd to say that the *Avasthaas* take place in chronological order in time or that they are side-by-side in space. The very ideas of time and space, though they appear to be infinite, are restricted to a particular state of waking or dream. In deep sleep there is no concept of time or space. But when we translate this direct experience of the intuition in the language of waking intellect then only we say 'there are three states'. Strictly speaking the triplicity (त्रित्व) itself is a delusion. Though this is the thing, for the purpose of teaching, at first we accept the states as three in number and start to show the different viewpoints regarding every state. This is the *Adhyaropa* of *Avasthaas*. At last, when the transcendental standpoint is shown and the disciple takes his stand there, then he himself realises that

there are no Avasthaas and he himself remains as *Turiya*, because, the Self is ever devoid of all types of Avasthaas. The Avasthaas are attributed on the Self only. When this realisation takes place, then the rescission or *Apavada* of the previous supposition of the Avasthaatraya will be realised. So, this *Avasthaaic method* itself comes under the purview of the methodology of *Adhyaropa & Apavada*, just like other methods which appear in the Upanishads.

In the fourth chapter I have discussed the nature of *Turiya* and also the significance of the method of getting the Turiya according to the teachings of Shankaracharya as interpreted by Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji. *Turiya* (तुरीय) is not a fourth state as usually understood, like Samadhi (trance) etc. According to Shankara's Bhashya, Turiya, which is the substratum of all the three states that are conceived to be really existing owing to ignorance, in relation to the illusory number three is said to be the *Fourth* for the purposes of teaching alone [*Maya-sankhya Turiyam*- मायासंख्या तुरीयम्, as Shankara describes it]. It is only Real Atman as the Upanishads expressly tell us. He is '*neti netyatma*' (नेति नेत्यात्मा). As Turiya is no avasthaa or state, so the popular identification of it with Samadhi is altogether unfounded. This has been shown elaborately in the fourth chapter of this book.

At first I had sent these matters as the answers to the queries of my philosophic friend *Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal, Calcutta*, who is an ardent student of Shankara-Vedanta and keen follower of the teachings of *Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji*. So these were not prepared with the intention of bringing out in the form of a book. But his enthusiasm has resulted in this book-form. The answers to all the queries sent by

Sri Sanyal are typed by my friend **Mr. R. B. Gopinath**, Bangalore, who is also an ardent student of Vedanta. So I have to give credit to Mr. Gopinath for his invaluable service.¹

The reader who has listened to the *Avasthaatraya Prakriya* that is prevailing now may feel a strange approach in this book but it has to be pointed out that the teachings contained herein are very much consistent with the teachings of Sri Shankara and are in consonance with the approach of Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji. The aspirant has to feel indebted to Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal for placing this methodology in his hands.

I will be failing in my duty if I do not appreciate the philanthropic attitude displayed by the Editor Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal. I congratulate on his successful attempt in understanding the subject and placing it to the readers as well. I pray to the Almighty Lord and Sri Sadguru Maharaj to bless him and the aspirants with the realisation of Reality.

11th August, 1989
Bengaluru.

DEVARAO KULKARNI
Bengaluru

1. *Mr. R. B. Gopinath* also typed very nicely the subject matters that I had dictated to him for preparing my book "*Teaching of Brahman Through the Attributions of Avidya and Maya*" which has already been published from Calcutta. May God grant him a long and prosperous life.

ॐ

“अवस्थात्रितयं यस्य क्रीडाभूमितया स्थितम्।
तदेव ब्रह्म जानीयादिति वेदान्तदिण्डिमः ॥”

AVASTHATRAYA VIVEKA

(METHOD OF EXAMINATION OF
THE THREE STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS,
VIZ., WAKING, DREAM AND DEEP SLEEP)

Dedicated
To
His Holiness,
Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji
of revered memory

"The Vedantic method of *Avasthaas* assumes nothing, entails no belief in authority and seeks the aid of no special intuition. It builds upon the fundamentals of human experience and insists that all the three *Avasthaas*—the *Waking*, *Dream* & *Deep Sleep* should be investigated before we can light upon the Absolute Reality underlying the manifestations of life..... By a procedure peculiarly its own, it teaches us to look upon each of the three states as a complete expression of Reality, and then equating each of them to the other two, arrives at the remarkable result that our Atman as the Witnessing consciousness of all the three states, is really the Highest Reality free from the taint of all the three illusory *Avasthaas* which are superimposed upon it by the empirical understanding."

— Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji.

Avasthaatraya Viveka

(Method of examination of the three states of consciousness, that is, waking, dream and deep sleep states)

THE UNIQUENESS OF AVASTHĀTRAYA VIVEKA

Man's life, if taken in its totality, comprises the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep. If man wishes to arrive at Truth, he cannot afford to take a partial view of life, giving predominance to waking state alone. The whole gamut of human experiences are subsumed in these three states alone "ज्ञेयमेतान्येव त्रीणि । एतद्व्यतिरेकेण ज्ञेयानुपपत्तेः ।" (G. K. Bhashya-4/88).—"There is nothing beyond these three states to be known, for all the postulates of different schools are comprehended in these." And hence taking into account all these three states of consciousness alone will be the comprehensive vision or outlook of life. Vedanta takes the human experiences of all the three states, viz, waking, dream and deep sleep to arrive at its conclusion, so that they become irrefutable and valid for all times. No other system of philosophy except Vedanta bases its enquiry on a comprehensive tri-basic view of life and the principle of Universal acceptance. Many people are of opinion that through the valid means of knowledge like perception (*Pratyaksha*), inference (*Anumana*), elder's statement (*Aptavakya*) alone the examination of objects must be carried out. But Shankara says that one should undertake any inquiry by keeping the intuitive experience (*Saakshi Anuhava*) alone, which exists in all the three states of consciousness, viz.,

waking, dream and deep sleep and which is the substratum for even the valid means of knowledge (*Pramanas*).

Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji has given this peculiar outlook of comprehensive vision of life while explaining the tribasic method of Vedanta i. e., AVASTHAATRAYA. For this the reader is referred to the english introduction to the Sanskrit work Mandukya Rahasya Vivriti by Sri Swamiji. Here he explains the whole range of life which is divided into two parts : That is *Darshana Vritti Avasthaa* (—the states of waking and dream wherein one sees something else) and *Adarshana Vritti Avasthaa* (the state wherein one sees nothing), based on Shankara Bhashya, Mandukya-5.

“दर्शनादर्शनवृत्तयोः तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधलक्षणस्य स्वापस्य तुल्यत्वात्” here Shankara treats both waking and dream as dream since one misconceives Reality in either of them.

In Upanishads the same method is taken as for example in Kena Upanishad - 1/4, it is said as *Vidita and Avidita*- (‘अन्यदेव तद्विदितादधो अविदितादधि 1’); *Moorta and Amoorta* in Brihadaranyaka- 2/3/1 (‘द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चैवामूर्तञ्च 1’)

The same thing is said in Bh. Geeta -15/16- as *Kshara and Akshara* (‘द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च 1’); in Bhagavad Geeta - 13/12 as *Sat and Asat* (‘अनादिमत् परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्मासदुच्यते 1’); - as *Vyakta and Avyakta* in Bh. Geeta-8/18. (‘अव्यक्तादव्यक्तयः सर्वाः प्रभवन्त्यहरागमे 1’) and as *Vyakrita and Avyakrita* in S. Bh.-2/1/27. (‘नामरूपलक्षणेन रूपभेदेन व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन 1’).

Taking these both sides of life (i. e., the whole of life in all its manifested and unmanifested forms) and determining the truth is an important thing in Vedanta. All types of experiences just as

common man's experiences, mystic experiences of various Yogis, Upasakas and so on, are included in Vyakta or Darshana Vritti Avasthaa. And in deep sleep, where there is no appearance of the dualistic world, it is said from the standpoint of waking state which is common to all, that the dualistic world remains in the seed-form, meaning that it disappears for the time being etc. This is called as Avyakta or Adarshana Vritti Avasthaa. It is an undeniable fact that there is no third category of experience. This is comprehensive vision of life. This type of analysis of life is not based on any individual experience. The individual experiences which are gained through effort are bound to time, space and causation factors, but one's own Being which is the substratum of the two states of *Darshana and Adarshana Vritti Avasthaas*, is clearly beyond the dualistic conditions such as space, time, etc. On this firm ground of one's own Being (i. e., the Witnessing principle of life) Shankara's Vedanta is built. Those who have not noticed this pure Being are clearly unable to understand Shankara's heart properly.

This methodology of the tribasic intuitional experience is enough to enable a true seeker to take a stand in his true, essential nature of 'Being' or the Witnessing Self directly and immediately.

VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE AVASTHAAS

The people at large do not have any idea about the viewing of the Avasthaas from four different view points. For this purpose the various aspects of the three states are shown below :

a) *Waking State -*

- (1) From the standpoint of Physical science,
- (2) From the standpoint of Psychology,
- (3) From the standpoint of Religious aspects,

- (4) From the standpoint of Vedantic aspect or the standpoint of the Witnessing principle of life:

b) *Dream State* -

- (1) From the empirical standpoint,
- (2) From the scriptural standpoint,
- (3) From the standpoint of the Witnessing principle,
- (4) From the standpoint of dream itself.

c) *Deep sleep State* -

- (1) From the standpoint of fatigue,
- (2) From the standpoint of the seed-form of the world and Vasanas,
- (3) From the standpoint of causal ignorance,
- (4) From the standpoint of the Intuitive experience of deep sleep.

Now we shall discuss in detail the various standpoints in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER-1

FOUR ASPECTS OF WAKING STATE

I. From the standpoint of physical (i. e., material) Science :

Commonly man assumes that the world or the Universe is existing and I am also existing in this world. From this standpoint, one starts understanding the truth about the outer world. For this, man relies on his sense organs, mind etc. The process of material science runs in three ways, i. e., experiment, observation and inference for the verification of the objects. In this way, modern science has discovered so many wonderful things, such as useful machines etc. To discover the truth of outer objects by using so many methods, now science has come to the conclusion that the electrons, protons and neutrons are the basic units for all things in the world and hence the creation. In this way investigation on the animate beings has resulted in the discovery that the underlying principle of animate beings is cells, genes etc. By this, they have started a new type of genetic science. To the question wherefrom do the things like the nucleus, electrons, the cells, the genes etc., are produced, the scientists have no answer and they explain it away by saying that they are there naturally. Then, naturally for these things to function the apriori concepts of time and space are required. Then, if they are further questioned as to how time and space have come into existence, then they dismiss it away by saying that these questions are concerned to metaphysics. In other words, they admit that these questions are beyond their sphere.

All these are the barest description of the material science which pertains to the outer things alone.

Some thinkers of metaphysics hold the view that all the above said Universe is regulated by time, space and causation factor. So these people have started to think over the nature of time and space—what is time, and what is space? In brief, there are three types of opinions :

i) 'Space' means the distance which is there between two things, and the 'Time' means the intervening period between two occurrences (events).

ii) Some hold the view that the above contention is wrong, because to assert 1, 2, 3, etc., there must be space or time which continues eternally. For example, things which are side by side or existing in space can be called 1, 2, 3 etc. Here the things are in the space. So the existence of the space is not proved through the things. But the space is the substratum for the things to exist. Then only we will be able to count the things as 1, 2, 3 etc. The same principle will have to be applied to the time factor also i. e., without the substratum of time, there will be no counting of series of events. Thus the above contention as in (i) is not correct.

iii) Some other Western philosophers say that the concept of time and space are the apriori notions of the mind—meaning, whenever the function of the mind starts, inevitably, it starts with the notion such as time, space and causation etc. The mind holds the view that the time-space factors are eternal. Hence we cannot know 'the Thing in itself' i.e., how the world and the mind are there without these concepts of time & space. The conclusion drawn here is mental concepts. And there is another view also.

From this stand-point they say that time, space and causation and the outer things are all connected to one with the other relatively. Here there is no absolute thing in this world. This is the theory of relativity. And they infer that apart from this phenomenon of the world which is totally in the relative field there may be "Noumenon" (absolute principle) and it may be the God (= the great Geometer). This final conclusion is drawn by Einstein.

All these types of thinkings regarding meta physics do not provide final conclusion regarding the world with time, space and causation.

II. From the standpoint of Psychology :

These people have shifted their field of enquiry from the outer world to the knowing mind. They study the nature of the mind and the kinds of thoughts etc. Here also, probably they examine the minds of other people and animals. This is the study of objective mind. Just as one's own mind is evident through direct intuition, others mind is not so evident directly but can only be inferred. Through these inferences they have classified them (nature of mind etc.) as child psychology, animal psychology etc. In this theory, they hold the view that the mind itself is consciousness. They also have to accept the concepts of time, space and causation to determine the nature of the mind. Even though it is useful in our daily life providing relief from mundane problems, yet they are unable to determine the real nature of time, space, causation and the world.

III. From the standpoint of religious aspects :

The religious ideas say that there is a Soul i.e., Jiva. He who owns the body, mind and the senses is this Jiva. This Soul is

capable of controlling the mind, sense organs and the body. And that this Soul is quite different from this gross body. Being a doer, he has to reap the consequences of his actions, good or bad, in this world or in other worlds.

Probably these beliefs are based on the utterances of various scriptures like Veda, Puranas, Granthasahib, Bible, Quran etc. These ideas are more subjective than the above two views. Here also, they accept the existence of many Souls, and existence of God, quite separate from the world and the Souls, as the creator, sustainer and destroyer of this Universe. When they say that the doer has to reap the fruits of his own actions, they automatically accept the concepts of time, space and causation. In this viewpoint also the final conclusion regarding the real nature of the world, time, space and causation is not possible.

IV. From the standpoint of Vedanta :

In Vedanta Shastra, it is said that the whole Universe is restricted to the waking state. To explain: the phenomenon of the Universe is divided into three planes :

i) *The Divine plane*—the sun, the moon, the planets, billions of stars etc., and also other worlds like heaven etc.—this group is called as divine plane or *Aadhidaivika prapancha*.

ii) *The Material plane*—the material world which is the conglomeration of the five elements—space (akasha), air, fire, water and earth, all inventions of material science, the physical bodies of all creatures etc.,—this group is called as material plane or *Aadhibhoutika prapancha*.

iii) *The Corporeal plane*—the body, the vital force, organs

of action, sense organs, the mind, the intellect, feelings of sufferings and enjoyments and including the 'I-sense' or Me-notion i. e., the idea of 'I'—this group from body to ego is called as corporeal plane or *Aadhyaatmika prapancha*.

The ideas of infinite time, space, causation are also to be included in the phenomenon of the Universe.

According to the Vedanta the whole of the above said Universe with all its multiplicity together with the concepts of infinite time, space and causation is restricted to the waking state alone. Thus Sri Shankara explains the nature of the Universe itself in his Sutra Bahashya—1/1/2, as follows: "..... this Universe that is manifested through name and form ('अस्य जगतः नामरूपाभ्यां व्याकृतस्य'), that is associated with diverse agents and experiences ('अनेककर्तृभोक्तृसंयुक्तस्य'), that provides the support for actions and results having well-regulated space, time and causation ('प्रतिनियतदेशकालनिमित्तक्रियाफलाश्रयस्य') and that defies all thoughts about the real nature of its creation ('मनसापि अचिन्त्यरचनारूपस्य').....".

Whenever the waking state appears, all the above said phenomenon appear simultaneously or co-eval. The Witnessing principle of life i. e., the Self which is beyond Me-notion is the substratum of the appearance of waking state. The aspirant has to realise that 'as I am the witness of the waking state (including the 'Me-notion'), in me the waking state occurs'. This is same as in the case of dream state. Before the occurrence of the dream, one's own Being is there (in deep sleep), and in that being the whole dream state occurs, with all its phenomena as described for the waking state such as the divine plane, material plane, corporeal plane, the concepts of time, space, causation etc. The waking

also is to be observed as the same case. When the aspirant observes this, at the time of observation he takes his stand in his true nature of the Witnessing principle of life and loses the wrong identification with the waking ego as well as with the dream ego. This Being is not only the substratum of the waking state but there is no other source for this waking state apart from this Being. Hence the conclusion that arises is that pure Being itself appears in the garb of waking state without forfeiting his true nature. So this form is described as 'VAISHVAANARA PADA' (विश्वानर पाद) in Mandukya Mantra No.—3. Here the Atman is called *Vaishvaanara* and it is described as having seven limbs (the divine plane is the head; the sun is the eye; fire is the mouth; space is the waist; water as the bladder ; and the earth as the feet) and 19 mouths (five organs of actions, five sense organs, five praanas or vital forces, four forms of antahkarana i.e., Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankaara), because He is the Witnessing principle of all the Universe consisting of the knower, means of knowledge and the object of knowledge, encompassed by the waking state.

An objection is raised here by the Bhashyakara that the Self who is the innermost and beyond the 'I-notion' (i. e., the individual Self), how do all these concern to him? (or belong to him?), because the Self is restricted to a particular body.

For this objection Shankara replies in his Bhashya thus:

“नैष दोषः ; सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य साधिदैविकस्य अनेनात्मना चतुष्पात्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । एवञ्च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः । सर्वभूतस्थश्च आत्मा एको दृष्टः स्यात् सर्वभूतानि च आत्मनि । अन्यथा हि स्वदेहपरिच्छिन्न एव प्रत्यगात्मा सांख्यादिभिरिव दृष्टः स्यात् ; तथा च सति अद्वैतमिति श्रुतिकृतो विशेषो न स्यात् ।.....

[Mandukya Bhashya—3].

The meaning of this Bhashya statement is that "all the dualistic phenomena of the whole waking state including the *Divine plane* should be taken as an adjunct to the innermost Self (and not the individual Self with the limiting adjunct of the body and senses is referred to here). By this one can sublimate or falsify the waking state and realise the non-dual nature of the Self and he can see all the creatures in him and in all the creatures himself. This type of non-dual nature which is described in Upanishads (Isha—6) and Geeta—6/29 will be realised only by taking the "Self i. e., the Witnessing Atman" as conditioned by the associate of the whole phenomenon of the waking state. Then only this right vision of non-dual realisation takes place. It is on this supposition alone, that he can be identified as Brahman really, the conditioning Universe being shown to be only an appearance. Otherwise if we hold the view that the Self is separate in each body, then we will come to the conclusion of the Kapila Sankhya doctrine which is a sophisticated dualism. And if it be so taken, Advaita—the unique teaching of the Shrutis, would be missed." From this standpoint Vedanta discerns the nature of the Universe as Brahman. When one does not know the true nature of Brahman he mistakes the Brahman as the Universe.

How to realise the true nature of Brahman

To realise the true nature of Brahman here five steps are adopted according to the methodology of Vedanta i.e., *Superimposition and Rescission*.

i) Elaborating, the superimposed waking state as a whole—the superimposed factors (i.e., *Vaishvanarapada* etc.) are first described in a precise and comprehensive manner, as depicted above.

ii) Pointing out the true nature of the Self as beyond the waking state and bereft of the waking state and untouched by the waking state on the firm ground of the comprehensive vision of life based on Universal acceptance i. e., by discriminative analysis of "constancy and variability" i. e., by noting the continuity of persistence of the Atman in all the three states as the residual factor (*Anvaya*) and adventitious & ephemeral nature of the waking state, the not-self, as the differentiating factor (*Vyatireka*).¹

iii) The Self is the substratum of the waking state and there is no other source apart from this true nature of the Self for the waking state i. e., the very existence of the waking state itself is borrowed from the true nature of the pure Being which is the Self. So, there is no independent existence of the waking state apart from the Self. This is evident for all that one's own being is continuing in deep sleep state bereft of waking state, while there is no experience as such apart from one's own being, of the existence of the waking state. Hence the waking state is mere appearance and the Self is the essence and the only truth.

iv) Whenever the waking state occurs in the Self, it is pervaded by the Self completely just as the *Vinayaka* (गणेश or गरुडमूर्ति) that appears in the clay (i.e., which is made up of clay) is fully pervaded by the clay. When one sees this 'all-pervasiveness' of the Self, then for him the waking state is falsified.

v) The final stage is the firm conviction that the all-pervading consciousness is the only Reality. At this time the aspirant intuitively discerns the non-dual nature of Brahman as his own Self. When we discriminate the waking state and its substratum i. e., the Self and

1. For details about this *Anavaya-Vyatireka Tarka*, the reader is referred to my book, "Direct Means of Self-knowledge."

draw the judgement or conclusion as said above, we will realise that even when we had taken the view that there is the world and there is the Self—only the non-dual Self remains. In the example of the *Vinayaka* made of clay mentioned above, the clay and the *Vinayaka* are not two separate entities, the clay itself is appearing in the form of *Vinayaka*. Hence, the clay is non-dual one even though it appears in the form of *Vinayaka*. Similarly the Self appears in the form of waking state without undergoing any change in his true nature. So there is no real distinction such as the Self is one and the waking state is the second. So the Self is non-dual one.

All these discriminating activities pertain to the 'Me-notion' alone. When we have lost the identification with the 'I-notion' and take a stand in the true nature of our Being, then there is no complaint regarding the word or concept of waking state. At this stage, we will realise the non-duality of the Self. For this purpose *Vaishvaanaratva* (वैश्वानरत्व) is attributed on Self i. e., to remove the notion of individuality the Vedanta has attributed the *Vaishvaanarahood* on the Self. After that, pointing out the non-dual nature of the Self, the previous attribution of *Vaishvaanarahood* is also removed. At this stage, the *Vaishvaanara* himself remains as *Turiya* (तुरीय). This is said by Shankara in this connection. 'When one cognises that the whole waking state resides in me, and I am the substratum of the waking world, then he will realise the non-dual nature of the Self as well as the cession of the waking world'.—

“एवं च सति सर्वप्रपञ्चोपशमे अद्वैतसिद्धिः, सर्वभूतस्थश्चात्मा
एको दृष्टः स्यात्, सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।”]

[*Mandukya Bhashya*—3]

The Vedantic viewpoint is most subjective and relies on the Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. Hence, the conclusion that arises through this method remains unshaken. All other Sciences do not have this idea of the Witnessing principle of life which is the substratum of the whole waking state. So this fourth viewpoint of examining the waking state, from the standpoint of Vedantic teaching is quite unique one.

CHAPTER-II

FOUR ASPECTS OF DREAM STATE

I. Dream state from the empirical i. e., waking standpoint:

Everyone thinks that 'I am in this world; I work here ; after sometime I will get tired and so I go to sleep to take rest, and in sleep, I get dream occasionally; when I wake up I remember the dream and so the dreams are only illusory appearances due to Vasanas and so on.' In Vedanta, this view is first accepted and described as follows :

According to Vedanta, the heart is the residence of our mind, and the brain is the office room from where it acts and deals with all the transactions of daily life. When we wake up, the mind comes to the brain and takes all the sense organs and the body in its possession and starts daily transactions. When body and senses are tired, then mind wants to take rest and thus one wants to go to sleep. Here, the mind withdraws all the faculties of the sense organs such as seeing, hearing etc., and slowly it starts descending from brain to heart, which is its residence. It descends through subtle nerves which are called *Nadis*. This is said in Briha. Upanishad—4/3/20 and in Prasna Upanishad, it is described in fourth Prasna that the mind withdraws along with all the faculties of sense organs and descends through *Nadis*. While descending from brain to heart in the middle, the mind is forcibly stopped by other *Nadis* carrying juices such as blue, white, pink, green etc. When the mind gets into this obstacle, it stops in the middle —

in between the brain and the heart. In Patanjala Yoga Shastra, it is said that at this point the mind remains in the region of the neck. They hold the view that dream takes place when the mind comes to this region. In Kaivalya Upanishad also it is described in a similar manner. When the mind is thus stopped, the impressions start emerging. In this stage, the mind starts throwing images according to impressions. This is described in Prasna Upanishad—4/5 and Brihadaranyaka Upanishad—4/3/9 to 20.

When the red juice which is endowed with sunlight (*Sourena Tejasa*.) comes out of the Nadi which is called *Pitta*, it overwhelms all other Nadis. In this stage, the dream ceases to exist. When mind is released from the clutches of Vasanas by the above event then it goes to the heart and it enters in *Puritat* (पुरीतत्) i. e., the cover of the heart and then it goes in to the middle part of the heart where there is a space of the area of thumb. When the mind reaches this *Hridayaakaasha* (हृदयाकाश), the space of the heart, there it merges. This is called as 'deep sleep'. This is the process of going to sleep from the waking via dream (Refer 'Prasna—4/6, Briha.—4/3/20 and Sutra Bhashya—3/2/7). When the mind merges, then the Jiva or the Soul remains in his true nature of Brahman and this is also described in Brahma-Sutra Bhashya—3/2/7-ब्रह्म तु अनपायिसुप्तिस्थानम् ।

Sometimes, when Jiva comes from sleep to waking, in the middle also he can have the dreams according to the above process in the Nadis. So the dream is possible to be experienced in both the ways.

This is the first viewpoint of the dream which is described in the Vedanta. Here it is accepted that the dream state occurs. So this is called as empirical viewpoint. From this standpoint the

dream is due to Vasanas and it is a false appearance, while the waking is real. We can reconcile some other sciences just as Ayurveda which says that the dreams occur due to irregularity of the food etc., due to imbalance of Vata (वायु), Pitta (पित्त) and Kapha (कफ). In psychological investigations they have also taken the view that the same mind which functions in the waking state, enjoys the dreams. Recently they have started recording the dream state through the E. E. G. which graphs on the screen. From this we can understand that according to Vedānta also which says that the dream occurs due to mind-vibrations in the Nadis through the brain and the above E.E.G., confirms this view also which records these vibrations. It must be noted that this viewpoint of the Vedānta is from the empirical standpoint only. Thus we can reconcile all the sciences which observe the dream state from the waking standpoint only.

II. From the Scriptural standpoint (i. e., from the point of view of Religion) or Vaidika Vyavahaara Drishti :

In the view of religion, one should accept the existence of the Soul apart from the gross body. The Nihilists or the Athiests won't agree with this point. They say that the consciousness is a byproduct of the five gross elements. So apart from the body and the mind there is nothing like Soul as such which has to take rebirth & nothing is left to enjoy the other worlds after death because, there is no proof for the existence of the Soul apart from the psycho-physical complex. Only on the ground of blind belief, relied on the utterances of the scriptures, we have to accept the existence of the Soul. This is the standpoint of the athiests. Previously this argument was called as *Chāruvākavāda*. But in the scriptures it has been admitted that there is a Soul which

departs from this body and takes rebirth or enjoys in the other worlds such as heaven etc. What is the proof to accept the existence of the Soul? For this crucial question, Vedānta has given the satisfactory answer which is based on the Universal acceptance of the experience of the dream:

In Brihadāranyaka Upanishad, the sage Yājñavalkya teaches the king Janaka that all the dealings of the mind and body etc., take place in the light of the Self-effulgent Self which is every one's true nature 'आत्मनैवायं ज्योतिपास्ते पल्ययते कर्म कुरुते विपल्येतीति' Briha.—4/3/6. When the Soul remains in this body, his all dealings are dealt in the light of this Self. After departing from this body, the same Soul takes another body or goes to heavenly worlds etc. and enjoys there according to his meritorious actions here and suffers according to demeritorious actions here. At this stage Janaka asks the question : Why do we have to accept the existence of the Soul apart from the gross body and the mind ? What is the proof for such an existence apart from the utterances of the Shāstra or should we simply believe because it is said in the Shastras ?

For this the sage Yājñavalkya's reply is : "Everyone experiences the dream. In dream state he himself is there. He, the dreamer, deals with all the conscious dealings such as hearing, seeing, thinking etc. but he has not been followed by this gross body in the dream state i. e., he has not taken this body there. This gross body will lie along the bed while he is dreaming. So one should accept that apart from this gross body, his existence is there. He feels during the dream time that he has got a body. This shows that the Soul can take another body after the death. This dream-experience is an indication to assert that the Soul is different from this gross body and that he may take another body

and that he may enjoy other worlds. Probably his dream will be according to Vāsanās or impressions that he gathers while performing actions in this waking world. While this is commonly experienced by all, there may be different types of dreams also, though rarely. By this we can assume that 'as he sows, so he reaps'. According to this, the merit and demerit and the consequences of these actions become acceptable. So all these religious points are supported on the 'Universal acceptance' of the dream in Vedānta. By this it is proved that one has to observe the morality in our life here. Thus Vedānta supports the religious ideas by giving the Universal experience of dream :

- a) *Existence of Soul apart from the body.*
- b) *Soul taking rebirth.*
- c) *Existence of other worlds like heaven and hell etc.*
- d) *The necessity of leading austere life here, etc.*

Though the dream itself is not rebirth, it indicates the possibility of rebirth (Briha. Bhāshya—4/3/8).

This is the second view point regarding the dream state which supports the *Vaidika-vyavahāra* i.e., scriptural dealings.

In other religions like Christianity and Islam, though they do not accept the previous births and rebirths, they say that the Soul after departing from this body rests eternally in the heaven or hell according to his meritorious and demeritorious works. He who follows the religious sacred duties and who does not follow, for both of them the haven and the hell will be permanent abodes respectively. To believe this also they have to accept the existence of the Soul apart from this gross body. To accept this, there is

no sound evidence as it is in this *Sanātana Vaidika Dharma*. The existence of the Soul shown on the firm ground of Universal acceptance of the dream experience is found only in the Upanishads which belong to the *Sanātana Vaidika Dharma* i. e., Vedas. But the experience which is shown here is Universal. So the merit of showing the existence of the Soul inevitably goes to the *Sanātana Vaidika Dharma*.

This is the second viewpoint of the dream state.

III. Dream state from the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life i. e., SAAKSHI :

In the first viewpoint i. e., *Loukika Vyavahāra Drishti*, it is accepted that the man or *Purusha* is known predominantly from the viewpoint of the body while sleeping. But in the second-standpoint it is shown that the man is really not the gross body; he is a Soul who resides in this gross body and that he takes rebirth etc. In this third view we have to change the standpoint from Ego to Witness. So it is the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life. To understand this, the following points should be remembered ;

a) As I am the witness of the 'Ego-sense' or 'Me-notion' and as my nature is the pure-Being, in me the dream state arises.

b) In that dream, the 'Me-notion', which is conditioned by that state appears with its respective world. So, I am quite different from the Ego or 'Me-notion' of the dream state.

c) As it is dealt with in previous chapter regarding the waking state, one should remember that 'as I am pure Being and as I am the substratum, in me the waking state arises with its full retinue i. e., ego and the world'.

d) Hence I am the substratum of these two states.

Holding this viewpoint, the conclusions which are drawn in Vedānta are as follows :

i) The Self, who is the Witness and the substratum of these two states is untainted by these two states.

ii) The self-effulgent Self by whose light the dream and the waking states are illumined is ever free from these two states.

iii) He is non-dual because there is no other source for these two states and He is one who pervades both the states.

iv) Though from the empirical viewpoint the waking is real and the dream is unreal (because this dream occurs due to Vasanas), holding this view also the self-effulgent Self is the illuminer of these two states. As He is the illuminer, He is the transcendental reality i. e., really real. From this really real standpoint, both the states are equally unreal, because they are of adventitious and ephemeral nature, in the Self, while the Self is the constant truth i. e., unchanging reality.

These four conclusions are drawn in Bhāshya in various places. For the present we shall give some excerpts from the Shankara's Bhāshya, Kathopanishad—2/1/4—(SVAPNĀNTAM JĀGARITĀNTAM) ; the significance of the above mantra is explained by Shankara in his Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/6, while showing the Shrouta Tarka—

“स्वप्नान्तबुद्धान्तयोः उभयोः इतरेतारव्यभिचारात् आत्मनः
अनन्वागतत्वम् ।”

—The waking and the dream states when they appear, one necessarily cancels the very existence of the other, but the Atman

being the very substratum of these two states remains ever untainted by them.

In Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya—1/ 4/10, Shankara says,

“तया अविपरिलुप्तया नित्यया दृष्ट्या स्वरूपभूतया स्वयं ज्योतिः
समाख्यया इतरामनित्यां दृष्टिं स्वप्रान्तबुद्धान्तयोर्वासनाप्रत्ययरूपां
नित्यमेव पश्यन् दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा भवति ।”

—meaning, “Through that unfailing eternal vision, which is identical with It and is called the self-effulgent light, the Self always sees the other, transitory vision in the dream and waking states, as impressions (Vāsanās) and perceptions respectively, and becomes the seer of sight.”

In this third viewpoint, it is taken here as the dream is due to Vasanas or latent impressions, while the waking is a real perception from the Vyāvahārika standpoint.

“अपि च स्मृतिरेषा (तद्वासनाविशिष्टः) यत् स्वप्रदर्शनम्, उपलब्धुं
जागरितदर्शनम्।”

—Sutra Bhashya—2/2/29

This empirical assumption is taken for granted here to denote that real nature of the Self is untainted by these two states. And in Brihadāranyaka Upanishad—4/3/8 to 18, the following subjects are dealt with :

i) The dream is the illustration for the rebirth,

ii) *The nature of the Self* who is the Witness of both the dream and waking states, is *Self-effulgent* one, here it is called as SVAYAMJYOTI (‘अत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयं ज्योतिर्भवति’ Briha.—4/3/9). Though in waking state also the nature of the Self is self-effulgent one, reference to the dream state will clearly show the self-effulgent

nature of the Self. Because one may 'think' that in waking state, there are some other lights just like the sun, the moon, etc. But in dream state all these lights are absent. And one has seen the things in the dream state through one's own light. Not only this, but the whole dream state is grasped through one's own nature of pure consciousness. That nature of pure consciousness is the self-effulgent Self. So in this connection this word 'light' or 'effulgence' denotes the nature of consciousness alone and not in an ordinary sense like light, darkness etc. This nature of consciousness, seeing the darkness and light, is merely seeing the effects of right and wrong deeds ('दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं च पापं च'—4/3/16). Thus, the nature of the Self is taught through this superimposition of Self-effulgence.

iii) And also that the *nature of the Self is untainted*. For, the words used in these mantras are 'ASANGO HYAYAM PURUSHAHA' (-असङ्गो ह्ययम् पुरुषः —Briha—4/3/15). He, the Self, has no taint of perceptions which occur in the waking state as well as no taint of Vāsanās which appear in dream state because the Vāsanās pertain to Antahakarana alone, and not to the Self. This is clearly stated In Briha. Bhāshya—2/3/6.

iv) *The Self is non dual one*. This is shown by using the words 'EKAHAMSAHA' (-हिरण्यम् पुरुषः एकहंसः—Briha—4/3/11 and 4/3/12) and the words 'EKA DRASHTĀ ADVAITA' (एकं द्रष्टा अद्वैत—Briha.—4/3/32). This non-dual nature of the Self is to be understood in two ways :

a) The same Self is the substratum for both the states and there is no other source for these two states.

b) There is no real distinction such as the Self is one and the state is the second, because whenever a state appears in the Self, it is fully pervaded by the Self and the Self is the reality and

the state is a false appearance due to Avidya. So the Self is ever non-dual one.

All these are dealt within the above third point and all these are shown in Brihadāranyaka—4/3/8 to 18. Through this teaching, the aspirant realises his true nature and takes his stand in the self thereby falsifying both the states. This is the utility of this viewpoint.

IV. Observing the dream from the standpoint of the dream state itself:

Probably everyone thinks that the waking state is real & the dream state is false. Taking this view also one can realise his true nature through the pretext of these states. But, it is very difficult to think regarding the dream state from the standpoint of the dream experience as it was exactly. This thinking requires rigorous indispassionate thinking. The thinker should give up the ideas regarding the dream which are there in his present waking mind. If one is ready to take up this task of indispassionate thinking, then only he can understand the following arguments.

For the present to understand clearly this fourth standpoint regarding dream, we shall show here two types of arguments :

a) The arguments regarding the dream state from the standpoint of waking state.

i) In waking state, there is a continuity of time. So if we take up any work, we will finish little by little in due course, for example construction of house etc. But the dream-time has no continuity. When dream disappears, at once everything will vanish. The above example of construction of house etc., will vanish when the dream state disappears. So the waking is real and dream is false.

ii) The waking world is common to all but the dream, as it is an individual experience, is different for different persons. So waking is real and dream is false.

iii) The things that appear in waking are real for ever and hence we try to accumulate and keep for future use, whereas the things that we see in dream state are not so. For example, one may get a huge sum of money as lottery in dream, but that will not come to the waking state. But whereas when we earn something in waking state, that continues to serve us for future time also.

iv) The waking world is regulated by rigorous rules and regulations of time, space and causation. So we can find things here as they are, for example, a man as a man only, animal as animal, a dead person will never come back to life etc. While in dream state there is no regulation of time, space, causation etc., and the things will change in very strange manner. For example a man may fly like a bird, dead man can be seen as alive in dream etc., and vice versa. So, due to Vasanas (latent impressions), dream appears in a wild manner. And hence the waking is real and dream is unreal.

All other sciences like Psychology, Medical science, Upāsana Shāstras etc., confirm the above idea that the dream is a Vāsāna and a subordinate state to the waking state. In Shankara's Bhāṣhya also it is said that the dreams are indications for the happenings in waking world, good or bad. Brahma Sutra Bhāṣhya—2/1/14 :

तथा च श्रुतिः - 'यदा कर्मसु काम्येषु स्त्रियं स्वप्नेषु पश्यति। समृद्धिं तत्र जानीयात्तस्मिन् स्वप्ननिदर्शने' - इति असत्येन स्वप्नदर्शनेन सत्यायाः समृद्धेः प्रतिपत्तिं दर्शयति । तथा प्रत्यक्षदर्शनेषु केषुचित् अरिष्टेषु जातेषु 'न चिरम् इव जीविष्यति इति विद्यात्', इत्युक्त्वा 'अथ

स्वप्नाः, पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं हन्ति' इत्यादिना तेन तेन असत्येन एव स्वप्नदर्शनेन सत्यं मरणं सूच्यते इति दर्शयति। प्रसिद्धं च इदं लोके अन्वयव्यतिरेककुशलानाम् ईदृशेन स्वप्नदर्शनेन साध्वागमः सूच्यते, ईदृशेन असाध्वागमः इति ।''

(and refer to Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/3 & 3/2/4 also).

In all these places Shankara explains that the dream is due to Vasānās. In Mandukya—4 & Brihādaranyaka also, the same argument is put forth by the Āchārya. Hence, the dream is a false appearance and waking is the real one. It being so, arguing with the idea that the dream and waking are equal and both are unreal is absurd. These are the arguments from the standpoint of the waking regarding the dream.

b) Arguments regarding dream state from the standpoint of dream experience alone :

i) From the stand point of waking intellect, we have kept the name as *dream* to that state. But strictly speaking, no one feels while dreaming that 'that it is a dream', no one will know the unreality of the dreaming state while they are in dream state or while they are dreaming. Every one feels there—'this is the real state'. So calling by the name as dream, itself is due to the bias towards waking state. But dream experience says that 'I am not dreaming at all, I am the true waking in my realm.' From the standpoint of waking state you may say that It is a dream, but from the standpoint of actual experience of the dream state, it is true waking.

ii) The waking intellect objects that the continuity of time is there in the waking state, while it is not so is dream state. After waking, the time concept which was in the dream has not continued

in the waking state. So the concept of time in the dream is unreal. This is the objection. For this the reply is that in dream state, the concept of time was eternal, infinite and real. There also in the dream we feel thousands of years of span of time as real. Thus in the dream state, the concept of time is real. The main objection is that this time-series of the dream has not continued in the waking state. If we were to see vice-versa then we can say the infinite concept of time which is concerned to the waking state, is also not continued in the dream. So, we have to agree with the point that the concept of continuity of time is restricted only to the respective states alone. There is no common denominator of time or space between these two states. So, the feeling of continuity of time is not a criterion to determine the reality.

iii) The dream-world is also common to all people who have appeared in the dream state. If we had started the Vedantic discussion in our dream, we will raise all the above points regarding dream state. Because, during the dream, inevitably we hold the view that it is true waking. From that standpoint we say there also that 'this waking world is common to all of us. But the dream is an individual experience'. So, the waking world is common to waking people and dream world is common to dream people.

iv) The things which appear in the dream state are useful in that state. The things which pertain to waking state are useful in waking state alone. The things which are seen in dream state are termed as unreal because these things are not seen in our daily life—this was the objection. For this we say, "Why should we not say that the waking things are not useful in the dream and therefore, they are also unreal?" So the utility of the things and the concept of reality of the things are restricted to the respective states alone.

v) The objection raised here was that the waking world has got rigorous rules and regulations while the dream is uncertain. For this we say that in the waking state the rules and regulations are real and these are restricted to the waking state alone. So the reality of these things are here alone. While we are staying in dream, the strange thing which appear to have occurred in dream appears to be real and natural in that dream state. For example, the aeronauts go beyond the orbit of the earth, and in that outer space they float easily in the space because there is no gravitational force to draw them or pull them down. The same aeronaut, when comes back to the earth has to follow the rules and regulations of the gravitational force of the earth. As the rules and regulations of the gravitation do not govern in the space beyond the gravitational pull of the earth, so also with the case of dream and waking. Hence the rules and regulations are not the criterion for reality.

All other sciences like Medical science, Psychology, Upāsanā-Shāstras, Omens about good or bad etc., are all based on the biased view of waking state. So their conclusion is not sufficient to determine the reality, that which is really real.

To understand all the above counter arguments regarding dream and waking states, the aspirant should observe that as his true nature is the Witness of these two states, substratum, Self-elffulgent & untainted by these two states, in that Self the waking and dream states appear and disappear, i. e., the nature of the states are of adventitious and ephemeral nature. So he realises that "in me (as I am the substratum) the dream state appears and the same is the case with the waking and hence these two appearances are equal for me". The feeling that the waking is real and the dream is due to Vāsanās is only from the waking state. The mind clinging to the waking state alone is the cause of all

these ideas or feelings. This judgement is drawn from the standpoint of the true nature of the Self which is transcendental reality. From this standpoint, waking and dream are equal. The reader is referred to—

Māndukya Kārikā—2/4 to 2/10 with commentary on these karikas in MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIHI and Māndukya Kārikā—4/31 to 4/41 with Shankara's commentary and MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIHI. Here Sri Gaudapada argues in the following manner :

Commonly people hold the view that the Vasanas (latent impressions) of the waking state is the cause for the dream. By this it is meant that the waking state is the cause and the dream is the effect. How is it possible to believe that the real cause produces an unreal effect? Sometimes people hold the view that the dream is the cause and the waking, the effect; for example, one may say that "I saw a tiger in my dream which was ready to pounce on me. At once I feared and after waking also the fear and shivering in the body were continuing." Here the dream was the cause, the shivering etc., are the effects which pertain to the waking. Here also we ask the question how can the unreal cause produce the real effect? If one were to say that both the states are real, then, there will be no cause and effect relation between the two. If one were to hold the view that both are unreal, then to accept the cause and effect principle is absurd. So in all the viewpoints it is said that the waking and dream are both false appearances and both are unreal. So between false appearances no one will accept one to be the cause and the other the effect. So all the relationships or the causation-ships between these two states

are imagined from the point of the waking intellect only.

Here, we have not set out to prove that waking is also unreal just like dream, but the true intention of this argument is to assert or confirm the transcendental reality which is the Self, is itself the essence of these two states. So to teach the nature of the Self, we have taken these two false appearances namely waking and dream. This is clearly said in Māndukya Kārikā from 2/11 to 2/18.

The argument of Sri Gaudapada regarding the unreality of the waking state is quite unlike the Buddhist's arguments. Buddhists rely on the waking intellect alone and they want to show the unreality of the waking state through the very same intellect. But in Vedānta we have relied on the firm ground of Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision and taken a stand in the Witnessing principle of life and from that firm ground we have shown the equal unreality of both these states. Shankara says in Brahma Sutra Bhashya—2/2/31:

“न हि अयं सर्वप्रमाणप्रसिद्धः लोकव्यवहारः अन्यत् तत्त्वम् अनधिगम्य
शक्यते अपह्नोतुम्, अपवादाभावे उत्सर्गप्रसिद्धेः ।”

—The practical dealings of the waking state which are based on all the authorities of the means of right knowledge are impossible to be denied or negated unless and until one has not shown the other type of reality which transcends all the empirical dealings. Because if there is no exception, the general rule alone stands there.

According to this rule, Vedāntins have shown the transcendental reality which is the Self of all. On that firm ground they have negated the reality of the waking state. So it is quite unlike the Buddhistic view.

From the empirical standpoint, meaning from the standpoint of Adhyāropa, we accept the reality of the waking state compared to the dream state. But from the standpoint of the transcendental reality only we say that both the states are unreal. For this the reader is referred to Brahma Sutra Bhashya—3/2/4 .

“न विषदादि सर्गस्य अपि आत्यन्तिकं सत्यत्वमस्ति । प्रतिपादितं हि ‘तदनन्यत्वम् आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः- इत्यत्र समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम् । प्राक् तु ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शनात् विषदादिप्रपञ्चो व्यवस्थितरूपः भवति, सन्ध्याश्रयस्तु प्रपञ्चः प्रतिदिनं बाध्यते, इत्यतः वैशेषिकमिदं मायामात्रत्वमुदितम् ।”

“...Yet the creation of space etc., also has no absolute reality; for, under the aphorism the effect is non-different from the cause, where the terms like ‘origin’ etc., are met with (Sutra Bhashya—2/1/14), we showed that the whole creation is but Māyā (illusory). But before realization of the identity of the Self with Brahman, creation counting from space etc., continues just as it is, whereas the creation within dream is abrogated everyday. Hence the statement that dream is merely Māyā has a special significance.”

An objection :

One ardent student of Shankara Vedanta had questioned regarding this problem of dream and waking as follows :

In all the Prasthanātraya Bhāshyas regarding the dream state Shankara asserts that the dream is a Vāsanā (i. e., dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking) and the waking is real. For example in Māndukya mantra—4 (= मनस्तद्वासनारूपा च स्वप्ने), in Sutra Bhāshya, in Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya, in Chāndogya Bhāshya etc. Thus in about 95 percent of the Bhāshyas, this view is stated. While commenting on the Gaudapāda’s kārīkās alone,

especially in chapters 2 & 4, he argues that both the states are equal and both are unreal. Is it not a contradictory statement?

Supposing that Sri Gaudapāda is his Grandguru and he knows the Vedāntic tradition well and so he is called SAMPRADĀYAVIT (अत्रोक्तं वेदान्तार्थसम्प्रदायविद्भिराचार्यैः—Sutra Bhāshya—2/1/9) and so Shankara has not dealt against the grandguru in his Mandukya kārikā Bhāshya, then also the question arises that where is the voucher to Sri Gaudapāda to argue that both the states are equally unreal according to Upanishad?

Answer to the above objection :

It is true that Sri Shankara has said in most parts of the Bhāshyas that the dream is caused by the latent impressions of the waking as e.g. Shankara writes: “तद्वासनाविशिष्टः स्वप्नान् पश्यन् मनःशब्दवाच्यो भवति”—Sutra Bhāshya—1/1/9—that the Jīva goes to the dream state taking the mental impression & is called by the name of Manas and the waking is real from empirical standpoint. But, does Shankara say anywhere that waking experiences are real from the standpoint of the Ultimate Truth? He has clearly declared from the standpoint of transcendental reality, that the waking is also a false appearance.

i) Refer to Brahma -Sutra Bhāshya which is just stated above:

“न च वियदादिसर्गस्य अपि आत्यन्तिकं सत्यत्वमस्ति । प्रतिपादितं हि ‘तदनन्यत्वम् आरम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः’ इत्यत्र समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम् । प्रकृ तु ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शनात् वियदादिप्रपञ्चः व्यवस्थितरूपः भवति, सन्ध्याश्रयस्तु प्रपञ्चः प्रतिदिनं बाध्यते इति, अतः वैशेषिकम् इदं सन्ध्यस्य मायामात्रत्वम् उदितम् ।”

(Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/4)

—Here he says, “by saying that the dream is illusory or mayic one should not confuse that the waking world is real. It is

not really real, it is also an illusory appearance i. e., *Māyā* due to ignorance (= *मायामात्रत्वम्*). We have dealt with this while commenting on Sutra *Bhāshya*—2/1/14. But from the standpoint of empirical view, unless and until one realises the non-dual Brahman as his own Self, the waking continues to appear to be real with all its rules and regulations, while the dream falsifies every day when one awakes from the dream. For this purpose, we said here that the dream is illusory (= *मायामात्रत्वम्*). When this awareness of Brahman takes place then he realises that the waking state also is only a false appearance." So, Shankara does not accept the dream as due to *Vāsanās* as a final conclusion.

In Upanishad Bhāshyas :

ii) Shankara said in his *Chāndogya Upanishad Bhāshya*—8/5/4, thus ;

“ननु स्वप्ने दृष्टाः प्रतिबुद्धस्यानृता भवन्ति विषयाः । सत्यमेव, जाग्रद्रोधापेक्षन्तु तदनृतत्वं, न स्वतः । तथा स्वप्नरोधापेक्षञ्च जाग्रद्दृष्टविषयानृतत्वं, न स्वतः । प्राक् सदात्मप्रतिबोधात् स्वविषयेऽपि सर्वं सत्यमेव स्वप्नदृष्ट्या इवेति न कश्चिद्विरोधः ।”

—The perception of things in the dream becoming falsified or unreal is caused by the viewpoint of waking knowledge, but not in itself. Similarly, the perception of things in waking state also becoming unreal or falsified is caused by the ‘viewpoint of dream knowledge’ alone, but they are not unreal by themselves. Till we intuit the ultimate reality, both the states during their respective times are real in their own form only; but after our realizing the identity with the ultimate reality both are unreal or illusory, i.e., both are real in the form of Brahman (pure Existence) alone.

In this regard it is not possible to mention any difference whatsoever between, these two states—waking & dream. Thus there is no contradiction.

iii) In Aitareya—(1/3/12) Upanishad, it is said that all the three states are dreams,

“तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्नाः ।”

Shankara clearly comments on this Mantra and takes one objection thus; 'the waking state is endowed with awareness. so how the waking be called as dream?' And he answers thus; “Not so, this waking state is also a dream (Swapna eva). How? In the waking state there is no awareness of the true nature of the Self which is transcendental reality and he sees the not-selves which are not really there, as if they are there just as in dream.” In this sentence, Shankara clearly states the equality of the waking and dream states.

iv) In Taittiriya,—2/8/5-

“स यश्चायं पुरुषे यश्चासावादित्ये स एकः ।” - भाष्यम्-
 “जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरन्यस्य ग्रहणात् सत्त्वमेवेति चेत्, न; अविद्याकृतत्वात् जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः, यदन्यग्रहणं जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोः तदविद्याकृतम्, अविद्याभावे अभावात् ।”

“Objection : Duality has existence because of its perception in the dream and waking states.

Answer: No, for the dream and waking states are creations of ignorance. The perception of duality that occurs in the dream and waking states is the result of ignorance, because it ceases on the cessation of ignorance.”

Here Shankara declares that अविद्याकृतत्वात् जाग्रत् स्वप्नयोः— the waking and dream having both been conjured up by avidya.

v) In Brihadāranyaka Bhāshya—4/3/19—

- “जागरितेऽपि यद्दर्शनं तदपि स्वप्नं मन्यते श्रुतिः। अत आह
‘न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति’ इति। तथा च श्रुत्यन्तरम् - ‘तस्य त्रय
आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्नाः’ इति॥”

—Āchārya Shankara remarks here; The Shruti considers even the experience of waking state to be but dream and hence it says, ‘where one sees no dream whatever’. Another Shruti passage bears this out : ‘He has three abodes, three dream states.’

vi) In Māndukya Upanishad—3 and 4, it is declared that VAISHVĀNARA (वैश्वानरः) and TAIJASA (तैजसः), both have got 19 mouths (एकोनविंशतिमुखः) and 7 limbs (सप्ताङ्गः). Here Shankara has written—

“बहिर्विषया इव प्रज्ञा अविद्याकृता अवभासते..... जाग्रत्प्रज्ञा
अनेकसाधना बहिर्विषया इवावभासमाना मनः स्पन्दनामात्रा सती
etc.”

—i.e., “Consciousness appears, as it were, related to outward objects on account of Avidyā. Waking consciousness, being associated as it is with many means (subject - object relationship, agency, instrumentality etc.), and appearing conscious of objects as if external, though in reality they are nothing but mental existents produced by Avidyā etc.”

vii) In Brihadaranyaka Bhāshya —2/1/18.

“तस्मात् स्वप्ने मृषाध्यारोपिता एव आत्मभूतत्वेन लोका अविद्यमाना
एव सन्तः । तथा जागरितेऽपि- इति प्रत्येतव्यम् ।”

—“Therefore in dreams worlds that never exist are falsely superimposed as being a part of the Self. One must know the worlds experienced in the waking state also to be such.”

On this firm ground of utterances of the Shruti, Sri Gaudapāda has declared that waking and dream are equal. Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmiji has clearly shown this in his English introduction of MĀNDUKYA RAHASYA VIVRITIHI viz.,

“The identity of waking and dream Ātmans—hinted at in the Shruti by the two epithets (सप्ताङ्गः, एकोनविंशतिमुखः) ‘seven-organed’ & ‘ninteen-faced’ (Mantras 3 & 4) and in Agama Prakarana by two epithets (कार्यकारणबद्धौ) ‘bound both by cause & effect and (स्वप्ननिद्राशुतावायी) ‘having both sleep and dream’ —is clarified in the second chapter of the kārīka. In the Sanskrit introduction of the same book he has said that :

“तत्र वैतध्ये तावत् ‘सप्ताङ्ग एकोनविंशतिमुखः’ इति
वैश्वानरतैजसोभयविशेषणसमर्पिकां श्रुतिं व्याश्रित्य स्वप्नजागरितयोः
सर्वसमत्वमुपपादितं प्रपञ्चवैतध्यावगमाय ।”

Hence from the standpoint of transcendental reality which is the true nature of the Self, both the states—waking and dream—are equally false appearances due to ignorance. It is strengthened here in this fourth view-point of the dream state—i.e. examining the dream from the standpoint of the dream experience as it was during the dream time.

CHAPTER-III

FOUR ASPECTS OF DEEP SLEEP STATE

Regarding deep sleep there are four standpoints or viewpoints according Shankara's Bhashyas.

I. From the standpoint of fatigue :

Nidrā (निद्रा) means *Tamoguna* (तमोगुणः) (Gītā Bhāshya—14/8 and 18/39 तमः गुणः सर्वेषां देहवतां..... प्रमादालस्यनिद्राः ताभिस्तत् तमः निबध्नाति). This is from the viewpoint of body. When it is tired by work in its waking state and when the *Tamoguna* acquires the body, then the sense organs will stop their work and the mind wants to merge. In this stage yawning and drowsing etc., will start. This is called as *Nidra* by common people. This is essential to our life, but it should be controlled by observing regulation in food and work etc. [Refer Bhagavat Gītā—6/17]. This modification in the body which occurs due to tiredness etc., is called *Nidrā*. The experience of this *Tamoguna* is observed in the waking state before and after the sleep. This does not pertain to the deep sleep state; it concerns to the waking state alone. But most persons hanker confusion and get confounded regarding this. According to them 'in deep sleep state there is *Tamoguna*; we feel this *Tamoguna* after waking etc.' So one should clearly understand that the experience of *Tamoguna* which occurs before and after sleep is concerned to the body and belongs to waking state. It is not the direct intuitional experience of the deep sleep.

II. From the standpoint of seed-form of world and vaasanaas:

According to the common man's experience, he who sleeps, will himself awaken as he was before. By this experience the seed-form of the ego with vāsānās etc., is there in deep sleep without losing its potentiality of differentiation. Because again it appears in various forms as it was before. This is to be inferred from the standpoint of adhyāropa of Jiva and his states like waking, dream and deep sleep etc. This is accepted by Shankara from the Vyāvahārika standpoint in his Sutra-Bhāshya—2/1/9, particularly in the sentences:

यथा हि सुषुप्तिसमाध्यादौ अपि सत्यां स्वाभाविकाम् अविभागप्राप्तौ मिथ्याज्ञानस्य अनपोदितत्वात् पूर्ववत् पुनः प्रबोधे विभागः भवति, एवम् इहापि भाविष्यति ।”यथा हि अविभागे अपि परमात्मनि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धः विभागव्यवहारः स्वप्नवत् अव्याहतः स्थितः दृश्यते, एवम् अपीतौ अपि मिथ्याज्ञानप्रतिबद्धा एव विभागशक्तिः अनुमास्यते ।”

Just as in *Sushupti* 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. "Just as even in Supreme Ātman without any distinction 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 in the period of dissolution also." And in Sutra-Bhāshya—3/2/9 particularly the sentence :

“अपि च न जीवः नाम कश्चित् परस्मात् अन्यः विद्यते, यः जलबिन्दुः इव जलराशेः सतः विविच्यते । सदेव तु उपाधिसम्पर्कात्

जीवः इति उपचर्यते इति असकृत् प्रपञ्चितम्। सः एव अयम् उपाधिः
स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः बीजाङ्कुरन्यायेन इति अतः स एव जीवः प्रतिबुध्यते
इति युक्तम्।”

—There is no such entity like Jīva, different from the supreme Self, which has to be distinguished from pure existence like a drop of water from a mass of water. It has been shown more than once that pure existence Itself comes to be called indirectly as Jīva, because of the intervention of limiting adjuncts. That very same set of adjuncts persists in deep sleep and waking states on the maxim of the seed and seedling, so that the reasonable position is that the selfsame Jīva wakes up from deep sleep.

This is accepted from the standpoint of Adhyaropa, which means empirical stand point. So the seed-form of vāsanās and potential form of the Antahkarana are accepted in deep sleep according to empirical experience.

Along with the ego the whole waking state merges in the deep sleep and remains there in the seed-form with its potency of diversity. It is said in Māndukya Upanishad—5, particularly in Bhāshya portion :

“तथा रूपापरित्यागेन अविवेकापन्नं नैशतमोग्रस्तमिवाहः प्रपञ्चकम्
एकीभूतमित्युच्यते ।”

—Here Shankara says that the waking and dream states merge here (in Sushupti) without losing their potential form of diversity and they have taken seed-form. This seed-form is called as JAGADBEEJA (जगद्बीजम्), AVYAKTA (अव्यक्तम्) etc. This is the second attribution made by Shāstra from the VAIDIKA-VYAVAVHĀRA DRISHTI.

III. From the standpoint of causal ignorance :

The attribution of causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधमात्रमेव हि बीजम्—G.K.Bh.—1/11) in deep sleep is made from the standpoint of the Vaidika Vyavahāra i.e., with a view that one should get the Self-knowledge ('तुर्ययायात्म्यावधारणार्थम्'—G.K. Bh.—1/11). Though from the standpoint of Shruti and enlightened persons Sushupti is non-dual Self alone, the pure Consciousness alone, it is not Sushupti from their standpoint but from the standpoint of common man, as he is ignorant regarding his true nature of the Self and as he has to obtain the Self-knowledge—from this standpoint the causal ignorance i.e., non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self is attributed to deep sleep. In waking and dream the common man has got the causal ignorance, i.e., non-perception regarding the true nature of the Self as well as the misconception. (See the commentary by Shankara on Māndukya kārikā—1/11). In deep sleep, he has no misunderstanding or wrong identification with the body, mind etc. Though this is the thing, he has no right knowledge regarding his true nature in deep sleep and it is impossible to get the Self-knowledge in deep sleep because of the absence of the mind and the teachings of the Guru and the Shāstra and Sādhana. From this standpoint, it is attributed that in deep sleep, the causal ignorance remains there. So it is said that PRAJNA is bound only by causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रतिबोधमात्रमेव हि बीजम् प्राज्ञत्वे निमित्तम्—G Karika Bh.—1/11). When one cognises his true nature through the teachings of the Guru and the Shāstra, then the previous attribution of the Sushupti will get removed along with the attributions of VĀSANĀBEEJA & JAGADBEEJA (seed-form of the intellect and the world etc.) and the causal ignorance (तत्त्वाग्रहणलक्षणं बीजम्) also will be removed.

At this stage, previously he who was called as PRĀJNA as having seed-form, the same Prajna will be recognised as TURIYA and ever free from all the attributes of seed-form and sprout-form etc. See the particular sentence of Shankara Bhāshya on Māndukya Kārikā—1/2, viz.,

“तामबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादिसम्बन्ध
रहितां पारमार्थिकीं पृथग्वक्ष्यति ।”

“That which is designated as *Prājña* (when it is viewed as the cause of the phenomenal world) will be described as *Turiya* separately when it is not viewed as the cause and when it is free from all phenomenal relationship i. e., in its absolutely real aspect.”

Here Shankara clearly says that the same PRĀJNA is recognised as TURIYA through Viveka. From the standpoint of ignorance only, the seed-form of ignorance (causal Ignorance) and seed-form of the Universe etc., are attributed by the Shāstra for the purpose of teaching. For this reason, Shankara has shown the main differences between the deep sleep and the state of enlightenment i. e., Turiya in his commentary on Gaudapāda kārikā—3/34 & 3/35.

Hence the attributions of the state of Sushupti, Vāsanā-bīja, seed-form of the Universe (*Jagad-bīja*) and causal ignorance (तत्त्वाप्रतिबोध) are all superimposed on the pure nature of the Self from the various standpoints of the waking world for the purposes of teachings alone.

IV. From the standpoint of the direct intuition of the deep sleep:

Now we have to give up the standpoint of the waking state. We have to observe the intuitive experience of the deep sleep. From this standpoint the Shruti describes :

“यत्र सुप्तो न कञ्चन कामं कामयते, न कञ्चन स्वप्नं पश्यति, तत् सुषुप्तम् ।” [Brhadāranyaka—4/3/19 & Māndukya—4]

Here Sushupti means one's own true nature of being bereft of waking and dream. As waking and dream states are false appearances concocted by Avidyā on the true nature of the Self, so also the seed-form of the world etc., are the false imaginations from the standpoint of the waking state. So SUSHUPTI means the true nature of the Self. We have kept the name *Sushupti* on the real Self from the standpoint of the waking state. As that is our true nature, it is impossible to give up the true nature at any cost. It is said by Shankara thus in his Brahma-Sutra Bhāshya—3/2/7 in the sentence;

“अपि च न कदाचिद् जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा संपत्तिर्नास्ति, स्वरूपस्यानपायित्वात्। स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसंपर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिमिवापेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिर्विवक्ष्यते ॥”

—“Besides, there is no time when Jiva has not become one with the Brahman for one's intrinsic nature can never disappear. Only relative to the seeming foreign aspect which he assumes in dream and waking owing to contact of conditioning associates, it is proposed to say that he attains his own form on the dissolution of that foreign aspect.”

From the standpoint of the Shruti and the Guru, always the Jiva is Brahman in his true nature. But from the standpoint of the adjuncts like the waking and dream which are concocted by Avidya and which are only the false appearances, the same Brahman appears as if he has taken the form of Jiva or the soul. So, Jiva goes to sleep and comes back to the waking etc., are all false notions.

Conclusive Remarks:

a) From the standpoint of the world, the seed-form of world is attributed on the pure Self. From the VAIDIKA VYAVAHARA, meaning dealings according to Shastra, one should obtain the Self-knowledge in this life—so from this standpoint the causal ignorance is attributed on the Self. The Self is the substratum for the seed-form of the world as well as the appearances of the world. From this standpoint the Self is described as SARVAJNA, MAHAMAYAM, SARVESHVARA, NAMAROOPAYOR NIRVAHITA, (He who differentiates the names and forms which were in seed-form into manifested form) etc. Hence to PRAJNA all these three types of attributions (seed-form, having causal ignorance and being Sarvajna) are attributed from the various standpoints of the Universe which is conjured up by Avidya.

b) But from the standpoint of direct intuition of the deep sleep, it is only the pure Self, pure-Being, pure-Consciousness and pure-Bliss (refer Brhadaranayaka Bhashya—3/4/22 to 32). Here Shankara takes this stand of direct intuition and said that the true nature of the deep sleep is pure Self. This is the illustration of Moksha. In Sūtra Bhāshya—1/1/9,

‘सः उपाधिद्वयोपरमे सुषुप्तावस्थायाम् उपाधिकृतविशेषाभावात् स्वात्मनि प्रलीनः इव इति ‘स्वं हि अपीतः भवति’ इत्युच्यते ।’

—Here Shankara says that when the two types of adjuncts i.e., waking and dream disappear, then the Self remains in its pure nature in deep sleep. It is called as if Jiva has merged in his true nature in sound sleep. And in Sūtra Bhāshya—3/2/7, Shankara says,

“स्वप्नजागरितयोस्तु उपाधिसम्पर्कवशात् पररूपापत्तिम् इव अपेक्ष्य तदुपशमात् सुषुप्ते स्वरूपापत्तिः विवक्ष्यते, ‘स्वम् अपीतो भवति’ इति ।”

—i. e., When two types of adjuncts appear as if they are there in the Self, then the Self appears as if he has taken the form of Jīva and he is said to resume his own nature in sleep on the dissolution of those two types of adjuncts. In these two sentences particularly one has to observe the words “PRALEENA IVA” (प्रलीन इव) and “PARAROOPĀPATTIM IVA” (पररूपापत्तिम् इव). So from the standpoint of ignorance alone, it is said that in deep sleep, Jīva remains in his true nature or merges and he comes back etc. But when we give up the standpoint of adjuncts, he is always Brahman, and he never ceases to be Brahman. To take this standpoint the common experience of Sushupti alone is sufficient. There is no need of getting any new experience of “ASAMPRAJNĀTA SAMĀDHI” (असम्प्रज्ञात समाधि) etc., according to commentators. It is possible only through the instructions of the Shāstra and the Guru and Viveka. For this refer the following Bhāshya portions :

The intuitional experience of deep sleep is described as the illustration for Mōksha (Bṛhadāranayaka- Bhāshya—4/3/21 to 32)—recognising one’s own true nature, here and now and also as it was in deep sleep and not affected in the least by the appearance of dream and waking states in him, just like a screen in a cinema. This recognition occurs through Viveka alone with the help of the teachings of the Shāstra and the Guru. For this purpose some references in Shankara Bhāshyas are given.

a) Bṛhadāranayaka Upanishad Bhāshya—4/4/6, here Shankara says that,

“यो हि सुषुप्तावस्थमिव निर्विशेषमद्वैतम् अलुप्तचिद्रूपज्योतिः स्वभावम् आत्मानं पश्यति.... स इहैव ब्रह्म, यद्यपि देहावानिव लक्ष्यते, स ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति..... न हि विदुषो मृतस्य भावान्तरापत्तौ जीवतोऽन्योभावः, देहान्तरप्रतिसन्धानाभावमात्रेणैव तु ब्रह्माप्येती-
त्युच्यते ।”

i. e., He who sees himself as permanent pure consciousness as in deep sleep, becomes Brahman. A man of realisation, 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’.

b) Brahma-Sūtra Bhāshya—3/2/7, the last sentence is :

“ब्रह्म तु अनपायि सुसिस्थानम् इति एतत् प्रतिपादयामः । तेन तु विज्ञानेन प्रयोजनमस्ति जीवस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वावधारणं स्वप्नजागरितव्यवहार-
विमुक्तत्वावधारणं च । तस्मात् आत्मा एव सुसिस्थानम् ।”

—We are going to prove that Sushupti means Brahman. Such a knowledge serves a purpose, namely that individual Jiva is ascertained to be identical with Brahman and it is realized to be free from the dealings consequent on the dream and waking states. Hence the individual’s deep sleep means ĀTMAN.

c) From this standpoint, the non-perception in deep sleep i.e., the common man’s experience that ‘I know nothing in deep sleep’ is not due to causal ignorance or BEEJĀVIDYĀ, but due to oneness of the Self. This is clearly stated in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad Bhāshya—4/3/23 to 4/3/30.

d) In Sūtra Bhāshya—2/3/18, refer the sentence:

“यत्तु सुप्तादयः न चेतयन्ते इति.... एतदुक्तं भवति- विषयाभावात्

एवम् अचेतयमानता, न चैतन्याभावात् इति। यथा वियदाश्रयस्य प्रकाशस्य प्रकाश्याभावात् अनभिव्यक्तिः, न स्वरूपाभावात् तद्वत् ।”

—As for the objection that the people in deep sleep etc., have no awareness..... this appearance of absence of awareness is owing to the absence of objects of knowledge, but not owing to the absence of consciousness. Here Shankara gives one illustration that in the dark night if a torch light is illumined and directed towards the sky, though there is light we cannot see anything because there is nothing else to be illumined by this torch light. So also in deep sleep the nature of the Self is full of pure consciousness, but, there is no other second thing to be known apart from the Self.

e) “स यदि आत्मा अत्र अविनष्टश्चैतन्यस्वरूपः स्वेनैव रूपेण वर्तते, कस्मादयम् अहमस्मीत्यात्मानं वा बहिर्वा इमानि भूतानीति जाग्रत्स्वप्नयोरिव न जानातीति? अत्रोच्यते, शृणु अत्राज्ञानहेतुम्, एकत्वमेवाज्ञानहेतुः ।”

—[Bṛhadāraṇyaka Bhāṣhya—4/3/21]

—Here Shankara says, in deep sleep the individual is freed from ignorance which is the cause of duality. Ātman is pure consciousness. He is capable of seeing anything. He does not see anything in deep sleep because nothing other than Ātman exists there to see. The individual Jīva is one with SAT and SAT only. Therefore he does not know anything.

Previously it is said in Shankara Bhāṣhya on Māṇdukiya Kārikā Āgama Prakaraṇa—2 that,

“बीजावस्थापि ‘न किञ्चिदवेदिषम्’ इत्युत्थितस्य प्रत्ययदर्शनाद्देहे अनुभूयत एव इति त्रिधा देहे व्यवस्थित इत्युच्यते ।”

The causal condition is also verily experienced in this body

from such cognition of the man who is awakened from deep sleep, as, 'I did not know anything at the time of deep sleep.' Therefore it said that one *Ātman* is perceived as three fold (*Vishva, Taijasa & Prājna*) in this body and in the Jāgrat state alone.

This is said from the standpoint of empirical view—the non-perception in deep sleep is attributed to the Self. But in the above said manner, the standpoint has been changed from the empirical to the direct experience of the Self. So from the standpoint of Viveka, Sushupti-hood of Sushupti will be removed and it is recognised as the true nature of the self. This is the *fourth viewpoint of Sushupti*.

Neglecting these viewpoints, post-Shankara sub-commentators have taken the empirical viewpoint as the standard and have said that :

i) In Sushupti there is seed-form of the world with *Ātman* and the same seed-form is called as *Mūlāvidyā* and *Vāsanābījā* etc., that is the cause for this Universe.

ii) Hence one should get the experience of *Asamprajnāta Samādhi* where there is no deep sleep as well as the appearance of dualistic world, then he will transcend *avidyā* and hence the experience of the Sushupti is not enough or sufficient to get Self-knowledge. All these types of wrong notions including the idea that *Jīva* goes to Sushupti and comes back etc., are propagated. The author of *Vivarana* (commentator on the *Panchapādikā*) writes:

“ननु ब्रह्मात्मानुभवद्वैतदर्शनयोः कुतः साहित्यमुच्यते ? न वयं साहित्यं
ब्रूमः। कदाचित् असं प्रज्ञात-आत्मैकत्वदर्शनम्, कदाचित्
आरब्धकर्मोपस्थापितदोषनिमित्तद्वैतदर्शनं चेति ।” [-पञ्चपादिका-विवरणम्]

According to Vivarana, the intuition of non-dual Atman is in the Yogic trance of Asamprajnāta Samādhi, while the perception of duality is due to the defect engendered by the Prārabdha Karma (i. e., fructified karma).

This explanation of Vivarana, is in direct opposition to Shankara who says in emphatic terms:

“न चायं व्यवहाराभावोऽवस्थाविशेषनिबद्धोऽभिधीयत इति पुक्तं वक्तुम्
‘तत्त्वमसि’ इति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्यानवस्थाविशेष निबन्धनत्वात्।”

—[Sūtra Bhāshya—2/1/14]

—The Self is not to be attained in any particular state or condition, for the identity of the Self and Brahman stated ‘That Thou Art’ is not contingent on any particular state.

This innovation of Vivarana is diametrically opposed to Gaudapāda’s dictum (Gaudapāda Kārikā—1/17) also that Atman is always *nishprapancha* (निष्प्रपञ्च) i.e., free from all duality.

According to Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmīji’s teachings and Shankara’s Bhāshyas, if we try to understand the various standpoints adopted for the purpose of teachings, then all our doubts will get removed.

CHAPTER-IV

DETERMINING THE NATURE OF TURIYA

When is one established in Turiya? It is thus replied by Gaudapāda:

“अन्यथा गृह्यतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः ।
विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥”

[Gaudapāda Kārīkā—1/15]

Dream belongs to one who wrongly cognises the Reality and sleep to one who does not know the Reality. When the erroneous knowledge in these two is removed one attains the state that is *Turiya* called the ‘*Fourth*’.

To explain the above Kārīkā, here we will give some important points regarding the *Avasthātraya* and the nature of *Turiya*.

I. Description of the three states from four different viewpoints:

The three states are described in Māndukya Upanishad and Gaudapāda Kārīkās from the standpoint of four different *aspects* (angles of vision) :

i) As is commonly known by all that the present state is the *waking state*. When we speak about our entering the deep sleep and where we do not know anything, that is the *state of deep sleep*. In the middle, before waking, we experience sometimes the dream and this is the *dream state*. According to this common belief Vedānta starts to teach one’s own true nature which is the

substratum of these three states and explains in the first place that the appearance of the real nature of the Self in the form of waking state is *the Vaishvānara Pada* (वैश्वानर पाद) and the appearance in the form of dream state as the *Taijasa Pada* (तेजस पाद). When both the states are absorbed in the Self, it is called *Prājña Pāda* (प्राज्ञ पाद).

This is one type of discrimination about the three states.

ii) According to Sri Gaudapāda, these three states are explained from the standpoint of their special features. According to this the functions of sense organs with the outer world is *waking*, the functions of mind alone is *dream*, and the merging of the mind in one's own Self is the *sleep*. From this standpoint we can observe the experineces of all the three states in this present waking state alone. This is said in Karika—1/2 and more elaborately in the commentary on this Karika by Sri Swāmiji of Holenarsipur in his *Māndukya Rahasya Vivriti*hi.

This is the second type of the description of the three states.

iii) From the standpoint of *Mōksha Vyavahāra*, according to Shāstra, one should get the knowledge or realisation of one's own true nature of the Self to get *Mōksha* (मोक्ष). From this standpoint, Sri Gaudapāda explains the three states in his *Kārikās* from 1/11 to 16. According to this portion, non-perception of the real nature of the 'Self is the *sleep*' and misunderstanding regarding the nature of the Self (such as misunderstanding the nature of the Self as waking, dream etc.) is *dream* and realising the real nature of the Self through Viveka is the *real waking*. When this real waking takes place the aspirant himself remains as *Turiya* (तुरीय).

When a person awakes to the truth he realises there is neither this sleep (=non-perception) nor this dream (= misunderstanding) from the standpoint of the intuition of *Turiya*, the real Ātman. These are explained in Kārikās—1/11 and 1/16.

This is the third type of discrimination of the three states.

From the standpoint of third description of Avasthātraya the *generic* and *specific* characters are ascribed on *Vishva* and *Taijasa* and also on *Prājna* that is, on the three states of consciousness—waking, dream and sleep. According to this, we do not know our true nature of the Self while we are in waking state. Not only this, we have also misunderstood our true nature as “I am a man, I am a doer of actions, I am happy, I am miserable” etc. So there is non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self and there is misconception also. As it is in the case of waking, so also it is in the case of dream. The non-perception is called causal ignorance (*Kāranāvidyā*) and the misconception is called effective ignorance (*Kāryāvidyā*). In deep sleep, though from the standpoint of Shruti and realised persons, Ātman of the nature of pure consciousness alone remains there, from the standpoint of Mōksha Vyavahāra, there is no possibility of getting the Self-knowledge in deep sleep. Hence what is superimposed here is the non-perception regarding the real-nature of the Self in sleep. From this viewpoint it is said that ‘Prājna is bound by causal ignorance’ (‘प्राज्ञःकारणबद्धस्तु—Gaudapāda Kārikā—1/11). In this way the “non-perception” of the real nature of the Self is the *generic* or common characteristic of all the three states. But “misunderstanding” is the *specific* nature of *Vishva* and *Taijasa*. So also the ‘non-perception’ is the *specific* feature of *Prājna*. Therefore, the three states are classified into two groups only and

these are deliberately imputed on the Self for the purpose of teaching. All these ways of attributions are enumerated in 'I-(iii)' above. When the error of absence of knowledge and the error of misconception are sublated by the dawn of the true knowledge, then one comes to be convinced that he is really the Turīya (the 4th) beyond all the illusory states.

iv) The three states are also described by Gaudapāda in the fourth chapter of Māndūkya Kārikā using some Buddhistic terminology such as *Laukika* (लौकिक), *Shuddha Laukika* (शुद्ध-लौकिक), *Lōkōttara* (लोकोत्तर). These words are used in the context of comparative study of Buddhism and Vedānta and to show the difference between the two doctrines by Shri Gaudapāda. In the last portion of the book Sri Gaudapāda proceeds to show his own *Prakriyā* which is taught in Vedānta—the *tribasic method*. But the intention here is that the words like *Laukikā*, *Shuddha Laukikā* and *Lōkōttara* which are used in Buddhistic literature with particular sense and which are to be achieved through the practice of Yōga according to their system in order to get the mystic experience of these three states which are concerned to an individual person, but the same words can be used here to denote that the words can be applied more appropriately to the Tribasic method of Vedānta rather than to the Buddhistic philosophy and determining the nature of Turīya is the main purport for describing in this way. This is also clearly stated by Shankara in his commentary on Māndūkya Kārikās—4/87, 88 & 89.

Gaudapāda applies the terms '*Laukika*' (common experience), '*Shuddha Laukika*', (pure experience) and '*Lōkōttara*' (transcendental experience) to *waking*, *dream* and

deep sleep respectively, unlike a Vijnānāvādin who recognizes three grades of consciousness. The three states are really no states of consciousness. They are only the Witnessing pure consciousness taking the garb of these states, pure consciousness being unaffected by their appearance or disappearance. The three states admit neither of juxtaposition in space nor of succession in time.

This is a way to describe the Avasthās and this is the fourth-kind of description of Avasthās.

II. Determining the true nature of the Self through the Viveka.

Before going to determine the true nature of Turiya through *Viveka*, which as an important thing in Vedānta, we have to remember some crucial points :

a) Turīya is not a state at all as is usually understood like *fourth avasthā* by present-day Vedāntins. It is the real nature of the Self.

b) The substratum of the waking is Turīya, so also in the case of the dream.

c) From the standpoint of waking and dream the name of sleep is attributed on the Turīya itself.

d) The reality which appears in the form of three states to the ignorant, that very reality itself is Turiya as it is the substratum of all the three states.

e) Turīya is absolutely free from the taint of avasthas i.e. It remains unaffected by the appearance or disappearance of the three states.

f) Turiya in relation to these three states which are conceived to be really existing owing to ignorance, is said to be the Fourth for the purpose of teaching alone.

g) As Turiya is no avastha or state, so the popular identification of it with *Nirvikalpa Samadhi* (निर्विकल्प समाधि) is altogether unfounded.

h) The Turiya has no specific features which could be described by words (सर्वशब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तशून्यत्वात् तस्य शब्दानभिधेयत्वम् इति—Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7).

i) The Turiya is the self-evident inmost Self and hence no description, definition or proof of its existence is needed. It is not to be gained newly by efforts.

Here it is said in Kārikā (—1/15) that “when the two errors of these two (i. e. non-apprehension and misapprehension of Reality) which are deliberately attributed on the Turiya for the purpose of teaching are removed one attains the state that is Turiya.” Strictly speaking it is not a state at all and also it is not to be attained newly by some efforts. But from the standpoint of superimposition of three states, it is said in the manner—‘the Turiya is the state which will be attained.’ And those errors are rescinded in Kārikā—1/16:

“अनादिमायया सुप्तो यदा जीवः प्रबुध्यते ।

अजमनिद्रमस्वप्नमद्वैतं बुध्यते तदा ॥”

—When the Jiva or the individual Soul wakes up from his beginningless illusory dream, then he becomes aware of the truth by dint of teaching imparted by the Shrutis & the preceptor, that it is really the secondless one (the non-duality) unborn, forever unsullied or untainted by the sleep of ignorance or by the dream of wrong knowledge”.

So by the negation of the false appearance of these three states through *Viveka* one can remain in his true nature at the very end of discrimination and this true nature is ever-luminous Turiya.

Shankara clearly states that Turiya is not a separate state apart from these three states. It is the substratum of these three states. If it were to be the fourth state (i.e. beyond the experience of these three states) there will be no way to realise the nature of Turiya. Hence the teaching of the Shastra will be a futile exercise and Turiya would be a void (= the ultimate Reality itself does not exist). So it is not a separate state, the ultimate Reality itself is appearing in the forms of these three states of consciousness (Māndūkya Bhāṣhya of Mantra—7)¹ and further in the same place Shankara says that these three states are only imaginations, that is Vikalpas (विकल्प) and when this thing is realised through Viveka and the appearance of these three states is negated or falsified by means of right intuitive knowledge, then the ultimate Reality manifests itself. As It Is, i.e., one will remain himself as Turiya at that moment and there remains no need to search for any other means of knowledge or any other discipline for the realisation of Turiya after comprehending the import of the Vedāntic texts.² Here Shri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swāmiji

-
1. “यदि हि त्रयवस्थात्मविलक्षणं तुरीयमन्यत्, तत्प्रतिपत्तिद्वाराभावात् शास्त्रोपदेशानर्थक्यं शून्यतापत्तिर्वा ।”

—[Māndūkya Mantra Bhāṣhya—7]

2. “रज्जुरिव सर्पादिभिर्विकल्पयमाना स्थानत्रयेऽपि आत्मैक एवान्तप्रज्ञादित्वेन विकल्पयते यदा तदा अन्तःप्रज्ञादित्वप्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणसमकालमेव आत्मनि अध्यारोपित अनर्थप्रपञ्चनिवृत्तिलक्षणं फलं परिसमाप्तम् इति तुरीयाधिगमे प्रमाणान्तरं साधनान्तरं वा न मृग्यम् ।”

—[Māndūkya Mantra Bhāṣhya—7]

has given a foot note in his Kannada translation of the Bhāṣhya that apart from Viveka there is no need to get the fourth Avasthā like *Samadhi* etc., and there is no need of disciplines such as Prasankhyāna (repetition of knowledge of Vedānta Vākyas) etc. Elsewhere he has said, persons who have not understood this truth imagine that the Vedāntic text only yields an indirect knowledge (परोक्षज्ञान) of Ātman and hence the repeated practice of the knowledge of the Mahāvākyas (वाक्यज्ञानाभ्यास or प्रसंख्यान) or the merging of the world of multiplicity in Ātman by means of meditation (प्रपञ्चप्रविलय or Laya-chintana) or the practice of PatanjalaYōga (पातञ्जल योगानुष्ठान) etc., are necessary to get Ātma-Sākshatkāra or fourth Avasthā like Samādhi.

On one occasion Shankara explicitly states that “one who is the Prājña (प्राज्ञ) having the seed-form of the world and having causal ignorance (seed-form of ignorance or Avidyā Bija)—that same Prājña in his true nature is the Turīya, when his being the potential seed of the world is not taken into account.” See the following Bhāṣhya portion of Māndūkya Kārikā—1/2:

“तामबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादिसम्बन्ध-
जाग्रदादिरहितां पारमार्थिकीम् पृथग्वक्ष्यति ।”

Here Shankara clearly says that “one who is Prājña from the standpoint of attribution of world and ignorance, that same Prājña is Turīya in his true nature altogether free from the body and other conditioning associates.” For this the readers have to refer the fourth viewpoint regarding Sushupti (सुषुप्ति) which is explained previously in Chapter-III. Thus when one cognises his true nature of the Self as ever Turīya then the two types of errors viz., non-perception and misconception regarding the real nature

of the Self will be removed. The same thing is said in the Kārikā No.-1/15 which is quoted in the beginning of this Chapter.

III. Process of determining the nature of Turiya (Turīyatva Pratipatti Kramaha) :

The scriptures (Upanishads) teach or signify the essential nature of Turiya (Ātman) by *Ataddharma Nivartana* i.e., by negating all the qualities or characteristics of Anātman i. e., not-self, which are superimposed on our Ātman or misconceived in Ātman through Avidyā.

The process of determining the nature of Turiya is given very beautifully by Shri Swāmiji in his Māndūkya Rahasya Vivṛithi. I shall give the significances of this portion—तुरीयप्रतिपत्तिक्रमः which contains the six types of *negations* on the ground of intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self. For this purpose Shankara declares in the Māndūkya Bhāṣhya 7 that;

“तस्मात् प्रतिषेधविज्ञान प्रमाणव्यापारसमकाल एव आत्मनि
अध्यारोपितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वाद्यनर्थनिवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम् ।”

—Therefore, it is established that the rescission of unreal attributes superimposed upon Ātman is accomplished simultaneously with the manifestation of the knowledge which, in itself, is the means for the negation of duality. Here ‘*Vijnāna*’ means the intuitional experience of one’s own true nature. On this firm ground the *Pratishedha* (प्रतिषेध) or *negation* of the superimposed appearance will take place. To *negate* this misconception the Pramāna (प्रमाण) is the sentences of Vedānta and the instruction of the Guru. So the Shāstra & the Ācharya are the pramānas which negate the attributions on the firm ground of intuitional experience. Shankara further remarks :

“द्वैताभावे शास्त्रव्यापारः नाद्वैते विरोधात्..... ‘सिद्धन्तु निवर्तकत्वात्’
इत्यागमविदां सूत्रम् ।”

—[Gaudapāda Kārikā Bhāṣhya—2/32]

—The function of the Shrutis is to remove duality and not to affirm something about non-duality, for that would be a contradiction in terms. The fact is that the negation of the superimposed factors is the only way to direct the attention of the seeker towards the Turiya as it is Self-evident inmost-self of the seeker. Hence the aphorism of the right tradition ; “Its validity is substantiated by its *negation* of wrong ascriptions.” At last, at the sametime one takes a stand in his true nature which is Turiya. So *Viveka* is the only means to get Turiya. This is the significance of the sentence of Bhāṣhya (Māndukya—7) quoted above (for more details see next article No.-IV).

Now for Turiyatva Pratipattikramaha (तुरीयत्व प्रतिपत्तिक्रमः), I shall furnish the significances of *six types of negations* which are furnished by the Swāmiji in his Māndūkya Rahasya Vivritiḥ as already noted above.

Turiya is sought to be indicated by the negation of all attributes (characteristics) ;

“विशेष-प्रतिषेधेनैव तुरीयं निर्दिदिक्षति ।” Shankara

[Māndukya Bhāṣhya—7]

i) *Pramāṭritva Nirākarana* (प्रमातृत्व प्रतिषेधः).

According to common experience we are Pramātṛs meaning ‘knowers of the external objects through the means of right knowledge such as Indriyas and Antahkaranas’. Due to this knowership we see the dualistic world as if it is there really. But according to Shruti, all these are Brahman and there is no

multiplicity at all (नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन—बृह.—4/4/19), but we see the multiplicity here. So this is the misconception. To remove this misconception the aspirant should observe the following process:

The knowership which appears in the waking or in dream state is due to Adhyāsa or taking wrong identification with Antahkarana and mutual transference of the natures of Antahkarana and the Real Self. Hence it is here 'Pramāitva is Ādhyāsika'. When an aspirant realises his true nature which is the *witness* of these two states, from that "standpoint of transcendental reality", he is the pure and absolute nature of consciousness. By cognising this truth, he falsifies his own pramāitva (knowership). By this the misconception of seeing the dualistic world is removed. Here 'seeing the dualistic world as if it is there is itself a dream because it is the misconception due to Adhyāsa. This type of dream will vanish through the discrimination shown above. The first type of negation is called as **PRAMĀTRITVA NIRĀKARANA**. The dualistic world will be there only from the standpoint of Pramāta and not from the Witness. This is the secret here.

ii) *Agrahana Nirākarana and Bījabhāva Nirākarana*
(अग्रहणरूपबीजभावप्रतिषेधः)

From the standpoint of waking and dream states we say that in deep sleep we know nothing. This non-perception of the dualistic world is attributed on deep sleep state from the standpoint of waking and dream alone. This wrong notion is called as '*Agrahana or Nidrā*'. To remove this wrong notion one should observe that the pure Being which is our true nature—from that pure Being alone the states like waking and dream emerge out and sustained by the same Being and at last they merge in the

same Being. So, the false appearance of the states disappear and they become one with the Being. This pure Being which remains in deep sleep is called as *Avyākṛitātmā* (अव्याकृतात्मा), meaning having unmanifested seed-form of both the states. This attribution is made from the standpoint of appearance and disappearance of the dualistic states i.e., waking and dream. But from the standpoint of the intuitional experience of the deep sleep as it is, the *Avyākṛitātmā* is the pure and absolute consciousness without the second. This is the true nature of everyone. From this standpoint there is no question of knowing or not-knowing because it is the pure consciousness. By this process of discrimination one will get rid of the wrong idea that, 'I know nothing in deep sleep'. This is *Agrahanaṣoopa Nidrāviparyāsa Kshayaha*.

From this, we may observe that the attribution of the seed-form of the Universe which is superimposed from the standpoint of Vaidika Vyavahāra also will be removed because the appearance of the Universe is only a false appearance and hence the seed-form also is a false attribution. As the Self is of the nature of non-dual one in deep sleep, this nature continues uninterruptedly while the waking and dream states appear. Thus the attribution of the *Jagat Bīja* is also removed. When one discerns that the nature of the Self is pure and absolute consciousness and non-dual one, then he will get rid of idea of 'not knowing' the non-dual nature of the Self also, which is called as causal ignorance or *Bijāvidya* or *Avidya-Bijā*. Because as the Self is pure consciousness, he has no *Agrahana* (अग्रहण) or *Anyathāgrahana* (अन्यथाग्रहण) just as in the sun whose nature is ever resplendent there cannot be any possibility of non-shining or shining in any way other than that of the sun ('न हि सवितरि सदा प्रकाशात्मके

तद्विरुद्धमप्रकाशनम् अन्यथाप्रकाशनं वा सम्भवति।'—Māndūkya Kārikā Bhāṣhya—1/12).

This second type of negation is called **AGRAHANA NIRĀKARANA AND BĪJABHĀVA NIRĀKARANA**. Here the *Bija* means the seed-form of the world as well as Avidya Bija.

iii) Anekātmatva Nirākarana (अनेकात्मत्वप्रतिषेधः)

Either in waking or in dream we assume that there are so many souls or selves in this world. According to Sāṅkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Pātaṅjala Yoga etc., this hold is taken as real. So they agree that there are many souls (*Anekātma Vāda* अनेकात्मवाद), because they have no comprehensive vision of life which is denoted in Upanishads. According to Vedānta, from the standpoint of empirical view when we believe that 'I am in this world' etc., by taking the identification with the body, then it is correct to say that there are so many other persons and creatures in this world. But, from the standpoint of the true nature of the Witness of the whole state, the same witness of waking or dream is called as *Vaiśvānara* or *Taijasa*, because this witnessing principle is the substratum and the essence of these states. From this view-point the same Witness appeared in the form of all souls (Jīvas) either in waking or in dream without forfeiting His true nature (आत्मस्वरूपापरित्यागेनैव व्याक्रियते). So, *Vishva* alone is the Self of all the beings and *Taijasa* alone is the Self of all the beings which have appeared in waking and dream respectively. By this discrimination one gets rid of the wrong notion of multiplicity of the Self. This third type of negation of the multiplicity of the selves is called **ANEKĀTMATVA NIRĀKARANA**.

iv) *Vishvādi Sthāni dharma Nirākarana* (विश्वादिस्थानि-धर्मप्रतिषेधः)

Due to the adjuncts of waking, dream and deep sleep states, which are conjured up on the real nature of the Self by Avidyā—from the standpoint of these adjuncts, the real Self appears as if he has taken the form of *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājna*. In these three appearances there is difference among one another as stated in the Shrutis : "He who is in the waking state of outward consciousness is Vaishvanara; experiencer of the Gross" (Māndūkya Mantra—3); 'He who is in the dream state of inward consciousness is the Taijasa, experiencer of the subtle' (Māndūkya Mantra—4); "He who is in the state of sound sleep, reduced to a single entity only, one mass of consciousness, is Prājna, experiencer of Bliss" (Māndūkya Mantra—5). Though this is a fact, if we observe from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self which is the substratum of these false imaginations, He is ever devoid of all adjuncts. From this standpoint there is no difference among *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prājna* which manifest themselves in these three states and they cannot be regarded as pertaining to the essential nature of Ātman, because, Ātman of the nature of Pure Consciousness alone remains there. All these seeming Selves are essentially identical with the Turiya. By realising this truth one can get rid of the dream of misunderstanding the Self as Vishva, Taijasa etc. This fourth type of negation is called *Vishvaadi Sthānadharm Nirākarana*. ('अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादिस्थानिधर्मप्रतिषेधः कृतः..... न बहिःप्रज्ञमिति विश्वप्रतिषेधः । नान्तःप्रज्ञमिति तैजसप्रतिषेधः । न प्रज्ञानघनमिति प्राज्ञप्रतिषेधः'—Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7)

v) *Jāgradādi Sthānadharm Nirākarana* (जाग्रदादिस्थान-धर्म प्रतिषेधः).

In this way though from the standpoint of waking state we

assume that there are three states and they are different from one another and that they are really existing in the Self etc., one should observe that the appearance of a particular state inevitably cancels the very existence of the other two. But the Ātman, who maintains his self-identity unaffected by the appearance or disappearance of the states, is clearly seen to be the only entity that is really Real.

(“ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वम्, रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पधारादिविकल्पितभेदवत् सर्वत्राव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वम् ।” Māndūkya Mantra Bhāshya—7).

Hence these are only false appearances such as the snake, garland, waterflow etc., superimposed on the rope. By determining this one can easily get rid of the belief that there are three states. And he will realise that the *states-waking, dream and deep sleep* have no independent existence apart from Self. By this the dream, that is the misconception of assuming the reality of the states will vanish. This fifth type of negation is called **Jaagradaadi Sthaanadharma Niraakarana** (‘प्रपञ्चोपशममिति जाग्रदादि स्थानधर्माभाव उच्यते’—Māndūkya Mantra Bh.—7).

vi) *Sadvitīyatva Nirākarana* (सद्वितीयत्व प्रतिषेधः)

From the standpoint of ego, i. e., Pramātr, it appears that the real nature of the Self is the witness of these three states. But as the Self is there so also the states are also there. Hence the Self is not *non-dual* one. This objection may be raised when one takes identification with the Pramātr̥atva of the waking state. Though this is the thing, the appearance of the states are only false appearances due to ignorance and hence they have no existence at all. But the Self whose nature is pure, absolute consciousness is called as Turiya from the standpoint of those

false appearances ('मायासंख्यातुरीयम्'—as stated in Mangala Slōkas by Bhāshyakāra in the beginning of Māndūkya Bhāshya). This Self is ever devoid of all special features and is *non-dual* nature of consciousness alone. When the aspirant takes a stand in this true nature of his own Self, then there will be no complaint regarding the three states, because the complainer of the states is the Pramatr of the waking state, not the real nature of the Self. If this truth is realised then one will get awakened from the dream that there is a dualistic world apart from the Self. This last type of negation is called **Sadviteeyatva Niraakarana**.

So it is correct to say that when one cognises the transcendental reality then he will get rid of the wrong notions regarding the real nature of the Self. This is called as attaining the *Turiya-hood* ('तुरीयं पदमप्नुते'—G. K.—1/15). Strictly speaking it is not really attaining the Turiya newly, because he is already Turiya. It is only getting rid of the wrong notions i.e., to despel or to cease one's identification with not-selves with the help of teachings of the Shastra & the Guru. The reader is referred to the following Bhāshya portion regarding this :

“तस्मात् अविद्याधारोपणनिराकरणमात्रं ब्रह्मणि कर्तव्यं न तु ब्रह्मज्ञाने यत्नः अत्यन्तप्रसिद्धत्वात् ।” (Gita Bhāshya—19/50).

—“Therefore, we have only to eliminate what is falsely ascribed to Brahman by Avidyā; we have to make no more effort to acquire knowledge of Brahman as he is quite Self-evident.”

So through discrimination only one can get Turiya.

IV. Significance of the method of getting Turiya according to Bhaashya :

“तस्मात् प्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणव्यापारसमकाल एव ,आत्मनि अध्यारोपितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वाद्यनर्थनिवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम्।”

—“Therefore it is established that the cessation of such unreal attributes as *Antah-Prajna* etc., superimposed upon Ātman is simultaneous with the manifestation of the knowledge, which, in itself, is the means (*Pramāṇa*) for the negation of duality.”

Here '*Pratishedha*' (प्रतिषेध) means negation of attributions. '*Vijnāna*' (विज्ञान) means taking the standpoint of Witnessing principle of life which is beyond the ego and which is to be realised through the intuitional experience (one's own Anubhava). On this firm ground of the intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self one should negate all types of superimpositions which are conjured up through ignorance. To do this, '*Pramāṇa*' (प्रमाण) is required. *Pramāṇa* means the utterances of the Upanishads and the instructions of the Guru who has naturally established in his true nature of the Self. This is *Pramāṇa* by means of which we become aware of the negation of attributes superimposed on Ātman. This *pramāṇa* denotes that the Self is not a *Prameya* (प्रमेय) (i. e. an objectifiable one) and the aspirant is not a *Pramatṛ* (प्रमातृ). So it cancels the triple distinctions of knower, knowledge & knowable ('प्रमातृत्वादिभेदनिवृत्ते:- —Māndūkya Mantra Bh.—7). Simultaneously with this assurance, Turiya is realised. Shankara says.:

“न हि शास्त्रम् इदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति, किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्य-वेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति।” - (Sūtra Bhāṣhya—1/1/4).

—“The scriptures do not indeed propose to teach Brahman positively by saying, 'This is so & so', but they teach Brahman as no object at all. On account of its being the inmost Self (of the knower) they remove all the distinctions created by Avidya such as the 'knowable', the 'knower' and the 'knowledge'.”

When the aspirant uses this Pramāna, in his Antahkarana a type of function takes place. This function is described here as *Vyāpāra* ('व्यापार'). The function is as follows (when the aspirant turns inwardly in accordance with the guidance of the Shāstra & the Āchārya) :

i) Antahkarana stops to see outer things through the sense organs.

ii) It gives up the thinking regarding outer things through the mind.

iii) It rejects imaginings or inferring the matter through the intellect.

iv) It gives up the idea of 'I am so & so' 'I am a doer of actions', 'I am happy', 'I am miserable' and so on—the feelings which will arise by taking the identification with the ego.

v) Lastly he completely turns his attention towards the Witnessing principle of the ego through discrimination and concentration.

At this stage the aspirant himself remains as Turīya (witness) and the Antahkarana which follows this nature (i.e., which gives up its functions of conceiving or ideations and attains *Amanastam* (अमनस्ताम्—a state of no-mind) also starts to appear in the form of Witnessing principle as it is completely pervaded and directly illumined by the Self just like the sunshine that illumines and pervades the mirage.

(“तत्र तत्र स्थाने चिद्ब्यासेन चिदाभास्यत्वेन च चिद्रूपात्मनोऽव्यतिरिक्तमिदं स्थानमिति निश्चयेनापि सूक्ष्मदृशां तत्तद्वानेन तुरीयतत्त्वनिर्धारणासंभवात् ।” - माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः ।)

This correct reflection of the true nature of the Self is called *Ātmapratyaya* (आत्मप्रत्यय). When this *Ātmapratyaya* (i.e. *Nirvikalpa Vidyāvriti*) arises one gets rid of this wrong notions of *Antahprajnatva* (अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादि) etc., simultaneously. Then, all duality becomes sublated or falsified and their substrate of non-duality is realized. This is the true significance of the above sentence of the Bhāṣya. An aspirant should observe the above described function through which he remains as non-dual one.

V. EXAMINING THE NATURE OF THE INTUITIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE PRESENT MOMENT ALSO LEADS TO THE DETERMINATION OF TURIYA WHICH IS THE REAL NATURE OF THE SELF:

Sri Sri Satchidānandendra Saraswatī Swāmiji has given in his English introduction to Sanskrit work *Māndūkya Rahasya Vivṛti*, a process of discrimination of the intuitional experience of the present moment which is very subtle and crucial.

The intuitional experience which appears as if it is conditioned or circumscribed by the present moment appears as waking state as compared to the dream experience which had taken place in the past. The same experience appears to be equal to the dream if we take the standpoint of direct experience of each state as it appears during that period. When both these states are determined as similar and equal, then the waking itself becomes a dream. By this type of discrimination and seeing the equality between the two states we have sublated the waking state in the dream i. e. Vishva in Taijasa. That the whole phenomenon of the dream state including the outer and the inner phenomenon i. e. Macrocosm and Microcosm are both false appearances, is a fact acceptable to all. It is determined by the people possessed of discriminating nature

that the dream has no reality even though the Universe of the dream appears as if it is there during the dream time as it is a false appearance. The reality is only the Self who is the substratum of the dream (Here dream and waking are both considered as dream).

As in deep sleep state there is no dualistic world, similarly even at the time of appearance of the dream there is really no dualistic world or Universe. In this way dream has become equivalent to the deep sleep. The special feature of the dream state (i. e. waking & dream) is the misconception regarding the real nature of the Self and, of course, the non-apprehension of the reality of the Self is persisting there in the dream (both waking & dream)—this non-apprehension being the special feature of the deep sleep. From the standpoint of this non-apprehension also the dream and deep sleep are equal. In this way the waking has become dream and dream has become deep sleep.

Now we have to take the standpoint of the direct intuitional experience of the deep sleep. From this standpoint there is nothing but the Self whose nature is pure consciousness, Absolute, Non-dual and this is called as **Nirvikalpa Chaitanyamaatram** (निर्विकल्प चैतन्यमात्रम्). By determining this, all the wrong notions such as deep sleep having the non-apprehension of the Self and having the seed-form of the waking etc., are all cognised to be attributed from the standpoint of the waking world. So the deep sleep itself has remained here as **Turiya**. This is said by Shri Gaudapāda as “when the two errors of these two (i. e. misconception and non-apprehension) are removed, one attains the state of Turiya” (M. K.—1/15).

According to this teaching, the true nature of the present moment is only the **Turiya**. To attain this conclusion one should

sublate the states one by one, the present state in the previous states through discrimination. By this, at the end of the discrimination one remains in natural state of his own Self which is called as *Turiya* and is ever devoid of the 'Knower', the 'Knowledge' and the 'Known' and as unborn Absolute Consciousness.

All these are taught by the Grand Preceptor Sri Gaudapāda through his lucid teachings. It being so we do not know how this grand preceptor could be equalised with the Idealism (i.e. Vijnānavāda) or Nihilism (Shūnyavāda).

VI. *Turiya Vedane kramaha* (तुरीय वेदनेक्रमः) :

(To determine the nature of Turiya what type of process could be applied?)

"When the knowledge of *Laukika* (Waking), *Shuddhalaukika* (Dream) and *Lōkōttara* (Deep Sleep) is attained and when the threefold knowable is realized by a gradual process & the *Turiya* (the fourth)—the non-dual, unborn, fearless entity is intuited, the aspirant take his stand in his own Self-his true nature"—G K.Bh.—4/89.

It is explained as follows: At first, we have to take *Laukika* (लौकिक), meaning the Self to whom the whole waking world is the *upādhi*. Due to this adjunct of waking he is called as *Vaishvānara*. The innermost Self who is the substratum of the whole waking state including macrocosm (cosmic-consciousness) and microcosm (individual-I consciousness) is called as *Vaishvānara*. Here an aspirant should not give any predominance to the waking state but to the Self who is the substratum. Then he intuits that, "the whole waking state appears and disappears in me." By this cognition, he loses his identification with his individuality. Knowing of this is called as the knowledge of *Laukika*.

Observing the experience of the dream state, he has to cognise the absence of waking in that state. Though from the standpoint of waking there is difference between waking and dream, observing the direct experience of the particular state as it is shown in वैतथ्यप्रकरणम् of Māndūkya Kārikā (see the fourth standpoint of dream state in chapter - II) one has to discern that both the states are false appearances from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self. In Brahma Sūtra—2/2/29 (विधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत्) it is said that there is difference between waking and dream and hence they are not equal. It has to be noted here that this statement is not used to teach the transcendental reality of the Self, but to contradict or negate or refute the Nihilists (*Shūnyavādins*) and the Idealists (*Vijñānavādins*) who hold the view that the perception may occur without the real things, which are inside. To prove this, they use the illustrations of the dream. To refute their view-point this Sūtra is made use of. According to Vedānta, if one accepts the consciousness of empirical state then inevitably one has to accept the existence of outer things and viceversa (see G. K.—4/67.). Thus by the above Sūtra, there is no harm to the present subject matter. So there is no Laukika i.e. waking state because both are dreams. Hence, the self who is called as Taijasa meaning the substratum of the dream, is the only reality. Cognising this, one will intuit that “As I am the witness of these two states, I myself am the Taijasa”. Knowing of this is called as the knowledge of **Shuddhalaukika** (शुद्धलौकिक).

After this, one has to reflect with rapt attention towards the deep sleep state, which is called as Lōkōttara (लोकोत्तर). When

the appearance of waking and dream are falsified then with this determination alone, the Self will remain as he is in deep sleep state. So the Revered Swāmiji has said here that “when Shuddhalaukika gets falsified then the Self remains as Lōkōttara because in deep sleep there is nothing other than the Self.” While the appearance and disappearance of the previous states have not affected the true nature of the Self, then it is equal to the “Being” of the deep sleep. In deep sleep state, the other two states cancel their existence. Though this is the thing, the absence of these two states has been determined by intuition. From this standpoint one should know that the name which is kept as ‘Lōkōttara’ to deep sleep state is mere attribution. Strictly speaking it is not a deep sleep but it is the Self alone. So, the Lōkōttara or deep sleep is merely a name. The Self who is called as Prājña (Sthāni of Sushupti), apart from him, there is nothing. Imagining anything other than the Atman is as absurd as imagining the sixth sense. The meaning of the word Lōkōttara denotes that principle which is ever devoid of Lōka.

The seed-form of the world and Vāsanās (latent impressions) and the causal-ignorance (seed-form of ignorance) are imagined on the Self from the standpoint of the false appearances of waking and dream. So it is only an attribution from the standpoint of superimposition. This is said here as Sāmvyritikam (सांवृतिकम्). Just as the difference between waking and dream and the causation between the two are accepted from the standpoint of empirical view, but through the keen observation of the direct experience of both the states all the relationships between them could get cancelled by the impartial scrutiny, so also this seed-form etc., regarding the deep sleep is equally mere attributions.

In this way, in *Shuddhalaukika* there is a no *Laukika*, in *Lōkōttara* there is no *Shuddhalaukika*, and the notion of *Lōkōttara* is only an attribution. By observing this gradual process, one should dissolve the present state in the previous one and this is called here as the "Knowing of Laukika, Shuddhalaukika and Lokottara" ('ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम्'—G. K.—4/89). Here knowing the Laukika(waking), Shuddhalaukika (dream) and Lōkōtrara (deep sleep) 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' (*Turiya*). There is no other way than this process of discrimination.

All these are called as *Sthāna* (स्थान). When a particular state appears, inevitably it cancels the very existence of the other two states. Though states are of this nature, the Self who is the substratum of these false 'appearances', is a constant factor. It is impossible to imagine the absence of the Self and also impossible to either know or doubt it. So it is proved that the *Sthānas* like Laukika etc., are mutually exclusive but they are in their true nature of the Self which is Absolute Consciousness. This nature of the Self is a constant one. It being so, this Self is untainted by the *Sthānas* which are merely false appearances conjured up by Avidyā. By determining this, the *Sthanitva* (स्थानित्व) of the Ātman also is automatically cancelled, because he is ever a non-dual one. So in the Self there is no *Sthānihood* also.

In this way, when all the three states or *Sthānas* have been falsified, the nature of the Self remains as transcendental reality, *Turiya*, Nondual one, birthless, fearless and ever devoid of causation. This truth is to be known by the aspirant as his own true nature through the previous teachings of Āgama Prakarana

etc. At the end of this discrimination he himself remains as a non-dual Self.¹

VII. Steps to initiation of the Self-knowledge (ज्ञानाङ्गोपदेशः)

“Three types of knowables when known successively” (ज्ञाने च त्रिविधे ज्ञेये क्रमेण विदिते स्वयम्—G.K.—4/89)—by this it is said here that the three states like Laukika (लौकिक), Shuddhalaukika (शुद्धलौकिक) and Lōkōttara (लोकोत्तर) are to be known or to be objectified by the aspirant.² By saying this, one might mistake that all these three states are there really. To remove this misunderstanding, this śloka—G. K.—4/90 is told, which is :

‘‘हेय-ज्ञेयाप्य-पाक्यानि विज्ञेयान्यग्रयाणतः ।
तेषामन्यत्र विज्ञेयादुपलम्भसिषु स्मृतः ॥’’

In this Sloka, it is said that

- i) to be rejected (हेयानि),
- ii) to be realised (विज्ञेयानि),
- iii) to be accepted (आप्यानि) &
- iv) to be made ineffective (पाक्यानि).

-
1. “ज्ञाने च लौकिकादिविषये ज्ञेये च लौकिकादौत्रिविधे-पूर्वं लौकिकं स्थलम्, तदभावेन पश्चात् शुद्धं लौकिकम् तदभावेन लोकोत्तरम् इत्येवं क्रमेण स्थानत्रयाभावेन परमार्थसत्ये तुर्ये अद्वये अजे अभये विदिते स्वयमेव आत्मस्वरूपमेव ।”

—[G. K. Bh. —4/89]

2. This karika elaborates the Advaita method of realising the Self (Turiya) which consists in the analysis and co-ordination of the experience of the three states.

These four types of Sādhana are initiated here to get the final consummation i.e. Parājñāna Nishtā (पराज्ञाननिष्ठा). These are to be practised in the beginning as a means alone, but they are not real. After getting established in the true nature of the Self he will realise that the Self is the only reality and everything else are the means alone.

i) Here the three states meaning Lōukika, Shuddhalōukika & Lōkōttara as they are called as, 'Waking, Dream and Deep sleep' respectively, are to be rejected. The methodology of rejecting these states is said here. These three notions of the states are conjured up on the Self through ignorance just as snake etc., on the rope. According to Mandukya Bh.—7:

“कथं पुनः अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादीनामात्मनि गम्यमानानां रज्ज्वादी सर्पादिवत्
प्रतिषेधात् असत्त्वं गम्यत इति ? उच्यते, ज्ञस्वरूपाविशेषेऽपि
इतरेतरव्यभिचारात् असत्यत्वं रज्ज्वादाविव सर्पधारादिविकल्पभेदवत् ;
सर्वत्र अव्यभिचारात् ज्ञस्वरूपस्य सत्यत्वम् ।”

—The significance of this sentence is that whenever a particular state appears on the Self it cancels the existence of other two inevitably. So these are false appearances just as the serpent etc., on the rope. But one should realise that the nature of consciousness which is one's own Being is a constant factor of these appearances. So one should discern that the Self is the only reality and the states are false appearances. This is the process of rejecting the states. This is the first of the above four points.

Here also the word used as successively (क्रमेण), is to be known. Strictly speaking there is no emphasis on the process of successive knowing meaning first, one has to take waking state, it should be merged in the dream state, and that should be merged

in deep sleep etc. But this discipline is not intended to be stressed here, because when a brilliant student starts to determine the nature of any particular state and if he observes (a) that the whole state is pervaded by the nature of consciousness; (b) the whole phenomenon of the state has been illumined by the nature of consciousness; and at last (c) the state has no independent existence apart from the nature of consciousness just as cinema pictures not having any independent existence apart from arc lamp, then by this minute observation the aspirant can falsify the statehood and realise that the Self is ever devoid of these states and hence he is *Turiya*. For example, the Vaishvānara—the real nature of the Self when appears as if it is conditioned or circumscribed by the waking state, one can observe that the whole waking state is pervaded and illumined by the Self whose nature is pure consciousness and that there is no independent existence to this waking apart from the consciousness and so it is a false appearance and the Self is the only reality. In this way when the waking state itself has been falsified, where are the ideas regarding dream or deep sleep ?

Initially the complainant of the three states is lodged by this waking ego. The waking ego assumes that this is the true waking state and apart from this there are two other states such as dream and deep sleep. The same is the case with the dream ego also. So, where there is a “Me-notion”, it holds that particular state is the true waking and apart from that there are two other states. When the waking state is falsified, then there will be no question of other two states. So one can determine that Vaishvanara himself is *Turiya*. So for him there will be no other State to discriminate. Only by this practice also one will stay in the true nature of *Turiya*. Hence there is no stress or emphasis on the successive

discipline or successive thinking. Though this is true of the brilliant student, for others who have no such brilliancy and fall under middle order or lower order in their capacity, for them the Shruti kindly initiates the way of successive thinking regarding the Avasthās, sublating the former state (avasthā) in the latter such as waking in dream and dream in deep sleep. Hence the word *Kramena* (क्रमेण) should be known as it is taught in general.

ii) Jneya (ज्ञेय) means the four types of assumptions—that it exists, does not exist, both existence and non-existence and totally non-existent i.e. void. One should discern that the transcendental reality which is the real nature of the Self and which is called as *Turīya* is beyond all the above said assumptions. This is intended here by the word Jneya as in Shvetāshvatara it is said एतद् ज्ञेयम् नित्यमेव आत्मसंस्थम् (1/2).

iii) To be acquired i. e. *Āpya* (आप्य) are *three*—*Pāṇḍitya* (पाण्डित्य), *Bālyā* (बाल्य) and *Mouna* (मौन). The mendicant who have renounced the three types of desires (पुत्रैषणा, लोकेषणा, वित्तैषणा) should acquire the above said three qualities viz, Pāṇḍitya. etc. “Therefore the Brāhmin having completed Pāṇḍitya has to stay on the strength of Balya, acquiring these two, he will become Muni” (Bṛha—3/5/1). Here *Pāṇḍitya* means getting the Ātmapratiyaya (आत्मप्रत्यय) i. e. Ātma Vijnana through the teachings of Shāstra and Guru. The word *Bālyā* has got two meanings—(i) according to Brhadaranyaka; on the strength of Ātmapratiyaya one should falsify the whole appearance of Anatman, the not-self, and (ii) according to Sūtra Bhāshya—3/4/50; he should be free from pride, conceit etc., like a child and so this word denotes that he should not display his knowledge and other virtues unnecessarily. And the word *Mouna* denotes the effortless awareness regarding

the real nature of the Self which is called as **Atmachintana Nisthaa**. These three should be acquired by a Sādhaka. This is *Āpya*.

iv) The fourth is **Pākya** meaning “made ineffective”. For eg., when the grains like rice etc., are boiled and used, they become ineffective to render resistance for digestion. So also the habits of Antahkarana such as blemishes i. e. attraction (Rāga), Repulsion (Dvesha), Delusion, (Mōha), etc., which are called passions (Kashāya)—all these are to be made ineffective relying on Pratipakshabhāvanā (प्रतिपक्षभावना) meaning subduing these Kashayās (कषाय) through the contradictory (opposing) thoughts like Vairāgya etc., in his mind. This Sāadhanā should be observed by a mendicant or Sadhaka.

So these four (i) to be rejected (avasthās) ; (ii) to be known that the transcendental reality is beyond all concepts such as ‘existence’ etc., (चतुष्कोटि वर्जितं परमार्थतत्त्वम्); (iii) to be achieved (Panditya, Bālyā etc.) and (iv) to be made ineffective as described above—these four should be observed at first by a Sādhaka. This is hinted by the word *Agrayānataha* (अग्रयाणतः), but one should not misunderstand that all these are real things, because except *Vijneya* (विज्ञेय) i. e., the true nature of the Self i.e., the non-dual, unborn, fearless *Turiya Atman*, all the above said things are only the means to realise the non-duality. This is said in this kārikā by the word **Upalambhaha** (उपलम्भः). The reality is the Brahman alone.

AUM TAT SAT

‘अलुप्तदृष्टिरात्माऽयं यथोक्तः स्वप्नबोधयोः ।
 प्राज्ञेऽपि च तथैवायं यद्वैतदिति वाक्यतः ॥
 अतिकारहेतुश्च यथात्मायं सुषुप्तिगः ।
 कूटस्थदृष्टिमात्रत्वात् तथा स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः ॥’

[*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Vārtika*—4/3/1907, 1908]

“Just as this Ātman is held to be possessed of an imperishable, self-luminous vision (consciousness) during dream and waking, so is he in the *Prājña* state of sleep. And just as this Ātman, on account of its imperishable, eternal, changeless vision, transcends all motives and factors of action in sound sleep, so does He in dream and waking too.” That is to say, Ātman is, by nature, ever the same Pure Consciousness in all the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep.”

**TEACHING OF
BRAHMAN THROUGH THE
ATTRIBUTIONS OF
AVIDYA AND MAYA**

Pages 273 — 352

about the Book....

Shankara was perhaps the first after Goudapaada to refer to the traditional method of Vedanta in his Gectha Bhashya by name.

तथा हि संप्रदायविदां वचनम् 'अध्यरोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते' इति ।

"Accordingly, knowers of the traditional method have declared 'That which is devoid of all distinctions and details is explained through deliberate Super-imposition and Recission'" (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 Super-imposition called *Avidyā* complexes us all to look upon Reality as infected with manifold distinctions. Now, in order to eduate the mind to interpret Reality as It is, the Upanishads uniformly employ the aforesaid method of Adhyārōpāpavāda or deliberate Super-imposition or provisional ascription and subsequent Rescission or abrogation.

In the book the Author has discussed in detail how teaching of the Brahman by superimposition of knowledge and ignorance or Vidya and Avidya is carried out. In the same way by superimposition of Māyā-Māyāvitva on the Brahman. Both the above 2 methods are sub-varities of the "Adhyārōpa-Apavāda" method.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Introduction	277
2. CHAPTER - I	
Vidya-Avidya Adhyaropa and Brahma - Bodha	283
3. CHAPTER - II	
Maya-Mayavitva Adhyaropa and Brahma-Bodha	327
4. APPENDIX	
Some view points regarding Avidya and Maya	349

अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते ।
 शिष्याणां बोधसिध्यर्थं तत्त्वज्ञैः कल्पितः क्रमः ॥
 अविद्योपाधिको जीवो मायोपाधिक ईश्वरः ।
 मायाविद्यागुणातीतं ब्रह्म वेदान्तडिण्डिमः ॥

INTRODUCTION

नमामि भगवत्पादं शङ्करं लोकशङ्करम् ।
धर्मसंस्थापकं देवं भाष्यकारं शिवात्मकम् ॥
पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञं सम्प्रदायविदं गुरुम् ।
सच्चिदानन्दयोगीन्द्रं वन्देऽहं देशिकोत्तमम् ।

It is very strange to say that the traditional teachings of Sri Gaudapada, Sri Shankara and Sri Sureshvara i.e., the line of Advaita Vedanta, are distorted by the later commentators who have started to twist Sri Shankara's original teachings according to their own system of Advaita.

In the *Brahmasiddhi* written by Sri Mandana Misra, who was mostly a contemporary to Sri Shankara and Sureshvara, has mentioned that there are some advaitins who have held the view regarding avidya, that it is the material cause for Adhyasa, this material cause is beginningless avidya etc. [तथा चोत्कम् अविद्योपादानभेदवादिभिः अनादिरप्रयोजना चाविद्या इति - (Brahma Siddhi-10)]. Mandana himself differs in so many points with Sri Shankara's Bhashyas.

When Sri Sureshvara's *Varthika* and *Naishkarmya Siddhi* have got popularised with Sri Shankara's

Bhashyas, the above said Advaita systems have lost their importance in the field of philosophy, because the traditional teaching of pristine pure Advaita system which had been taught since the time of Sri Gaudapada to Sri Sureshvara, is based mainly on *Universal acceptance and Comprehensive vision of life* according to the utterances of Shrutis & supported by the intuitive reasonings.

After some years the above said Avidyopadana Vada and the teachings of Sri Mandana Mishra have reappeared in the garb of commentaries on Shankara's Bhashyas and acquired important place in Advaita Vedanta. The author of *Panchapadika* is an advocate of *avidya-upadana vada*. Commonly the propaganda is made that Sri Padmapada, the author of Panchapadika is the direct disciple of Sri Shankara, though there is no reliable evidence for this. The sub-commentary for Panchapadika which is called *Vivarana* written by Sri Prakashatman Yathi also has not said that this is the work of Sri Padmapada. This ancient commentary is available only for the Shankara's Sutra Bhashya, upto four Sutras only. *Panchapadika* and *Vivarana* systems are called as *Vivarana Prasthanas*. In this line there are so many books, written by various followers of this tradition. Mostly in these days this Vivarana system has taken predominant place in the teaching of Advaita Vedanta.

The second commentary on Sutra Bhashya has been written by Vachaspathi Mishra, which is known popularly as *Bhāmati*. The full commentary on the

whole of Sutra Bhashya is available for us. This commentary has followed mostly the Mandana's system of Advaita.

The author of Panchapadika and Vachaspathi Mishra have set out to show their own methods of Advaita in Shankara's original commentary. Taking up this extra-ordinary task in hand they have twisted the meaning of the sentences of Sri Shankara's Bhashya in a manner so as to suit their own systems.

Through their scholarly writings they have captured the hearts of Pundits, who have entered into Advaita philosophy and have acquired some how oneness with the Bhashya of Sri Shankara. After these commentaries and sub-commentaries so many books have been written by various authors, giving the predominance to prove logically the Advaita Siddhanta to understand its theory or methodology. And by the by to get the experience of Advaita teaching, the process of Patanjali Yoga system has been prescribed in all the Advaitic works from top to bottom. So Advaita Vedanta, as interpreted by Post-Shankara advaitins, is mostly a conglomeration of two systems i.e., the *logic (Tarka-Shastra)* for the Prakriya (or methodology) and *Patanjala Yoga* process for the practical experience.

Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji has freed the Advaita Vedanta from the clutches of the above said Tarka (Syllogistic reasonings) and Patanjala Yoga, and resuscitated the pristine pure Vedanta, which

is taught by Sri Gaudapada, Sri Shankara and Sri Sureshvara, after purging all later accretions and misinterpretations.

There are various differences between Bhashya and commentary. For the present I have tried to show in this book that the Superimposition and Rescission of *Avidya & Maya* - through these two attributions how the non-dual nature of Brahman is taught in Sri Shankara's Prasthanatraya Bhashyas. In these days commonly these two words namely Avidya and Maya are not clearly understood by the people and some scholars also. Regarding these two concepts, Advaita followers have confused and confronted such as Maya is the cause and Avidya (Adhyasa) is the effect and vice-versa and that both are *Anirvachaniya*. Avidya or Maya means an insentient power of Brahman or Atman to delude Souls etc. I have tried to show the exact definitions of these two words and also many other allied topics such as 'Vidya', 'Adhyaropa', 'Adhyasa', 'Adhyaropita', 'Maya Shakti', 'Eka Jiva Vada' and 'Nana Jiva Vada' etc., in two chapters, according to Shankara's Bhashyas. Adhyaropa-Apavada Prakriya (deliberate superimposition and subsequent rescission), the unique method of teaching the Brahman has been assigned a prominent place and the line of reasoning based on the utterances of the Shrutis and intuitive experiences, has been employed in determining the nature of Reality in this booklet.

Though in Shankara's Vedanta 'Avidya' and 'Maya'

are not identical, but the two terms can be used indiscriminately only in the figurative (secondary) sense. But it is not true that Maya is the material cause of Avidya or Adhyasa. This has been shown in the Appendix of this booklet.

At first I had no intention to publish a book regarding these matters. So I have furnished the subject matter as the answers to the queries/doubts etc., asked by my good philosophic friend *Sri Manas Kumar Sanyal, Calcutta*. I owe my deep debt to my friend who has edited and arranged the answers in a beautiful way in a book-form and also enthusiastically and philanthropically donated to publish this book. Sri Sanyal is an ardent aspirant of Advaita Vedanta and is the real devotee of Sri Sadguru Maharaj. May Almighty Lord bless him in all the aspects. I hope this attempt will be of some assistance to the critical reader in appreciating Shankara's teachings as revealed by *Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji of Karnataka*.

It is my duty to convey my thanks to the **Bani Printers** and also devotees who have helped in publishing this book in various ways. I wish Almighty will bless them also.

Dedicated to *H.H. Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji of Revered Memory*.

26th June 1989
Guntur, Andra Pradesh

DEVARAO KULKARNI

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	277
2.	Vidya-Avidya Adhyaaropa and Brahma-Bodha	283
3.	Maya-Mayavitva Adhyaropa and Brahma-Bodha	327

* * * * *

Teaching of Brahman Through The Attributions of Avidya and Maya

CHAPTER - I

VIDYA-AVIDYA ADHYAROPA AND BRAHMA-BODHA

(Teaching of Brahman through the superimpositions of knowledge and ignorance.)

1. The Methodology of Vedanta :

The methodology of Vedanta is *superimposition* and *Rescission* (अध्यारोप - अपवाद) alone which is used throughout Vedanta in teaching the nature of Reality. In this method there are so many subordinate methods which have been dealt with in Upanishads and also in Shankara's Bhashyas. The above said method (viz, teaching of the true nature of the Self through the superimpositions of knowledge and ignorance or Vidya & Avidya) is one of the sub-varieties of the 'Adhyaropa-Apavada' method.

Due to ignorance regarding the reality, one by nature, attributes certain features, e.g. the distinctions like 'I am a seeker of Truth, Brahman as an object to be known and

the teacher and the scriptures are the means to know it', 'the existence of three states like waking, dream & deep sleep as being independent states' etc. on the Reality, which in truth, are non-existence. To remove this innate misconception, the scriptural texts deliberately attribute certain other superior features which are in due course rescinded, ultimately leading to the realisation of the true nature of the Self after abolishing all superimpositions.

The superimposition is of two different varieties: one due to innate avidya of the common man and the other a deliberate device employed by the Shastra.

(i) The attribution or superimposition is seen in the common experience of life and is evident for all in daily life (अहमिदम्, ममेदम्, इति नैसर्गिकोऽयम् अध्यासः मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः). This attribution will be deliberately extended by Shastra to teach the nature of Brahman (अध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते). To elaborate, the superimposition is called as **Kalpita Samvriti** or **Adhyaropa** by Shastra (see G.Karika-4/73) i.e. the deliberate superimposition employed by the shastra for the purpose of teaching.

(ii) In our ordinary life what we have supposed regrading our life is called as **Adhyasa**, which means misconception regarding the truth. This is called as **Paratantra Samvriti** (G.K. Bh: 4-73). This ordinary human procedure due to avidya is also called **Loka-**

Samvriti (see G.Karika Bh-4/87). It will be seen that the empirical procedure and the Vedic one are both in the sphere of avidya only. In the beginning the adhyasa is explained and then the adhyaropa will be explained i.e. superimposed factors are described in a comprehensive manner before they are negated. After teaching the truth, the aspirant himself realises that there is no adhyasa or adhyaropa in the Self. When this realisation takes place then automatically the negation of the thing attributed will occur. This is called here as 'apavada' or *Rescission*.

II. Is There any difference between Adhyaropa and Adhyasa?

Adhyasa means misunderstanding, that is the defect of the antahkarana or mind. Due to adhyasa, when one mistakes one thing for another, which really does not exist, that false appearance is called Adhyaropa or Adhyaropita. For example when one does not know the real nature of the rope, he misunderstands the rope as a snake. Here his 'misunderstanding' i.e. wrong superimposition is called adhyasa. This is the subjective defect which pertains to antahkarana or mind. Due to this misunderstanding he feels such as there is a snake (this happens due to wrong identification between the rope and the snake) and he sees the rope as a snake—this is called Adhyaropa or Adhyaropita. Here 'feeling' as a snake is adhyaropa and 'seeing' the snake outside (i.e. a wrong perception of one as the other) is adhyaropita.

This is the case of common man's view. In the illustrated, the non-dual Brahman is misunderstood naturally by the mind as the world or universe etc. This misunderstanding which pertains to the mind is called *adhyasa*. And due to this *adhyasa*, he assumes the Brahman as the world, then this is called *adhyaropa*. So the world is called as *Adhyaropita* (or *Adhyastha* or *Vikalpita*). This is from the standpoint of common man's point of view. So it is called *Paratantra Samvriti* or *Loukika-Samvriti*.

To remove this misunderstanding, *Shastra* attributes primarily something else on Brahman. This type of attribution is called as *Kalpita-Samvriti*, which means *adhyaropa* by *Shastra* (previous *adhyaropa* was stated from the standpoint of common man). For example, I am a man, I am born in this world and I have been brought up in such and such a way and one day I will die etc. are common ideas which are called *Paratantra Samvriti* or *Loukika-Samvriti*. To remove this, at first the *Shastra* attributes the **VAISHVANARA-HOOD** on Atman (*Mandukya Upanishad-3*). This attribution by *Shastra* is intended to remove the common idea that I am an individual soul. This is *Shastric adhyaropa* or *Kalpita-Samvriti*. When this is also removed by *Shastra*, saying that **NA BAHISHPRAJNAM** (न बहिष्प्रज्ञम्—मां. 7), then this *adhyaropa* is gone and the non-dual Atman remains. So *adhyasa* is the subjective defect and *adhyaropita* is objective false appearance. For this refer *Gita-Bhashya*-

13/26, particularly the portion:

“अध्यारोपितसर्परजतादिसंयोगवत् सोऽयमध्यासरूपः
क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञसंयोगो मिथ्याज्ञानलक्षणः ।”

-Here the false appearance of the snake and silver are called ‘adhyaropita’ by Shankara and the misunderstanding is called as adhyasa.

So, in Shankara Vedanta ‘avidya’ is equal to adhyasa and ‘maya’ is adhyaropita. This is called in Sutra-Bhashya-2/1/14, as ‘avidyakalpita’ etc. When Moolavidyavaadins say that maya or prakriti, which is called as ‘Moolaavidya’ is the material cause for adhyasa, then moolaavidya would not be an attributed thing (i.e. adhyaropita). So it will not get removed by vidya. If it is ‘kalpita’ or avidya-adhyaropita, then it will be absurd to say, according to them, that it is the material cause of adhyasa. So ‘adhyaropita’ means the false appearance, ‘adhyaropa’ means feeling one thing as another (e.g., conceiving the nacre as silver) and ‘adhyasa’ means misunderstanding.

The difference between the ‘adhyasa’ and ‘adhyaropa’ is very subtle. The misunderstanding is there in the mind in the first place and then he feels the thing which it is not there. This ‘feeling’ is called as adhyaropa. This is clearly stated by Shankara in Sutra-Bhashya-4/1/5 thus:

“ततश्च यथा ‘शुक्तिकायां रजतम् इति प्रत्येति’, इत्यत्र शुक्तिवचनः एव शुक्तिका शब्दः, रजतशब्दस्तु रजत

प्रतीतिलक्षणार्थः । प्रत्येति एव हि केवलं रजतं इति, न तु अत्र रजतमस्ति ।”

In this sentence, Shankara shows that the word **Pratyeti Atra** the adhyaropa due to adhyasa (e.g., the man has merely a cognition of silver) and the word **Pratitilakshanaarthaha** shows adhyaropita, the false appearance (i.e., the word ‘rajata’ denotes an appearance of silver by a figure of speech).

In conclusion, bereft of adhyasa there will be no adhyaropa or adhyaropita. So, in adhyasa only other two words are included. Though this is the thing, if we were to analyse these points, ‘adhyasa’ and ‘adhyaropa’ are the defects pertaining to the mind i.e., subjective and ‘adhyaropita’ is the objective false appearance.

Now we have to proceed to the attribution of ‘Knowledge’ and ‘Ignorance’.

III. Common Experience of knowledge and ignorance in our daily life: Three aspects of Avidya:

Ignorance is natural for human mind. For example, the just born child does not know anything regarding himself or others. As the child grows slowly, he gets the knowledge of mother, father etc., and regarding the surroundings. So, in our life, ignorance is natural regarding anything. When the knowledge occurs regarding a particular thing, ignorance of that thing will be removed completely.

Ignorance is of three kinds :

- i) Non-perception or non-apprehension, also called AGRAHANA (तत्त्वाग्रहण),
- (ii) Misconception or misunderstanding, also called ADHYASA (अध्यास),
(Anyatha-grahana, Anyatha-jnana, Anyatha-pratyaya; Viparita-grahana, Viparita-jnana, Viparita-pratyaya; Mithya-grahana, Mithya-jnana, Mithya-pratyaya—these are all synonymous terms which mean misunderstanding or adhyasa).
- (iii) Doubting, also called SAMSHAYA (संशय).

All these three kinds are called Ignorance or Avidya meaning the word avidya includes all the three kinds. When the knowledge occurs in the mind, then all the three will vanish at once. Sri Shankara says this in his Bhashya clearly:

- (i) ‘Indeed nescience is a Tamasic notion; for, basically it is what obscures. It gives rise to mis-apprehension, doubt or non-apprehension. It does not exist where there is the light of discrimination.’
(Geeta-Bh-13/2)¹

- (ii) ‘Ignorance, whether it means the want of Knowledge

1 “अविद्यायास्तामसत्वात् । तामसो हि प्रत्यय आवरणात्मकत्वात् अविद्या विपरीत ग्राहकः संशयोपस्थापको वा अग्रहणात्मको वा । विवेकप्रकाशभावे तदभावात् ।”
(Geeta-Bh-13-12)

or Doubt or a False notion, is always removable by knowledge....' (Briha-Bh-3/3/1)¹

So, the ignorance is natural for human mind. It is removed by the knowledge. Here one thing we have to remember is that the knowledge will be got by the effort only. Efforts are of various kinds just as taking teachings from others or observation of things or performing experiments etc. So, we have to try for knowledge of anything. Hence he who has got plenty of knowledge of so many things or so many sciences is called as scholar or pandit in this world. He who does not know anything is called an ignorant man. Misconceptions, unlike right knowledge, are quite natural to mankind. All these are the explanations of ignorance and knowledge which are inherent in our life.

IV. Ignorance regarding one's own true nature :

According to Vedanta there is ignorance regarding one's own true nature of the Self common to human mind naturally. For example, according to Shrutis, one's own true nature is non-dual Brahman. If we ask the question to anybody as to whether he knows his true nature as Brahman, his reply would be that he does not know. 'Then, who are you'? His reply would be 'I am so and so.' And then being asked the question - 'How do you

1 "यदि ज्ञानाभावः, यदि संशयज्ञानम्, यदि विपरीत ज्ञानम् वा उच्यते अज्ञानमिति सर्वं हि तत् ज्ञानेनैव निवर्त्यते ।" (Briha-Bh-3/3/1)

say that you are this body? You have to leave this body one day. Then, who are you'? He replies that there are so many doubts regarding these things. Hence he does not want to enter into these metaphysical arguments. By this common experience Vedanta says that there is ignorance regarding the true nature of one's own Self which is common for human mind. Accordingly, this ignorance regarding one's own self is common for the ignorant and the scholar. Hence the dealings of the ignorant and the pandit are in the ignorance only, just like the darkness and light which appear in a cinema, are in the darkness which is there in the theatre. In this way, Vedanta shows the ignorance regarding the self which is there in our life. It is this natural tendency of the human mind ('अहमिदम्', 'ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः) to mix up the real Atman and the unreal un-Atman owing to a misconception (मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः, सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य) as well as the mistaken transference of the mutual properties on each other, for want of discrimination (अन्योन्यस्मिन् अन्योन्यात्मकताम् अन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्य इतरेतराविवेकेन) that has been called Avidya in Vedanta according to Shankara's interpretation. To remove this ignorance regarding one's own Self, the knowledge of Self must be gained through the help of the teachings of the knower of the Self and the Vedanta Shastra. This is the attribution of the dealings of the Avidya and Vidya.

‘तमेतमेबलक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिता अविद्येति मन्यन्ते, तद्विवेकेन
च वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः।’

(Adhyasa Bhashya)

V. Two Categories of Avidya :

It is said earlier that the ignorance is of three kinds. All these three kinds will be included in two groups :

- (i) Causal ignorance or **Kaaranaavidya** (कारणाविद्या) and
- (ii) Effective ignorance or **Kaaryaavidya** (कार्याविद्या).

The non-perception is called causal ignorance and misconception and doubting are called as effective ignorance, meaning due to non-perception or want of discrimination (**Aviveka**) one misconceives the things or will have the doubts. So these are called as Causal and Effective ignorances.

We have to discuss here a subtle point that in all these three kinds of ignorances, which is predominant one?

From the stand-point of scientific analysis of human mind, it seems that the non-perception itself is the predominant factor. It is correct also. Shri Sureshvara endorses this view in his Taittiriya Vartika. He holds that mistaken knowledge can never arise without the absence of correct knowledge and according to him, absence of

correct knowledge (ज्ञानाभाव) is Avidya in the main.

But from the stand-point of life and experience, the predominance goes to the misconception (मिथ्याज्ञान or विपरीतज्ञान) alone, because the human dealings start with misconception at first, but he does not suspect that this is misconception. He takes it as the right knowledge. When the result goes against his expectations, then he suspects about the correctness of his knowledge. Through the proper guidance when he gets the correct knowledge of the things, then he himself realises that what he had understood before is wrong. Due to non-perception or non-discrimination or want of discrimination, I have misunderstood the thing. So, he himself systemises that the cause of his misnuderstanding is non-perception and that he had proceeded with misconception in the beginning. Hence the misconception or adhyasa is the predominant factor in ignorance. So Shankara emphatically states this in his introduction to his Sutra Bhashya :

‘This superimposition, that is of this nature, is considered by the learned to be avidya, nescience.’

“तमेतम् एवं लक्षणम् अध्यासं पण्डिताः अविद्या इति मन्यन्ते”

Thus in the opinion of Shankara, Avidya is equal to adhyasa. Though the word avidya consists of all the three

kinds, that is non perception, misconception and doubting, the word 'adhyasa' denotes misconception alone. Because adhyasa is the predominant factor in all these three kinds. Hence the non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self is the causal ignorance and misconception and doubting are effective ignorance. [See Maandukya Karika- 1/11 to 15 and Shankara's commentary thereof].

VI. *Why should we not say that the ignorance pertains to the Self and why should we understand that the ignorance pertains to the mind?*

In Shankara's Bhashyas, this question is raised mainly on two occasions. (i) Geeta-Bh-13/2 and (ii) Tai-Bh-2/8/5.

In Geeta-Bhashya Shankara has given the common experience of life as an illustration. For example, a man gets cataract in his eyes. Due to this defect, non-perception, misconception and doubting will occur regarding the forms and colours. This is not due to the defect of the seer. Because when the cataract is removed the seer sees the forms and colours as they are. So the defect pertains to the instrument alone and not to the user of the instruments. Hence, here also the ignorance pertains to the instrument i.e., the mind or antahkarana. By this Shankara confirms that the knower who is the Kshetrajna (क्षेत्रज्ञ) whose nature is pure consciousness, for him there is no dealing such as ignorance and

knowledge etc. He is Absolute Consciousness. From the stand-point of empirical life the ignorance pertains to the mind alone and that should be as it is. So he says in his Adhyasa-Bhashya that :

“एवमयम् अनादिः अनन्तः नैसर्गिकः अध्यासः मिथ्याप्रत्यय रूपः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वप्रवर्तकः सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः ।”

This argument is based on the common empirical experience of life and shows the fact that the knower has no ignorance.

In the Tai. Upanishad Bhashya-2/8/5, Shankara shows that from the standpoint of witnessing principle of life (साक्षी अनुभव) here and now one can intuit that one's own true nature is beyond the dealings of ignorance and knowledge and is of the nature of Pure and Absolute consciousness. For this we can study the question and answer given below :

Are knowledge and ignorance the qualities of the Self? Not so, for they are perceived. Discrimination (i.e. knowledge) and non-discrimination (i.e. ignorance) are directly perceived, like colours etc, as attributes of the mind. Not that colour, perceived as an object, can be an attribute of the perceiver. And ignorance is objectified by one's own intuition when one thinks as, 'I am ignorant', 'My knowledge is not distinct'. Similarly the difference of knowledge (from the Self) is perceived and the enlightened people communicate the knowledge of the

Self to others; and so too, others grasp it. Accordingly, knowledge and ignorance are to be ranked with name and form; (तस्मात् नामरूपपक्षस्यैव विद्याविद्ये) they are not attributes of the Self, in accordance with other Vedic text, '(that which is called space) brings about the manifestation of name and form'.

So, it is clarified by Shankara that these three aspects of avidya are the modifications of the Antahkarana (inner instrument or mind).

VII. There are no Dealings such as Vidya and Avidya in Brahman:

Commonly one says that 'I do not know this thing'—for this the meaning is that there is no knowledge for my intellect or mind regarding the particular thing. Here the question is—'How do you know that I "don't know"? For this, automatically one replies that 'This is my experience.' Here the ignorance which pertains to the mind regarding that particular thing, is illumined by the nature of Consciousness. When he gets the knowledge of that thing, he says 'I know it'. Here, the knowledge which has occurred in the mind is also illumined by the witnessing principle of life, as for example, the darkness in the film and also the light both are illumined by the arc lamp. Hence ignorance pertains to the mind alone and not to the Self. This is attributed to teach the true nature of the Self.

When one discriminates himself as the witness of the mind, and takes his stand there, from that standpoint he is ever Absolute Consciousness. This firm conviction regarding one's own true nature which has generated in the mind is called as *Self-Knowledge*. This knowledge, as it is the mental condition, is also a false one. From the standpoint of ignorance regarding the real nature of the Self, the Self is called ignorant person (because of the modification of the mind of the nature of non-discriminating knowledge of Self and non-Self) and from the stand-point of knowledge, the Self is called as Jnani (because of the modification of the mind, which is *unreal* likewise, of the nature of discriminating knowledge of Self and non-Self) this is clearly stated by Shankara in his Geeta-Bhashya-2/21¹. Just as in the dream both the conceptions distinguished as 'this is the right knowledge' and 'this is the false knowledge' are included in the dream alone and from the standpoint of waking they both become false knowledge alone, similarly when viewed from the standpoint of non-dual nature of Atman or the intuitive vision of non-dual Self, both right knowledge and false knowledge are avidya only. So, in the real nature of the Self, there are no empirical dealings such as ignorance

१. "यथा बुद्ध्याद्याहतस्य शब्दाद्यर्थस्य अविक्रिय एव सन् बुद्धिवृत्त्यविवेकविज्ञानेन अविद्यया उपलभ्य आत्मा कल्प्यते, एवमेवात्मानात्मविवेकज्ञानेन बुद्धिवृत्त्या विद्यया असत्यरूपयैव परमार्थतोऽविक्रिय एवात्मा विद्वान् उच्यते ।

and knowledge etc. It is transcendental consciousness. Only from the standpoint of common experience of life this attribution is made and when one takes a stand in the true nature of the witness of the mind, then automatically this previous attribution falsifies. This is called subsequent negation or *Apavada*.

Therefore the viewpoints imagined by the commentators such as avidya is a potency of the Self, and that it encompasses the Self etc. are quite contradictory statements to Shankara's Bhashya. The dealings like thinking regarding the cause and effect relationship and location of avidya, subject matter for avidya, etc. are in the field of avidya because Shankara says in his Adhyasa Bhashya in consonance with the experience thus :

‘All forms of worldly and Vedic behaviour that are connected with the valid means of knowledge and objects of knowledge start by taking for granted this mutual superimposition of the Self and non-Self, known as nescience, and so do all the scripture dealing with injunction, prohibition or emancipation’¹.

Not understanding, doubt or misconception may be possible in the case of knowledge of objective

१. तमेतम् अविद्याख्यं आत्मानात्मानोः इतरेतराध्यासं पुरस्कृत्य सर्वे प्रमाणप्रमेय व्यवहाराः लौकिकाः वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः, सर्वाणि च शास्त्राणि विधिप्रतिषेध मोक्षपराणि ।
(Adhyasa Bhashya)

phenomena, but never with regard to Atman who is the real Self of the knower himself. Hence there is no necessity of removing the ignorance which has encompassed Brahman. According to Shankara, the dealings of ignorance and knowledge which are evident for all in daily life are attributed regarding the Self for the purpose of teaching the Truth and ultimately he states that when the unity of Atman is intuited, there is no place for any ignorance and knowledge in Brahman or Atman as it is the pure Consciousness and non-dual one and from that stand-point the attributions are rescinded.....

So the dealings of the ignorance and the knowledge about the Self, is itself in the realm of avidya or ignorance, they are not related to Atman.

VIII. What is the correct view to take about these concepts of Vidya and Avidya?

The following excerpt from Shankara's Sutra Bhashya (4/1/3) will clarify this:

- Opponent : To whom does this Avidya, non-apprehension (Agrahana) pertain ?
- Vedantin : To you, who are asking this question.
- Opponent : Is it not stated by the Shruti that I am Ishvara, that is Absolute nature of consciousness ?
- Vedantin : If you have realised this thing, then you are already an enlightened person and there

is no Avidya or non-apprehension to anybody.

Opponent : But, if Advaitins accept the Avidya as a second entity besides Atman, then there will be no *Advaita* (because with Atman avidya also exists as a standing menace).

Vedantin : This objection which is raised on Advaita philosophy is also refuted by this answer (i.e. by showing the superimposition and rescission of the dealings of Vidya & Advīdya).¹

The significance of the above Bhashya portion is given below :

- (i) We have previously said that, from the empirical standpoint, a man naturally takes identification with his corporeal plane i.e. from body to ego (body, vital force, organs of action, sense organs, mind and intellect, feeling of enjoyments, such as happiness and misery). Here he assumes that 'I am the body and sense organs etc. are mine'. At this stage, ignorance is natural to the man regarding the true nature of the Self. So, from the empirical experience, *Avidya* is there and it is natural.

1. "कस्य पुनरयमप्रबोध इति चेत्, यस्त्वं पृच्छसि तस्य ते - इति वदामः । ननु अहं ईश्वर एवोक्तः श्रुत्या । यद्येवं प्रतिबुद्धोऽसि नास्ति कस्यचिदप्रबोधः । योऽपि दोषश्च्योद्यते कैश्चिदविद्यया किल आत्मनः सद्वितीयत्वात् अद्वैतानुपपत्तिरिति, सोऽप्येतेन प्रत्युक्तः ॥"

- (ii) If we ask a man, 'Do you know your true nature according to Shruti, that you are non-dual Brahman?' He replies frankly "that I don't know". This shows that he has got non-apprehension regarding his true nature. If we ask then, 'Who are you?' He replies simply, 'I am so and so'. This shows the misconception is there regarding his true nature. If we start to argue with him, how have you ascertained that you are this body or the body is yours? etc, then he says in this regard "I have got so many doubts." This shows that he has got doubtful knowledge also regarding his true nature.

In this way the non-perception, misconception and doubting are there naturally for everyone regarding his true nature. For this purpose, Sri Shankara has said in his **Adhyasa Bhashya** that the Avidya is evident for all so long as the unity of non-dual Atman is not intuited. So from the stand-point of Lokānubhava (dealings of empirical view), Avidya is there. Keeping all these ideas in mind Sri Shankara has replied here at first Avidya pertains to you who asks these questions. Hence from the stand-point of the superimposition, Avidya is accepted on the firm ground of Lokānubhava i.e. empirical view point.

- (iii) Taking this stand-point of empirical view Vedanta accepts the Avidya regarding one's own true nature.

(iv) Avidya will be removed inevitably by Vidya. As it is in the case of outer things so also it is in the case of one's own Self. So, Self-knowledge is required to remove this Avidya. Presupposing this Avidya for the purpose of teaching, the Shrutis teach that Atman is to be known and immortality attained by means of Self-knowledge. For this purpose Shankara said in Adhyasa Bhashya that :

(a) “तद्विवेकेन वस्तुस्वरूपावधारणं विद्यामाहुः ।”

(b) “अस्य (अध्यासस्य) अनर्थहितोः प्रहाणाय आत्मैकत्व विद्याप्रतिपत्तये सर्वे वेदान्ताः आरभ्यन्ते ।”

(v) After getting Self-knowledge, he takes a stand in his true nature of non-dual Self and realises that my nature is ‘Absolute consciousness’. From this stand-point of transcendental reality, there are no dealings of Avidya and Vidya. Hence from this transcendental stand-point Sri Shankara has said that there is no Avidya to anybody.

(vi) From the stand-point of superimposition, the Avidya is accepted on the firm ground of Lokānubhava and then the superimposition of getting knowledge i.e. Vidya is accepted from the stand-point on the firm ground of utterances of Shruti and comprehensive vision of life and universal acceptance. When he takes a stand in this true nature of the witnessing Self, then he realises

that as 'I am the nature of Absolute consciousness, so I have no dealings of Vidya and Avidya'. That is, the dealings of Vidya and Avidya cease to exist on the rise of enlightenment. This is the rescission of the previous attributions. From this stand-point Sri Shankara has said that the objection, which is raised on Advaita philosophy viz, 'if Advaitins have accepted the existence of Avidya as standing menace, then Atman will become '*Sadviteeya*' (सद्वितीय), is also refuted by showing the superimposition and rescission of Vidya and Avidya.

IX. Avidya is not a Potence of Brahman:

In the whole of the Prasthanatraya Bhashyas of Shankara, there is nowhere this type of contention regarding Avidya viz, **Avidya** is a potency of Brahman and it has got two powers : (i) **Avarana Shakti** (आवरणशक्ति) & (ii) **Vikshepa Shakti** (विक्षेपशक्ति)

- (i) According to Bhashya avidya is not a shakti. The word **Shakti** of Brahman which is called as Maya, is conjured up by avidya (अविद्याकल्पिता, for which see next chapter—'*Maya-Mayavitva Adhyaropa and Brahma-Bodha*') for the purpose of teaching alone.
- (ii) Whenever Shankara explains the nature of avidya he clearly states that avidya is natural to human mind.

(iii) The nature of avidya is non perception, misconception and doubting—this is clearly stated by Shankara in his Geeta-Bhashya 13/2. Here there is one word **Avaranaatmakatvaat** (आवरणात्मकत्वात्) in which this *avarana* is not the same as what Mulaavidyaavadins say. It is not a shakti. Shankara clearly explains this avarana as *tāmasa pratyaya* (तामसो हि प्रत्ययः) pertaining to the intellect or antahkarana alone, not to Brahman or the Self. For this he has given the illustration of the cataract which hinders the eyesight.

(iv) In Brihadaranyaka-Bhashya-4/3/20, Shankara states his position regarding the nature of avidya :

“अतः इदम् अविद्यायाः सतत्त्वमुक्तं भवति । सर्वात्मानं सन्तमसर्वात्मत्वेन ग्राहयति । आत्मनोऽन्यद्वस्त्वंन्तरमविद्यमानं प्रत्युपस्थापयति, आत्मानमसर्वमापादयति, ततस्तद्विषयः कामो भवति; यतो भिद्यते, कामतः क्रियामुपादत्ते, ततः फलम् । इदम् विद्यायाः सतत्त्वम् सह कार्येण प्रदर्शितम् ॥” (Briha-Bh-4/3/20)

In Sanskrit the word **Satattvam** (सतत्त्वम्) means ‘the true nature.’ Here in this portion Shankara has not said such as avidya is a *shakti* and it has got two types of powers etc. He says clearly that avidya projects the non-Self as if it is there in the Self even though it is not really there and then the dualistic world appears and due to dualism the desire starts etc. By this also it is clear that

according to Shankara the world or its seed-form is conjured up by avidya.

After **Panchapadika Prasthanam** (Pancha-padika commentary), the Shankara's utterances have been twisted to suit their theory of **Mulāvidyā**. And it is propagated as the genuine teachings of Shankara.

Shankara never says that the avidya is a potency of Brahman and it is *anirvachaniya* (अनिर्वचनीय), because to imagine or differentiate the relationship between *Shakta* (शक्त i.e. शक्तिमान्) and *Shakti* (शक्ति) the avidya is required inevitably. So avidya is not a potency of Brahman. The difference between the potency and one who is in possession of it, is made through avidya. This is Shankara's teaching.

X. Ajnana is not Bhaavaroopā, Sanatani and Anirvachaniya:

Commentators hold the view that ajnāna (अज्ञान) is **Bhaavaroopā** (भाव रूपम्). According to Shankara, any positive thing, that is Bhaavaroopā, will not be removed by Jnana (ज्ञान). Jnana, the knowledge is able to remove only the misunderstanding. Jnana has no capacity to destroy any positive thing and create anything new. It removes only the misunderstanding regarding the fact. This is emphatically declared by Shankara:

“न हि कचित् साक्षाद्वस्तुधर्मस्य अपोद्धी द्रष्टा ब्रह्मविद्या;
अविद्यायास्तु सर्वत्रैव निवर्तका दृश्यते न तु पारमार्थिकं वस्तु
कर्तुं निवर्तयितुं वा अर्हति ब्रह्मविद्या ।”

[Briha.Bh-1/4/10]

And Shankara often says *Jnanam Tu Jnapakam Na Karakamiti* (‘ज्ञानं तु ज्ञापकं न कारकमिति’ - Briha.Bh-1/4/10), which means that Shastra (or knowledge) won’t create anything but only reminds the real fact. When one understands the real nature of the rope, the knowledge regarding the rope has not destroyed the snake and has not created the rope newly. So, holding the view that avidya is Bhaavaroopa and Sanatani is quite contradictory to the common experience.

For this purpose the commentator says that ‘we have accepted avidya as Bhaavaroopa not for the purpose of saying that avidya is a thing, but only to say that it is not *Abhaava* such as the horns of hare. So it is *Sadasadanirvachaniya* (apparent things which are neither being nor not-being)’. This contention is incongruous, because if it is not ‘*Abhaava*’ then it falls into the category of ‘*Bhaavaroopa*’ only.

The illustration which is given by the commentators of *Darkness* (viz, it is not absence of light, it is positive something) is quite incongruous. For this refer *Panchapadika Prasthanam* by Sri Satchidanandendra

Saraswati (page 6). The absence of light is called here as 'darkness', since the darkness is not an existing thing or a positive thing. That which is darkness for human beings will no longer be so for few animals. In that darkness also some animals are capable of seeing things as for example—cat, wolf, tiger etc. This shows that the eyesight of these animals are able to see things even in that least quantity of light whereas we require sufficient light. From this we can easily understand that darkness is simply an absence of light and not something positive. So also the ignorance itself is not at all an entity (Bhaavaroopta). Therefore Shankara says in his Geeta Bhashya-13/2 thus, '*Viveka Prakasha Bhava Tadabhaavaat*' ('विवेकप्रकाशभावे तदभावात्') - meaning if the light of discrimination dawns, there will be no ignorance. From this we can easily judge that ignorance means want of discriminating knowledge. This is called here as *ajnāna*. The want of discrimination is called as *Kāraṇāvidyā* (i.e. causal ignorance) and the misunderstanding and doubting which are the consequences of avidyā as *Kāryāvidyā*. (This has already been discussed in the previous article-V.)

XI. Jñānavritti and Jñeyavagati:

The nature of the Self is itself the pure consciousness. It never becomes an object for anything. He is self-established. Hence there is no need for any pramāṇa or means of knowledge to know Him; only it is necessary

to cease or dispel one's identification with not-selves with the help of the teachings of the shastra and the Acharya or Guru and not any necessity whatsoever of creating the direct knowledge of Him (see Geeta Bh-18/50). From this standpoint it is correct to say that the Self is not *Chaitanya-prakaashyam* (चैतन्यप्रकाश्यम्).

But Shankara says in Geeta Bhasya-2/21, that the mind is the instrument to realise the Self which is purified by the Sadhanas of Shama (शम), Dama (दम) etc. and endowed with the teachings of the Shastra and the Acharya. Here the objection raised is that there is no possibility of the self-knowledge because the Self is not an objectifiable one 'by any means i.e. instruments such as sense organs and the mind etc. For this objection, Shankara has given the above answer i.e. 'शास्त्राचार्योपदेशजनितशमदमादिसंस्कृतं मन आत्मदर्शने करणम्।' This thing is explained by vedantins as 'Self is the Vishaya (विषय) of Shuddha-Chittavritti'

But we have to remember here that by purified mind also it is impossible to objectify the nature of the Self. For Brahman is, according to the Upanishads, beyond the objective range of both words and mind. One should not forget or ignore the Shruti: 'That which cannot be expressed by the word', 'That which cannot be thought of by the mind' (Kena-1/5,6), and also one should not disregard the dictum of the Sutra Bhashya, 'Shruti etc.

and immediate intuition and the like too are the immediate means according to the context' ('अनुभवादयश्च प्रमाणं')- Su. Bh.-1/1/2. So it can know Him only by intuition when it is merged in Him.

When mind turns towards the Self the mind loses its mindness (*manastva*) and appears as the Self i.e. the mind will have become one with Atman when one has realized the true nature of his Self. This type of appearance is called as *Jnānavritti* (शास्त्राचार्योपदेशजनितमात्मप्रत्ययिकं ज्ञानम्) Geeta.Bh-13/34. This is misinterpreted by some people as the Atman has been objectified by this Vritti. There is one anecdote connected with the infancy of Sri Rama. He wanted to play with the full-moon. The minister played a trick. He gave a mirror in the hand of Rama and the child was satisfied with the image, because he thought that he has the moon in his hand. Here also the same is the case with the Self-knowledge. Thus it is not contradictory to say that the Self is un-objectifiable one and it can be realised through the *Shuddha Chitta*.

When one understands the nacre (शुक्तिका) as silver he determines that 'that is Silver'. This is Vrittijnana of Silver. After cognising the true nature of the nacre he realises that the previous knowledge which he had got as silver, is a wrong notion. This type of cognition of the real nature of nacre is also a vritti. Thus from the standpoint of vritti both are concerned to the antahkarana

alone. These are called as *ajnana* (misunderstanding) and *Jnana* (knowledge) respectively. But here there is one subtlest point—we have to cognise that after knowing the real nature of the nacre one says, previously I had misunderstood this nacre as silver; here the notion regarding the silver is wrong and unreal. But the judgement that this type of notion had taken place previously in my mind is born now. This judgement emerges out when one takes his stand in his true nature of the Self and unknowingly he has objectified the modifications of his own mind as misunderstanding and understanding etc. This type of determination regarding the misunderstanding or true understanding of the mind is called here as *Avagati* (or *Anubhava*). By this, the conclusion that can be arrived at is that the notion of nacre is false, but the type of notion which had arisen in my mind perviously was real. This judgement is real because this has arisen on the firm ground of *Saakshi anubhava*. Shankara said,

“यद्यपि स्वप्नदर्शनावस्थस्य सर्पदंशनोदकस्नानादिकार्यं
मनृतम्, तथापि तदवगतिः सत्यमेव फलम् । प्रतिबुद्धस्या
प्यबाध्यमानत्वात् । न हि स्वप्नादुत्थितः स्वप्नदृष्टं सर्पदंशनोदक
स्नानादिकार्यं मिथ्येति मन्यमानः, तदवगतिमपि मिथ्येति मन्यते
कश्चित् ।”

(Sutra-Bhashya-2/1/14)

When one dreams he feels so many things in his dream such as bathing, being bitten by a serpent etc.

After waking he says that all of them are false and unreal. But he does not say that the intuitional experience of the dream which had occurred in him is false. This means that one says that the dream is false, but the intuitional experience of the dream such as a dream had taken place is not false. Because it concerns to the *Saakshyanubhava* (साक्ष्यनुभव). This type of Saakshyanubhava or intuition is called as *avagati*.

This is a very subtle point and one will be able to understand this with discriminative mind—discrimination between the *vritti* which has arisen in the mind and the true nature of the Self which illumines all the *vrittis*. When it illumines, at that time the intuitional experience in *antahkarana* such as, ‘I dreamt’, ‘I misunderstood’ etc.,—this type of knowledge is directly reflected in our mind without the intervening means of any instruments of knowledge. Thus that which has been illumined is false and the nature of the Self as pure consciousness which illumines the *vrittis* is true.

XII. Pramanabhuta Jnana and Phalabhuta jnana :

According to commentaries like Panchapadika, Vivarana etc. : The commentators have distinguished Jnana as:

Vritti-vyaapti (वृत्तिव्याप्ति) and *Phala-vyaapti* (फलव्याप्ति). The first is called Pramana Bhuta Jnana and the other one is Phala Bhuta Jnana. According to this

theory, the Moolavidya encompasses Brahman. And the same avidya or a part of Moolavidya encompasses the outer things also. Hence we have no knowledge of those things. To get the knowledge of outer things two functions are necessary—

- (1) The *Vritti* should pervade things. By this the curtain of *avidya* will be removed.
- (2) After that *Chidabhāsa* comes there and gets the right knowledge of the thing.

Here the former function is called *Pramana Bhuta Jnana* while the latter, the *Phala Bhuta Jnana*. These are divided as *Vritti-vyapti* and *Phala-vyapti* respectively. ('घटविषयकाज्ञानं च निवर्त्य घटप्राकट्यं च कार्यमित्युभयत्रापि प्रमाणव्यापारः इति मतम् - माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः' page 86). So these two types of functions are necessary to understand the outer things according to commentators.

But according to Shankara, there are no two separate functions in this process. Firstly, there is no *Avarana* (आवरण) of *avidya* on the outer things. *Avidya* means 'Non-perception, Misconception and Doubting' alone (Ref. Geeta Bhashya-13/2). This is a *Tamasic avarana* which pertains to *antahkarana*. When one tries to get the knowledge of a particular thing with the help of teachings, observations etc, then the *vritti* pervades the thing with *chidābhāsa*. Without being pervaded by the nature of consciousness of the Self, it is impossible to imagine

the very existence of the vritti. Whenever there is any knowledge of any object, the knowledge of the object pervaded by the pure consciousness of Atman alone is obtained. So when the Vritti with consciousness (i.e. with Chidabhasa) pervades the thing, then automatically the Phala Bhūta Jnana or Phalabhūta Anubhava generates in the mind. Hence, once the pramana removes the non-perception and misconception of a thing the Phala Bhūta Jnana will result and that alone is the function of a pramāna. For example, the pot which is in a dark room is not seen by the naked eyes. When light comes, it removes darkness alone and the knowledge regarding the pot takes place automatically which is the result ('तमोनिवृत्तिरेव तु फलं प्रमाणव्यापारस्य,.... न तु घटाधिगमेऽपि व्याप्प्रियते तमोनिवृत्तिनान्तरियकत्वात् घटविज्ञानस्येति - माण्डूक्यरहस्यविवृतिः'—page-106).

So for pramāna there are no two functions, such as removing wrong knowledge or non-perception of a thing and giving knowledge of a thing. The only function of the pramāna (the valid means of knowledge) is merely to remove misconception regarding the thing—then, the knowledge of the thing arises naturally without requiring any other function whatsoever. For this, the reader is referred to the introductory Bhashya of Maandukya Mantra No.7.

In this way regarding the knowledge of the Self

also, the function of *pramāna* is to remove the misconception alone. Since *Atmajnāna* is self-established; only it is necessary to cease or dispel one's identification with not-selves with the help of the *Shāstra* and *Ācharya*. See the following portion of Shankara *Bhāshya* and their English translation by Swāmiji of *Holenarasipura*.

- (a) “अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत्, न; अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वाच्छास्त्रस्य । न हि शास्त्रं इदं तया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति, किं तर्हि, प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्यवेदितृवेदनादिभेदमपनयति ।” (S.Bh-1/1/4)

Objection : If Brahman is not an object of any action, then it cannot be maintained that the *Shāstra* is the means of knowing it.

Reply : Not so, for the *Shāstra* purports to wipe off the distinctions superimposed on Brahman by *Avidya*. (To explain:-) ‘The *Shāstra* does not indeed propose to teach Brahman as such and such an object, but it teaches It as no object at all, being the inmost Self and removes all distinctions created by *Avidya* such as the knowledge, knower and knowable’.

- (b) “शास्त्रं तु अन्त्यं प्रमाणमतद्धर्माधारोपणमात्रनिवर्तकत्वेन प्रमाणत्वमात्मनिप्रतिपद्यते न त्वज्ञातार्थज्ञापकत्वेन ।”

(Geeta *Bhāshya*-2/18)

Here it is said: Even the statement that the Shāstra teaches how to know Atman, is only by the process of removing the **Pramatrutva** (प्रमातृत्व) or knowership that is imagined or conceived in Him and thereby falsifying the dealings of Pramāna and Prameya. Because Atman is the real nature of the Pramātru and as He is Self-established, there is no need for any Pramāna or means of knowledge or aid to know Him. It is for this reason only the Shastra is known as the ultimate or final proof or '*Anthya Pramana*' (अन्त्यप्रमाण)

- (c) The same is dealt in Brihadaranayaka Bhashya- 4/4/20 also.

According to the commentators the Moolavidya encompasses Brahman. They say that when the knowledge of the Self takes place then the vrittis pervade the nature of the Self. By this the curtain of Moolavidya which resides on Brahman is removed. But there is no necessity of Phala-vyaapti, because Brahman is Self-effulgent. For example, to see the pot which is in the dark-room, the light and eyesight both are required. But when we want to see the light then the eyesight is enough—no necessity of another light. The same is the case with Brahmajāna. In this point some commentators differ and say—where even there is Vritti-vyaapti, there must be Phala-Vyaapti. In the case of Brahma-Jnāna or Self-knowledge, even though the Self is Self-effulgent one, the Chidabhāsa also shines there. But in the presence of brilliant light of

the Self, this Chidabhāsa is insignificant, just like a candle-flame in a daylight. These are the opinions of commentators.

But in Shankara Bhāshya, these types of arguments are not found. The real nature of the Self pervades the Vrittis (pratyaya), not the vrittis pervade the Self as contended by the commentators. But one thing to be noted here is that when the **antashkarana-vritti** completely turns towards the true nature of the Self through the discrimination, then it loses its vrittitva - (वृत्तित्व). At that time aspirant himself remains as the witnessing principle of life (साक्षिचैतन्य) which is the true nature of the Self and the antahkarana which follows this nature starts to appear just like the true nature of the Self. For this purpose Sri Gaudapada said in Maandukya Karika-3/33 that this Jnana-vritti or pratyaya is not separate entirely apart from Brahman - ज्ञानं ज्ञेयाभिन्नम्. Here the antahkarana is completely pervaded by the Self, so it appears just like Self. This is called as *Ātmapratyaya* in Māndukya Mantra-7. This is Shankara's contention. According to this great Master, when the Pramāna removes the misconception regarding a thing, then *Phalabhūta Anubhava* or *Phalabhūtajnana* emerges out automatically—which agrees with the *Universal Intutitional Experience*.

XIII. Regarding Eka-jiva vāda and nānā-jiva vāda:

Controversy about the number of Jivas :

The discussion about the relative merits of *Ekajiva-Vada* एकजीववाद—the theory of a single Jiva) and *Nānājiva-Vāda* नानाजीववाद—the theory of many Jivas) is futile, since from the empirical standpoint (vyāvahāric dristi), we do believe and behave as if there are actually a number of Jivas. For this refer to Brahma-Sutra Bhashya-3/2/9—the last paragraph:

“सदेव तूपाधिसंपर्कात् जीव इत्युपचर्यते इत्यसकृत् प्रपञ्चितम् । एवं सति यावदेकोपाधिगता बन्धानुवृत्तिः, तावदेक जीवव्यवहारः । उपाध्यन्तरगतायाम् तु बन्धानुवृत्तौ जीवान्तर व्यवहारः ।”

‘We have explained at length again and again, that it is Pure Being (Brahman) alone that is spoken of as a Jiva owing to connection with a conditioning associate. This being so, we talk of one particular Jiva, so long as bondage continues as attaching itself to one *Upādhi* (conditioning associate). But in the case of bondage continuing to attach itself to another *Upādhi*, the talk of another Jivā becomes necessary.’

Here Shankara accepts both the views that if we hold the *Samasthi* (समष्टि) or collective antahkarana as the upādhi for Atman, then it is *Eka-Jiva-Vada*; instead of this, if we hold the individual antahkaranas—as they are many—then *Nānājiva-Vyavahāra* will take place. Sri

Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji has translated the *Brahma Sutra Bhashya* in Kannada and he has given the foot-note that in *Nyayanirnaya-Commentary* of the *Bhashya*, it is said that Shankara has refuted the *Nānā-jiva vāda*, but it is baseless, and it is not supported by the *Bhāshyakāra*. The *Bhāshyakāra* has accepted both the views from two different standpoints. When the *Samashti upādhi*, meaning *Samashti antahkarana upādhi* is taken, the Self is called as *Mahān Atman* or *Hiranyagarbha* or *Prathamajā* (see *Kathopanishad* -1/3/13 and *Brahma Sutra Bhashya* - 1/4/1, last para).

Here in *Sutra-Bhashya*, the two words are used as **Bhokta भोक्ता** and **Hiranyagarbha** (*Agryaam* i.e. *Agrajā* meaning the first born one). The word 'Bhokta' denotes an individual soul. Here it is taken from the standpoint of various *antahkaranas* as *upādhis*. This is *Nānājiva vāda*. And in the word *Agryaam* or 'Hiranyagarbha', the standpoint is taken from the *Samashti antahkarana* which is one. This is *Ekajiva vāda*. The same single *antahkarana* appears as many due to the *upādhis* of the body. So, the *Ekajiva-vādā* or *Nanajiva-vādā* are from the standpoint of *upadhis* which in itself is false appearance conjured up by *Avidya*. Hence Shankara accepts both the views from the different standpoints. It is clearly mentioned in the above mentioned *Brahma-Sutra Bhashya*-3/2/9, that the implication of the plurality of Jives in this Sutra is

justified by Shankara as due to conditioning associates. This is so because the Jivadhoo itself is a false appearance conjured up by Avidya. This is clearly stated by Shankara in his Sutra Bhashya-1/3/19:

“नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तस्वभावे कूटस्थनित्ये एकस्मिन् असङ्गे परमात्मनि तद्विपरीतम् जैवम् रूपम् व्योम्नीव तलमलादि परिकल्पितम् ।” — ‘In the supreme Atman, ever pure, ever conscious and ever free in nature, absolutely changeless, one and untainted by anything else, has been conjured up, the Jiva-form quite opposed to this in nature, just as a surface and dirt are fancied to pertain to the sky’.

The statement—‘various types of Jivas exist in this world’ is made from the empirical or the waking point of view alone. If it is observed from the comprehensive view point of the three states, one & only one Atman alone exists. Nothing whatsoever exists second to or apart from Him i.e., Atman or the Self is the only Reality and it has no gradations—‘एकं च पुनः सत्त्वम्—Sutra Bh.-2/1/16. So, it is foolish to quarrel on the issue of which is correct and which is wrong in the above said Ekajiva-vādā & Nanajiva-vādā.

We can understand this from the illustration of the dream. The dream state occurs (takes place) in one’s own Being which is the substratum of the whole dream state and absolute nondual one. During the dream state

naturally one feels that 'I am an individual soul residing in this world and there are so many other souls and creatures like me in this world' etc. From the standpoint of this notion during the dream-time, the Nānājiva-vādā is accepted. When we see from the standpoint of the substratum i.e., the real nature of the Self, as there is no other source for the dream state apart from this Self, only the Self appeared as if it has taken the form of many souls. And the same Self has appeared in the form of Samashti antahkarana (collective mind) and from that standpoint the Self is described as Hiranyagarbha through this collective Upādhi. The same principle is applied to the waking state in Maandukya while describing the word *Vaishvanara* (वैश्वानर)

“विश्वश्चासौ नरश्चेति विश्वानरः, विश्वानर एव वैश्वानरः; सर्वपिण्डात्मानन्यत्वात्।” (Maandukya. Bhashya-3)

Here the Ekajiva-vādā is taken from Samasthi Upādhi. It helps to realise the truth (i.e., the realisation of the non-dual Atman) which is said in Geeta-6/29 and Ishavasya Upanisad- 6 & 7, as 'One sees all the creatures in himself and sees himself in all the creatures, for he sees the same Reality (Atman) everywhere.'

In Briha-upanisad Bhāshya also, Shankara has said these two view points;

“उपाधिबशात् संसारित्वं, न परमार्थतः; स्वतोऽसंसार्येव।

एवमेकत्वं नानात्वञ्च हिरण्यगर्भस्य । तथा सर्वजीवानां, 'तत्त्वमसि'
इति श्रुतेः ।”

That the transmigratory character of Hiranyagarbha is not real, but due to limiting adjuncts, is known from the Shruti texts (Ka.-1/2/21). Essentially he is but the Superme Self. So, Hiranyagarbha is one as well as many. The same is the case with all beings, as the Shruti says, 'That thou art' (Ch.- 6/8/7). When divested of all limiting adjuncts, everyone is spoken of by the Shrutis & Smritis as the Supreme Self.

So both the view points are accepted by Shankara from the point of Adhyaropa for the purpose of teaching. Yet post-Shankara advaitins, who have interpreted Advaita wrongly, have entertained different views as to whether Eka-jivavada or Nana-jivavada is the more correct one! The commentary of Nyayanirnaya (mentioned previsously) consists in Vivarana Prasthanā. This Prasthanā holds the view of Eka-jivavada and condemns Nana-jivavada often.

XIV. Regarding Drishtisrishti-Vāda and Srishti-drishti-Vādā:

In Prasthanatraya Bhashyas of Shankara there is no mention of these two types of visions (i.e., दृष्टिसृष्टिवाद, सृष्टिदृष्टिवाद). In Yoga Vasishtha, it is said that where there is Drishti there is Srishti. But though this Yoga Vasishtha

Ramayana or Jnana Vasishtha deals with Advaita, it is not a standard book such as the Prasthanatraya Bhashyas of Shankara. Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji has said that Yogavasishtha, Ramayana, Bhagavata, Sutasamhita (Yajnavalkya Smriti), *Adhyatma Ramayana*-all these four books are posterior to Shankara Bhashya. If they had been available at the time of Bhashyakara, inevitably he would have mentioned them in his Bhashyas. The above phrases have started from Yogavasishtha only.

The Drishti-srishti-vādā means when one sees outside then only one will find the world or Srishti. So the mind is the creator. This is the argument. This argument resembles the Vijnanavādā of Buddhism. The Srishti-drishtivāda means there is Srishti or the world outside really and we only perceive it through the mind. This argument resembles the Baahyasthitva-vada or Realistic view of Buddhism. Between these two the former argument is more logical than the latter. For this purpose Sri Gaudapada has accepted the former theory as better than the latter. And Shankara also has agreed with this point in Maandukya-karika Bhashya-4/28 in the first sentence as the policy of Vedanta is to accept every reasoning unopposed to Vedas.

“प्रज्ञप्ते सनिमित्तम् ” इत्यादि एतदन्तं विज्ञानवादिनो बौद्धस्य वचनम् बाह्यार्थवादिपक्षप्रतिषेधपरम् आचार्येण अनुमादितम् । यस्मात् असत्येव घटादौ घटाद्याभ्यासता चित्तस्य विज्ञानवादिना अभ्युपगता, तदनुमोदितम् अस्माभिरपि भूतदर्शनात्

। तस्मात् तस्यापि चित्तस्य जायमानावभासता असत्येव जन्मनि युक्ता भवितुमिति ॥

And Shankara has given the reason to accept tentatively the view point of Vijnanavadins by Gaudapada. For this see Karika Bhashya-4/99, last paragraph—

“यद्यपि बाह्यार्थनिराकरणं ज्ञानमात्रकल्पना चाद्वयवस्तु सामीप्यम् उक्तम् । इदन्तु परमार्थतत्त्वम् अद्वैतम् वेदान्तेष्वेव विज्ञेयमित्यर्थः ।”

Strictly speaking in the above two stand-points—Drishti-srishti-vādā and Srishti-drishti-vādā, it is wrong to assert that anyone is superior to the other. This judgement is given in Maandukya-karika Bhashya— 4/67. The gist of this judgement is ‘If we accept the outer things inevitably we have to accept the consciousness which objectifies the external world. In the same manner, if we accept the consciousness i.e., Vijnana or Buddhiviritti, then inevitably we have to accept the outer things. There is no independent existence of either this or that’. In our experience also both the microcosm (the individual I-sense) and the macrocosm (the cosmic I-sense) appear simultaneously and disappear simulatneously. When the ‘I’-sense is described from the standpoint of the Microcosm, then it is called as a *Jeeva* and when this ‘I’-sense is described from the standpoint of the Macrocosm, then it is called as

Hiranyagarbhaha or Mahān Atmā. This is evident in our waking and dream states. So there is no use in having any quarrel between these two views.

In Prasthanatraya Bhashyas, it is said that the Srishti or the creation of the universe is not an incident which takes place in a time series, because the time is also an effect. But for the purpose of teaching the non-dual nature of Brahman the Shruti attributes the theory of creation from Brahman. It has no intention of asserting that the creation is real. Shankara says:

- (i) “तत्र एतत् सिद्धं भवति - ब्रह्मप्रकरणे सर्वधर्मविशेषरहित ब्रह्मदर्शनात् एव फलसिद्धौ सत्यां यत् तत्र अफलम् श्रूयते ब्रह्मणः जगदाकारपरिणामित्वादि तत् ब्रह्मदर्शनोपायत्वेनैव विनियुज्यते, न हि परिणामवत्त्वविज्ञानात् परिणामवत्त्वम् आत्मनः फलं स्यात् इति वक्तुं युक्तं, कूटस्थ नित्यत्वात् मोक्षस्य । ”

[Sutra Bhashya—2/1/14]

The conclusion is; ‘Since in a context speaking of Brahman, it stands proved that the result (i.e., liberation) accrues only from the realization of Brahman, devoid of all distinctions created by attributes, therefore when in that context some other fact is heard of that has no result, as for instance, the modification of Brahman into the world, that fact has to be interpreted as a means leading to that realization. It is not reasonable to say that from a knowledge of Brahman as capable of transformation, one will get that capacity of transforming one’s own Self;

for liberation is eternally changeless'.

- (ii) “न हि अयं सृष्ट्यादि प्रपञ्चप्रतिपिपादयिषितः, न हि तत् प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित् पुरुषार्थः दृश्यते, श्रूयते वा । न च कल्पयितुं शक्यते, उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्याम् तत्र तत्र ब्रह्मविषयैः वाक्यैः साकं एकवाक्यतायाः गम्यमानत्वात् । दर्शयति च सृष्ट्यादिप्रपञ्चस्य ब्रह्म पतिपत्त्यर्थताम् ।”

(S.Bh.—1/4/14)

‘Not that all these forms of manifestation, that creation is, are sought to be propounded by the Upanisads; for no human goal is seen or heard of in the Upanisads as remaining linked up with them; nor can this be imagined to be so, for in those respective places, they are seen to combine with the texts about Brahman to convey a single unified fact—this is what the Upanisad also shows.’

- (iii) मृदादिदृष्टान्तैश्च कार्यस्य कारणेन अभेदं वदितुं सृष्ट्यादि प्रपञ्चः श्राव्यते इति गम्यते । तथा च संप्रदायविदः वदन्ति-

“मृल्लोहविस्फुक्कुलिङ्गाद्यैः सृष्टिर्याचोदिताऽन्यथा ।

उपायः सोऽवताराय नास्ति भेदः कथञ्चन ।”

(गौ. का. १-१५)

(S.Bh.—1/4/14)

‘We can understand that when the Upanishad speaks of the forms of manifestation etc., in extenso, the intention is to declare the non-difference of the effects from the cause with the help of such illustrations as clay.

And this is what people well-versed in the Vedantic tradition say; 'The creation that is taught divergently with the help of clay, iron, sparks, etc, is only a means for inculcating the knowledge of Brahman; but there is no diversity whatsoever.'

Hence the judgement is that Brahman itself appears in the form of Srishti due to Avidya. To teach Brahman, the *Srishti-prakriya* or the theory of creation is accepted as a tool in Shrutis. So one should not hold the view that there is really a Srishti. From the standpoint of Avidya it is Srishti but from the standpoint of Vidya, it is Mithya or an illusion or it can be said that it is real in the form of Brahman alone. We may call this as Avidya-drishti and Vidya-drishti respectively. Through Avidya-drishti there is Srishti, but from the standpoint of Vidya-drishti, there is no creation or Srishti, it is Brahman alone. Whether it is said that the Srishti is illusory or that it is real in the form of Brahman alone— both mean the same. Due to non-comprehension of this truth now-a-days the Vedantins have coined new words, thus confounding and confusing themselves and others.

CHAPTER - II

MAYA-MAYAVITVA ADHYAROPA AND BRAHMA-BODHA

*(Teaching of Brahman through the attributions of
Maya & mayavitva)*

In Shankara's Vedanta the concepts like Avidya and Maya are confused in our present days. We have seen in the first chapter, the word 'Avidya' is used in what sense by Shankara in his Bhashyas and how he has shown the methodology of superimposition and rescission and ultimately the nature of Brahman is taught through this attribution. Now we shall first try to understand what Shankara has said about *Maya* in his commentaries.

I. FOUR ASPECTS OF MAYA:

(a) Maya is Avidya-kalpita

In Shankara's Vedanta, according to Bhashya, the word *Maya* means *false appearance*—which appears as if it is really there due to ignorance of the truth. For example, when one does not know the real nature of the rope, due to this ignorance he misconceives this rope as a snake, water-flow or garland etc., Due to this

misconception, he feels that there is really a snake. For him the snake appears as if it is there really. This false appearance of snake is called as MAYA. Hence, according to Shankara's Bhashyas, avidya is subjective defect (defect of the mind) and Maya is an objective false appearance due to ignorance, meaning thereby, ignorance gives the existence for the false appearance. For this purpose, wherever Shankara has described Maya, he uses these following terms to Maya—

Avidyakalpita (अविद्याकल्पिता)—conjured up or imagined by avidya.

Avidyapratyupasthaapita अविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापिता brought forth or projected by avidya.

Avidyakrita—(अविद्याकृता) cooked up by Avidya

Avidyaakaarya (अविद्याकार्या) — made up of avidya.

Avidyaatmaka (अविद्यात्मका) —of the nature of avidya (i.e. avidya is the essence or self of Maya).

Avidyaalakshana (अविद्यालक्षणा) —indicated by avidya (or appearance of Maya indicates the existence of avidya).

All of which mean the objective appearance due to avidya. Maya, then, according to Shankara, is the objective false appearance due to ignorance or Adhyasa. All these descriptions are given in Brahma-Sutra Bhashya—2/1/14; the only word Avidyalakshana is used in the Geeta

Bhashya. Hence the first significance of Maya is 'Avidya kalpita' or its equivalent words as mentioned above by Shankara.

(b) Maya is Vyakta-Avyaktastmaka:

The second aspect of Maya is Vyakta-avyaktaatmaka (व्यक्त - अव्यक्त आत्मका) or Vyakrita-avyakrita-atma (व्याकृताव्याकृतात्मकेन) —S.Bh.—2/1/27). For example, when one sees a snake on the road, at first he fears regarding the snake. Due to darkness sometimes he may not see the snake but fear is not removed. He thinks that the snake which he had seen before is still there in some place, but for the time being it has disappeared. And later he sees the same snake as it was before. Here the snake has got two forms—(i) as manifested (i.e., differentiated) and another (ii) as unmanifested (i.e., undifferentiated). The manifested form is called *Vyakta* (व्यक्त), *Vyaakrita* (व्याकृत), *Kshara* (क्षर), *Sat* (सत्), *Vidita* (विदित), *Moorta* (मूर्त) and the unmanifested form is called *Avyakta* (अव्यक्त —Gi—8/18), *Avyaakrita* (अव्याकृत —S.Bh. 2/1/27). *Akshara* (अक्षर — Gi.—15/16), *Asat* (असत् —Gi.—13/12), *Avidita* (अविदित — *Kena*—1/4), *Amoorta* (अमूर्त —Bri.—2/3/1).

Due to ignorance in the mind regarding the non-dual Brahman, Brahman Himself appears in the form of universe i.e., Brahman is mistaken for the world through

ignorance. This false appearance of Brahman due to ignorance is called as Maya. This universe appears in the waking state & disappears in deep sleep (Swoon, Samadhi etc.) and the same world and the same ego appear again as they were before. This method of manifested and unmanifested forms of the universe is to be applied to the state of death and rebirth and Mahapralaya, that is dissolution of universe according to Shastras and recreation. All these are based on the firm ground of common experience of life that the man who goes to the sleep, the same individual comes again with his attributes and similarly Vedanta has accepted the seed form of the universe which is in potential form in deep sleep, death and dissolution of the universe etc. This seed-form is inferred (admitted) in Vedanta to teach the true nature of the Self. Hence the manifested-form of the universe and the unmanifested-form are there in Brahman due to ignorance. From this standpoint the false appearance of the universe & its seed-form are called as *effect* and Brahman, which is substratum of this false appearance is called as *cause*. So, in Vedanta, cause means the *substratum* and the effect means *false appearance* which is superimposed on Brahman, due to ignorance.

(See Sri Shankara's Bhashya—2/1/14 & 2/1/9)

For the purpose of teaching when Vedanta accepts the seed-form and the manifested-form of the universe, it describes the cause and effect respectively. But from

the standpoint of Brahman, both are effects. So the second description of the Maya is *Vyakta-avyaktaatmaka*.

(c) **Maya is Anirvachaniya :**

The third significance is *Anirvachaniya* (अनिर्वचनीय), meaning indefinable. This word has created so many confusions in present days. It is very necessary to understand the exact meaning of this word according to Shankara. Commonly this word denotes the incapability of explanation either as being—सत् or as not-being—असत्. But it is not used in this sense in Bhashyas. According to Shankara the definition is : *Tatva Anyatvaabhyaaam Anirvachaniya*. अनिर्वचनीय —S. Bh.—2/1/14, 2/1/27 etc.). This is the correct definition or description of the false appearance. Here *Tatva* (तत्त्व) means the reality or the substratum & *Anyatva* (अन्यत्व) means having independent existence of its own. In our daily experience whenever the false appearance appears just like rope-snake, nacre-silver etc., these false appearances are not really the substratum or the reality and at the same time they have no independent existence of their own apart from the substratum. Hence these false appearances are called as *Anirvachaniya*. This expression 'anirvachaniya' has been explained by Shankara by citing the illustration of the foam, the waves, the bubbles which are not quite the same as water, but yet not different from water. ('न सलिलं न च सलिलात् अत्यन्तं भिन्नं फेनम्, सलिलव्यतिरेकेन

अदर्शनात्, सलिलं तु स्वच्छं अन्यत् फेनात् मलरूपात्') —
Upadeshasahasri — शिष्यानुशासनप्रकरणम् and also in
Brihadaranyaka Bhashya;

‘नामरूपयोरेव हि परमात्मोपाधिभूतयोः व्याक्रियमाणयोः
सलिलफेनवत् तत्त्वान्यत्वेनानिर्वक्तव्ययोः सर्वावस्थयोः
संसारत्वमिति । (Briha. - Bh.—2/4/10)

According to this the universe which appears in Brahman is false and the seed-form of this appearance which is inferred from the standpoint of the manifested world is also a false one. This false appearance of Maya or Prakriti etc., is not there really in Brahman and it has no independent existence apart from Brahman. So it is not **Tatva** and not **Anyatva** and hence it is **Anirvachaniya** (see S. Bh.—2/1/14). That is, Maya cannot be defined to be identical with Ishwara or Brahman or quite distinct from Brahman. This is the third description of the word Maya.

(d) Maya is Ishvara Shakti :

The fourth description of Maya is **Ishvara Shakti**, the potency of the Lord (Gi. Bh.—13/5, 13/19). Some thinkers misled by the word **Shakti** occurring in the Bhashyas as well as in Shruti think that Maya is a power of God or Lord to delude souls. They say God has created Maya which envelopes all Jivas. By means of surrendering to God He Himself will remove the Maya, because He is

all-merciful etc. Strictly speaking there is no Lordhood in non-dual Brahman because it requires the distinction between the ordainer and the ordained, ruler and the ruled. But when Vedanta accepts the Universe and its seed-form which is conjured up by avidya, then Brahman is considered as the substratum of this false appearance and there is no other source apart from Brahman to this universe. From this standpoint Vedanta attributes the **Ishvarahood** or **Lordship** on Brahman. The nature of Brahman as it is ever unchangeable, immutable but the same Brahman appears in the form of universe without forfeiting his true nature, so he is described as 'Mayavi' (S.Bh.—2/1/37). These are the attributions of '**Maya**' and '**Mayavitva**'. Shankara uses the word **Shakti** as synonymous with Prakriti—the causal potentiality of the world on the authority of the Shruti '**मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात् मायिनन्तु महेश्वरम्**' —(Shvethashwathara—4/10), meaning Prakriti is to be known to be the Maya and the Supreme Lord to be the Mayin.

So from the standpoint of adhyaropa when Maya is seen (meaning the world and its seed-form are seen) due to avidya in non-dual Self, from that standpoint this non-dual Self is described as 'Ishvara', 'Mayavi' (like magician) etc. The very Godhood is attributed on the non-dual Self through this Maya which is concocted by avidya, when it is thought of as the cause and ruler of the world containing individual souls for the purpose of teaching. Here really

the avidya does not produce the Maya, but it creates the misunderstanding regarding non-dual Brahman as the universe and its seed-form. So God has not created Maya intentionally. Maya is conjured up by avidya. Through vidya, when avidya is removed, then the Maya will be falsified meaning he realises that this is only a false appearance. For this purpose Shankara has given the definition of maya thus: **Saa Cha Maya Na Vidyate, Maya Iti Avidyamanasya Akhyaa** (माया नाम वस्तु तर्हि? न सा च माया न विद्यते, माया इति अविद्यमानस्य अख्या) — Maandukyakarika Bhashya—4/58 - ‘....and that Maya does not exist, the idea being that the term ‘Maya’ relates to something non existing.’

Brahman is described as **Sarvajna** (सर्वज्ञ) — Omniscient, **Sarvashakta** (सर्वशक्त) — Omnipotent, **Sarvavyaapaka** (सर्वव्यापक)—omnipresent and **Sarvesvara** (सर्वेश्वर) —Lord of all etc. These descriptions are given from the standpoint of the above said conception of Maya. Here the word ‘**Sarva**’ is the Maya which is conjured up by avidya (i.e. अविद्या कल्पिता). But ‘**Jna**’ is the self. ‘**Shakta**’ is the self. ‘**Vyaapaka**’ is the self. ‘**Ishvara**’ (Lord) is the Self. Taking the attribution of ‘**Sarva**’ the Shastra keeps the name to the Self as ‘**Sarvajna**’ etc., So in Shankara’s Bhashya ‘Atman’, ‘Ishvara’, ‘Brahman’ are synonymous terms. According to Vyaakhyanakaras ‘Atman’ or ‘Brahman’ is superior to the word ‘Ishvara’.

They say Ishvara is '*Maya-Upahita*'—circumscribed by maya; '*Maya-Vishishta*'—having special features due to maya; '*Maya-Pratibimba*'—Brahman reflected in maya etc. But Godhood or Ishvara, the Almighty, according to Shankara, is not Maya-upahita or Maya-vishishta or Maya-pratibimba, as is taught by various present-day Vedantins. On the other hand, Brahman or the Witnessing Principle, in relation to the appearance of the universe and its seed form (Primordial matter, called maya or prakriti which is conjured up by ignorance or avidya), is treated as Ishvara for the purpose of teaching alone. Shankara holds the view that Brahman is Eternal, Pure, Nature of Consciousness, Ever free by nature, and All-knowing and All-powerful (S.Bh.—1/1/1). 'That Omniscient source must be Brahman'... (S.Bh.—1/1/2) etc. Here the adjectives are given to Brahman synonymously such as Nityashuddha, Sarvajnam, Sarvashaktisamanvitam. Hence to point out the true nature of Brahman these words are used through the attribution of 'Sarva'. From this standpoint these are Swaroopa- lakshanas (स्वरूपलक्षण)- and not Tatasthalakshanas (तटस्थलक्षण). Here, it should not be forgotten that the Upadhi (उपाधि) of 'Sarva' is conjured up by avidya. So the real nature of Brahman is Absolute and non-dual. These words are used for the purpose of teaching only. Strictly speaking as the consciousness is the nature of Brahman, so also the Shakti etc., are the nature of Brahman. Jnana, Shakti, Ishvara are

the nature of non-dual Brahman. But to distinguish the difference between Shakti and Shaktiman or Shakta, the upadhis or adjuncts, which are conjured up by avidya, are required. Through these adjuncts He is called as Sarvajna, Sarvashakta etc. So Sarvajnatva, Ishvaratva etc., attributed from the standpoint of adjuncts or upadhis, but the nature of Brahman itself is nature of Consciousness, nature of potency etc., and as such they can never be alienated from Brahman. This is the secret. If this secret is not understood, then we will feel the contradictions to the statement of Bhashya. This difference in description should be noticed between Shankara's Bhashya and commentator's other books.

To summarise all these, the non-dual Brahman is called Ishvara from the standpoint of Maya which is conjured up by avidya and Vedanta has attributed the creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe etc., on Brahman on this basis.

But when avidya is removed through the knowledge of non-dual Brahman then all the above attributes are automatically falsified. This is clearly stated by Shankara thus:

'Moreover, when the idea of non-difference is generated by such declaration of identity as 'That thou art', the transmigratoriness of the individual is removed as also the creatorship of Brahman; for all dualistic

dealings, brought about by ignorance get sublated by right knowledge.' (S.Bh.—2/1/22)¹

So Maya is **Avidyakalpita, Vyakta - Avyakta-atmaka, Anirvachaniya and Ishvara-shakti**. Through the attribution of the Maya, non-dual Brahman is called Ishvara when it is thought of as the cause and ruler of the phenomenal world including individual souls.

II. AN OBJECTION RAISED BY MOOLA-VIDYA-VADINS:

Avidya is described as non-perception, misconception and doubting. And it is said that this is the defect of Antahkarana. It is not concerned to the self. It is said that by this avidya, Maya is conjured up. And you have told that Maya and prakriti are the same. The antahkarana in which avidya is there, is the very product of prakriti accoring to Shastra.

The Prakriti that is avyakta is modified as Mahat, Ahankara, Panchatanmatra and then through panchikarana this antahkarana or the mind is created (Ka.Up.-- 1/3/10, 11). It being so how the prakriti will be 'Avidyakalpita'? Hence we have to hold the view that the material cause of the antahkarana or the mind which is called as prakriti

1. अपि च यदा 'तत्त्वमसि' इति एवं जातीयकेन अभेदनिर्देशेन अभेदः प्रतिबोधितः भवति, अपगतम् भवति तदा जीवस्य संसारित्वं ब्रह्मणश्च स्रष्टृत्वं, समस्तस्य मिथ्याज्ञानविजृम्भितस्य भेदव्यवहारस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाधितत्वात् ।

and which is the potence of the Lord is the casual-ignorance or 'Moolavidya' and all the three like non-perception etc., are effective ignorance.

Answer to the above objection :

- (i) From the standpoint of empirical view, our intellect always wants the rigorous rules and regulations of causation. So we seek the cause for our mind and the world etc.
- (ii) The caustion i.e., the relationship between the cause and the effect inevitably requires the time series or time factor. Because the cause must be in a previous time and effect comes afterwards. So Nyayashastra says, that **Kaarya Niyata Purva Vrittihi—Kaaranam** (कार्यनियतपूर्ववृत्तिः कारणम्) So whenever we seek the cause for someting, inevitably we have the appriori notion of time, space and causation. Hence our intellect always follows these rigorous rules of time, space and caustion.
- (iii) But from the standpoint of Vedantic view, when the whole phenomenon of the universe including the notions of time, space, caustion also is taken as a whole, then the complete view-point will change. For example, before the occurrence of the dream state, there is non-dual Self alone which remains in the deep sleep. In that pure Being the whole dream

state appears. The phenomenon of the dream consists of the three types of the worlds or planes:

- (a) Divine plane i.e., sun, moon, stars and the millions of planets and the heavenly worlds upto Brahmaloaka etc.
- (b) Material plane—which is conglomeration of five elements such as space or ether, air, fire, water and the earth. In this plane all the bodies of all creatures and all the machineries of various kinds like computers etc., which are invented by the material scientists are included.
- (c) The Corporeal plane i.e., body, vital force, organs of actions, sense organs, mind, intellect or ego and feelings of all kinds just like common man's experiences and mystic experience of Yogis etc., are included.

These three types of planes are called in Vedata respectively as **Aadhidaivika** (आधिदैविक) **Prapancha**, **Aadhibhoutika** (आधिभौतिक) **Prapancha** & **Aadhyatmika** (आध्यात्मिक) **prapancha**. All this whole phenomenon of the universe including the concept of infinite time, space and causation is restricted to the dream state or to the waking state which occurs in the pure being which is everyone's true nature of the Self. This is the Vedantic view. It is called as **Poorna-**

Anubhava Dristi. From this standpoint, as I am the pure being, in me the whole waking or the whole dream state appears and disappears. When one realises this truth, he has taken the stand in the nature of the Witnessing principle of life. From this standpoint, the whole dream state exists in me as I am the substratum of that state and Pure Being.

- (iv) But in the dream state everyone feels that 'I am in this world, I have been born here some time ago and I will die one day. I am an individual etc.' From the feeling of this individuality, he sees the universe there and starts to investigate the cause of that world. At last he comes to the conclusion that the *Prakriti* or primordial matter of the universe is the cause. And he feels that this prakriti is the cause of his own mind etc. Here he feels the time series and the causation etc., as real things. But when the dream disappears, all the phenomenon will be falsified including the idea of infinite time, space, causation etc. Here, in this illustration the world which is seen in the dream state, exists in its essence, as the pure Being. And the mind which appeared in the dream did not cognise the truth. Hence it holds the view that the world is real and starts the investigation and arises to the certain conclusions such as prakriti is the cause of his own mind etc.

- (v) Strictly speaking, the outer world, the inner mind and all the notions such as time, space, causation etc., appears simultaneously in the dream state. So also the same is the case with the waking state. This is to be realised taking a stand in the Witnessing principle which is the substratum of the waking and dream states. From the standpoint of this realisation, there is no cause or effect. All the notions of cause and effects etc., are in avidya i.e., in the Me-notion. This Me-notion is called avidya (Me-notion= 'I am so and so' and 'this is mine') and that which appears to this Me-notion is called as Maya. For this reason we have said that 'avidya' is the subjective defect (i.e. primarily denotes a species of knowledge) and 'maya' is the objective one (i.e. an illusory object).
- (vi) Very important thing we have to remember is that the idea like the prakriti is the cause and the world is effect etc., are not imaginations of Brahman, but these are the imaginations of the individual soul which is the 'Me-notion'. Therefore the complaint regarding avidya or maya are from the stand point of 'Me-notion' and not from the standpoint of the Witnessing principle of life. For this purpose Vedanta has attributed these two concepts of 'avidya' and 'maya' to teach the non-dual Brahman

(अध्यारोपापवादाभ्याम् निष्प्रपञ्चं प्रपञ्च्यते) and never as a really real something to be defended. When Brahman is realised, both will be falsified. This is called Rescission (अपवाद).

Swamiji says, 'That we pass through the three states of consciousness, that we appear to age, die and are born again, and that there is creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world, is an inborn delusion of human mind, which can be overcome only by the dawn of Vedantic enlightenment'. *This is pristine pure Shankara's Vadanta*. From the standpoint of intellect, it is very difficult to solve the problem, but from the standpoint of the transcendental Reality or the Pure Being, which is called as the intuitional experience of Brahman, all the contradictions i.e. problems or questions are resolved.

III. Some defects of Moolaavidya-Vada:

The Moolaavidya as well as Toolaavidya are not mentioned in the right tradition of Shankara i.e., Gaudapada-karikas, Shankara's Bhashyas and Sureshvara's Brihadvartika, Taittiriya vartika and Naishkaarmya-siddhihi. These are correct traditional texts which we have to rely upon according to Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji. The origin of this theory of Moolaavidya is

traced to Panchapadikakara who wrote his Panchapadika-Prasthanam as a commentary on Shankara's commentary on Brahma sutras. After Panchapadika-Prasthanam, the Shankara's utterances have been twisted to suit their theory of *Moolaavidya*. And it is propagated as the genuine teachings of Shankara. It is called by the name of *Moolaavidya* as it is held to be the material cause of both the world and Adhyasa. *Moolaavidyavadins* say:

Moolaavidya hides or covers up Brahman and because of this alone ignorances of the forms of *not knowing* (अग्रहण) and *wrong knowledge or misconception* (अन्यथाग्रहण) as well as 'the world' are produced or projected. *Moolaavidya* exists in all the three states of consciousness; the names and forms remain hidden or latent in deep-sleep (*sushupti*) as well as in dissolution or creation the world (*pralaya*) either as the seed-form (*beeja roopa*) or as the energy-form (*Shakti roopa*). This seed of names and forms is called as *Moolaavidya*. And it (*moolaavidya*) can be removed by **Knowledge of Atman**.

In the previous article, it has been shown how *Moolaavidya-vada* has entered into the Bhashya and what are the defects of this contention. For the present some main defects will be shown here regarding the acceptance of *Moolaavidya*.

Main defects of Moolaavidya-Vada

- (a) According to Gaudapada and Shankara, non-perception is the causal ignorance and mis-understanding and doubting are the effective ignorance (refer Gaudapadakarika with Shankara's commentary, Agamaprakarana-11 to15). The sub-commentators say that Moolaavidya is the material cause for the universe and Ahankara and also for the three types of avidya i.e., Agrahana, Samshaya and Viparitajnana (or misconception). Again they say that this moolaavidya is a Kalpita one. Here if it is Kalpita, it would not be a material cause for Adhyasa (i.e, misconception). If it is the material cause for Adhyasa, then it is not Kalpita by Adhyasa. It pertains to Brahman alone. And as it is a thing (भावरूप) so it is impossible to remove it by knowledge.
- (b) If Jiva is endowed with Toolaavidya and toolaavidya is a part of moolaavidya, then the real cause i.e., moolaavidya will not be removed by the knowledge which is obtained by Jiva. Because according to Moolaavidyavadins, moolaavidya covers Brahman. Then Brahman should have removed moolaavidya which pertains to him through his getting knowledge and Jiva can never destroy Brahman's moolaavidya.

- (c) In our Antahkarana there is ignorance regarding the outer objects. When we know the objects, at that time the knowledge arises in our mind. Being so, to imagine that avidya (moolaavidya or toolaavidya) encompasses the outer things is absurd. No one says that when I know the thing the encompassed avidya on that thing is removed. Everyone says that I have got a knowledge regarding the things & my ignorance is gone. So, regarding *Brahmajnana* there is no cover of ignorance on Brahman.
- (d) Many defects are raised by *Dvaita Vedantins* on the Moolaavidya which is *Bhaavaroopa-avidya* according to Moolaavidyavadins. If we were to accept this Bhaavaroopaavidya, then the defects raised by Dvaita-Vedantins are impossible to be refuted. But these defects will not affect the *Adhyasavada* of Shankara, because of the following reasons :
- (i) Adhyasa i.e., identification with body etc., is evident for all in empirical life. It is clearly stated by Shankara in his Adhyasa Bhashya *Sarvaloka Pratyakshaha* (सर्वलोकप्रत्यक्षः) while Moolaavidya is an imagined thing by the sub-commentators.
 - (ii) Moolaavidyavadins hold the view that the Moolaavidya is the material cause for Avidya.

According to Shankara, the causation, as it is a dealing, so thinking about *cause and effect relationship* itself takes place in Adhyasa.

- (iii) One may say in Adhyasavada also there may be shown so many defects. For this, the answer is the act of thinking such as defects, virtues etc., itself is endowed with avidya, because without taking wrong identification with the mind, one cannot think or move (अविद्यावत्वेनैव जीवस्य सर्वः संब्यवहारः सन्ततो वर्तते - Br.Su.Bh.-1/4/3). So from the empirical standpoint Adhyasa is there as evident for all. And when one cognises the true nature of his own Self which is untainted by this Avidya then the whole empirical view is falsified. So the removal of Adhyasa also is evident for those endowed with discriminative knowledge. Here we do not find any dogmatic assertions, while in Moolaavidya, we see many such dogmatic assertions.
- (e) The sub-commentatators hold the view that Moolaavidya is Bhaavarooopa and it is destroyed by the knowledge of Atman. According to Shankara, any positive thing, that is Bhaavarooopa, will not be removed by knowledge. Jnana i.e., the knowledge is able

to remove only the misunderstanding which is not at all an entity (i.e., Bhaavarooapa). Jnana has no capacity to destroy any positive thing and create anything new. It removes only the misunderstanding regarding the fact (see Briha-Bhashya-1/4/10 and this point is clearly stated in the 1st chapter, para No.9).

- (f) Moolaavidyavadins accept the three types of Padartha (पदार्थ); the self as Svayamsiddha (स्वयंसिद्ध), Moolaavidya as Saakshisiddha (साक्षिसिद्ध) and the outer things as Pramanasiddha (प्रमाणसिद्ध). So outer things have got Ajnatasatta (अज्ञातसत्ता) and Moolaavidya is not Ajnatasatta etc., These types of interpretations have no place in Shankara's Bhashyas anywhere and these commentators have interpreted according to their own understanding. The doctrine of three grades of existence viz., the Paaramarthikasatta (पारमार्थिकसत्ता), Vyaavahaarikasatta (व्यावहारिकसत्ता) and the Paraatibhaasikasatta (प्रातिभासिकसत्ता) i.e., the Absolute, the empirical and the apparent realities is not found either in Shankara's Bhashyas or in Gaudapada's Karika. For Shankara, *satta* or reality is one only and there are no grades of existence;

(‘‘यथा च कारणं ब्रह्म त्रिषु कालेषु सत्त्वं न व्यभिचरति, एवं कार्यमपि जगत् त्रिषु कालेषु सत्त्वं न व्यभिचरति । एकं च पुनः सत्त्वम्, अतोऽप्यनन्यत्वं कारणं कार्यस्य) (S.Bh.-2/1/16)

Just as Brahman the cause never deviates from existence in all the three periods of time, so also the effect, the world, never deviate from existence in all the periods of creation, sustenance and dissolution. And *existence again is only one*. So for this reason also, the effect is none other than the cause.

APPENDIX

SOME VIEW POINTS REGARDING AVIDYA AND MAYA

Can we use the terms 'Maya' and 'Avidya' indiscriminately even while strictly adhering to Shankara's Adhyasa-vada?

From the standpoint of transcendental reality there is no dealing such as Vidya and Avidya, because It is of the nature of non-dual Absolute Consciousness. But from empirical standpoint there are dealings of Vidya and Avidya not only regarding the outer things, but also about the true nature of the Self. It is evident for all. So in Vedanta, this dealing of Vidya and Avidya is called as Maya, which means, that which is not there really but appears as if it is there really, is Maya. In this sense if we call Avidya as Maya figuratively, then it is not wrong. Shankara hints about this in his Tai. Bh.-2/8/5 thus: Accordingly knowledge and ignorance are to be ranked with name and form; they are not attributes of the self¹, meaning in so far as Vidya and Avidya are regarded as a function of the mind and are included in the world of names and forms, it may also be called 'Maya' meaning thereby an illusory appearance.

1. 'तस्मान्नामरूपपक्षस्यैव विद्याविद्ये । नामरूपे... च न आत्मधर्मौ ते च पुनर्नामरूपे सवितर्यहोरात्रे इव कल्पिते; न परमार्थतो विद्यमाने ।' (Tai.Bh. 2-8-5)

In the same way, the Prakriti or Avyakta may be called as Avidya in a secondary sense. There are two reasons for this;

The first is, if there is avidya, then only Maya will appear as if it is there. So maya is the projection of avidya. In this sense; we may include maya in avidya i.e., one is perfectly justified in calling it avidya in a secondary sense, just as one may say 'this is all his foolery'.

The second reason is that commonly no one knows that he is in grip of the ignorance or under the influence of ignorance. So this ignorance is not manifested for the common man though it is behind his all dealings. From this standpoint, the ignorance is called as 'Avyakta'. Shankara hints this in his Su. Bh.1/4/3, *Yada Tu Jiva Mahan*¹.

Therefore from these higher standpoints we may call avidya as maya and maya as avidya in a secondary sense. Because both are attributed or superimposed on Brahman for the purpose of teaching. See the Sanskrit introduction of '*Vedanta Vidvat Goshti*' & '*Essays on Vedanta*' (page 44) by Sri Swamji in this regard. To avoid confusion we usually restrict the use of these words

1. 'अव्यक्ता हि सा माया तदिदं महतः परं अव्यक्तं' इत्युक्तं, अव्यक्तप्रभवत्वात् महतः, यदा हैरण्यगर्भी बुद्धिः महान् । यदा तु जीवः महान् तदापि अव्यक्ताधीनत्वात् जीवभावस्य महतः परम् अव्यक्तम् इत्युक्तम् । अविद्या हि अव्यक्तं, अविद्यावत्त्वेन एव जीवस्य सर्वः संव्यवहारः सन्ततः वर्तते । (S.Bh.-1/4/3)

Avidya and Maya to denote ignorance (Subjective notion) and (objective) name and form respectively, according to Shankara Bhashya.

If however, the individual Jiva be the meaning of *Mahat*, still the statement 'Avyakta is higher than Mahat', is admissible, since the state of becoming an individual creature depends on the influence of Avyakta ('Maya') acting as a limiting adjunct. For ignorance is Avyakta, and it is because of the possession of ignorance by the individual soul that all kinds of empirical behaviour continue for ever.

But it is wrong to argue that the Prakriti is the material cause of Avidya and it will get vanished through knowledge etc. So from the standpoint of the methodology of Vedanta, i.e., from the superimposition point of view, it is first accepted that brahman is the location of avidya and Brahman is the subject matter of avidya. See Briha.-Upa. Bh.-1/4/10, *Brahmani SaadhaKatva Kalpana...Apeshala Iti.*¹

Shankara hints here from the standpoint of superimposition that Brahman is the location and Brahman

1. ब्रह्मणि साधकत्वकल्पना अस्मदादिष्विव अपेशला- 'तदात्मानमेवावेत्, तस्मात् तत् सर्वमभवत्' इति चेत्, न; शास्त्रोपालम्भात्;... न चैतावत्येवाक्षमा युक्ताः भवतः, सर्वं हि नानात्वम् ब्रह्मणि कल्पितमेव 'एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यं' 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति' 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' इत्यादि वाक्यशतेभ्यः, सर्वो हि लोकव्यवहारो ब्रह्मण्येव कल्पितो न परमार्थः सन्; इत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते इयमेव कल्पना अपेशलेति । (Briha.-Bh.-1/4/10)

is the subject matter of the Avidya. All these are accepted for the purpose of teaching the truth alone. From standpoint of Absolute standpoint of Reality neither Avidya nor Maya called into being by it, ever existed as entities side by side with Brahman, nor is there any need for Vidya to actually destroy either of the two, as Sureshvara says,

‘तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्योक्त्य सम्यग्धीजन्ममात्रतः ।

अविद्यासहकार्येण नासीदस्ति भविष्यति ॥

(सं.वा. १८३)

This is the rescission of the ideas of the attributions of Avidya and Maya.

AUM TAT SAT

Objection: To think that Brahman, like us, is a seeker of liberation is not proper, and that is what we see in the passage ‘It knew only Itself.... therefore It became all’.

Reply : Not so, for by saying this you will be flouting the scriptures. It is not our idea, but that of the scriptures. Nor should you lose your patience over this much only, for all plurality is but imagined in Brahman, as we know from hundreds of texts like the following : ‘It should be realised in one form only’ (Bri.-4/4/20); ‘There is no difference whatsoever in Brahman’ (Bri.-4/4/19, Ka.-2/1/11); ‘When there is duality, *as it were*’ (Bri.-2/4/14 & 4/5/15) and ‘One only without a second’ (Ch.-6/2/1). Since the whole phenomenal world is imagined in Brahman alone and is not real, you say very little when you condemn this particular idea as improper.

**PROSPECTUS FOR TEACHING
GENUINE VEDANTA**

Pages 353 - 374

About the Book

The Scriptures of all religions commonly deliberate upon ritual matters, but the Hindu religious scriptures (the Vedas) deliberate upon two types of subject matters : viz. the religious duties and the nature of the Transcendental Reality, which is to be intuited or cognised here and now. The enquiry into the nature of the Transcendental Reality is known as Brahma Jignasa, whereas the enquiry into ritual matters is known as Dharma Jignasa. Brahma Jignasa is based on the principles of Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. This deliberation resulting in the intuitive cognition of Reality in this very life is taught mainly in the last portions of the Vedas, known as the Upanishads. The validity of Dharma Jignasa, the results of which accrue after sometime or after death in other worlds, is again based on the firm ground of Brahma Jignasa, detailed in the same scriptures. This is the unique interpretation of Adi Shankara regarding the authority of the scriptures, where as all other philosophies accept the authority of the scriptures on dogmatic faith alone.

No other system of philosophy except Vedanta bases its enquiry on a comprehensive tri-basic view of life and the principle of Universal acceptance. Vedanta which is a true Science of Reality adopts a unique method which comprehends, assimilates and transcends the psycho-physical complex of life.

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Genuine Texts for Study -	361
2. Fundamentals of Vedanta -	361
i) The rudimentary principles -	361
ii) Cognising the Witnessing Principle of Life -	362
iii) Methodology of Vedanta -	362
iv) Difference between Kartru Tantra & Vastu Tantra	363
v) Two Different Standpoints viz. (Empirical and Transcendental Standpoint) -	363
vi) Methodology of Avasthatraya or the three States of consciousness	364
vii) Various Aspects of the three Avasthas	364
a) Waking State	
b) Dream State	
c) Deep Sleep	
viii) Determining the Nature of Turiya -	365
ix) Godhood of the Self -	365
x) Benefit of the Self knowledge -	365
xi) Direct Means of the Self knowledge	366

xii)	Essential Qualifications to Attain Self-knowledge	366
xiii)	Co-operative Means to Self knowledge and Their Utility in Practical life	367
xiv)	Accessory means to Self-knowledge	367
xv)	Misconceptions about Certain Technical Terms	368
xvi)	Comparative Study of Philosophies	368
xvii)	Misinterpretations of Shankara's Genuine Teachings	369

Note:- The hours noted are meant for teaching a brief outline and for an intensive and detailed course double and triple the time respectively may be required.

Publisher's Note

Beginning with the sub - commentaries - Bhamati and Panchapadika, several misconceptions about the Genuine tradition of Shankara's Vedanta have arisen due to the interpretations of professed Shankara's own followers no less than by his adverse critics. Many of the modern pandits, professors and oriental scholars both in this country and abroad have given expression to different views about Shankara's Vedanta so that, any earnest student of truth gets confused and bewildered.

It was therefore necessary that a thoroughly revolutionary approach to the study of the real philosophy of Vedanta was undertaken to help the earnest seekers of truth throughout the world.

Fortunately for the good of humanity, Shankara himself arose again like the resplendent Sun in the form of Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji to dispel the darkness of ignorance and the mist of confusion about Genuine Vedanta by a ceaseless effort of study, research, writing, preaching and publishing (more than 160 works in Kannada, Sanskrit and English and a monthly magazine named 'Adhyatma Prakasha') continuously for over six decades of fruitful life and through the efforts of enlightened immediate disciples like Sri Devrao Kulkarni.

We present here a brief synopsis of important topics of Vedanta for guidance of teachers and students and a life sketch of Sri Devarao Kulkarni for information.

O. V. RAMAIAH,
President, Shankarashram,
No. 9, Serpentine Road,
Kumara Park West, Bangalore 20

Prospectus for Teaching Genuine Vedanta

The Scriptures of all religions commonly deliberate upon ritual matters, but the Hindu religious scriptures (the Vedas) deliberate upon two types of subject matters : viz. the religious duties and the nature of the Transcendental Reality, which is to be intuited or cognised here and now. The enquiry into the nature of the Transcendental Reality is known as Brahma Jijnasa, whereas the enquiry into ritual matters is known as Dharma Jijnasa. Brahma Jijnasa is based on the principles of Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life. This deliberation resulting in the intuitive cognition of Reality in this very life is taught mainly in the last portions of the Vedas, known as the Upanishads. The validity of Dharma Jijnasa, the results of which accrue after sometime or after death in other worlds, is again based on the firm ground of Brahma Jijnasa, detailed in the same scriptures. This is the unique interpretation of Adi Shankara regarding the authority of the scriptures, where as all other philosophies accept the authority of the scriptures on dogmatic faith alone.

The enquiry by scientists into the nature of the Reality of objects in the external world is based mainly on the empirical viewpoint, which suffers from limitations of time, space, causation and change etc. Even the enquiry into the nature of the Self according to the principles of psychology, either modern or ancient has not been able to transgress these limitations.

No other system of philosophy except Vedanta bases its enquiry on a comprehensive tri-basic view of life and the principle of Universal acceptance. All other systems of philosophy and the physical sciences totally depend on the experiences obtained in the waking state alone. The physical sciences seek the aid of instruments, gadgets and appliances to establish their truths, and even so they can never reach any finality because they thrive only in one state, the waking state discarding the universal experiences of two other states of life. This is evidently a partial view of life and the truths arrived at thereby are also only partial.

Vedanta which is a true Science of Reality adopts a unique method which comprehends, assimilates and transcends the psycho-physical complex of life. Again, it is only Vedanta which has cognized the Witnessing Principle of life in its totality as the Absolute Reality. The apparent reality of entities like-the soul (Jeeva), the world (Jagat) and Godhood (Ishwara) are, in the ultimate analysis, based or superimposed on the transcendental Witnessing Principle of life, which is the really real or the Ultimate Truth of Vedanta.

It is only Shankara who concludes that the Scriptures (Upanishads) are the genuine means for teaching the Absolute Truth, whose validity and veracity are verifiable here and now on the firm ground of intuitive experience of every one, irrespective of caste, creed, sex and nationality etc. He has established in his commentaries that the real purport of the Upanishads is to teach this non-dual Self-Knowledge.

The genuine teachings of Vedanta not only enlighten but also ennoble the lives of individuals who adopt them sincerely

as a way of life and they contain the potential of bringing about or promoting Universal peace and camaraderie among all nations and mankind in general. Hence, it is only Vedanta which can provide a sound foundation for the ideal of a Universal Religion.

1. Genuine Texts For Study

- (a) The primary sources for the teaching of Vedanta are the Prasthanatrayi viz, the ten principal Upanishads, the Bhagavad Gita and the Vedanta Sstras.
- (b) The Commentaries on these triple canons of Vedanta written by Shankara have been accepted as genuine traditional texts.
- (c) Out of the Prakarana Granthas or Shankara's own works the Upadesha Sahasri is accepted as the only genuine text.
- (d) The historical validity of the popular biography on Adi Shankara is highly doubtful and questionable.
- (e) The works of Sri Sureswara, a direct disciple of Sri Shankara, viz., Vaarthikas on Brihadaranyaka and Taittiriya Upanishad Bhashyas and his own work, Naishkarmya Siddhi, are also accepted as genuine.

2. Fundamentals of Vedanta

- (I) **The rudimentary principles of Universal acceptance and comprehensive vision of life:**

The teachings of Vedanta are not based on mystic experiences of individuals or miracles performed by means of the occult practices of Yoga. Neither do they depend on the

implicit faith alone in the mere utterances of the scriptures or of the Prophets nor on the inferences drawn by either Eastern or Western philosophers and thinkers, nor even on the so-called scientific conclusions of material sciences. Vedantic conclusions are based on the intuitive experiences which are common to all persons. Vedanta takes into consideration the whole gamut of experiences of life in its entirety and does not restrict its sphere to the waking world alone. On the other hand, Vedanta takes the human experiences of all the three states, viz., waking, dream and deep sleep to arrive at its conclusions, so that they become irrefutable and valid for all times.

II. Cognising the Witnessing Principle of Life:

Ego or the 'I' notion is the pivot around which all the activities of practical life are centred. It is only Vedanta which declares that the true nature of life is beyond this 'I' notion, transcending the limitations of time, space, causation, change and the triple states of consciousness. The cognition of this true nature of one's own Self is the kernel of the Vedantic teachings

III. Methodology of Vedanta:

Adhyaropa-Apavada or superimposition and rescission is the only method of teaching the Transcendental Truth of Vedanta. In general, the process of knowledge consists in removing the ignorance or wrong notions only and not creating or destroying anything, whether it is in the realm of empirical world or of the Absolute Truth. Only right knowledge removes nescience (misconception) and doubting which are the innate tendencies of the mind and it does not create or bring about changes or transformation in the object perceived.

IV. Difference between Kartru Tantra & Vastu Tantra :

Kartru Tantra means actions which are to be performed either physically or mentally and which depend upon the will or wish of the doer or agent. There are only three alternatives before an agent of action viz., he may do, may not do or may perform the action in a different way altogether. Vastu Tantra means the Knowledge as per the facts, which do not depend upon the will or wish of the doer or agent. Hence Vastu Tantra (Knowledge) has no alternative. It will be therefore evident that Dharma Jijnasa is Kartru Tantra and Brahma Jijnasa is Vastu Tantra.

V. Two Different Standpoints viz., Vyavahara Drishti (Empirical standpoint) and Paramartha Drishti (Transcendental or Absolute standpoint):

Vyavahara or empirical dealings comprise thoughts, speech and deeds: These three, according to Vedanta, are in the realm of ignorance or nescience only and hence do not pertain to the Transcendental Reality, which is beyond the ken of these three. Therefore, with a view to turning the attention of the enquirer towards the Absolute Reality the scriptural texts use the method of superimposition. Due to ignorance regarding the Reality one by nature attributes certain features on the Reality which, in truth, are non-existent. To remove this innate misconception the scriptural texts deliberately attribute certain other superior features which are in due course rescinded. At this stage the Transcendental Reality alone subsists and this is called cognition of the Reality in Vedanta. If these two different standpoints adopted in and through the scriptural texts are not properly understood the students get confused and confounded.

VI. Methodology of Avastharaya or the three states of consciousness :

Man's life, if taken in its totality, comprises the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep. If Man wishes to arrive at Truth, he cannot afford to take a partial view of life, giving predominance to waking state alone. The whole gamut of human experiences are subsumed in these three states alone and hence taking into account all these three states of Consciousness alone will be the comprehensive vision or outlook of life. This methodology of the tribasic intuitional experience is enough to enable a true seeker to take a stand in his true, essential nature of Being or the Self directly and immediately.

VII. Various Aspects of the Three Avasthas:

- (a) Waking State: From the standpoint of - (1) Physical science; (2) Psychology; (3) Religious aspects; (4) Vedantic aspect or the standpoint of the Witnessing Principle of Life,
- (b) Dream State : (1) From the empirical standpoint ; (2) From the scriptural stand point; (3) From the standpoint of the Witnessing Principle; (4) From the standpoint of the dream itself.
- (c) Deep Sleep: (1) From the stand point of fatigue ; (2) From the standpoint of the seed form of the world and Vasanas; (3) From the standpoint of causal ignorance; (4) From the standpoint of the intuitive experience of deep sleep.

VIII. Determining the Nature of Turiya:

Turiya is not a fourth state as is usually understood, like Samadhi etc. According to Shankara's Bhashya, Turiya, which is the substratum of all the three states that are conceived to be really existing owing to ignorance, is in relation to these three states said to be the fourth for the purposes of teaching alone.

IX. Godhood of the Self:

Godhood or Ishwara, the Almighty, according to Shankara, is not circumscribed by Maya or having special features due to Maya or reflected in Maya (Maya Upandhi, Maya Vishishta and Maya Pratibimba, respectively) as is taught by various present-day Vedantins. On the other hand, Brahman or the Witnessing Principle, in relation to the appearance of the universe and its seed-form (Primordial Matter), called Maya or Prakriti which is conjured up by ignorance or Avidya, is treated as Ishwara for the purposes of teaching alone.

X. Benefit of the Self-knowledge:

No benefit can ever accrue from an unreal thing. As the Self alone is the Reality, if the aspirant seeks real benefit of this life, he will have to attain the Knowledge of the Reality, ie. the Self. This Self-Knowledge removes in its wake all doubts or difficulties due to ignorance of this Reality. He becomes free from the trammels of feverish activity for the sake of the baubles and trinkets of life such as sensual enjoyment, wealth, power and fame which the common man hankers after in his ignorance. Vedantic Knowledge being the complete effacement of ignorance and passions, the wiseman's moral perfection is permanent, for

they are the very nature of Brahman with which he is identical forever. Vinaya, Shama, Dama - modesty and self-control, become his inherent characteristics, requiring no special effort to keep them up. He has discovered the precious truth that from the very beginning everyone without exception possesses intrinsic wisdom, freedom from all bondage of duality and unalloyed Bliss.

XI. Direct Means of Self-Knowledge :

According to Shankara, Shravana (listening to the Upanishadic teaching under the guidance of a preceptor), Manana (Reasoning based on Intuitive experiences), Nididhyasana (contemplation based on Intuitive experiences) are the direct means to attain Self-Knowledge, and these three are not injunctions stipulated to be practised one after the other in the above order. But the best aspirant can achieve the goal of Self-Knowledge by Shravana alone. And for him there are no traces of either the ignorance or the ego, which is the root cause of doership or agent-ship. If, however, the seeker does not have such superior qualities, he is expected to supplement his Shravana with Manana or Nidhidhyasana.

XII. Essential Qualifications to Attain Self-Knowledge :

a) Pure mind; b) Concentrated mind; c) Introvert mind- are the essential mental qualifications for the true seeker. Hankering after the outer enjoyment must be first minimized. Only then the mind can be said to be pure. Thinking about the external distractions should be readily given up by the aspirant and only then his mind can be said to be concentrated. An introvert mind means the capability of cognising the true, essential

nature of one's own Self or Being, which is beyond the mind. This cognition is nothing but taking a stand in the Witnessing Principle of the Self, which objectifies the mind.

XIII. Co-operative Means to Self-Knowledge and Their Utility in Practical Life :

All religions are unanimous about an aspirant having the necessary qualities like humility, honesty, compassion, non-violence, tolerance etc. All prophets and religious leaders have in them these qualities as their very nature. These qualities are called co-operative means to attain Self-Knowledge in Vedanta. In this regard, Vedanta is not opposed to any religious teachings and treats all religions alike. These fundamental qualities needed to be practised by a true seeker are delineated in the Bhagavad Gita, 13th Chapter-Verses 7 to 11, 18th Chapter-Verses 51 to 54 and at the beginning of the Brahma Sutras, etc.

If a true seeker diligently practises these qualities, it will be evident to him that there need not be any conflict or confrontation among the various religions of the world which have ultimately the same goal or objective. Hence this comprehensive outlook of Vedanta is the true utility that accrues from the practice of these qualities.

XIV. Accessory Means to Self-Knowledge:

Karma Yoga and Upasana or meditations are called accessory means in Vedanta. To attain purification, concentration and introvert nature of the mind, these accessory means are very effective. In the life of a householder the practice of these accessory means bring about an equanimity of mind leading to

real peace. All saints and sages advocate total surrender unto God, the Almighty and these accessory means help the seeker to develop such surrender and devotion to the Ultimate Reality.

XV. Misconceptions about Certain Technical Terms:

Words like Sannyasa (Renunciation), Yoga, Yajna or Sacrifice, Devotion, Samadhi etc., are loosely used in religious parlance giving rise to many misconceptions and confusions. If the Bhashyas or commentaries of Shankara are understood in their proper perspective, these confusion or misconceptions will be rooted out, for Shankara uses these terms on the basis of a comprehensive vision of Life in its totality and on universal experience taught in Vedanta. It will be realized that Vedanta enables the dispassionate seeker to get an insight into the significance of this esoteric terminology used by various religions in their methods of teaching the Ultimate Reality.

XVI. Comparative Study of Philosophies:

In the philosophical world, it has become the order of the day to make a comparative study of teachings of various philosophical schools. This comparative study should enable an aspirant to imbibe all helpful teachings from these schools so as to develop a comprehensive vision of Life in which there is room for all good tenets. In this regard, Shankara in his Bhashyas has pointed out clearly the merits and demerits of other contemporary philosophies like Kapila's Sankhya, Patanjali's Yoga, Buddhism, Jainism, etc.

XVII. Misinterpretations of Shankara's Genuine Teachings:

At present authoritative works by traditional teachers viz. Gaudapada, Shankara and his direct disciple Sureshwara, only are extant. All these three preceptors, who were well-versed in the traditional methodology of teaching, were unanimous, but unfortunately later commentators on Shankara's Bhashyas have mixed up alien teachings of other schools with Shankara's original teachings and have even misinterpreted his teachings. These interpretations by later commentators do not stand the test of being in full agreement with the tenets of scriptural texts and reasoning based on intuitive, universal experiences. Thus they run contrary to Shankara's teachings and even lead the true aspirants astray.

BIO - Data

Name : DEVARAO KULKARNI (Hombala)

Date of Birth: 2-12-1922 (2nd December Nineteen Twenty Two)

Place : Koliwada, Hubballi Taluk, Dharwar District, Karnataka State, South India.

Devarao Kulkarni hails from a family of pious cultured Brahmins of Hombala, Gadag Taluk, Dharwar District. Sri Raghavendra Rao Kulkarni, father of Devarao, was a prosperous land-lord always ready to help any religious or philanthropic cause in his life. On the maternal side, he belongs to the lineage of Kumara Vyasa of Koliwada, a famous poet in Kannada literature who has translated the great epic, Mahabharata into a beautiful verse form in Kannada. His work is held in high esteem in Kannada literature.

He had his early education in Hombala and Gadag. He had acquired a fairly good knowledge of Kannada and Marathi languages. He had developed a great hunger for philosophy from his younger days and partly quenched it from a study under the guidance of a famous Vedantin, Sadguru Sri Shankar Bhatt Agnihotri of Hombala. Sri Kulkarni obtained an insight into the Vedantic philosophy as taught in the Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, Panchadashi, Yoga Vashistha etc., with the help of this teacher.

His natural musical and poetic talents enabled him to teach the purport of the Upanishads in the form of 'Vedantic Harikeertane', himself composing many Keerthans like the ballads.

He was married in 1941. After some time he had to face many serious difficulties in life which deprived him of everything, leaving him almost penniless. His wife had a serious setback in her health becoming a victim to the designs of witchcraft by a relative. With great fortitude he took all these difficulties in his stride and treated them as blessing in disguise. By the grace of the Divine Mother, Mahamaya of Koliwada whom he was worshipping from his boyhood as advised by his mother, he sought refuge of a great divine force at Narsobawadi in Maharashtra State. This was a turning point in his life. Lord Dattatreya, who is the combination of three Gods in one, is the presiding deity of the place. He did hard penance there for over three years, the austerities being equally shared by his wife also. Thereon he devoted his life exclusively to the service of the Lord and to preaching Vedanta. While engaged in this way at Davangere, he had a rare opportunity of meeting H. H. Sri Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswathi Swamiji of Holenarsipur, who was giving discourses on Vedanta during Chaturmassya, ie., the monsoon months. This proved to be a divine dispensation and a big milestone in his life. Guided by the revered Swamiji, he took to a serious study of Vedanta and the commentaries of Sri Adi Shankara on Prasthanatrayi or the triple canons of Vedanta.

In 1956 Sri Devarao Kulkarni came to Bangalore to teach Vedanta and he was conducting classes at Adhyatma Mandir and Ananthashram. While at Bangalore, he had an opportunity of visiting some parts of Andhra Pradesh with the help of Sri Nikhilanda Gupta, an ardent seeker of Vedantic truth. Since 1962 he has been visiting many centres in Andhra Pradesh

to preach pristine pure Vedanta as expounded by the great Shankara and faithfully interpreted by the Revered Swamiji of Holenarsipura. Sri Kulkarni spent more than six months in a year in Andhra Pradesh for preaching true Vedanta. This enabled him to speak in Telugu quite fluently.

Incidentally, while he was travelling in Andhra, he was able to visit Peethapuram (another sanctuary of Lord Dattatreya), which had been almost forgotten by the devotees. This was almost a discovery by Sri Kulkarni, who by his earnest efforts and with the help of the devotees revived it and restored it to its ancient prestigious position. Today it has once again become a sacred place of worship of the deity. On the direction of H.H. Swamiji of Holenarasipura he guided some foreign students of Vedanta, thereby developing contacts with a few earnest seekers from abroad. Mr. Alessandra Bruschettini of Italy, who was deeply impressed by the works of Sri Swamiji, requested Kulkarni to translate into English "Mandukya Rahasya Vivruti", the magnum opus of Sri Swamiji in Sanskrit. With the help of Sri D. B. Gangolli, a retired journalist of Bombay, who is also an ardent devotee of Sri Swamiji, he completely translated the above work into English. This exercise was helpful to him to express himself in English, in which he also acquired considerable fluency.

In August 1982, he visited France to guide Mr. Yann Le Boucher, of Cesson Seviagne (Rennes) to prepare a thesis on 'Genuine Shankara Vedanta'. He continues to guide many foreign students.

Through the influence of Sri D. B. Gangolli he was appointed as the Dharma Pracharaka (Religious Preacher) by

the Chitrapur Saraswat Mutt of Shirali for four years and he visited many places in India like Bombay, Madras, Delhi, Bangalore etc. to give discourses for a fortnight or a month.

With the help of Sri O. V. Ramiah, founder president of Shankarashrama at Yelahanka, Bangalore North, Sri Devarao Kulkarni established Sri Dattaguru Shankara Vedanta Nilaya at the same premises with the intention of propagating the tenets of pure Shankara Vedanta. He has been one of the members of the Trust of the Ashrama, which has been propagating the salient principles of Vedanta, Yoga and Natural Living (Naturopathy) by conducting periodical training camps. He has thus devoted his entire life for the teaching of Vedanta.

He has authored many works on Vedantic philosophy in Kannada, Telugu and English, viz:

1. Shankara Darshana (poetic work) containing the gist of the teachings of the triple canons of Vedanta.
2. Shankara Samsmarana, Part I & II, high lighting the salient features of Shankara Vedanta.
3. Vedantada Valagannu - explaining the features of the tribasic view of life, that is, waking, dream and deep sleep states.
4. Adhyatma Yoga : A unique method of meditation in Vedanta (also translated into English and Telugu). All these above books are written in Kannada.
5. Mandukya Upanyasamulu (Telugu): It is a collection of lectures delivered on Mandukya Upanishad and is the quintessence of Vedanta.

He has completed the translation of 'Mandukya Rahasya Vivruthihi' into English and has prepared notes on 'Essentials of Shankara Vedanta', which are still in the manuscript form.

Because of his intelligent and popular way of presenting the Vedantic teachings, both in speech and poetic forms, he is popularly known as 'Brahmagna Kavi' & 'Vedanta Chatura' which titles have also been conferred on him by the authorities of Adhyatma Prakasha Karyalaya, founded by H. H. Sri Swamiji at Holenarsipura and Bangalore.

**ARTICLES OF
DEVARAO KULKARNI
ON VEDANTA**

Pages 375 - 497

About the Book

Replies give by Brahmajna Kavi,
Vedanta Chatura Sri Devarao Kulkarni for
queries by the Jignasus on Vedanta.

CONTENTS

1.	Letter dated 26th Dec. 1989:	379
2.	Note on Avadhuta Sanyasa:	384
3.	Clarification regarding SHABDAADAATMANI SAMYAJNAAANOTPATTI PRAKARAH	385
4.	Jeevanmukti Viveka:	387
5.	Rama Tatva:	390
6.	Vasanakshaya and Manonasha:	393
7.	Manonasha:	399
8.	Contemplation on discrimination:	403
9.	Adhyasa:	406
10.	Clarification regarding two types of Adhyasa:	412
11.	Translation of Mulavidyaanirasa P.No. 85, 86 & 87 (section 64):	414
12.	Supplementary to evidence about the existence of God (Eswara)	426
(i).	Arguments of the theists:	426
(ii).	Brahman as the cause of the universe according to Vedanta:	434
(a)	Theories of causation according to Indian philosophers:	434
(b)	Scrutiny about the Samkhya's opinion about the causation:	435
(c)	Scrutiny of some of the modern theories about causation:	437
(d)	Scrutiny of the theory of Vaisheshikas:	439
(e)	Scrutiny of the theory of 'Arambhavada':	440
(f)	Vedantic view	442

13.	Significance of Mandukya Bhashya Mantra No. 7	444
14.	Determining the nature of <i>Turiya</i> :	446
15.	Significance of Karika 2-4 according to MRV:	460
16.	The significance of G.K. 3-23 (P.No. 332 of 2011 edition):	467
17.	Significance of Mandukya Karika 3-26: (letter dated. 05.02.1990)	470
18.	Clarification regarding Shabdaaparokshavaada and Manoaparokshavaada:	485
19.	Regarding the conflict between <i>Avachchedavaada</i> and <i>Aabhaasavaada</i> : (29.09.1989)	492
20.	Regarding Practical Vedanta as told by Ramakrishnaiats:	496

**Replies given by Ved. Br. Sri. Devarao Kulkarni
for queries by his disciples on Vedanta:**

1. Letter dated 26th Dec. 1989:

Qn: Can Phalatyaga Sanyasa be called as Gouna Sanyasa?

Ans: Yes, Shankara himself has written this while commenting on Gita 6-1 ननु च दर्शयितुं आह, In this portion particularly see the phrase कर्मफलसंकल्पसत्यासात् योगित्वं च इति गौणम् उभयम् ।

Regarding five points raised in the same question as mentioned by H. H. Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji in his book 'Shankara's Clarification of certain Vedantic Concepts' P.No. 78,79 (Second Edition-1996), the significance of these steps are as follows:

The word Sanyasa gives the exact meaning as that of renunciation or giving up. On this basis Sri Swamyji describes that (a) at first the Sadhaka (practitioner, disciple) gives up 'Nishiddha Karmas' (sin of omissions) according to Katha Upanishad. 'नाविरतो दुश्चरितात्'. This is the first step in Sanyasa. (b) When the Sadhaka becomes Mumukshu, meaning when he wants release from samsara and is not interested in getting any benefits of enjoyments

either of this world or other worlds, at this stage of non-attachment regarding the enjoyments of both the worlds he gives up the Kamya Karmas. This is Kamyakarma Sanyasa. (c) After this, he gives up the hankering desires for the fruits of actions of all the activities, either Loukika (secular) karmas or Vaidika (sacred) karmas, but he performs them correctly as they are his duties and are to be submitted to the Lord's feet as His Aradhana (worship). This is Sarvakarmaphalatyaga (giving up fruits of all actions). This is also mentioned in Gita 12-11. This is called as Karma Yoga or Phalatyagarupa Sanyasa (Sanyasa No, 3 as per my previous article). That is why I have mentioned the definition of Karma in the context of Karma Yoga portion as 'that which is not Akarma (not performing) and Vikarma (performing prohibited actions) is Karma' and when it is surrendered to the Lord it becomes Karma Yoga or Phalatyagarupa Sanyasa. (d) While describing Karma Yoga, four aspects of this Yoga is shown: (1) Ahamkaratyaga, (2) Phalatyaga, (3) Samatvabuddhi and (4) Isvaraarpana. When the fruits of actions are surrendered to the Lord along with observing these four aspects, the Sadhaka loses his Kartrutvaabhimana (concept of agentship). So, this Karma Yoga is called as Kartrutvaabhimana Sanyasa by Swamyji. (e) After this, when he gets chittashuddhi (purification of mind and eligibility for Jnananishtha i.e., Jnananishthaayogyata) by grace of Almighty he will

achieve Atmajnaanishthaa. In this stage all the duality gets falsified. So it is called Sarvakarmasanyasa or Paramarthasanyasa which is the resultant. This is the significance of the steps of Sanyasa as narrated by Swamyji. [See 'Introduction to the fourth chapter of Gita 'ज्ञाननिष्ठा लक्षणः सन्यासः कर्मयोगोपायः' and introduction to Gita 5-27, 'कर्मयोगश्च.....वक्ष्यति च' Here the steps mentioned are Satvashuddhi, Jnaanapraapti, and Sarvakarmasanyasa. Thus, the last stage is Sarvakarmasanyasa or Paramarthasanyasa.

But to achieve this Sanyasa there are mainly three ways: (i) Performing Karma Yoga, getting chittashuddhi, (ii) After getting chittashuddhi some people who have intense vairagya will take Mumukhuashramasanyasa (No. 2), and get Jnaanishtha. (iii) Some rare beings in the very childhood due to samskara of previous lives directly go to Mumukshuashramasanyasa, according to Jabala Shruti,ब्रह्मचर्याद् वा', just like Shuka, Shankaracharya, Ramana Maharshi etc. Anyhow in all these three the goal is Sarvakarmasanyasa or Paramarthasanyasa or Atmajnaanishthaa. (Refer again the five types of Sanyasa that I have sent). So, wherever the Sarvakarmasanyasa is mentioned it is Jnana Nishthaa alone and it is not restricted to the Ashrama Sanyasa, i.e., Mumukshuashramasanyasa (No. 2). Hence there is no rule that without taking Ashrama Sanyasa there will be no Moksha. If we hold the view that Ashrama Sanyasa is a

must for getting Moksha, in effect we mean that Sri Rama, Sri Krishna, King Janaka etc., are not Muktas they did not take Sanyasa. The true meaning of Sanyasa is in fact Jnana Nishthaa and the Ashrama Sanyasa is a means for getting this true Sanyasa or Jnana Nishthaa.

Qn 3: Can Mumukshuashramasanyasa be called Avidvat Sanyasa?

Ans: Yes, this is correct. Shankara has said in his Gita Bh. Introduction to fifth chapter thus: 'तस्मात् अनात्मवित्कर्तृकयोरेव सन्यासकर्मयोगयोः निःश्रेयसकरत्त्ववचनं, तदीयाच्च कर्मसन्यसात् पूर्वोत्कात्मवित्कर्तृकसर्वकर्मसन्यासविलक्षणात् सत्येव कर्तृत्वविज्ञाने कर्मैकदेशविषयात् यमनियमादिसहितत्वेन न दुरुन्धेयत्वात् सुकरत्वेन च कर्मयोगस्य विशिष्टत्वाभिधानं इत्येवं प्रतिवचनवाक्य निरूपणेनापि पूर्वोक्तः प्रष्टुरभिप्रायः निश्चीयते इति स्थितम्'. Here the main significant point is that the Mumukshua shramasanyasa is to be taken to get Atmajnana by the one who has not yet got the Jnana Nishthaa. So, it is Avidvatsanyasa. Here in this sentence Shankara says that 'this Ashramasanyasa is quite distinct from Sarvakarmasanyasa which is the very nature of the knower of the Self'. This Ashramasanyasa is inferior to Sarvakarmasanyasa and hence Sarvakarmasanyasa is superior. And this Ashramasanyasa is very difficult to perform (Duranushteyatvaat) and for this reason Bhagavan gives preference for Karma Yoga'. This is the significance of this sentence.

Qn 4: What is the meaning of *Aparamaarthasanyasa* (*Gita*. 18-12)?

Ans: *Aparamaarthasanyasa* means *Phalatyaga Sanyasa*. Sri Swamyji in his foot note states thus: 'Here *Atyagis* (who have not got *Paramarthasanyasa*) does not mean that those who have not renounced the fruits of actions through the practice of *Karma Yoga* but means the *Karma Yogis* or those who are practicing *Phalatyagarupa Sanyasa*'. Here the significance is that though they will not get the particular fruits of actions, they will get the purification of mind by practicing this *Karma Yoga*. And through this purified mind they will get the *Self Knowledge* which is itself the result. But from the standpoint of *Paramarthasanyasis*, meaning those who have *Jnana Nishthaa*, the word 'result' itself is meaningless which means that apart from the *Self* there is nothing for them. So, here *Aparamaarthasanyasa* means *Phalatyaga Sanyasa* and *Paramarthasanyasa* means *Jnana Nishthaa*.

Qn. 5: Whether *Parivraajya* is *Vidvatsanyasa* and *Mukhya Ashrama Sanyasa*?

Ans: Mainly *Parivraajya* here is concerned with the *Ashrama Sanyasa* or *Sanyasa No.2*, because Shankara says here 'विविदिषोरपि सिद्धं पारिव्राज्यं' meaning for him who wants to get *Jnana Nishthaa* also *Parivraajya* is prescribed. This is established in the above sentence. Here we have to observe one important thing. According to Shankara, for

one who gets Atmajnana Parivraajya is natural. (In some cases, he may remain in the householdership because through Atma Jnana desire will vanish and when there is no desire there cannot be any Karma to him and hence Parivraajya is natural for a Jnani). On this ground for him who has got full Virakti and wants to get Jnana Nishthaa, the Parivraajyam, i.e., Ashrama Sanyasa is preferable. And in this context Shankara says that for Mumukshus this Parivraajya is the best means to get Jnana Nishthaa than trying while staying in Grihasthashrama. For this reason, I had stated in Sanyasa portion that Shankara has advocated Sanyasa and he has established this on the firm ground of Atma Jnana Nishthaa as well as the utterances of the Shrutis and reasons.

* * * * *

2. Note on Avadhuta Sanyasa:

This Sanyasa resembles Smartha Sanyasa (No. 4) but in this cult some Avadhutas have misunderstood that they are Avadhutas and hence they have no restrictions of any Shastras and hence they can do as they please. This belief is wrong. They have to observe Yama, Niyama and Tapas etc. Here, I have no clear idea regarding Avadhuta Sanyasa which is in practice in West Bengal. But in other parts I have seen some Avadhutas. In this cult also there are some great Viraktas. But as I am the devotee of Sri Dattatreya and this Lord Dattatreya is called Avadhuta, I

understand that in all his Avatars (incarnations) he has appeared as a Tapasvi and Dharma Sthapaka etc. So, in Avadhuta cult also vairagya is the important thing. This is my opinion regarding Avadhuta Sanyasa.

* * * * *

(Undated letter filed after the previous letter)

3. Clarification regarding SHABDAADAATMANI SAMYAJNAAANOTPATTI PRAKARAH (शब्दादात्मनि सम्यग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तिप्रकारः) Naishkarmya Siddhi – Kleshaapaharini by Sri Swamyji in stanza Nos. 3-104 to 3-107:

Your doubt appears to be as follows: The word Rama makes him to awake from his sleep. There is no connection between the word (sound) and the deep sleep. Even though this is the fact, one gets awakened by the sound such as Rama etc., and there may be any sound such as bursting of cracker etc., which awakens him. It being so, there is no restriction that to get the Self-awareness one should have recourse to the Vedantic teachings (sound) alone and that he may get Self-awareness by other words also. And further he may get awakened naturally without using any sound. It being so, how this illustration is an apt one in this connection?

The answer is (a) the mistake here is that you tried to make resemblance of all the features of the illustration to the illustrated. To teach a particular aspect of the subject matter the illustration is used. For example, when

we describe a woman as Chandramukhi no one questions as to why the moon light has not come in spite of her presence on a new moon day. The description says a particular aspect that as we get pleasure in seeing the full moon so her face is very beautiful. This is set out in detail by Sri Shankara in his B.S.B (Brahma Sutra Bhashya) 3-2-20 (this had been quoted earlier by me) thus: 'न हि स्यात्'. (b) Here the point is that the sound, whether as Rama or that produced by a cracker bursting, (strictly speaking) has no connection between this sound or word and the deep sleep state. Though this is the position, the man wakes up from sleep through this sound. So also the word "Tat tvam asi" etc., though are not really connected with the Self, through the destruction of the misconception or ignorance regarding the real nature of the Self, it is described here as the 'Awareness of the Self has occurred'. Strictly speaking the awareness of the Self does not take place newly; it was there even in the state of ignorance as 'I am so and so'. Hence the sentences of Vedanta do not create the awareness regarding the Self but they will remove the wrong ideas regarding the true nature of the Self. This removal also is not at all connected with the real nature of the Self. Thus in Stanza No. 107, an illustration of ether is given. So the apt point here is that 'though there is no real connection between the Self and the word (or any sound), through removal of misconception in the antahkarana, the

awareness of the true nature of the Self is generated by the Vedantic sentences'. (c) Your objection that without any sound also one may be awakened from sleep etc., is fraught with the mistake of adopting all the features of the illustration with the illustrated.

Refer again, rather carefully study Swamyji's *Kleshapaharini* 3-42 to 3-44. Hence the teachings of Vedanta and getting awareness of the real nature of the Self, getting the misconceptions destroyed are only attributions (*Adhyaropa*) on Brahman.

* * * * *

4. Jeevanmukti Viveka:

Once before I had touched on the point in my previous article that *Vasanakshaya* and *Manonasha* gained currency in Vedanta from *Yoga Vasishtha Grantha*. Strictly speaking after Self-realisation there will not be any duality because all the dualities have been falsified. Those who have obtained this realisation will not see anything but the Self. In *Brihadaranyaka* it is said 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति' (regarding the viewpoint of realised person). This falsification is not observed by the recent Vedantins who came after *Sureshvaracharya*. And they hold the view that after realising the non-dual Self also the trace of ignorance remains till the complete exhaustion of *Praarabdha Karma*. Due to these types of misconception the contention of *Vasanakshaya*, *Manonasha*,

Jeevanmuktivilakshanasukha (Ananda) etc., gained currency.

In Br. 3-9-28 (last portion), a discussion as follows has been given by the Bhashyakaara. 'Is there any feeling of great pleasure (Bhavyaanubhava) etc., in the state of Self-realisation because the Brahman is described as the nature of bliss and consciousness and so there must be the constant feeling of joy or pleasure or bliss to the realised person?' And he replies that 'the words bliss, consciousness are not meant here as feelings which manifests through Antahkarana but are very nature of the non-dual Brahman and from the standpoint of realised person the Antahkarana has itself been falsified'. Strictly speaking, the state of realised person quite resembles the intuitional experience of the deep sleep state. It is said in Br. 4-4-6 'यो हि सुषुप्तावस्थायामिव.....ब्रह्माप्येति'. The meaning is 'He who sees the Self as in the profound sleep as undifferentiated, one without a second and as the constant light of pure intelligence – only this disinterested person has no work and consequently no cause for transmigration; therefore his organs, such as that of speech, do not depart. Rather this man of realisation is Brahman in this very life, though he seems to have a body. BEING BUT BRAHMAN HE IS MERGED IN BRAHMAN. Since he has no desires that cause the limitation of non-Brahmanhood, and hence being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman in this very life, and not after the body falls'.

So, in Self-realisation as non-dual Brahman there will be no room for enjoying abnormal bliss or joy etc.

In some practices of Upasanas or Yoga sadhanas there is possibility of enjoying higher type of bliss or pleasure like ecstasy (Bhavyaanubhava, Divyaanubhava) etc., such as is the case with Gauranga Prabhu, Ramakrishna Paramahansa, etc. These are of course a very high degree of enjoyments when compared to worldly enjoyments. But from the standpoint of Vedanta all these are connected with the Antahkarana. The nature of the Self is non-dual one. Hence the idea of Jeevanmukti Vilakshanaananda or Sukha is in the purview of Antahkarana. According to Vedanta the final judgment is न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः न बद्धो न च साधकः । न मुमुक्षुर्न वै मुक्तः इत्येषा परमार्थता ॥ (मा.का ३-३२). So bondage, liberation, Jnaana, Ajnaana, etc., are said from the standpoint of Adhyaropa alone but Brahman is the only truth. This highest philosophy is forgotten and therefore this misconception has gained currency. Panchadasi, Jeevanmukti Viveka and Anubhooti Prakasha are popular in the name of Sri. Vidyaranya. All these three books are having contradictory statements amongst themselves in many respects and hence appear to be attributed to Sri Vidyaranya. It is very obvious that the teachings in these three books contradict the pristine pure teachings of Sri Shankara. Sri Swamiji has revealed this in many of his Kannada books while discussing Jeevanmukti Viveka. Hence it is necessary to

understand every subject in the light of the utterances of the Bhashya and according to guidance of Sri Swamiji.

* * * * *

5. Rama Tatva:

My revered Gurudev H.H. Sri Satchidanandendra Saraswati Swamiji in his Purvashrama when he was very young he was working as a teacher at Haridwar. There is a temple of Sri Harihareshwara on the bank of Tungabhadra river. Once when this young man (Sri Y. Subba Rao, as he was then called) went to take bath in the river and after that he came to the temple to take the darshanam of Sri Harihareshwara. At that time he saw a sanyasin sitting there at the corner of the Mantapam. This Subba Rao went and bowed to Sri Swamyji and requested him to go over to his house. At first the sanyasin rejected his offer but then on persuasion the sanyasin accepted his invitation. At that time Subba Rao was the only person residing in that house as he had not married at that time. After sanyasin took his seat in that house, this Subba Rao was spreading the clothes for drying. After finishing that work, Subba Rao chanted the name of Rama as 'Rama, Rama'. Hearing this chanting the sanyasin asked Subba Rao as to which Rama he was calling or remembering. Then Subba Rao was surprised and asked the sanyasin as to how many Ramas are there. The sanyasin replied as follows: (i) for common man Rama means the son of

Dasharatha, (ii) for some others Rama is a best king, (iii) for yet others he is a very obedient son who renounced the kingdom as per his father's wishes, (iv) for some others he is an incarnation of Maha Vishnu, (v) for others he is the protector of virtuous people and destroyer of sinners, (vi) for others Rama is in the form of whole universe, i.e., Vishvarupa, (vii) but from the standpoint of a realised soul who has got Atma Jnana Nishthaa the word Rama denotes the real nature of the Self which is non-dual absolute Being, the nature of Consciousness and nature of Bliss itself. In all these forms Rama can be meditated, and out of these which kind of Rama you are calling? he asked. Subba Rao was surprised and exclaimed – Oh! The word Rama has so many meanings!

Thus, Rama means, strictly speaking, as the Self of all which is the witnessing principle of life and which is called as Brahman. This is real Rama Tatva. He who has got the awareness of his true nature, for him, the word Rama denotes the real nature of the Self. But for him who does not have that much capacity, Shastra says that Rama means the incarnation (Avatar) of the Lord Vishnu. And according to one's capacity the other aspects of Rama could be meditated upon. Once upon a time I went to a village in Andhra Pradesh which is near Samalakot to participate in the Rama Navami celebrations. In that function my lecture had been fixed to be delivered on Mandukya Upanishad and Vedanta. Occasionally I dealt

with Om kara also which is said in Mandukya as the real nature of Rama etc., according to our Guruji's teachings. But, in the evening there was a lecture arranged from a woman who belonged to Arya Samaj of Hyderabad. She was giving lectures on Ramayana written by Swamy Ranganathananda comparing here and there with Ramayana. But in all her lectures the main theme was to show that Rama was a best politician. So, according to their level of understanding the word Rama gives different meanings. But for you it is quite correct to say that Rama Tatva means non-dual absolute pure Self. This is enough for you for the present.

When we agree that the nature of Self is Almighty, then we have to accept that the same Self has taken the incarnation of Rama without forfeiting his indefinable power of Maya for the benefit of the devotees. This is said by Shankara on one occasion in Sutra Bhashya. According to this concept he who meditates on the names and forms of Rama as the Lord with the intention of getting Atma Jnana which means with Jignasa Bhakti he will get chitta shuddhi and will have the ultimate goal of Atma Jnana Nishthaa. This is the glory of Rama Tatva. Hence sages and saints praise the glory of Sri Rama Nama. As you know already, Sri Thyagaraja has said - all this is pervaded by Rama—Anta Ramamayam. And Sri Ramadasa of Andhra and Sri Samartha Ramadasa of Maharashtra who was the Guru of Chatrapati Shivaji Maharaj have

praised the glory of Sri Rama and Rama as Parambrahma. These things have to be remembered again and again in our mind and that is the real Rama Janmotsava.

Sri Ramadas of Kannangad of Kerala was a staunch devotee of Sri Rama and got Self-realisation purely from devotion of Sri Rama. This Kannangad is in Kerala near Mangalore. I went there to see this pilgrim center. There is a good Ashram and always the chanting of OM SRI RAMA JAYA RAMA JAYA JAYA RAMA from early morning 5 O' clock to night 9 O' clock will be going on. So, we should also keep the practice of chanting the name of Lord Rama and observe the Rama as Parambrahma who is our own Self which is beyond this ego. That pure 'I' is called as Rama.

* * * * *

6. Vasanakshaya and Manonasha:

In Shankara Bhashya, these types of words are not used in any context. Instead of this, Shankara has condemned the Vasanakshayavada on one occasion in his Br. Bh. 2-3-1 to 2-3-6 the gist of which is as follows:

- (a) The whole empirical world has been divided into two categories – Murta and Amurta i.e., gross and subtle. Out of five elements earth, water, and fire are called as Murta and air and ether (space or Akasha) are called as Amurta. Born out of these two kinds, the gross body;

and the mind & sense organs are subtle. When the mind, i.e., Antahkarana gets into contact with outer objects through sense organs it gets enjoyment of various kinds.

- (b) At the time of enjoyment, the antahkarana gets satisfaction with that object but at the same time, it takes a duplicate of that enjoyment and keeps it in its latent portion. This duplicate copy of enjoyment is called as vasana.
- (c) In this connection the Upanishad gives a good illustration: just as a white cloth dipped in yellow colour becomes yellow, the mind or antahkarana becomes tainted according to the colour of vasanas.
- (d) Thus, all types of vasanas belong to antahkarana alone. The real nature of the Self which is pure Consciousness illumines and objectifies the antahkarana with all its modifications and colours of vasanas just as an arc-lamp in a cinema illumines the film with the modifications and colours of film. Thus, the real nature of the Self has no taint whatever of the vasanas.

In the above context, an objection is raised by some Vedantins as follows: 'After vanishing of all the vasanas only the Self will get released from samsara. So the

sadhaka has to destroy all the vasanas by practicing some occult yogic process or meditation etc.',—this objection is called as Vasanakshayavada.

Shankara's reply in Br. Bh. 2-3-1 to 2-3-6 is as follows:

- (a) No one can exactly determine as to how many vasanas are there in the latent portion of antahkarana. These vasanas are accumulated in the antahkarana from so many births. Some may be destroyed and some new vasanas will enter antahkarana. It is impossible to determine the quantity of all these by any person. And also, one cannot assert as to when all these vasanas get destroyed. So, imagining the destruction of vasanas is absurd.
- (b) This is because only when the concept of time as eternal appears we can imagine the existence of vasanas. In a prior time, the enjoyment takes place and then the vasanas will enter the latent portion of antahkarana and again the vasana raises its ugly head in the future. So, we have to accept the time factor whenever we want to deal with the vasanas and we have to accept that the enjoyments are the cause and vasanas are effect.

- (c) According to Vedanta the very idea of time, space and causation itself is due to ignorance and hence is a false appearance because we see these factors in the waking and dream states only. And these concepts are quite different in both the states. In deep sleep state there is no trace of these concepts at all. This is a universal truth. Our being, which is the substratum of these three states, and which illumines the appearance and disappearance of the waking and dream, is beyond the concepts of time, space and causation. As our true nature is this pure Being and pure Consciousness there is no taint of vasanas for our true nature.
- (d) From the standpoint of sadhaka, it is true that he has to get rid of bad vasanas that are in his mind, and he has to obtain good vasanas by practicing vyragya Bhavana, satsanga and surrendering to the Lord etc. This discipline is called as obtaining Satva Guna and getting rid of Rajasa and Tamasa Gunas. For this purpose in Bhagavad-Gita, particularly in Chapters 14, 16, 17 & 18, the nature of all types of three Gunas are described in detail. According to that process one can conquer the Tamoguna by relying on Rajoguna first and

then he has to conquer Rajoguna by relying on Sathvaguna. When the percentage of Satva Guna increases in antahkarana the shubha or good vasanas will increase. It is very necessary for the sadhaka at first to get the ability of discrimination of real nature of the Self and antahkarana by which he will lose the identification of antahkarana or the mind. Then he himself remains as the true nature of the Self. This is the process of Vedantic teaching.

- (e) When the sadhaka discriminates the true nature of the Self and that of the mind (which appears and disappears), he cognises that there is no independent existence to this antahkarana apart from the Self and that the Self is a constant factor which has no interruption and so it is independent pure Being. When one discriminates like this, at that time he himself remains as the true nature of the Self and observes that the antahkarana is pervaded by the nature of the Self. When this pervasive nature is observed the very existence of the antahkarana falsifies. In this stage there is no antahkarana at all and the Self is the only reality and due to ignorance of the true nature of the Self He

appeared as if He has taken the form of antahkarana.

- (f) So, from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self there is no antahkarana at all. When this truth is realised, he cognises himself as He Is, i.e., the Pure Consciousness, that he is ever free from all the vasanas which are only false appearances. This may be called as Vasanakshaya in one sense according to Shankara. So, from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self there is no antahkarana at all. Strictly speaking there is no usage of the word as Vasanakshaya in whole of Prasthanatraya Bhashya of Sri Adi Shankara. That is why in the last portion of Br. 2-3-6, Shankara declares as follows: when all the desires of time, space and causation are removed by negating all the adjuncts (Upadhis) the very desire of knowing something will be finished or disappears because the consciousness of the sadhaka will get established fully in the true nature of the Self which is the truth of the truths (meaning from the empirical standpoint the Murta and Amurta i.e., the gross and the subtle or the manifested and unmanifested form of the world is called as truth or real and

the Self is therefore Truth of the truths). But the nature of the Brahman or the Self is really real and so it is called as Truth of truths. And this nature of Brahman is the absolute Consciousness or mass of Consciousness just like rock salt (saindhavaghana), is homogeneous and sadhaka realises that “I am Brahman”.

Thus by realisation of true nature of Brahman only one can transcend the delusion of vasanas.

* * * * *

7. Manonasha:

There is no word mentioned as Manonasha by Shankara in his Prasthanatraya Bhashyas. The Karikas which have been written by Sri Gaudapada, grand preceptor of Sri Shankara has said about ‘Asparsha Yoga’ in third section.

- 1) In this connection he says that the pure Being which is in deep sleep, that true nature of Atman, appears as if He has taken the form of subject and object without forfeiting His true nature. This appearance is called as mind, meaning the mind means in its essence Atman alone, that is, when we have not recognised the true nature of the Self then it appears as the mind.

- 2) When this false appearance is there, then only subject-object relationship, i.e., the universe appears as if it is there.
- 3) When there is no appearance of this mind, there is no universe or subject-object relationship.
- 4) The appearance of the mind ceases to exist during two stages, the first is in deep sleep and the second is through Vivekadarshana and Abhyasa-Vairaagya.
- 5) When naturally mind ceases to exist in deep sleep for the time being, then it raises its ugly head again in waking but when it gets falsified through Vivekadarshana and Abhyasa-Vairaagya, then one realises that the mind will become no-mind, meaning one realises that there is no mind at all and only the Self is there. This realisation is called as Asparshayoga, meaning the Self is ever free from the mind or there is no touch of the mind to the Self just as there is no touch of snake to the rope when a rope is mistaken as the snake.
- 6) Here Viveka means that at first one should discriminate the mind and his own true nature which is beyond mind. To recognise this one

should observe one's own life in its entirety. The mind appears in waking state or in dream state and it disappears in deep sleep. This appearance and disappearance of the mind is illumined by one's own true nature which is the nature of pure Consciousness or Anubhavasvaroopa. So, he has to discern that as he is that Anubhavasvaroopa he is quite separate from the mind.

- 7) But the mind has no independent existence apart from the above said true nature of one's own Self and whenever the mind appears it is pervaded by that Anubhavasvaroopa alone. Hence it is evident that we have mistaken the Anubhavasvaroopa i.e., the true nature of the Self as the mind. In this stage the mind has been falsified by realising the nature of false appearance of the mind and the Self as the only reality.
- 8) This realisation is called as Asparsha Yoga'. From the standpoint of the true nature of the Self there is no complaint regarding the mind. When we complain regarding the mind, then it means that we have misunderstood the same Self as the mind. If you want you may call it as Manonasha but this word is not at all used

by Gaudapada or Shankara. Always in Vedanta it is said that the falsification of the mind. i.e., Baadha or the mind will get Baadhita – the word Nasha denotes that the thing existent once upon a time and in another time it is destroyed but here the idea of time itself comes under the realm of the mind and so in one sense it is wrong to say ‘destruction of mind’. When we cognise the true nature of the mind as the Self, this itself is called as the falsification of the mind.

- 9) In Brihadaranyaka, Shankara has discussed in an occasion on ‘Chitta Nirodhavaada’ in which an objection is raised by an opponent saying that ‘after realising the Self also you should prescribe the Chitta Nirodha, meaning control of mind as it is said in Paatanjala Yoga and it is required in Vedanta also’. For this objection, Shankara replies as follows: ‘cognising the Self as non-dual one and falsifying the (false) appearance of the mind is called as Chitta Nirodha’. We have said this accepting the word as Chitta Nirodha but strictly speaking in Upanishads, it is said that ‘by knowing the true nature of the Self alone, means by the Self-knowledge alone one gets released from samsara’. There is no mention

of the word Chittanirodha as genuine means in Upanishads. Where there is no mind there is no question of Chittanirodha or Manonasha. This is the correct position of Shankara according to Upanishads.

* * * * *

8. Contemplation on discrimination:

Our antahkarana or the mind is very subtle one. Sri Shankara describes it as a subtle body which is of the nature of crystal (sphatika). It holds the reflection of the nature of Consciousness of the true nature of the Self. So it resembles the very nature of the Self. Hence it is very difficult to discriminate or separate the true nature of the Self and the antahkarana, i.e., 'Me' notion.

(b) This antahkarana pervades the whole body from top to bottom through the pranas. Whenever the pleasure or pain or any modifications occur in the body, immediately this antahkarana takes identification with that modification of the body. Then one says that 'I am suffering, I am enjoying or I have forgotten all the spiritual practices and now I have become one with this body' etc. This is called as dukkhitvaadi Pratyaya. Sri Shankara describes this in his Bhashya.

(c) This type of dukkhitvaadi Pratyaya i.e., feeling the pain or enjoyment in oneself is very strong in antahkarana. So, one naturally feels that 'I am ill, I am

miserable, now I have to suffer and all the previous practices of spiritual discrimination etc., are lost for the present' etc., is the condition of the sadhaka in this stage.

At this stage one forgets the subtle point that the painful nature of the antahkarana and above described conditions of the antahkarana is objectified by oneself as He is the witnessing principle of the feelings of the antahkarana. For this reason it is said above that it is very difficult to discriminate the antahkarana i.e., 'Me' notion and the witnessing principle of life which is the true nature of the Self because this antahkarana is fully pervaded by Atman and as it resembles the nature of Atman, so it is very difficult to discriminate these two. This is said by Shankara in his *Adhyasa Bhashya* thus: 'Similarly one superimposes the attributes of the internal organ such as desire, will, doubt, perseverance, etc. In the same way, one first superimposes the internal organ, possessed of the idea of ego on the Self, the witness of all the manifestation of that organ, then by an opposite process, one superimposes on the internal organ etc., that Self which is opposed to the non-self and which is the witness of everything.

To give up this wrong identification with antahkarana, one should start discriminating in the following manner: (i) At first he has to observe his painful condition himself and then he has to think as to

how this painful condition is known? At once the answer comes that it is direct experience. So, for one to determine that the painful nature of the antahkarana vritti has culminated in and illumined by the Anubhava which is one's own true nature. So, the true nature of one's own self is not affected by this painful nature which is concerned to antahkarana. (ii) In the light of one's own true nature as being the Consciousness one objectified the modifications of antahkarana and ill-health in the body which has been increasing or decreasing etc. So, the witnessing principle of Self which is called here as Anubhava is unchangeable reality which illumines all the modifications. (iii) In the waking state the modifications which have appeared in antahkarana, the same modification do not follow in dream state because during the dream time the modifications are quite different from those of waking. So, these two cannot taint the true nature of the Self who is the illuminator of both. (iv) In deep sleep, there is no antahkarana and no modifications but pure Being of the Self is continuing as unchangeable reality. So here in the waking state also the nature of the ...

(Sorry, incomplete. Will be completed if and when available)

* * * * *

9. Adhyasa:

- (1) Dividing Adhyasa into two categories – Anubhavarupa and Vrittirupa according to ‘Shankara self-explained’ is for the purpose of teaching only. So, both types of Adhyasas are superimpositions from the standpoint of the teaching of Brahman.
- (2) Hence we should not get confused that there are two types of Adhyasa because to think or to say that there are two types in Adhyasa etc., starts from Adhyasa – taking identification with the mind. Sri Swamyji once upon a time while discussing regarding the locus and subject-matter (Ashraya and Vishaya) of Avidya has, for the first time, showed us the difference of opinions among commentators as ‘Jiva as Ashraya and Brahman as subject matter and vice versa’ etc. At last, Swamiji said that to think, regarding the locus and subject matter itself, adhyasa is required because without taking the wrong identification with the mind (which is itself imagined thing) there is no possibility of thinking itself. These commentators forgot the fundamental principle that the Shastra itself has superimposed the Avidya or adhyasa

on Brahman, basing on common experience, for the purpose of teaching the true nature of Brahman. It is said in Br. 1-4-10 thus: ब्रह्मणि साधक त्वकल्पना अस्मदादिवदिव अपेशला 'तदात्मानमेवावेत्तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्' (इति) चेत् । न । शास्त्रोपालम्भात् । न हि अस्मत्कल्पनेयं शास्त्रकृता तु तस्मात् शास्त्रस्यायं उपालम्भः । न च ब्रह्मणः इष्टं चिकीर्षुणा शास्त्रार्थविपरीतकल्पनया स्वार्थपरित्यागः कार्यः । न च एतावत्येव अक्षमा युक्ता भवतः । सर्वं हि नानात्वं ब्रह्मणि कल्पितमेव । 'एकधैवानुद्गष्टव्यं' (४-४-२०), 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (४-४-१९), 'यत्र हि द्वैतमिव भवति (४-५-१५), 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा. ६-२-१), इत्यादि वाक्यशतेभ्यः । सर्वो हि लोकव्यवहारो ब्रह्मण्येव कल्पितः, न परमार्थस्सन् इति अत्यल्पमिदमुच्यते इयमेव कल्पना अपेशला इति । Here Sri Shankara hints that Shastra itself has superimposed Avidya on Brahman and it is said here that the locus and subject matter are both Brahman (itself) from the standpoint of Avidya. The same judgment will have to be applied to the question of Adhyasa.

- (3) The notion 'I' commonly refers to the अहम् प्रत्ययः. As Aham is a Pratyaya, so it is vritti. For this reason, in the last portion of Adhyasa Bhashya Shankara says 'Evam Aham pratyayinam..... In this sense Aham Pratyaya is Vrittirupa Adhyasa.

Sometimes when one says that ‘I dreamt, I slept happily’ etc., this ‘I’ refers to the witness meaning the witness himself takes the garb of Aham Pratyaya and expresses through the mind and speech the intuitional experience of dream and deep sleep. So, there are no two entities such as Jiva and the Witness. When the witness appears as if he has identified himself with the mind he himself appears as Jiva without forfeiting his true nature. It is said in B.S.B. penultimate stanza of 1-1-4 that the Pramata himself remains as the witness if enquiry takes place leading to intuitional experience.

In the sentence that “in ‘I am so and so’, the ‘I’ is vrittijanita Anubhava” and your analysis there in is correct. In short, we can say this as ‘the Anubhavarupa Avidya itself manifests in Vrittirupa’. Here one should not misconceive that the Anubhavarupa Vidya will modify into vritti etc., just as Mulaavidyaavadins say. But we say that when we start analysis regarding Avidya or adhyasa, then its nature is Mithyaapratyayarupa meaning it appears in the form of vritti and so it is Atasmin tadbuddhihi.

4. As regards two sentences quoted by you, my opinion is as follows: Common man naturally takes identification with 'Me' notion. At that time also his true nature which is the witnessing principle is continuing to illumine all the vrittis including 'Me' notion. This is said by Shankara in Adhyasa Bhashya as 'अशेषस्वप्रचारसाक्षी'. Due to want of discrimination one mixes the real nature and the 'Me' notion. In this stage sometimes his utterances refer to the witnessing principle and some other times to the 'Me' notion. According to this statement your analysis is correct, but we should not say this as साक्ष्यनुभवरूपा अविद्या or अध्यास.
5. When one starts to analyse his own life and experience according to the teachings of Vedanta and the teacher – in this stage when he recognises that there is my real nature which deserves to be called as 'I' and which is beyond this 'I' sense – at that time he himself remains as the witnessing principle and objectifies the appearance and disappearance of the 'Me' notion. Here, the 'Me' notion which is itself Adhyasa is illumined by the witness. For this reason the Anubhavarupa Avidya – means- really being witness but

appearing in the garb of 'Me' notion without any change in his true nature – this intuitional experience is called as ANUBHAVARUPA AVIDYA' and it is illumined by the witness itself. So, Anubhavarupa Avidya as well as Vrittirupa Avidya or Adhyasa are both Saakshi Gochara. It is the experience of enlightened one as well as the real aspirant who has followed the teachings of proper Guru. Though it is the intuitional experience for all, those who have not discriminated cannot recognise this. But for an enlightened and a real aspirant it is an intuitional experience. This is the answer to the question as to 'all' represents whom?

6. 'Who is the Kalpaka of Avidya or Antahkarana' is your another question. For this Sri Gaudapada has already answered in his Karika 2-12 'Kalpayatyatmanaatmaanam – 'कल्पयत्यात्मनाऽत्मानम्' and refer to elaborate commentary to this Karika in Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih. In the last sentence Sri Swamiji has cleared that Kalpaka, Karana, Kalpita all are Atman alone. To teach this non-duality of Self only all the attributions such as antahkarana is Avidyaakalpita etc., are superimposed in the Shastra.

7. In the beginning of this article, I had said that there are really no two types of Adhyasas and in the middle it is said that the Anubhavarupa Adhyasa itself manifests in the Vrittirupa. So, we can divide as 'I am so and so' is Anubhavarupa and 'my body, my wife, son etc., as Vrittirupa Adhyasa. But in this Vrittirupa Adhyasa also Anubhava is continuing with delusion due to want of discrimination. This is said by Shankara as 'Bhraantyaanubhavati'. So, in all the Vrittirupa Adhyasas, Anubhava is pervading. Vrittirupa is the manifestation of Anubhavarupa Adhyasa or Avidya. Moreover, according to the situation the teachers will make some divisions with reference to Lokaanubhava and Saakshyanubhava (common experience and intuitional experience) for the purpose of teaching. In this regard though seemingly difference in using this methodology would take place, really there is no difference of opinion. Anyhow the teaching should not differ with the common experience, intuitional experience of the witnessing principle and the utterances of Saampradaayika Acharyas like Sri Shankara, Swamiji etc. The style of analyzing may differ but the principal tenet should never and will

never differ. Try to realise all these points in your own experience with concentrated mind.

* * * * *

10. Clarification regarding two types of Adhyasa:

According to Swamiji from तद्यथा पुत्रभार्याधिषुतः अध्यवसायादीन्, it is Vrutতিরূপা Adhyasa and from अहंप्रत्ययिनं अन्तःकरणेषु अध्यस्यति it is Anubhavarūpa Adhyasa.

(b) I have explained that the Adhyasa with Gounatman is vruttirupa and from Aham Pratyaya to the body it is Anubhavarupa adhyasa. This is what I have said previously.

(c) But I have said another important thing in my previous clarification regarding adhyasa that in vruttirupa adhyasa also the Anubhavarupa adhyasa inevitably continues or pervades. So, the predominant factor is Anubhavarupa adhyasa. The vruttirupa adhyasa is a secondary one.

For this reason, Swamiji has said अनुभवात्मकादा यासरूपान्तःकरण वाचिन्यां.....संगच्छते । By this sentence Swamiji has shown the predominance for Anubhavarupa adhyasa. The same thing is referred by Vitthala Shastriji in his book 'मूलाविद्या भाष्यवार्तिकविरूद्धा'. The question raised by Mulaavidyaavadins 'how the Avidya of an individual soul or vruttirupa antahkarana will be the cause of vyaktaavyakta

prapancha'? Answering this question Shastryji replied that 'we have not told that the world is created or imagined through vruttirupa adhyasa but it is the imagination of Anubhavarupa adhyasa etc.' This statement is quite in consonance with the Swamiji's above utterances.

Though I had said that adhyasa with Gounatman is vruttirupa i.e., secondary, and body to ego is Anubhavarupa, whenever one says that 'my body has become too old or too weak and my eyes have lost its full vision etc.' in this case, as he objectifies the defects of the body, sense organs etc., unknowingly he accepts that his own being is quite separate from the body and the sense organs. Even though he has not given up the wrong identification with 'Me' notion and that he has also assumed that 'Me' notion itself as his true nature, then also he has objectified the body and the sense organs. In this regard it may be said that this is vruttirupa adhyasa when we compare with the Anubhavarupa adhyasa, i.e., witnessing principle of the 'Me' notion.

As Anubhavarupa adhyasa inevitably pervades the vruttirupa adhyasa, in one sense both the types of Adhyasas are Saakshi janya but when the identification with the outer things takes place and gives pleasure or pain to that man then it may be called as Pramatrugochara adhyasa. For example. a man lost his purse containing thousands of rupees or so. He suffers due to adhyasa

with his purse and money. This suffering occurs after recognising the loss of the moneybag through means of perception etc., (i.e., through pramanas). Suppose afterwards Policeman catches the thief and informs this owner, then he becomes very happy with the news that the money has been found. This happiness also is due to adhyasa with the thing which is not his nature (meaning the body to ego, but not the witnessing principle). So this is called as Pramanagochara adhyasa in secondary sense but the suffering and enjoyment of the ego is illumined through the Saakshi alone. So, both the adhyasas are Saakshi Avidya. Thus in my opinion, my statements are not against the Swamyji's utterances. But the method of teaching regarding the varieties of adhyasa is different with my dividing the adhyasa in the above manner. This is only for the purpose of teaching but not against the conventional teachings of Swamiji.

* * * * *

11. Translation of Mulavidyaanirasa P.No. 85, 86 & 87 (section 64):

Seven types of incongruities raised by dualistic Vedantins on Advaita Vedanta cannot be answered if we accept Mulaavidyaa:

This Mulaavidyaa theory is unacceptable because the dualistic Vedantins say that in this contention or theory seven types of incongruities will occur. And these

objections are unanswerable by Advaita Vedantins who hold the Mulaavidyaa as valid. We will show here in brief how these objections raised by Dvaitins are unanswerable.

- 1) Firstly, the locus of Mulaavidyaa itself is incongruous. Their first question is as follows: The Brahman itself is Self-effulgent one i.e., of the nature of Consciousness. Hence there is no possibility of Avidya. Hence to say that the Brahman is the locus for Avidya is incongruous. The individual soulhood (i.e., Jiva) is itself conjured up by Avidya as accepted by Advaita Vedantins also. It being so, to create the delusion of soulhood (Jivatva) where should Avidya has to take its locus?
- 2) Secondly, the incongruity of encompassing. The Mulaavidyaavadins say that Mulaavidyaa encompasses Brahman. By this (encompassing) it produces delusion of soulhood etc. Here the question is 'as the Brahman is Self-effulgent one i.e., absolute nature of Consciousness, it is impossible to accept that this nature of Brahman will be covered or encompassed by anything. For this, Advaitins may say that 'we say this encompassing is itself conjured up by Avidya'. By saying this also their stand will not hold good because when it is conjured up by Avidya then one has

to accept that Brahman is never encompassed by anything.

In case they accept that really Avidya or Mulaavidyaa encompasses Brahman then they have to accept that the Brahman loses its very nature (of infinity).

- 3) Thirdly, the nature of Avidya becomes unacceptable and incongruous because this Avidya is not a real thing, meaning, really existing one, because Advaita Vedantins have not accepted the Avidya as an entity which is really existing. And it is not accepted as Avidya is non-existing one because in this doctrine it is accepted that the Mulaavidyaa is the cause for producing the delusion. If it is non-existent one then it has no capacity to produce delusion of world or the individual soul etc. And these people also have not accepted this Mulaavidyaa as completely non-existent one. If they accept that the Mulaavidyaa is absolute non-existent one then they have to face the argument that the things like horns of a hare etc., are not seen in the world as cause for delusion.
- 4) Fourthly, if Advaita Vedantins claim that as Mulaavidyaa is not real or unreal or both, and

that they have accepted it as indefinable one i.e., Anirvachaniya and hence in their contention there is no defect of objecting that the Mulaavidyaa is existent or non-existent etc., is incongruous. For this, the objection of Dvaitins is that it is against experience of appearance because all the appearances in the world come in the category of existing or non-existing thing i.e., real or unreal. To explain, for example if we see a real fruit we say it is real thing. Here the fruit appears really. In the picture as the fruit appears as if it is there we say it is unreal. There is no third category of appearance in common experience. It being so where is the criterion to accept the third category of appearance which is not real, not unreal, not both etc. Advaitins (who accept Mulaavidyaa) should not, to escape from the clutches of Dvaitins, say: that the Atman is the only reality and other than Atman all else is unreal. It being so, this Mulaavidyaa does not come in either of the above mentioned categories and so 'we have accepted this as indefinable and not as an existing one which stands by the side of the Self and hence it is Anirvachaniya'. This argument also will not hold water because the very existence of the

Self alone is unique and apart from this unique being the existence of any other thing has not been established by Advaitins (Mulaavidyavadins) till today. So, their contention of Anirvachaniyataa of Avidya, meaning indefinableness of Avidya is the fourth defect in this doctrine.

Due to this defect the argument of the nature of Avidya itself is incongruous.

- 5) The fifth defect is incongruousness of the authority or pramana for Avidya. To explain, the perceptions etc., which are used in daily life, are not sufficient means to prove the existence of Avidya. To prove the existence of Avidya whatever means or pramanas are brought, all these pramanas i.e., perceptions, inference etc., are useful in removing the non-perception of a particular thing alone. This non-perception is quite unwanted thing to you as your contention is 'the Mulaavidyaa is the cause for non-perception also'. It being so, to prove the existence of Mulaavidyaa there is no pramana or criterion (means of right knowledge). This defect is irrefutable by you. Again, your contention may be as follows: to show the existence of Mulaavidyaa through your system of inference, to explain,

knowledge arises by using pramanas destroys the ignorance which is other than the prior non-existence of the knowledge and it (knowledge) removes the veil on the object which is encompassed. This veil itself is the subject matter to be removed by the knowledge. So, not only the non-perception is to be removed by the knowledge but the veil which encompasses the object which is apart from the non-perception is also to be removed by the knowledge. This veil (curtain) of Avidya having its locus on the particular object is a different thing from non-perception or misconception etc. Hence knowledge destroys that which is other than non-perception etc. We have to hold this view because knowledge reveals the nature of a particular thing which was unrevealed before the dawn of the knowledge. For instance, the dawn of light which appears at first destroys the curtain of darkness. (So, we have to accept the veil of Mulaavidyaa on the Atman as well as on outer things and knowledge destroys this veil which is apart from the non-perception etc.).

For this objection, we (Dvaitins) reply (as follows):
Your description that the veil or curtain on the object is

there and it is quite separate from the non-perception etc., does not hold good. Though you may argue and use the descriptions of the Avarana (veil) which is quite different from non-perception, there is no reason to accept this view. There is no rule or experience in common life showing that by the knowledge the non-perception will not get removed. (It being so, why have we to accept the existence of the Avarana which is apart from the non-perception?). The illustration which is given by you (i.e., the dawn of knowledge) contains some dissimilarity because the light which dawns and destroys the darkness must and should be recognised by the knowledge alone. Apart from the existence of knowledge there is no recognition of the light. So your illustration has got some defect. The unsettled point of the knowledge which generates through means of right knowledge itself is in question (i.e., still not a settled issue). This is because it is impossible to say that the knowledge which is generated newly is quite different from the prior non-existence of the knowledge. (To explain) the knowledge is quite different from non-perception because the knowledge which has been generated is itself the result of using means of right knowledge. (So, it destroys the non-perception and hence is quite different from non-perception and it is generated by using the means of right knowledge). It being so, your inference which is used to prove the existence of Mulaavidyaa is not appropriate

because the same type of criteria or pramanas you use to prove the existence of Mulaavidyaa may be used against your contention to disprove the existence of Mulaavidyaa. (To explain, Mulaavidyaavadins say to prove the existence of the Mulaavidyaa as follows: (i) 'I am an ignorant man' - this is the common experience; (ii) in Shruti the knowledge is initiated and so there must be the ignorance which will get destroyed by the knowledge; (iii) the non-perception, misconception and doubting – all these pertain to Antahkarana as they are vrittis. To create this antahkarana there must be a cause of ignorance; (iv) in Gaudapada Karika there is a description of causal ignorance and effective ignorance and hence we have to accept the causal ignorance as Mulaavidyaa; (v) this Mulaavidyaa or causal ignorance is described by Shankara as Anirvachaniya, meaning it is not existent or non-existent). On all these grounds we have to accept existence of Mulaavidyaa. These are the contention of Mulaavidyaavadins. For this, Dvaitins may raise counter arguments such as (i) the common experience which is there such as "I am ignorant" will denote only the non-perception of the truth and so there is no necessity to accept Mulaavidyaa, (ii) In Shrutis the knowledge is described as useful to destroy the ignorance regarding Brahman. It is true. But here also we can comment that the ignorance means non-perception regarding Brahman, (iii) The cause for antahkarana is the Prakriti which is

subordinate to the Lord and so there is no necessity of thinking the existence of Mulaavidyaa according to Dvaita philosophy, (iv) in Gaudapada Karika 1-11, Shankara himself has explained that Karyavidyaa means misconception, (v) we have already refuted in the fourth contention existence of a thing which is undefinable (Anirvachaniya) meaning not real, not unreal etc. Hence from these entire points one can refute the existence of Mulaavidyaa. These are the counter arguments of Dvaitins against Mulaavidyaavadins who have used the five types of Pramanas to prove the existence of Mulaavidyaa. This is what is said in the last sentence of the fifth point above – ‘because the very type of criterion used by the Mulaavidyaavadins to prove the existence of Mulaavidyaa could be used to disprove its very existence’.

In this way what you have asserted as the nature of Mulaavidyaa is unestablished thing because for this Mulaavidyaa there is no Pramana or there is no Lakshana (special features) of that Avidya. So, what we have said before that the contention that ‘Mulaavidyaavada is not appropriate’ is well proved here.

- 6) Here there is one more incongruity also. There is no proof for the existence of knowledge which will remove Mulaavidyaa. You may say that the knowledge which is generated through the teachings of Shrutis and the nature of which is the unity of Brahman

and Atman etc., will remove the Mulaavidyaa. You have kept the firm belief in your tradition of Advaita and hence you may argue as above but this is your imagination only because the fullest import of the Shrutis has been described in other way by Dvaita Vedantins. (Dvaita Vedantins have taken Shruti as criteria and have drawn conclusion that dualism is real and this is the fullest import of Shrutis. In this way we have interpreted all the sentences of Shrutis. So, 'why we have to accept the interpretation of Advaitins alone'? is the idea of Dvaitins).

We will show in the following manner the Mulaavidyaa will not be removed by the knowledge. We will show the incongruity regarding the removal of Avidya through knowledge according to their school. (a) In Advaita philosophy it is accepted that the distinction of knower, knowledge and known is a false one. It being so, inevitably they have to admit that knowledge also is false. Then as we have to seek the means which removes the ignorance which in itself is false one and also we have to seek the other means to remove the knowledge which is also false in its nature. Then we have to seek another knowledge to remove the first knowledge and so on and so it will take the form of regresses ad infinitum

(Anavasthaadoshaprasangah) or we have to accept the irrevocability of Mulaavidyaa. (b) We should not say that the knowledge which dawns – its nature is Brahman and so it can remove the Mulaavidyaa. Then we say for this that when the ability of destroying the Mulaavidyaa itself is in the nature of Brahman then there is no necessity of the knowledge which will dawn newly. Or we have to accept that there is no possibility of dawning of knowledge (because it is already there in Brahman). (c) The knower i.e., to whom this knowledge occurs, whether this knower is a soul or a jiva or Brahman? If we take either side, in both the aspects there is defect because in your philosophy it is accepted that the soulhood (Jivatva) itself is attributed on Brahman and so soul himself is an attributed one. It being so, how the Mulaavidyaa will be removed by the knowledge which is generated in the mind of the soul? So, there is no possibility of destroying the Mulaavidyaa by Jiva. If you say, ‘by Brahman this Mulaavidyaa will be removed’, then you have to accept that the knowledge which belongs to the nature of Brahman which will destroy Mulaavidyaa – then it becomes real one as Brahman is real. Then your previous contention that the knowledge also is Mithyaa becomes false. If you say that this knowledge which belongs to Brahman also is false, then this knowledge also will come within the jurisdiction of Mulaavidyaa. So anyhow

there will be no capacity to remove the Mulaavidyaa for the knowledge. Hence removal of Avidya becomes incongruous in your contention. (d) If we had accepted the removal of Avidya in any kind then also there arises the problem of the contention because 'who is the agent by whose knowledge this Avidya will be removed?' (This is explained before that 'neither the Brahman nor the Jiva in 6-c above). Therefore to remove all these defects you have to accept that the knowledge regarding Brahman is not a false one. If you accept this, then your doctrine will suffer because in your doctrine of Advaita you have not accepted anything as real one apart from Brahman.

- 2) Moreover no one tries to destroy oneself. To explain, the knower is the soul and according to your doctrine if soul or jiva gets the knowledge of Brahman then the very soulhood will vanish by that knowledge. Hence the knower never wants to try his own suicidal action which occurs by knowledge. In this way also there is no removal of Avidya according to the Mulaavidyaavadins.

Conclusion (by Swamyji): In the above said manner the seven types of incongruities which are raised by Dvaita Vedantins has been explained here briefly. If Advaitins

accept the Mulaavidyaa methodology and say that this positive ignorance continues to persist with the Self in all the three states then there will be no escape from the seven objections raised by Dvaita Vedantins. We cannot see the answers to the above seven objections in Mulaavidyaavadins' contention. For this reason also this methodology of Mulaavidyaavadins is not reasonable.

* * * * *

12. Supplementary to evidence about the existence of God (Eswara)

Among the mankind there were and are going to be two groups at all times in this world viz., theists and atheists. Differences between these two groups will also persist as long as the world exists. The atheist denies the existence of God whereas the theist asserts His existence. Now the burden of proof lies on the asserter always but not on the denier. If the arguments advanced by the asserter are disproved by the opponent, then automatically the contention of the asserter will fail. This rule has to be followed by both the groups involved in any discussion. First we will take up the arguments of the theists and weigh them against the counter arguments of the atheists.

Arguments of the theists:

- 1) The existence of God has to be accepted by everyone on the authority of the scriptures like Vedas, Bible, Koran, Zend-Avesta etc.

Qn: Why have we to accept that these scriptures are authoritative?

Ans: These scriptures are not written by human beings but by Rishis (Vedas) or the son of God (Bible) or the messenger of God (Koran) etc., who were inspired by the Lord. Therefore these are to be accepted as authoritative.

Objection: The existence of God is based on the authority of scriptures and in turn their authority is based on the existence of God. So they are interdependent and therefore nothing is established. Hence this argument does not stand.

- 2) Miracles and mystic experiences are the proof for the existence of God.

These are the arguments of some theists.

For this reasoning one can object that if one person exhibiting miracles and is having mystic experience asserts about the existence of God and another person performing greater miracles and having wide mystic experiences denies the existence of God, then how can the common or layman believe about the existence of God and on whose authority between these two great persons. For

example, in India some Yogis who have mystic experiences and who are capable of performing miracles assert about the existence of God whereas there are many Lamas in Tibet who have mystic experiences and show miracles and are followers of Buddhism which propagates Nihilism in the world deny the existence of God. Therefore, the scriptures or miracles are not authoritative to prove existence of God.

- 3) The whole universe is controlled by time, space and causation complex and even every atom in the universe seems to follow an order. This orderly behavior is called by scientists as the law of nature. Therefore, where there is control, there must be controller. Thus, the existence of God as a controller of the universe and individuals has to be accepted. In India, the logicians like Patanjali yogis, Nayaayikas and Vysheshikas have accepted the existence of Lord for the control of Nature and union and separation of atoms respectively. Though they have relied on their own reasonings, they have also taken utterances of Vedas to prove the existence of God.

From the above, one may ask why should it not be inferred that there are so many lords controlling the

universe on a co-operative basis? What is the proof to say that there is only one God? If they have relied on the authenticity of Vedas, Bible etc., then the defect of interdependent Nature will arise naturally.

Moreover, if somehow, we accept the existence of God, then we have to inevitably accept that He is quite separate from the world and the souls, and that he will be circumscribed by space. How can the circumscribed being be the Lord? When he has no control over space how can he have overlordship of all?

If we accept that God has created the universe then the following questions will have to be answered:

- a) Why has he created the universe instead of keeping quiet?
- (b) Why are there calamities and miseries in this world of God's creation?
- (c) Why should God have created evil things and why has he given the souls bad motives etc.? Therefore, there appears to be no solid ground to accept the existence of God.

So far, we have scrutinised the views of both theists and atheists. In the examination, it can be seen that the arguments of the theists do not hold water.

Now we have to consider the utterances of Vedanta about the existence of God, particularly with reference to the Shankara Bhashyas.

In the first aphorism of Brahmasutra Bhashya, the discussion about the nature of Brahman has commenced. In the second sutra, it is stated that Brahman is the cause of the universe (means that the origin, sustenance and destruction of the universe takes place in the presence of Brahman). Hence the Brahman is the omniscient, omnipotent Lord of the universe. In the third aphorism it is stated that the scriptures (Vedas) have originated from Brahman and to know the real nature of Brahman the directions of the Vedas are the only means. In the fourth, it is stated that if an aspirant follows the directions of the Vedas his enquiry will culminate in the recognition of the ultimate truth, i.e., Brahman, which is nothing other than his own Self.

After all this, in the fourth aphorism a question has been raised as to why we have to accept or believe in the existence of Brahman. This question has been answered by Shankara in his Bhashya that in Shrutis it is stated that Brahman is the Self. There is no question of believing in the existence of one's own self. To believe or to disbelieve, one must be there already. There can never be any suspicion about one's own being. Even to suspect, he must be there. So, before thinking, suspecting, believing, one must be there as a believer, thinker etc. One's own existence is undeniable. If one tries to deny his own existence, even then he must be there before doing so. Hence one's own existence is undeniable. Shrutis

say that the nature of the Self is Brahman and if one denies the existence of Brahman, invariably he denies his own being, which is impossible. Therefore, one should not suspect the existence of Brahman.

Here the question will arise that ‘when you say that the Self is Brahman, then everyone knows himself as ‘I am’. Where is the necessity of the utterances of the Shrutis to know the nature of Brahman? It is already known as the idea of ‘I’?

“Not so, for this has been refuted by saying that the Self is the witness of that idea. Leaving aside the (erroneous) knowledge of the Self as the agent (of acts) as contained in the idea of ‘I’, ‘I’ the (real) Self which is the witness of the idea of ‘I’, which exists in all creatures, which is without any difference of degrees, and which is one, unchanging, eternal and all pervasive Consciousness is not known as the Self of all by anyone well conversant in the section of the Vedas dealing with virtuous deeds or in the scriptures of the logicians”. By this sentence it is to be observed that the nature of the Self is known by all commonly as ‘I am so and so’, and this is not the true nature of the Self as Shrutis say ‘the nature of the Self is Brahman’. An aspirant should cognise his own nature as it is – the witness of the ‘I’ sense. For example, when the waking state occurs then a kind of ‘I’ sense appears. So also in the dream, but in deep sleep there is no appearance of ‘I’ sense of either kind. This presence or absence of

the 'I' sense itself is objectified by the true nature of the Self, which is called here as the witness. There are many simple methods applicable to cognise the nature of the witness or the Self. When one cognises his own nature as the witness of the 'I' sense, then he discerns easily that witness is beyond all dualistic dealings and that it is the substratum of the phenomena of waking and dream. From this standpoint the witness is called the Lord, God, Ordainer, omniscient, omnipotent etc. But from the standpoint of the transcendental nature of the Self (witness) there are no dealings like the ordainer and ordained. Therefore according to Vedanta, the existence of God need not be believed blindly but it is pinpointed and brought within the sphere of everyone's experience. Hence to understand the existence of God, it is very essential to cognise the nature of the Self as the witness within us. When one understands God according to the teachings of Vedanta, then he will be free from the disputes of both theists and atheists which have been stated in the very beginning of the article.

After Sureshvaracharya some recent Vedantins say that Brahman (witness) is covered by nescience (ignorance) which is the potency of Brahman and is called as Prakriti, Maya or Mulaavidyaa. This Prakriti is divided into two. The first part is with abundance of 'Satva Guna' and this part is called as 'Maya' and the second part is with abundance of 'Rajoguna' and this part is also called

‘Avidya’. The Brahman which is reflected in the first part is called as ‘Eshvara’ (God), whereas the reflection in the second part is called ‘Jiva’ (the soul) and so on (see Panchadasi. 1-15 to 30). In this theory God is accepted as the reflection. It is ridiculous to say that the reflection (of Brahman) is the Lord, since the reflection has no independent existence apart from the original.

In this connection some modern Vedantins (like Sadananda in his Vedantasaara) have described that Maya is the total Avidya, and so by this adjunct ‘Eshvara’, the Lord can be said to be the greatest ignorant one. Maya is the total ego and hence ‘Eshvara’ is the biggest egoist etc. These are quite contradictory to the ideas expressed in Shankara’s Prasthanatrya Bhashyas. According to the Bhashya, the non-dual Self appears to the ignorant person as having the form of the universe as it were and the individuals. From this standpoint the absolute is called ‘Eshvara’ or the God etc. But when one cognises the true nature of the Self, then the distinctions of the world, the individuals and the God will be falsified. These two are the extracts from Sutrabhashya in support: “Thus God’s rulership, omniscience and omnipotence are contingent on the limiting adjuncts conjured up by nescience, but in reality the terms like ‘the ruler’, ‘the ruled’, ‘omniscience’ etc., can be used with regard to the Self shining in Its own nature after the removal of all limiting adjuncts through illumination” (B.S.B: 1-14). “Moreover,

when the idea of non-difference is generated by such declaration of identity as 'That thou art', then the transmigratariness of the individual is removed as also the creatorship of the Brahman, for all dualistic dealings brought about by ignorance get sublated by right knowledge" (B.S.B:2-1-22).

Here in the Mandukya Upanishad, from the standpoint of waking and dream states and their seed form the self who is in deep sleep is the substratum. In this regard he is called the God, though he is Non-duel in his true nature.

12(ii). Brahman as the cause of the universe according to Vedanta:

In Shankara Bhashya it is said that Brahman (Self) is the cause of the universe. (The Self is the cause and universe is the effect). Here what type of causation is taken is a point which needs explanation. To answer this question first we have to examine the causation as normally understood in the world.

(a) Theories of causation according to Indian philosophers:

The logicians in India have discussed about this subject matter in various ways. All their theories come under two categories: 1) Satkaryavada: from an existing entity the effect comes or the existing entity takes the

form of the effect (takes birth), 2) A thing non-existent before takes birth with its original causes. This theory is called 'Asatkaryavada'. The Sankhyas are satkaryavadins i.e., they come under the first category whereas the Vaisheshikas are in the second category. There is a third category of Nihilists of Buddhism. According to them the whole universe is essenceless. Nothing exists. All things seen in the universe are because of delusion. They appear as if existing and the existence of the seer of these things, that is the soul also is a false appearance. Hence this is all Shunya, means non-existent and therefore causation itself is mere delusion. This argument is considered at length in the books written by Buddhists like Chandrakeerthi, Nagarjuna etc. This third category is also called as 'Asatkaryavada'. This has been examined by Sri Swamyji in his English introduction to 'Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih'. We will now discuss about the first two types of causation.

(b) Scrutiny about the Samkhya's opinion about the causation:

The primordial matter of the world is called as Prakriti (nature) or Pradhana. This is the existent entity before the manifestation of the world. It is in an unmanifested seed form like the seed of a plant. In this stage it is called as 'Avyakta'. This Avyakta takes the form of the universe. Hence the 'Pradhana' (primordial matter of universe) is the cause for this universe. The

existent Prakriti is modified as the universe. So this theory is called as 'Satkaryavada'. Here the Pradhana is the material cause to this universe like clay to the pot. But in their theory the efficient cause is not accepted (like the potter for making pot). Patanjala Yoga accepts that Prakriti is the material cause and God (Eswara) as the efficient cause of the universe. It is absurd to say that a non-existent thing takes birth. Hence this kind of 'Satkaryavada' is the only reasonable theory according to Sankhyas. Here we have given a gist of Sankhya philosophy and accepted part of it according to necessity.

In this system of philosophy it is accepted that the primordial matter or Pradhana was there in this nature once upon a time and afterwards it transformed itself into the world in stages. Here it is to be observed that the primordial matter once remained in its nature as Avyakta and afterwards it got modified. We have to accept that it is ruled by time. Then what will be the nature of time? Is time an independent factor apart from the Prakriti? If time comes under the purview of Prakriti, then it is absurd to say that Prakriti once remained in its nature, that afterwards it got transformed and that again it regains its original nature etc. If this perennial nature of the universe is in the purview of time, then the Sankhyas must and should explain the nature of time. Hence in this system of philosophy there are no reasonable explanations for the nature of time.

(c) Scrutiny of some of the modern theories about causation:

In Darwin's theory of evolution and Sri Aravindo's philosophy the same difficulty regarding the explanation of the nature of time arises. According to the western philosophers like Kant or Einstein the concept of time, space and causation are all within the purview of the mind and based on relativity. Though the theories of these western philosophers are highly advanced, yet there is no clear explanation about the reality. Some opine that there is no necessity to find the cause for this universe which includes space, time and causation exists in its own glory. It is therefore meaningless to enquire about the cause of this universe. And all ideas also come under the purview of the universe. Hence it is impossible to determine the cause of the universe. The Sankhyas also hold the view that primordial matter itself changes as the world at creation and at the time of dissolution regains its nature. This idea is very similar to the idea of 'universe exists by nature'.

This universe remains in its nature. Hence the question arises what if the universe is by nature in its own glory, then it must be independent. But in fact, it is not so. Every atom of this universe is regulated by some law. These are called 'Laws of nature' by scientists. Hence nature is bound by some laws. When anything is under the subjection of some rules and regulations it is

absurd to say that it is in its own glory or in its nature. The conclusion is that the universe is not independent. Therefore it is natural to enquire about the cause of these rules and regulations.

By all this we can easily discern here that more or less the ancient Sankhya Philosophy is the basis for all modern philosophies even if one is unaware of this truth. Hence if the Sankhya philosophy is examined, all other philosophies will have been examined. It is therefore that Shankara in Sutra Bhashya (1-4-28) says that Sankhya is like the chief wrestler—‘Pradhana Malla’. Here the word ‘Malla’ means wrestler, ‘Pradhana’ means chief. If the chief wrestler is defeated in a bout, it means all other wrestlers are automatically defeated. So, if Sankhya philosophy has been scrutinised or refuted it means that all other philosophies have been scrutinised or refuted. This is the first meaning of Pradhana. The second meaning is that the word Pradhana means primordial matter of the universe. The Sankhyas argue that the Pradhana is the cause of the universe. On this ground they wrestle with others and therefore they are called as Pradhana Malla – champion of the cause of Pradhana.

Though Sankhya says that Vedanta also holds the Sankhyavada, meaning that from an existing entity birth of another entity is possible, when we keenly observe their arguments we can easily conclude they come under the category of Asatkaryavada also. For example, before

creation the primordial matter (Prakriti) was the only existing thing. After that when creation begins to take place then 'Mahat' is born first. Here, the question is before its birth Mahat was non-existent. That non-existent Mahat comes out from the Pradhana or Prakriti. Is this idea anyway different from that of the Vaisheshikas who say that a non-existent thing takes birth with its original cause? Similarly the non-existent Mahat takes birth from Prakriti. Hence Sankhyas also come under the category of Asatkaryavadins (See Gita Bhashya 18-46 – Refutation of Parinamavada).

(d) Scrutiny of the theory of Vaisheshikas:

There is no need to criticize the Vaisheshika theory after criticizing the theory of Sankhyas. We will consider their ideas in a brief manner. A thing that exists already has no necessity to take birth, therefore we have to agree that only a non-existent thing should take birth to come into being but when it takes birth then it requires its original cause. For example, the cloth which was non-existent before, after the process of weaving the cloth takes birth and comes into existence. But for the cloth to take birth, the yarns are its original cause. So also a house which is non-existent before construction requires its original causes (materials) like bricks, wood, iron, cement, etc. After the combination of all the original materials the house comes into existence, so also this world, which is the combination of four kinds of Atoms

(Anu) viz., Air, Fire, Water and earth. (Ether is the vacuum or space). Before combination it was non-existent. After the combination the world comes into existence. Hence it is appropriate to say that which is non-existent before takes birth with the original causes when it comes into existence. This type of causation is called as 'Arambhavada', the meaning is that the non-existent begins to exist. In sanskrit Arambha means beginning. In this theory the existence of Eswara or the Lord is accepted as a necessity for the combination of the Atmas and in this regard He is called as omnipotent, omniscient etc., When all the Atoms are separated into their original forms, the dissolution of the world takes place. Therefore, the Atoms are the material cause for this universe and God is the efficient cause. Nayaayikas also more or less follow the same theory about causation.

(e) Scrutiny of the theory of 'Arambhavada':

Here time and space are accepted as eternal and real entities as also the Atoms, God is taken as efficient cause, and He is the controller of the universe as well as the souls. Therefore, God is here circumscribed by space because it is accepted that God is separate entity from the world and the souls. Lastly the theory that 'the non-existent takes birth' and that it requires original causes has been accepted. This is quite unreasonable. A barren woman's son or the horns of a hare are totally non-existent things. Asserting that a non-existent thing takes birth is

absurd like the saying that a barren woman's son or hares' horns are born. But it is reasonable to say that the cloth before the act of weaving was in the form of yarn. So the existing yarn took the form of cloth. Instead of this, if it is said that a non-existent thing takes birth, then it is sheer dry logic. In Sutra Bhashya from 2-2-11 to 2-2-17 the whole Vaisheshika theory is scrutinised and refuted by Shankara.

The Sankhya theory of modification (Parinamavada) and the 'Arambhavada' of the Vaisheshikas are two important doctrines about causation in India. However all the logicians in common have taken that the cause for the universe or the relationship between the universe and its cause, if there is one, must be in the same manner as all causes or the principle of causation which is seen in the world. The principle of causation comes within the purview of time. The cause must be there before and effect comes afterwards. But when we discuss about the cause for the universe, then the concept of time, space, causation also are included in the universe. So questions like the cause for time or space arises. When time or space begins (in which time itself exists and where does the space itself exist)? These questions sound meaningless. Therefore, we have to accept that space and time are infinite by themselves, and causation occurs within time (and space). Then the original question that what is the cause for the universe remains unanswered.

According to Kant, it is said that time, space and causation are all mental concepts. Accordingly it is said that these are relative terms. According to Buddhists, this is all delusion of the mind, actually there is nothing real and everything is essenceless. After scrutiny of all views we can conclude that all these schools have failed to answer the original question about the cause of the universe.

(f) Vedantic view

Now we will scrutinise the Vedantic point of view about causation and the cause of this universe. According to Vedanta, the cause is 'The Reality', effect, the appearance or effect is imagined in the cause. So there is no independent existence for the effect apart from the cause. So, here there is no question of birth of anything. The Reality (cause) appears as if it has taken the form of the effect. This is seen in our daily life experience also. For example clay appears as pot etc. This is the main principle adopted to explain causation within the world. But in Vedanta when the enquiry starts about the cause of the whole universe (including the idea of time, space and causation), it points out the reality of the universe as the Self.

The universe which appears in the waking state is confined to the waking state only. The universe which appears in the dream is confined to the dream state only. And in deep sleep there is no appearance of either of them.

But the Self is the witness of these three states and is the substratum for the appearance and the disappearance of the universe (viz., both of waking state and dream state). Hence the Self is the Reality and the universe is an appearance. This is the relation of causation between Brahman (Self) and the universe. The universe has no independent existence apart from the Self. If we investigate the source or the origin of the universe (according to the guidance of the Shrutis) we will discern that 'all this is but the Self'. The cause of the universe, the Self, is called as Prajna, Avyaakrita, and Eswara etc. This subject has been dealt with in the sixth mantra of Mandukya in detail. The Self is the cause of time, space and causation. As the Self is beyond time and space he is absolute. In Taittiriya it is mentioned 'From that Brahman, which is the Self, was produced space' (T. 2-1-1). In Brihadaranyaka, it is said 'below which the year with the days rotates' (Br. 4-4-16). These two sentences denote that Atman is the origin of space and time respectively. In Sutra Bhashya (2-1-14), Shankara states 'As the space within pots or jars are non-different from the cosmic space or as water in a mirage is not different from the (sandy earth) desert since they sometimes appear and sometimes vanish away, and as such their name cannot be defined even so it is to be understood that this diverse phenomenal universe of experience, things experienced, and so on, has no existence apart from Brahman.

(g) Conclusion: In Vedanta it is described that the cause of the universe is the Brahman or the Self. It is based on the universal (intuitional) experience according to guidance of the Shrutis. This is neither a speculation nor an inference of the intellect. Taking a stand in the true nature of the witness, the Shrutis and a competent Guru and at times (simultaneously) having a comprehensive vision can easily cognise that the whole universe is nothing but the Self in its Reality. After getting this comprehensive vision there will be no doubts about the questions regarding time, space, causation and cause for the world, etc. By discrimination one recognises the ultimate Transcendental Reality here and now (the nature of the Self is such that it transcends time, space, causation and all duality). One sees the pervasiveness of the same Self in the whole universe. This is called 'Samyagdarshanam' or right vision.

13. Significance of Mandukya Bhashya Mantra No. 7 (Section 39, P. No. 104 of MRV)— 'तस्मात् प्रतिषेध विज्ञानप्रमाणव्यापारसमकाले एव आत्मनि अध्यारोपित अन्तःप्रज्ञत्वादि अनर्थ निवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम्': Here *Pratishedha* means negation of the attributions, *Vijnana* means taking the standpoint of the witnessing principle of life which is beyond the ego and which is to be realised through the intuitional experience (one's own *Anubhava*). On this firm ground of the intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self one should negate all types of superimpositions

which are conjured up through ignorance. To do this, the *Pramana* is required. *Pramana* means the utterances of the Upanishads and the instructions of the Guru who is naturally established in his true nature of the Self. This *Pramana* denotes that the Self is not a *Prameya* (i.e., an objectifiable one) and the aspirant is not a *Pramatru*. So, it cancels the triple difference of knower, knowledge and knowable (see Br. Su. 1-1-4 अविषयत्वे ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वानुपपत्तिरिति चेत् । न । अविद्याकल्पितभेदनिवृत्तिपरत्वात् शास्त्रस्य । न हि शास्त्रम् इदंतया विषयभूतं ब्रह्म प्रतिपिपादयिषति । किं तर्हि प्रत्यगात्मत्वेन अविषयतया प्रतिपादयत् अविद्याकल्पितं वेद्य-वेदितु-वेदनादिभेदम् अपनयति). When the aspirant uses this *Pramana*, in his *Antahkarana* a type of function takes place. This function is described here as *Vyaapara*. The function is as follows: (i) An aspirant stops to see the outer objects through sense organs, (ii) ceases to think over the objects by the mind, (iii) stops to imagine or infer the matters through intellect, (iv) loses the idea of 'I am happy or miserable' etc., the feelings which will arise by taking the identification with the ego, (v) turns his attention towards the witnessing principle of the ego, and at this stage he himself remains as the witness and the antahkarana which follows him inwardly also starts to appear in the form of the witnessing principle. This correct reflection of the true nature of the Self is called 'आत्मप्रत्ययः'. When this Atmapratyaya arises, simultaneously one gets rid of these wrong notions of *Antahprajnatva* etc. This is the true significance of the

above sentence. An aspirant should observe the above described function through which he remains as non-dual one.

Bangalore, 18.07.1989.

* * * * *

14. Determining the nature of *Turiya*:

‘Dream belongs to one who sees falsely and sleep to one who does not know Reality. When the two errors of these two are removed, one attains the state that is *Turiya* (Mandukya Karika 1-15). To explain the above Karika, some important points will be given regarding the *Avasthaatraya* and the nature of *Turiya*.

- (i) The three states are described in this Upanishad and in the Gaudapada Karika from three viewpoints: (a) As is commonly known by all, the present state is waking state. We speak about our entering the deep sleep where we do not see anything. In the middle, before waking, we experience sometimes the dream and this is dream state. According to this common belief Vedanta commences to teach one’s own true nature which is the substratum of these three states and explains in the first place that the appearance of the real nature of the Self in the form of waking state is the *Vaishvanara Paada*, appearance in the form

of dream state as *Taijasa Paada*. When both the states are absorbed in the Self, it is called as *Praajna Paada*. This is one type of discrimination of the three states. (b) According to Sri Gaudapada these three states are explained from the standpoint of their special features. According to this, the functions of sense organs with the outer world is waking, the function of the mind alone is dream and merging of the mind in one's own Self is the sleep. From this standpoint, we can observe the experience of all the three states in this present waking state alone. This is said in Karika 1-2. See also the elaborate commentary on this Karika by Swamyji in his *Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih*. This is the second type of the description of the three states. (c) From the standpoint of *Moksha Vyavahara*, according to Shastra one should get the knowledge or realisation of one's own true nature of the Self to get Moksha. From this standpoint, Sri Gaudapada explains in his Karikas 1-11 to 15, and according to this portion non-perception of the real nature of the Self is the sleep, misunderstanding regarding the nature of the Self (such as misunderstanding the nature of the Self as waking, dream etc.,) is dream and realising the

real nature of the Self through Viveka is the real waking. When this real waking takes place the aspirant himself remains as Turiya. This is explained in Karika Nos. 1-15 & 16. This is the third type of discrimination of the three states.

- (ii) From the standpoint of third description of Avasthaatraya, the generic and specific characters are ascribed for *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and also *Praajna* - that is waking, dream and sleep. According to this, we do not know our true nature of the Self while we are in a waking state. Not only this, but we have also misunderstood our true nature as 'I am a human being etc.,'. So there is non-perception regarding the real nature of the Self and there is misconception also. As it is in the case of waking, so also it is in the case of dream. The non-perception is called as causal ignorance and misconception is called as effective ignorance (कार्याविद्या). In deep sleep, though from the standpoint of Shruti and realised persons, there is only the real nature of the Self, from the standpoint of *Mokshavyavahara*, in deep sleep there is no possibility of getting the Self-knowledge. Hence the non-perception regarding the real

nature of the Self in deep sleep is superimposed here. From this viewpoint it is said that 'Prajna is bound by Causal ignorance'. In this way the non-perception of the real nature of the Self is the common factor in all the three states but the misunderstanding is the specific nature of Vishva and Taijasa. So also, the non-perception is the specific feature of Prajna. All these ways of attributions are enumerated (in i-c) above.

- (iii) Determining the true nature of the Self through Viveka is an important thing to determine the true nature of Turiya. Here we have to remember some crucial points – (a) Turiya is not a state at all, it is the real nature of the Self, (b) the substratum of the waking state is Turiya, so also is in the case of the dream, (c) from the standpoint of waking and dream the name of sleep is attributed on the Turiya itself, (d) the reality which appears in the form of three states to the ignorant is verily the reality itself i.e., Turiya.

Hence it is said in Karika 1-15 that 'when the two errors of these two (i.e., non-perception and misconception) are removed, one attains the state that is Turiya. Strictly speaking it is not a state at all and also it is not to be attained

newly by some efforts. But from the standpoint of superimposition of three states it is said – ‘Turiya is a state which will have to be attained’. By negation of the false appearance of these three states through *Viveka* one can remain in his true nature, at the very end of discrimination and this true nature is Turiya.

Shankara clearly states (Bh. section 38, P. No. 101 of M.R.V) that Turiya is not a separate state apart from these three states. It is the substratum of these three states. If it were to be a fourth state, there will be no way to realise the nature of Turiya. Hence the teaching of Shastra will be a futile exercise and Turiya would be void. So, it is not separate (Ma. Bh. section 38 of Mantra 7, P. 101) from ‘यदि हि त्र्यवस्थात्मविलक्षणं तुरीयम् अन्यत्, तत्प्रतिपत्तिद्वाराभावात्, शास्त्रोपदेशानर्थक्यं शून्यतापत्तिर्वा’) and further in the same place Shankara says that these three states are only imaginations, that is Vikalpas and when this is realised through *Viveka* and the appearance of these three states are negated, at the same time one will remain himself as Turiya and therefore there remains no need to search for any other means of Knowledge or any other discipline

for realisation of Turiya (section 39, P. 104). Here Swamyji has given a foot note in his Kannada translation of Bhashya that 'apart from Viveka there is no need to get the fourth Avastha like Samadhi etc., and there is no need for disciplines such as Prasankhyaana (repetition) etc.'

On one occasion Shankara explicitly states that 'one who is the Prajna having the seed form of the world and having causal ignorance (seed form of ignorance, *Avidyaabeeja*) that same Prajna in his true nature is the Turiya' (see last portion [section.25, P.75] of Mandukya Karika Bh. 1-2 'तां अबीजावस्थां तस्यैव प्राज्ञशब्दवाच्यस्य तुरीयत्वेन देहादिसम्बन्धरहिताम् पारमार्थिकीं पृथग् वक्ष्यति'. Here Shankara clearly says that 'one who is Prajna from the standpoint of attribution of world and ignorance, the same Prajna is Turiya in his true nature'. (For this reason, you have to refer to the fourth viewpoint regarding *Sushupti* which is explained in my previous article.) Thus, when one cognises that the true nature of the Self is ever Turiya then the two types of errors i.e., non-perception and misconception regarding the real nature of the Self will be removed. The same thing is said in the Karika

1-15 which is quoted in the beginning of this article. The process of determining the nature of Turiya is given very beautifully by our Swamyji in his Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih in P. No. 133-135. I will give the significance of this portion which contains the six types of negations on the ground of intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self. For this purpose Shankara declares in the Bhashya for 7th mantra, Section 39 (P. 104) of Mandukya Upanishad 'तस्मात् प्रतिषेधविज्ञानप्रमाणव्यापारसमकालमेव आत्मन्यध्यारोपितान्तःप्रज्ञत्वादि अनर्थनिवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम्'. Here the Vijnana means the intuitional experience of one's own true nature. On this firm ground the Pratishedha or negation will take place. To negate, the Pramana is the sentences of Vedanta. So the Shastra is the Pramana which negates the attributions on the firm ground of intuitional experience. At last, at the same time one takes a stand in his true nature which is Turiya. So Viveka is the only means to get Turiya. This is the significance of the sentence quoted above. Now I will furnish the six types of significances furnished by our Swamyji as already noted by me above.

1. According to common experience, as we are *Pramatrus* - meaning knowers of the outer objects through the means of right knowledge such as *Indriyas* and *Antahkarana* - due to this knowership we see the dualistic world as if it is there really. But according to Shruti, all this is Brahman and there is no multiplicity here. So this is the misconception. To remove this misconception an aspirant should observe the following process – the knowership which appears in the waking or in dream state is due to *Adhyasa* or taking wrong identification with *antahkarana* and mutual misconception of the natures of *antahkarana* and the real Self. Hence it is here said ‘*Pramatrutva is Antahkarana*’. When an aspirant realises his true nature which is the witness of these two states, from that standpoint of transcendental reality he is the pure and absolute nature of Consciousness. Cognising this truth he falsifies his own *Pramatrutva* (knowership). By this the misconception of seeing the dualistic world is removed. Here seeing the dualistic world as if it is there itself is the dream because it is the misconception due to *Adhyasa*. This type of dream will vanish through the

discrimination shown above. This first point is called as '*Pramatrutva Niraakarana*'. The dualistic world will be there only from the standpoint of Pramatra and not from the standpoint of Witness. This is the secret here.

2. From the standpoint of waking and dream states, we say that in deep sleep we knew nothing. This non-perception of the dualistic world is attributed to deep sleep state from the standpoint of waking and dream alone. This wrong notion is called as '*Agrahana*' or '*Nidraa*'. To remove this wrong notion, one should observe that from the Pure Being which is our true nature – from that Pure Being alone the states like waking or dream emerge and sustain in the same being and at last they merge in the same Being. So, the false appearance of the states disappears and becomes one with the Being. This pure Being, which is in deep sleep is called as '*Avyakraataatma*', meaning having unmanifested seed form of both the states. This attribution is made from the standpoint of appearance and disappearance of the dualistic states, i.e., waking and dream. But from the standpoint of the intuitional experience of the deep sleep, it is pure and absolute consciousness without the second.

This is the true nature of everyone. From this standpoint there is no question of knowing or not-knowing because it is the pure Consciousness. By this process of discrimination, one will get rid of the wrong idea that 'I knew nothing in deep sleep'. This is '*Nidraaviparyasa Kshayaha*'.

From this, we can observe that the attribution of the seed form of the universe which is superimposed from the standpoint of *Vaidika Vyavahara* also will be removed because the appearance of the universe is only a false appearance and hence the seed form also is a false attribution. As the Self is of the nature of non-dual Self in deep sleep this nature continues uninterruptedly even while the waking and dream states appear. Thus, the attribution of the '*Jagadbija*' is also removed. Though this is not mentioned in this portion by Swamiji, it can be inferred here.

When one discerns that the nature of the Self is pure and absolute Consciousness and non-dual, then he will get rid of the idea of not knowing the non-dual nature of the Self also, which is called as 'causal ignorance' or '*Bijaavidyaa*' or '*Avidya Bija*' etc., because as the Self is pure Consciousness, he has no '*Agrahana*' or '*Anyathaagrahana*', just as in sun whose nature is ever resplendent there cannot be any possibility of non-shining or shining in any way other than as that of the sun

‘न हि सवितरि सदा प्रकाशात्मके तद्विरुद्धम् अप्रकाशनम् अन्यथाप्रकाशनं वा संभवति’, Ma. Karika Bh. 1-12). This is called ‘*Agrahana Niraakarana*’ and ‘*Bija Bhaava Niraakarana*’. Here the *Bija* means the ‘seed form of the world’ and also as ‘*Avidya Bija*’.

- 3) Either in waking or in dream we assume that there are so many souls or selves in this world. According to Sankhya, Vaisheshika, Paatanjala Yoga etc., this world is taken as real. So they agree that there are many souls (*Anekaatmavaada*) because they have no comprehensive vision of life which is taught in Upanishads. According to Vedanta, from the standpoint of empirical view when we believe that ‘I am in this world’ by taking identification with the body then it is correct to say that there are so many other persons and creatures in this world. But from the standpoint of the true nature of the witness of the whole state, either waking or dream, the Witness is called *Vaishvanara* or *Taijasa* because this witnessing principle is the substratum and essence of these two states. From this view point the same witness appears in the form of all souls (jivas) either in waking or in dreaming without forfeiting his true nature. So, *Vishva* alone is the Self of all the

beings and *Taijasa* alone is the Self for all the beings which have appeared in waking and dreaming respectively. By this discrimination one gets rid of the wrong notion of multiplicity of the Self. This is called 'Negation of the multiplicity of the selves (अनेकात्मत्वनिराकरण).

- 4) Due to the adjuncts of waking, dream and sleep states which are conjured up on the real nature of the Self from the standpoint of these adjuncts the real Self appears as if he has taken the form of *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prajna*. In these three appearances there is difference among one another. Though this is a fact, if we observe from the standpoint of the real nature of the Self which is the substratum of these three false imaginations He has no difference in these three states, i.e., *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prajna* because the only one Self is there really. By realising this truth one can get rid of the dream of misunderstanding the Self as *Vishva* etc. This is called 'स्थानिधर्म निराकरण'.
- 5) In this way though from the standpoint of waking state we assume that there are three states, and they are different from one another and that they really exist in the Self etc., one

should observe that the appearance of a particular state inevitably cancels the very existence of the other two. Hence these are only false appearances such as the snake, garland, water flow etc., on the rope. By determining this one can easily get rid of the belief that there are three states. And he will realise that the states have no independent existence apart from the Self. By this the dream, which is the misconception of assuming the reality as the states will vanish. This is called 'स्थानघर्म निराकरण'.

- 6) From the standpoint of the ego, i.e., *Pramatru* it appears that the real nature of the Self is the witness of these three states but as the Self is there so also the states are also there. Hence the Self is not non-dual one. This objection may be raised when one takes identification with the *Pramatrutva* of waking state. Though this is the thing, the appearances of the states are only false appearances due to ignorance and hence they have no existence at all. But the Self whose nature is pure, absolute Consciousness is called as *Turiya* from the standpoint of these false appearances (see Mangala Slokas by Bhashyakaara in the beginning of Mandukya

Bhashya – ‘मयासन्ध्यातुरीयम्’). This Self is ever devoid of all specific features and non-dual nature of Consciousness alone. When the aspirant takes a stand in this true nature of his own Self then there will be no complaint regarding the three states because the complainer of the states is *Pramatru* of the waking state and not the real nature of the Self. If this truth is realised then one will be awakened from the dream that the Self is having dualistic world. This is called ‘सद्धितीयत्व निराकरण’.

So, it is correct to say that when one cognises the transcendental Reality then he will get rid of all wrong notions regarding the real nature of the Self. This is called as attaining the *Turiyahood* (‘तुरीयं पदमश्नुते’). Strictly speaking it is not really attaining the *Turiya* newly because he is already *Turiya*. It is only getting rid of the wrong notions (see Gi. Bh.18-50: ‘न तु ब्रह्मज्ञाने यत्नः कर्तव्यः किन्तु अनात्मनि आत्मबुद्धि निवृत्तावेव’). So, through discrimination only one can get *Turiya*.

(In my opinion it is better to study once again the Bhashya and the commentary of Swamiji i.e., Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih especially from Mantra No. 7 to Karika 16 of first chapter. This is the significance of the method of getting *Turiya* according to Bhashya).

* * * * *

15. Significance of Karika 2-4 according to MRV:

In the last paragraph of Page Nos. 187-189 of MRV the item taken up for discussion is “what kind of visualisation of the two states is said here”? In other words, it is stated that the dream and waking states are visions. Now the question is: “what kind of visualisation is this”?

If one thinks that the intellect itself is the seer of these two states, it is absurd. The very intellect which appears in a particular state is restricted to that particular state alone. Obviously, it has no capacity to comprehend both the states. The intellect which appeared in the dream state is incapable of grasping the whole dream state itself leave alone the waking state. This dream intellect can only objectify the things that appear within that state and so is the waking intellect. We may say that the waking intellect is capable of knowing the dream state because we remember the dream state through this intellect (but the message has come from inside – intuition). Hence one tends to agree to the point that the dream is a false appearance, and the waking state is real. For this purpose, the maxim as told by Badarayanacharya in his Sutra 2-2-29 has to be applied. If this is the case, then the argument that waking state also is equally false, like dream, goes. According to Shruti, one should realise the true nature of the Self through the purified mind. According to this

statement, the Self also will come under the category of seeable (objectifiable) one, and then one can say that the nature of the Self is also false, because your contention is that 'that which is Drishya (objectifiable) is false. This is the nature of doubt. Swamyji replies for this from Paragraph P. 188-ATRA BROOMAHA etc. It is as follows: 1) both the waking and dream states are apprehended through the true nature of the Self who is the witnessing principle of the two states, and whose nature is Pure Consciousness. This is clear from Katha 2-1-4. So, we may say that these two states are Drishyas to the Saakshi alone.

- 2) The objection raised here is that when the Self is also to be known, then it is false (because all that are seen are false, Drishyatvaat). This objection holds no water because the knowledge of the Self means not objectifying the Self but one should intuit that the Self is not an objectifiable one by any means because it is described as ADRISHYAM, AVYAVAHAARYAM (Mandukya Mantra 7) etc.
- 3) But the states like dream and waking are Drishyas meaning objects to the true nature of the Self. This fact is evident for all from the standpoint of intuitional experience of both the states. The same thing is asserted by Shruti in the above quoted Katha Mantra. On

this firm ground it is inferred here that as the true nature of the Self is the witness for the dream state and the dream state itself is a false appearance, so also from the standpoint of this witnessing principle of life, which is the real nature of the Self the whole waking state is also a false appearance. Strictly speaking it resembles the inference (Anumaana) but it is not the same which is called as inference in our daily life and by Taarkikas (Logicians) as well.

- 4) The general rule applied here is that 'that which is of adventitious and ephemerous nature is false' and 'the substratum is the reality'. In this maxim the common factor i.e., Vyaapti is applied to the waking state by taking the illustration of the dream state. This application of common factors is not possible by the ego (Pramatru) of the waking state because he is absent in the dream state and *vice versa*. Thus, it is impossible for either the intellect or the ego to comprehend both the states.
- 5) Hence we have to determine here that the witness who is the substratum of the two states alone can visualize or objectify the states and to him alone the states become Drishyas.

- 6) The witness who has witnessed the whole dream state will himself take the garb of waking ego and expresses through the instruments of waking intellect, mind and speech. So, though it appears as an inference, it is not really an inference which is to be inferred through intellect. For this reason, I have written in yesterday's letter that the logicians depend upon the intellectual concepts while Vedantins take the intuitional experience as the criterion. Hence Swamiji has said here that it is not Anumaana as commonly known. But the intention is to teach that "one's own true nature is ever free from both the states because the states are false appearances, and his own Being is the reality". For this purpose this inference is taken and it is said at the end of this paragraph that from the standpoint of 'egos' (either waking ego or dream ego), they are not common for both the states – it is to be determined that the witness who is the illuminer of the Antahkarana himself appears as if he has taken the garb of 'Pramatru' without forfeiting His true nature. On this firm ground of intuitional experience, Sri Gaudapada has shown the falsehood of both

the states and has shown that the nature of the Self is untainted by all kinds of mundane qualities. To teach this, he has started this Karika with '*Anstahsthaanaattu* (अन्तस्थानात्तु)' etc.

The significance of the next paragraph is as follows: Here the objection raised is that the dream takes place within the body, and it gets falsified every day when waking occurs. This is said by Gaudapada himself by using the word '*Antahsthaanaat*'. It being so how are we to determine that both the states are equal?

And: This difference is mentioned from the standpoint of waking state to understand the transcendental reality by dull minded students only. But it is not the final truth. We can use the meaning of the same Karika to show that both the states are false.

Qn: How is it?

Ans: In the real nature of the Self which is the substratum of these two states the whole waking state appears and disappears. The same is the case with dream states also. So the word *Antahsthaanaat* is to be applied from this standpoint of the substratum. In Taittiriya Bh. 2-8-8 to 10) it is said that *ANTARYAMIN IME LOKAAH ANTARVISHVAAN IDAM JAGAT* (अन्तरस्मिन् इमे लोकाः अन्तर्विश्वमिदं जगत्). The waking world has no independent existence apart from the true nature of the Self who is the substratum.

The waking state, as it appears, is indefinable, meaning, it is not by itself the nature of the Self, i.e., *Tatva and it has no independent existence apart from the true nature of the Self. So, it is not Anvaya.* Hence it is called as *Anirvachaniya*. Same is the case with the dream state also. In Br. Su. 2-2-29, it is said that there is difference between waking and dream and hence are not equal. It has to be noted here that this statement is not used to teach the transcendental reality of the Self, but to refute the *Nihilists* (Shunyavadins) and the Idealists (Vijnanavadins) who hold the view that the perception may occur without the real things which are inside. To prove this, they use the illustration of the dream. To refute their viewpoint this Sutra is made use of. According to Vedanta, if one accepts the consciousness of empirical state, then inevitably one has to accept the existence of outer things and vice versa (See G.K. 4-67). Thus, according to the above Sutra, there is no harm to the present subject matter.

Qn: Then how have you (Vedantin) taken the illustration of the dream state to prove the falsehood of the waking state?

Ans: At first, we have taken the common man's view that the dream state occurs in the body etc. From this standpoint we have taken the dream state as an illustration. But we have no intention to accept that really there is difference between waking state and dream state because

during the dream state, that world appears as if it is real waking state. One can experience another dream in this dream, and he can say that 'I dreamt, and I woke up'. Still he is in a dream. So, the dream appears as real waking during its appearance and from this standpoint one asserts that the dream which occurred was in my body etc. Strictly speaking there is no narrow space just like within the body or the vast ether outside the body. From this, we have to understand the method of falsifying also. The dream which occurred in the dream has been falsified by the appearance of the first dream which is supposed as the real waking. From this standpoint there is no difference between these two states (means between the first dream and the second dream) though we feel the difference because from the standpoint of real waking state, both the dreams have been falsified. So, the feeling of difference between the two states is not the truth or reality.

Hence here inference alone is not used by Sri Gaudapada but intuition as well. If he had employed the inference alone to prove the falsehood of the waking state, then that falsehood would remain as indirect and only intellectual gymnastics (exercise). So, we have to understand that Sri Gaudapada has employed here the intuitional experience of both the states which leads the Sadhaka directly to take his stand in his true nature. Sri Shankara (Bhashyakaara) who has put this intuitional

experience in the methodology of inference such as Pratijna etc., has employed this as a tool to teach the student whose mind is tainted by the vasanas of the Logics but who are trying to understand the Vedantic truths. As he is in proper way of understanding the reality, the above said forms of inferences are employed for him. This is to be known here.

This is the significance of G.K.2-4 according to MRV.

* * * * *

16. The significance of G.K. 3-23 (P.No. 332 of 2011 edition):

Here I will clarify the portion '*Tasmaat*' to the end.

Before this, it is determined that the Self is, by nature, birthless (unborn). It is not correct to imagine that since the Brahman has got many powers to solve the problems of the creation etc., the creation must be real or that the Brahman has really created the universe because He is Aja. After this also the reasons are used here to get the intuitional experience of the real nature of the Self who is ever birthless. The result of the Self-knowledge is quite unlike the result of rituals etc. It (Self-knowledge) has to culminate in one's own intuitional experience here and now. For this purpose, the reasons which are supported by the Shruti are also to be used to

determine the exact purport of Shruti because the Self realisation is not concerned with some happening in the future. This is because the Self is already Self-established one and it is said that the aspirant realises this truth at the time of listening. The nature of the Self can neither be rejected nor be accepted. It is one's own true nature. Hence by the teachings of Shruti and Guru it is to be determined that the Self is ever birthless. Though this is the position this determination has got appropriate reasonings which lead to the final intuition of the Self. If one has got the realisation of the birthless Self, for him, there is no necessity of using the reasoning because when the final intuition has taken place, in that state, reasonings will not do any enhancement of this realisation. So, for the mature student there is no necessity of using the reasoning after understanding the teachings of *Agama*. Therefore, there is no controversy between *Agama* and Reasoning. For the student who is incapable of realising the birthless nature of the Self through *Agama* alone – meaning only by listening – for him to get final intuition the reasonings are to be used which are endowed with the utterances of Shruti. Such reasonings are (i) the birth is due to *Maya* i.e., due to one's own ignorance the Self appears as if it has taken the birth. This false appearance of the birth in the Self is called as *Maya Jaati*. Using this method the reasoning leads to the nature of the birthless Self and (ii) confirming

perfect equality between waking and dream states through reasoning pointing out the true nature of the Self as birthless and as substratum of the two states. These types of *Tarkas* and the help of empirical logics also could be employed to get the final intuition of the Self. Thus, the reasonings are used to culminate at last in one's own intuitional experience of the true nature of the Self in Vedanta. These (reasonings used in Vedanta) are based on the practical intuitions of life and culminate in the realisation of the non-dual Self. Hence it is quite different from the process of inferences of logicians who have relied only on the intellectual concepts. This is to be known by the aspirants. Here Sri Swamyji has given the root-meaning of three words – (i) *Tarka*, (ii) *Upapatti*, and (iii) *Yukti*. The meanings are as follows: (i) the reasonings which are based on intuitional experience – for them only the capacity of determining the exact purpose of Shruti is present. This capacity is not there for the inferences which are based on intellectual concepts. So, these reasonings which are based on intuitions are called as *Tarkas* or *Shrouta Tarkas*. (ii) these reasonings have got the capacity to take the aspirant as nearest as possible to the true nature of the Self because they rely on intuitions. As these reasonings carry the aspirant directly to the true nature of the Self these are called as *Upapatti*. Here *Upa* means proximity or nearness and *Patti* means it carries the aspirant unto

the goal. (iii) The above said reasonings i.e., *Shrouta Tarka* joins the partial intuitional experiences which are generated in the mind of the aspirants and draws the conclusion of the true nature of the Self. Hence the root *Yuj*, to join is used. This is called *Yukti*.

This in brief is the significance of G.K. 23 according to M.R. V.

* * * * *

17. Significance of Mandukya Karika 3-26:(letter dated. 05.02.1990)

The plain meaning of this Karika is: “since by taking the help of incomprehensibility (of Brahman) as a reason, all that was explained earlier (as for the knowledge of Brahman) is negated by the text ‘This Self is that which has been described as NOT THIS, NOT THIS’, therefore the birthless Self becomes Self-revealed”.

- 1) The word ‘*Agraahyabhaavena*’ is used here with two purposes. This is called as ‘*Madhyamamani Nyaaya*’ or ‘*Dehalideepa Nyaaya*’, meaning in *Japamaala* there is middle ‘*Mani*’ (bead) which is called as *Meru* and this is concerned with both the sides of the *Maala*. So also, the light which is kept on the threshold illumines both the rooms simultaneously. In this way the word *Agraahyabhaavena* denotes two meanings.

- 2) The first meaning is that the nature of the Self is unobjectifiable one by any means, either by words or concepts. So, it is very difficult to understand the true nature of the Self by the aspirant. Here the aspirant has to lose the identification with the mind and he himself has to remain as the witnessing principle of life—that which illumines the words and concepts. The true nature of the Self is very subtle for cognition. Due to this reason, here it is said that cognising the real nature of the Self is very delicate because it is *Agraahya* (unobjectifiable) by any means. This meaning is hidden in the word *Sarvamagraahya- bhaavena*.
- 3) The second meaning is that to teach this true nature of the Self which is beyond the ken of words and concepts (mind) the Shastra uses many means which are really not related to the nature of the Self. When these various means have been described in various ways, those means should not be taken as real as the Self by the aspirant. In this sense also the word *Sarvamagraahyabhaavena* is used. This is the second meaning of the word *Sarvamagraahyabhaavena*.

In sum and substance, the real nature of the Self, as it is not an objectifiable one is *Agraahya*. This is said in Gita Bhashya 18-50 thus: तस्मात्न तु ब्रह्मविज्ञाने यत्नः कर्तव्यः and तस्मात् ज्ञाने यत्नः न कर्तव्य....निवृत्तिरेव । In these two sentences Shankara says that one should not try to know the Brahman but he has to give up the identification with all the not-selves including the ego and he automatically remains as the true nature of the Self, Hence Self is *Agraahya*.

For this purpose, that which is taught from the standpoint of *Adhyaropa* just as *Avasthaatraya*, *Panchakosha*, *Drig-Drishya*, *Avidya*, *Maya*, etc., are only the means but they are not really existing things just like the Self. Hence the aspirant should not misunderstand that as there is the true nature of the Self, so these things also really exist. This is the second meaning as pointed out earlier. So, the word *Agraahya* is to be applied to the true nature of the Self as well as to the means which have been taught (i.e., Atman cannot be known and Anatman do not exist to be known). Hence it is the final '*Mouna*'. This is the true significance of the word '*Agraahyabhaavana*'. As already pointed out, since it applies both to the Self and non-selves, it conforms to '*Madhyamamani Nyaaya*'.

Keeping in mind this significance, if we study the Swamiji's commentary on this Karika we will have a clear understanding of this Karika.

With this background let us proceed to study the significance of this Karika.

The Swamiji has given in his commentary five examples which are taught in Shruti. The first one is Br: 2-3-1 to 2-3-6. Here earth, water, fire are Murtas, air and aether are Amurtas. This is shown in the outer world. The same principle is applied in the corporeal plane – the perceptions are Murtas and vasanas are Amurtas. Just as the cloth is coloured with turmeric (decoction), so also the mind is tainted with the vasanas. Due to wrong identification with the sense organs and mind one misconceives that ‘I have got dealings such as perceptions and vasanas’. The mind or sense organs are also the subtle forms of the five elements which are mentioned above. So, the outer world and inner mind etc., are all the products of five elements. These *Upadhis* (adjuncts) are concocted by *Avidya* in Atman. At the time of appearance of these Upadhis also there is no taint of these two to the Self. For example, the dream occurs in our pure Being and in the dream both the dealings of Murta and Amurta appear and when the dream disappears then there is no taint to the real nature of the Self. The same is the case with the waking state. Hence it is said in Br: 2-3-6 ‘Not this, not this’ (‘नेति नेति’) meaning the Self is neither gross nor subtle. This is the first illustration. To denote the real nature of the Self negation is the only means because the seeker himself is the Self. He has only to cease to

have identification with the mind and sense organs. By this he remains in his true nature. There is no other way to remain as He is. Here, the seeker should not try to objectify the Self because it is *Agraahya* and also, he should not understand that the mind or the sense organs are there independently apart from the Self because they are connected by *Avidya* meaning before the knowledge of the true nature of the Self is obtained the seeker has misunderstood the same Self as the mind and sense organs. Hence these false appearances should be rejected and so these are *Agraahya* (i.e., they do not really exist to be rejected).

In the second illustration, Br: 3-8-8 is considered. Here it is shown that from earth to aether the previous ones are grosser, and the latter ones are subtler. The former is pervaded by the latter which is subtle just as the thread pervades the length and breadth of the cloth. In this way the earth is pervaded by water, water by fire, fire by air and air by aether. Here the latter ones are the realities of the former. By this way the Brahman which is all pervading is the only reality and all others (aether to earth which are pervaded) are concocted by *Avidya*. And at the end it says 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' (Br: 3-9-26). Here also the seeker should not think that elements like earth to aether really exist. So also, he should not try to understand Brahman as an object other than himself. In this way the seeker himself remains Brahman and nothing

but Brahman. To reach this standpoint the previous elements – earth to aether – are attributed.

In the third illustration, Br: 4-2-4 to 4-2-22 is taken into consideration. This is the conversation between Yajnavalkya and King Janaka which denotes the same method. At first the teaching commences by saying that the forms of the Self such as *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prajna* are (mere) attributions on the real nature of Self who is *Turiya*. After that again it is negated as 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' which means that the three forms i.e., *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Praajna* are concocted by *Avidya* and from this standpoint the real nature of the Self is called as *Turiya*. Here also the seeker should not mistake that there are really three – *Vishva*, *Taijasa* and *Prajna* - and the fourth is *Turiya* because *Vishva* etc., have no existence apart from the Self and he should not think that they are really existing. When he realises this, he himself remains as *Turiya* and so there is no other task to know that *Turiya* and hence it is said 'नेति नेति'.

In the fourth, the transmigratory life which is the bondage of birth and death is there to the person who has got desires, but who are freed from all desires will get emancipation or Moksha is narrated. This type of attribution of the dealings of bondage and release (Bandha-Moksha vyavahara) is attributed on the true nature of the Self. And it is said that to get rid of all the desires the only means is to cognise the real nature of the Self

alone. Here the proposition is that he who has got rid of all the desires will get liberation. The question here is 'how is it possible to become free from all the desires?' The answer is by one "acquiring all the desires at once" will become *Nishkaama*, desireless. This *Nishkaami* will become *Akaami*. The question that arises then is how is it possible to get all the desires fulfilled at once? The answer is he who cognises that all this is the Self alone and nothing but the Self will acquire all the desires at once. So, the *Atmakaama* leads to *Aaptakaama*, *Aaptakaama* to *Nishkaama*, and *Nishkaama* to *Akaama*. And by *Akaamatva* one will get release from *Samsaara*. So, the transmigratory life is to one who is *Sakaama* (with desires) and the release will occur to one who is *Akaami* (desireless). This is the attribution made here by the Shruti (See Br. Bh. 4-4-6, 'फलासक्तस्य हि.... कामयितव्याभावात् कर्म अनुपपत्तिः')

Here again the bondage and release are attributions to denote the true nature of the Seeker which is ever free (*Nityamukta*). When the seeker takes his stand in his true nature he realises that there is no *Bandha* (bondage) or *Moksha* (liberation) really for him. Hence the attribution of *Bandha* and *Moksha* (which are due to *Avidya* and *Vidya* respectively) are only the means and these means are negated by saying 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा' (Br: 4-4-22).

In the fifth, Br.4-5-1 to 4-5-15 is considered. The attribution of General and Particular (*Saamanya* and

Vishesha Bhaava) and the attribution of causation (the universe takes its birth from Brahman, sustains in It and dissolves into It; by saying this, the causation is attributed between the Brahman and the universe) are shown here. Then at last in 4-5-15 it is said that 'स एष नेतिनेत्यात्मा'. Here the previous attributions are negated which means that really there are no two things such as general and particular and that the particular is the imagination in the general and there is no causation really between Brahman and the universe. So the seeker should not think that these are also real things but should understand that they are only means to teach Brahman. And he should not try to understand the Brahman because it is *Agraahya*. When he ceases to have the knowership then he himself remains as Brahman. This is the significance of the five examples given by Swamyji in M.R.V. Page Nos. 340, 341.

In the next paragraph of P.No. 341, it is said that the means is used to denote the nature of the *Upeya*, i.e., *Paramaarth*. All the means which have been taken as existing things are only *Vikalpas* and hence one should not take that they are also the properties of the Self. This is said in this paragraph उपायस्य तु यद्यपि ग्राह्यः तथाप्यविद्याप्रत्युपस्थापितो विकल्पमात्रमिति तत्प्रत्याख्यानेन उपेयात्मस्वरूपसमर्पणार्थत्वात् उपेयनिष्ठतया एव उपदिष्टो न तु उपेयस्वरूपे प्रविष्टोऽत उच्यते नेतिनेत्यात्मेति । This is said in this article in the beginning as the back ground. Here one should remember that the Self, which is by nature beyond the

ken of speech and thought, the true nature of this Self also is not an objectifiable one and so it is *Agraahya*. This is also said in the beginning. These two points are confirmed in this paragraph.

The second paragraph in P. No. 342 shows that though the means is false one, meaning, its existence is accepted from the empirical standpoint alone and it is false appearance i.e., Mayic, it can be seen that the truth can be recognised. Here the example is of the letters and numerals which are denoted through the lines, curves etc. By these false means one can understand the true nature of the alphabets and numbers. After knowing the truth, one realises that the previous means is false. This illustration is given by Bhashyakaara in B.S.B. 2-1-14 and Br. 4-4-25. The determination of the Self is only to remove the wrong ideas because there is no necessity to reveal the nature of the Atman through the means of right knowledge (Pramana) because the Self is the Self-effulgent one, i.e., स्वयं प्रकाश. In His light all the dealings of Pramanas or Apramanas appear. So, there is no necessity of objectifying the Self through any means. When the wrong ideas regarding the Self are removed, then the Self Itself remains as He is. This remaining as the true nature of the Self is called as Self-knowledge. This is said in the last portion of this paragraph - प्रतिपत्तिश्च आत्मनो विकल्पविनिवृत्तिनान्तरीयकतया स्वयमेव प्रकाशमानत्वं न तु प्रमाणफलेन । स्वेयंप्रकाशस्य आत्मनः प्रमाणनिमित्तप्रतिपत्त्यनपेक्षणात्,

प्रमाणादेरापि तत्र कल्पितत्वात् तद्ग्लादेव प्रतिभासाच्च । In support of this two Vaartikas are given here. This is the significance of this third Paragraph.

Those who do not have this idea hold the view that the supreme Self can also be known through the words and sentences and their meanings. This wrong view is refuted in the fourth paragraph. The significances of that para are as follows:

Here Swamiji has cited two schools of thought. In the first opinion the Brahman also is under the purview of syntactical meaning. In Upanishads the existence of the dualistic world is negated. By this we should not think that there is the world as well as the negation. The nature of Brahman is ever devoid of all types of dualities. This nature is revealed through the connection of the sentences which negate the duality and describes Brahman as ever devoid of any distinctions and one can understand the nature of Brahman (through the sentences or through their syntactical meaning). It is said in the beginning of the paragraph that through all the concepts what we know is really the Brahman. So, the nature of Brahman is not entirely unknown. But by the Shashtra when the negation of the dualistic world is taught through the connection of these sentences and the sentences of revealing the nature of Brahman etc., one can understand the true nature of Brahman. Hence Brahman also is considered as coming under the purview of syntactical meaning.

In the second opinion if one says that there are some birds which have got legs of ruby—coloured diamonds, beaks of red coloured diamond, wings of golden and silver colours etc., we can imagine the form of those birds through the previous understanding of the bird category we already know of. In this way when Shruti describes the nature of Brahman as ‘It is the cause of this universe and It is the existing one etc.,’ then we understand in terms of what we already know as cause and effect of existing things. To deny this understanding the particulars of Brahman is negated by Shastra by the sentences ‘That is not gross, not subtle, not long, not short’ (Br. 3-8-8) etc. Thus, here Shastra distinguishes the nature of Brahman from other things which are usually known as cause, existing things, etc. For this reason, Brahman is not knowable one by any means other than Shastra. In this way it is said that the Brahman is known through the utterances of Shastra only. This is the gist of the second opinion.

Swamiji has refuted the above said two opinions from तदेतन्मताद्वयमपि असत्.....इति च (P. Nos. 343, 344) (full para). The reasons given by Swamiji are that (i) Shruti itself says that Brahman is एकमेवाद्वितीयम् (Ch. 6-2-1) ‘यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह’ (Tai. 2-9) etc. These Shrutis show that the Brahman is the only reality, and it is beyond the ken of speech and mind. The above, said views are quite contradictory to these two opinions.

(ii) The nature of Brahman is not related to the syntactical meaning of any words or sentences. The syntactical meaning is possible in the range of the things which could be reached by words or thoughts. This range is possible only where the dualistic appearance exists. This appearance is due to ignorance alone whereas the nature of Brahman is ever devoid of this range of dualistic appearances. Therefore, the connection of the syntactical meaning of the sentences of the words etc., are not possible with the Brahman. (iii) The nature of Brahman is described as non-dual and so it has no Swagata Bheda just as in a tree there are divisions such as trunk, branches, leaves, flowers etc. And no Sajaatiya Bheda also just like existence of other trees of the same family like mango trees, margosa trees etc., and no Vijaatiya Bheda as there are rocks etc., other than trees. As it is ever devoid of all these types of distinctions it is not possible to even think of Brahman as having the relation of causation and as having the distinctions such as general and particular, etc. Thus, the nature of Brahman is beyond the connection of syntactical meaning. For this, Swamiji has given the quotations from Vaartikas. Hence the negation of the dualistic appearance is the only means to teach Brahman but not through the positive utterances.

In the fifth and the last paragraph of M.R.V (P. Nos. 344, 345, 346) the opinion of some people who claim that 'if one wants to know the nature of Brahman it is

impossible to understand through only the sentences which negates the dualistic appearances, but should follow the positive utterances of the Shrutis and then only one can understand the nature of the Brahman' is refuted. The illustration for the above contention given by them is that 'when one mistakes the rope for a snake, etc., it is not sufficient to say that it is not a snake, but it is also necessary to say that it is a rope'; and 'so also is the case with the teachings of Brahman'. This contention is refuted from तदप्यसत्प्रसक्तानुप्रसक्तिचिन्तनेन (P. Nos. 344-346, full para). The main significances of this portion are as follows: (i) The teachings of the Upanishads culminate in negating those attributes which are taken as the means to teach Brahman. After complete negation, there are no positive statements anywhere in the Upanishads. Had there been positive statements, then it would have been right to say that the Brahman can also be taught through positive utterances after the negation of the not-selves. But this is not the case. For this Swamiji has cited the quotations from all the principal Upanishads upto इत्यादि (P. 345). After that he has given one sentence of Bhashya from Br. 2-3-6 the meaning of which is – "Brahman is described by means of name, form and action superimposed on It, in such terms as 'Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman' (3-9-28), and 'Pure Consciousness' (2-4-12), Brahman, and Atman. When however, we wish to describe Its true nature free from all differences due to limiting

adjuncts, then it is an utter impossibility. Then there is only one way left, viz., to describe It as 'Not this, not this', by eliminating all possible specifications of It that have been ascribed". The original Br. portion is from अध्यारोपित नेत्यन्यत्परमस्ति इति । Here Swamyji says that the meaning of this sentence is that apart from the negation of the dualistic world there is no other kind of instructions to denote the nature of Brahman which is one's own Self. It is wrong to say that the negative sentence has no power to remove the ignorance regarding the Self because one's own true nature of the Self is Self-effulgent and already existing one. So, the wrong notion regarding the Self is to be removed. When the wrong notion is removed by the negation of the not-selves the real nature of the Self remains as it is a Self-effulgent one. This is said by those well versed in the meaning of the scriptures (Agamavadinaam): 'सिद्धं तु निवर्तकत्वात्' – 'the validity of the scriptures is derived from their negation of positive qualities from the Self'. This is the significance of the portion न हि नेति नेतीत्यस्मात् आगमविदां सूत्रम्' (P.No. 341). (ii) In the case of rope-snake it may be accepted from a standpoint that to get the right knowledge of the rope the negation of the snake is not enough but after negating the snake one should also assert that the nature of the rope as 'this is the rope' because rope is an object and it has no Self-effulgence and hence in this case it may be said so. While in the true nature of the Self,

which is itself Self-effulgent there is no necessity for a positive statement or instructions regarding the Self. This is the difference between the illustrated and the illustration. Here also we have accepted tentatively that in the case of rope the positive statement also is required but strictly speaking there is no necessity of the positive instruction regarding the Self. This is because when one mistakes the rope for a snake, he sees the very rope as the snake. This wrong understanding itself is the ignorance regarding the rope. When through the light the rope is seen simultaneously the wrong notion vanishes and automatically knowledge of the rope dawns. Thus, there is no necessity of other injunction to know the real nature of the rope. Hence it is wrong to say that negative sentences are not enough means to know the Self. The very function of Pramanas or means of right knowledge is only to remove the wrong notion (i.e., Tamas – refer G.B. 10-11 for the meaning of the word Tamas - ‘अज्ञानतां अविवेकतो जातं मिथ्याप्रत्ययलक्षणं मोहान्धकारं तमः’, i.e., the Tamas means the darkness of delusion known as false comprehension) regarding the knowable thing. Apart from this there is no other function for the means of right knowledge (refer Ma. Mantra Bh. Section 39, P. No. 104 ‘रज्जुरिव सर्पादिभिः....निवृत्तिरिति सिद्धम् ॥’ If one says that after removing the wrong notion there is some function to the means of right knowledge regarding the knowable thing then it would amount to breaking the very nature of

Pramana. For this Swamiji has given the quotation from Upadesha Sahasri Sloka 18-4. This is the significance of the portion 'रज्जुदृष्टान्ते तु' प्रसक्तानुप्रसक्तिचिन्तनेन' (to the end of the para) in P. No. 345, 346. Swamyji has clarified in this portion that in the sentence, also the wrong notion regarding तत् त्वमसि such as Brahman is other than myself etc., and the wrong notion regarding 'त्वं पद' 'such as 'I am a soul and of transmigratory nature' etc., are only to be removed. Apart from this there is no other function to this sentence. This has also to be accepted by the opponent though he does not like to do so. The gist of the whole of this Karika is that '*apart from the removal of the wrong notion about the Self there is no other function*'.

* * * * *

18. Clarification regarding Shabdaaparokshavaada and Manoaparokshavaada:

- (i) According to Br. 3-4-1 and 3-5-1, the Self is Himself and is *Saakshaat* and *Aparokshaat*. Here *Saakshaat* means 'He is unobjectifiable one by any means because He Himself is the nature of pure Consciousness and He illumines all other not-selves including '*Aham Pratyaya*'. This is clearly stated by Bhashyakaara in *Adhyasa Bhashya* as 'अशेषस्वप्राचारसाक्षी'. And *Aparoksha* means 'He is no other than one's own Self' meaning the

aspirant should not seek the nature of the Self as other than himself in the outer world and also he should not understand that the Self is somewhere other than himself or to be meditated like 'Aditya is Brahman' etc., according to the injunction of the Shastra which is *Paroksha* meaning other than himself. To denote this, the word *Aparokshaat* is used.

- (ii) The cognition of the above said nature of one's own Self is called as *Jnana* or *Aparoksha Jnana*. Strictly speaking in *Upasanas* there are two divisions of *Jnanas* viz., *Paroksha* and the *Aparoksha*. For eg. Concentrating on the form of a deity such as Narayana etc., according to the Shastra is at first stage *Paroksha*. After practicing this meditation for quite some time he will get visualisation of that deity. This is called as *Aparoksha* or *Saakshaatkaara*. For eg. The Kali Maata was visualised by Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa and Sri Krishna was visualised by Chaitanya Prabhu etc. Thus in the case of *Upasanas* there are divisions like *Paroksha*, *Aparoksha*, *Saakshaatkaara* etc. But in the case of Self-knowledge, as the Self is the direct and immediate (*Saakshaat Aparokshaat*), there will be no divisions such

as first *Paroksha*, then *Aparoksha* and then *Saakshaatkaara* etc.

- (iii) Though this is the case, the commentators have started saying that these distinctions of *Paroksha*, *Aparoksha* and *Saakshaatkaara* etc., are there in the Self-knowledge as for eg. See *Panchadashi* 7-21 to 26. Here the divisions such as *Paroksha* and *Aparoksha* are shown and the 28th stanza concludes describing the seven stages of aspirant. Here the *Ajnaana* means *Mulaavidyaa*, *Aavarana* or *Avriti* means it encompasses the nature of Brahman, *Vikshepa* means it transforms as *Aham Pratyaya* i.e., Jiva or *Aabhaasa*. To understand that there is Brahman and that it is the Self of all – this knowledge is *Paroksha Jnana* and after that he realises that ‘I am that Brahman’ – this is *Aparoksha Jnana*. By this there will be unhindered satisfaction (*Tripti*) and by this he will get rid of all types of grief (*shoka nivritti*). These seven stages are described here.
- (iv) According to *Vivarana Prasthaana* after *Sravaana*, *Manana* and *Nididhyaasana* the aspirant should experience the *Nirvikalpa Samadhi*. By this he will get *Aparoksha Jnana* after waking from the experience of

Samadhi. This is said in Panchadashi 1-55 to 65. According to the opinion of *Bhaamati* after getting *Samadhi* also the constant repetition through concentrated mind regarding the real nature of the Self will lead to the *Saakshaatkaara* of the Self. These types of ideas have been propagated by these commentators which are not mentioned in Shankara Bhashya anywhere as regards Self-knowledge. Thus, the controversy about the predominance between *Shabdaaparoksha-vaada* and *Manoaparokshavaada* started.

- (v) According to Shankara Bhashya generating the *Atma Pratyaya* i.e., the firm conviction regarding the real nature of the Self in one's own mind is called *Atma Jnana*. For the present we take for granted that the above said *Atma Pratyaya* is '*Aparoksha Jnana*'. From this standpoint the controversy starts as to which is the predominant means to generate this *Atma Pratyaya* between the two i.e., the mind or the Shastra's teachings? For this the answer is 'in both ways'. In B.S.B.2-1-3, Shankara says 'शास्त्रादेव प्रमाणात् जगतो जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्माधिगम्यते इत्यभिप्रायः', 'रूपादद्यभावद्वि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षस्य गोचरः । लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनाम् । आगममात्रमधिगम्य एव त्वयमर्थो धर्मवत्' । In B.S.B.

2-1-6. 'न हि इदम् अतिगम्भीरं भावयाथात्म्यं मुक्तिनिबन्धनमागममन्तरेण उत्प्रेक्षितुमपि शक्यम् । रूपाद्यभावोद्भि नायमर्थः प्रत्यक्षगोचरः, लिङ्गाद्यभावाच्च नानुमानादीनामिति च अवोचाम्' । B.S.B 2-1-11. Again in B.S.B. 2-1-11 itself at the end Bhashyakara declares 'वेदस्य तु नित्यत्वे विज्ञानोत्पत्ति हेतुत्वे च सति व्यवस्थितार्थयित्वोपपत्तेः तज्जनितस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यक्त्वं अतीतानागतवर्तमानैः सर्वैरपि तार्किकैरपह्नोतुम् अशक्यम् । अतः सिद्धमस्यैव औपनिषदस्य ज्ञानस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानत्वम् । अतोऽन्यत्र सम्यग्ज्ञानत्वानुपपत्तेः संसाराविमोक्ष एव प्रसज्येत' । In all these three sentences the real nature of the Self as 'in order to eliminate that doubt, this aphorism says, 'Brahman is not known through any other means'. Since the scriptures are valid means of Its knowledge, in 1-1-3, again he says 'For, this entity is not an object of perception, It being devoid of form etc. And it is not subject to inference, being devoid of all grounds of inference etc. But like religious matters, this entity is known from the scriptures alone' in (2-1-6), and 'for, this extremely sublime subject-matter, concerned with the reality of the cause of the universe and leading to the goal of liberation, cannot even be guessed without the help of Vedas. And we said that It cannot be known either through perception, being devoid of form etc., or through inference etc.,

being devoid of the grounds of inference etc., (2-1-11) and in the same Bhashya Acharya says 'since the Vedas are eternal and a source of knowledge, they can reasonably reveal as their subject-matter something which is (well established and) unchanging, and the knowledge arising from them can be true, so that no logician – past, present or future – can deny it. Hence it is proved that the knowledge arising from the Upanishads alone is the true knowledge. And since there can be no other source of true knowledge (*Avimoksha-prasangah*), 'there will rise the possibility of liberation being ruled out'. Like these sentences Shankara declares that from the teachings of the Shastras only one can get *Aparoksha Jnana* i.e., *Atma Pratyaya*. This is called as *Shabdaaparoksha*. Here *Shabda* means the Shastra. For eg., see S.B. 2-3-4, 1-3-24, 1-3-28 etc. The word *Shabda* denotes the utterances of Vedas or Shastras. So, Shastra, Veda, *Shabda* are synonymous terms.

- (vi) According to the following sentences it seems that the mind is the predominant factor to get *Aparoksha Jnana*. 'मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यम्' (K. 4-11) etc. denote that the mind is the predominant factor to get *Aparoksha Jnana*.

Here the conclusion is that both are necessary to get the realisation of the Self. This is clearly stated by Shankara in his G.B.2-21 'शास्त्राचार्य उपदेश शमदमादि संस्कृतं मनः आत्मदर्शने करणम्'. The meaning of this sentence is 'to realise the real nature of the Self i.e., to get Atma Darshana, the mind which is purified and endowed with the teachings of the Shastra and Guru is the right *Karana*'. For this reason only always Shankara says that the Shastra and Acharya Upadesha is required to get the Self-knowledge. In some cases, by some practices the mind may get fully purified and concentrated. Through this the Sadhaka may remain as his true nature of the Self unknowingly. In this case if there is no availability of the proper teachings of Shastra and Guru, he may not understand or discern that 'this is my true nature and it is the transcendental reality and all else is the false appearances'. And in some cases, the Sadhaka will realise that this is the truth, and this is my true nature etc., by intuition. Here for him it seems like a mystic experience and there is no methodology of proper teaching in this case. For example, the sage Mansur in Sufi cult declared - 'Anal Haq' meaning 'I am the Allah, the great'. According to Mandan religion they say that 'Allah Ho Akbar' meaning 'the Allah is the great one' but this man has realised and declared that the great Allah is myself. So also, in Christianity there are some sentences like 'Kingdom of Heaven is within you', 'I and my father are

one', 'We live, move and have our beings within Him' etc. Recently we have seen some people like Sri J. Krishna Murthy etc., who have realised their Self in their own way due to purification of mind. But in all these cases it remains as a mystic experience of the individual one and there will be no proper methodology of teaching as is codified in Shankara's teachings of Prasthanatraya Bhashya. In this connection Shankara hints this in Mundaka introduction to 1-1-6 (i.e., at the end of 1-1-5) in connection with *Paraavidyaa* and he declares that 'Upanishad means not merely group of words but after listening the words the aspirant should, with renunciation and with the help of the teachings of the Guru, has to seek inwards and has to realise his own true nature of the Self through intuitional experience'. This realisation is called as *Paraavidyaa*. Instead of this only chanting of Upanishads is *Apara*. So, the perfect realisation of the Self will occur by employing both the means – Shabda, meaning teachings of the Guru and Shastra and the purity of mind.

* * * * *

19. Regarding the conflict between *Avachchedavaada* and *Aabhaasavaada*: (29.09.1989)

According to the commentators, as regards the reasons for the appearance of the Jivahood (soul) to the Brahman there are two kinds of opinions. The first is *Avachchedavaada* meaning Brahman is circumscribed

by the adjuncts just as the aether is circumscribed by pot, house, etc. So, by this only Brahman appears as Jiva and the *Avachcheda* or circumscription alone is enough for the appearance of the Jiva. This is the opinion of Bhaamati Prasthaana. They give illustration of Gaudapada Karikas 3-3 to 3-10. In these Karikas the *Avachchedavaada* is illustrated and so it is enough, according to them, for the appearance of *Jivatvam* in Brahman.

On the other hand, the *Vivarana Prasthaana* holds the view that only the circumscription is not good enough reason for appearance of Jivatva in Brahman but there must be the reflection of the Brahman in the *Upadhis*, i.e., *Antahkarana* and then only the Jivatva is possible. For this refer Bhashya to B.S. 2-3-50 आभास एव च. In Panchadashi it is clearly said that the reflection of the Brahman must be there in the *antahkarana* and only then the Jivatva can appear and not by mere circumscription (Panchadashi. 8-26 to 8-32). These two are the conflicting opinions raised by the commentators to the Bhashya. To prove their arguments, they quote as authorities from Bhashya and Upanishads etc., and give some reasons to prove that their stand alone is correct.

Sri Swamiji has taken up this subject in Mandukya Rahasya Vivrutih Karika 3-10, P. No. 288, 289. According to him, mistake committed by the above mentioned commentators is that they have forgotten that the two

types of illustrations are given only to teach the Brahman only. Instead of this they have taken the view that really the Brahman is circumscribed by the *Upadhis* and It has reflection in *Upadhis* etc. Thus, these two types of arguments have come forth due to their not understanding the Upanishads and the Bhashya properly. The real significance of these two illustrations has been forgotten by these commentators.

The purpose of *Avachchedavaada* is to show that the Brahman being only one without a second may appear as if it has taken various forms and that the nature of Brahman is untainted by the appearance of soulhood (*Jivatva*) and there is no taint of enjoyments or sufferings which are seen in the soul. To show this, an illustration of reflection of the sun in the water has been given. Strictly speaking as the nature of the Brahman is non-dual one there is no other thing to circumscribe the Brahman. That which appears as if it is there is only a false appearance conjured by Avidya. Those who have got the idea of multiplicity – to remove this wrong notion it is taught that the appearance of multiplicity is due to *Upadhi* alone and not in the real sense. To teach this the *Avachchedavada* is taught.

The taint of the modifications in the mind such as suffering, enjoyments etc., which appear – is not there in the Brahman just as the sun is not tainted by those on which he shines. And also, there is no real reflection of

Brahman in antahkarana because for reflection to appear the space and the adjuncts like water or mirror are required. But the nature of the Brahman is non-dual and as such there is no space or adjuncts for the reflection to take place. So, we have to take these illustrations 'as if it is reflected', 'as if it is circumscribed' etc. Shankara warns that the illustration and the illustrated should not be sought to be shown equal in all aspects but we have to take only one aspect that is sought to be conveyed to bring home the main point vide B.S.B. 3-2-20 'न हि द्रुष्टान्तदार्ष्टान्तिकयोः क्वचित् किञ्चित् विवक्षितांशं मुक्त्वा सर्वसारूप्यं केनचिद्दर्शयितुं शक्यते । सर्वसारूप्ये हि द्रुष्टान्तदार्ष्टान्तिकभावोच्छेद एव स्यात्' । The summary of this portion is 'for, as between the illustration and the thing illustrated, nobody can show equality in every respect over and above some points of similarity in some way which is sought to be presented. For, if such an all-round similarity exists, the very relation between illustration and the thing illustrated will fall through'. This has forgotten by these commentators and hence they began quarrelling with each other. Thus, there is no real conflict between these two, i.e., between *Avachchedavada* and *Pratibimbavada* but are mere illustrations used in the Upanishads to bring home certain aspects while teaching the Brahman.

* * * * *

20. Regarding Practical Vedanta as told by Ramakrishnaiats:

i) From the standpoint of a realised person there is nothing but Brahman. So *Kartrutva*, *Pramatrutva*, *Bhoktrutva* etc., are falsified by him. And the world which appears from the standpoint of sense organs and the mind is only a false appearance due to ignorance and its true nature is Brahman. So strictly speaking the truth is 'ज्ञाते द्वैतं न विद्यते' (मा.कां.1-18). This is the final truth.

ii) Though this is the thing, from the standpoint of the empirical view when we attribute a body, sense organs and the mind etc., on a realised person, from that standpoint Shastra describes his behavior in this world as it is described in *Sthitaprajna Lakshana* (G. 2-55 to 72, *Bhakta* (G. 12-13 to 20) and *Gunaateeta* (G.14-22 to 27) etc. These are natural for him and not injunctions. For example, when little children playing with mud etc., are called for taking food, they come in and start taking food even without washing their hands and feet. For them it has to be told that they have to wash their hands and feet before taking food. Thus for children, they have to be clean is an injunction. When they grow old, being clean is natural to them (and they need not be told to wash themselves as in the case of small children). For this refer to Sri Swamiji's English introduction in M.R.V. P. Nos. 96 & 97, 'The use of Vedantic knowledge'.

iii) But for Ramakrishna Mission people, they cannot understand this height of enlightenment and recently they have been building their mission as a counter to the Christian missionary. So, they have the idea that after knowing Brahman he has to serve the people or universe etc. And they hold the view that it is his duty. In one sense they argue just like *Jnana-Karma Samuchchayaavadins*. It is true that the arguments of these people will be attractive to the common man and there are some empirical benefits also which accrues. We agree with all this. But by this one should not get fad with the idea that 'I will correct this world'. According to Swamy Vivekananda also 'it is impossible to correct this world'. Shankara has also agreed with the point that the enlightened man can act in this world for the sake of well-being of the people, but he has no attachment with it and it is never an injunction to him. This he has dealt with in Bh. Gi. 3-22 to 26. Here Bhagavan Himself gives His example. 'He appeared as if he is working for the well-being of the world but from his standpoint there is never any action, or any dualistic world and he holds the view that all this is only a phenomenon and is false appearance' (Bh. Gi. Bh. 3-28).

* * * * *

This book contains the following five small books and articles on Vedanta by the author

1. Guide-Lines to Shankara Vedanta
2. Adhyatma Yoga
3. Avasthaatraya Viveka
4. Teaching of Brahman through the attributions of Avidya and Maya
5. Prospectus for Teaching GENUINE VEDANTA
6. Articles on Vedanta

All the above mentioned books except sl.no.6 were originally published separately in different contexts and places. We are now publishing them together as a single volume titled "Collected Books & Articles on Vedanta by Brahmajna Kavi Sri Devarao Kulkarni" for the convenience of readers.

Synopsis for all the above books have been separately given on the back side of the title page of each book